

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 2

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes I agree

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes I agree with the objective of reducing the use of these plastics

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I think other options should also be considered

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Criteria shouldn't include whether it can be done with existing legislation

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I think a voluntary option should be trialled first.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

I think it should be banned all at once

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I would leave out EPS packaging

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes if you want to remove contamination completely from the waste stream then this should be considered

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The costs will likely be higher to begin with but over time the benefits to the environment will be greater.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

information about how to make the right choices, more access to reuse systems

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the phase-out of all items except fruit stickers

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Better labelling

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

funding for innovation

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

5 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

you should do spot audits

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 3

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Must be done, as soon as possible.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It is one of the items I pick up regularly from the gutters, from the edge of the road from the storm drain and from the edge of the river. Some pieces are still big and there are hundreds of tiny pieces there everytime I look...

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Huge benefits for the environment.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I don't know what they are but if manufacturers can not use them, they will find an alternative way to solve their problems.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Notes

I don't know enough about these.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Unlikely in my view.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Making it compulsory to use alternative sustainable and safe options.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe,

versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Charging more for the use of these if they are not removed completely from the market. Cheaper rates for byo cups.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1 year max.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Spot checks, dob in apps, public education, incentives for young people

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 4

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The more non recyclable single use plastics removed from our waste stream and replaced with more sustainable options, the better.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If it's not mandatory then manufacturers and producers etc will continue to use the existing packaging options - there will be no driving motivation/requirement.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think a phase out period is necessary but I would be more supportive of a faster turn around deadline.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Unless appropriate recycling facilities are being invested in and actioned for the proposed excluded items then these will continue to be utilised and therefore continue to end up in landfill/the environment, and thus continue to be a long term problem.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs include funding research into development of alternative packaging options; sourcing the relevant replacement materials; ensuring that these materials are also harvested/manufactured/recycled in a SUSTAINABLE fashion, so as not to shift the burden from one aspect of the environment to another e.g. deforestation of intact primary forest for cardboard vs. utilising pre-existing waste products from primary production as a raw material source (corn husks), or alternatively establishing close loop recycling of ocean plastics. The benefits include driving innovation in the packaging and manufacturing industry; reduced burden of long-lived waste inputs will have positive health outcomes for humans, environment and wildlife; beginning stages/steps of encouraging design, development and establishment of closed loop waste stream systems between different businesses in production, processing, manufacturing, sale and logistics to support a transition to a more sustainable consumer society; education opportunity for public.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The technology or products that can be used as alternatives are already in use by businesses with a focus on environmental impact. E.g. potato starch puffs instead of polystyrene peanuts, mushroom materials instead of polystyrene packaging,

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Environmental contamination by degradation of oxoplastics into microplastics is very high

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

It's likely that there will be unforeseeable outcomes, can't guess as to those yet.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Recycling instore for credit at supermarkets works well internationally. If the products I buy regularly have options that aren't automatically wrapped in plastic e.g. meat at supermarket

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Covid is slowing progress

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Products such as biocup are available with a Ingeo lining. These would compost at a commercial composting facility. Collection receptacles to send to commercial composting facilities in high population urban areas with small tokens/coffee credits could encourage consumer behaviour to dispose of them appropriately. Subsidy/coffee discount with purchase of reusable cups. Second hand store ceramic coffee cup "swap outs" at businesses with local regulars who forget their reusable coffee cups. Increased tax on wipes with plastic, tax goes toward subsidising cost of (independently vetted) biodegradable wet wipes on the market.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Government support of alternatives so they are financially viable i.e. more cost effective to transition than to stay as is. People under financial constraints will select cheapest option available to meet their needs, plastic free alternatives need to be competitive.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I don't understand this question. Is in reference to monitoring the businesses or the governing body

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 5

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Also bread bag clips could be cardboard, or at least grade 1 or 2 Make ALL plastics in NZ only grade 1 or 2 ie yoghurt and butter containers etc are often 5's

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Happy for you to do this tomorrow, a short phase in

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Too long. Make it sooner

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

All non 1 and 2 grade disallowed

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Get rid of it, there are other options

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Saving the environment is the only factor for me

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There are plenty of alternatives if people just think laterally. And many things just don't need the high level of packaging either

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Except I wish it was sooner!

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If products we buy are in recyclable packaging. Some are unavoidable, like margarine. I make my own yoghurt, but sometimes need to buy the yoghurt new as a fresh starter (grade 5). Things like supermarket pizzas come in non 1 & 2 grades etc Also it is so hard to read the grades!!! They are tiny and so hard to see. Make them bigger on the container AND require printed grade of minimum size on the printed part of the packet. I am not old but I struggle to read these. Having it printed would help us identify and avoid "bad" plastics Make sure "compostable" items are truly (home) compostable) Make sure the whole item is home compostable ie coffee cup AND lid

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Phase out very quickly. Alternatives are available.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Get rid ASAP

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban "flushable" wipes Ban use of words like eco (greenwashing) etc on wipes that make them seem OK when they are not. Ensure single use cups are only home compostable and their lids are grade one or two only

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

One year

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

? My concern is imported stuff not meeting this code, ie things from china etc will still have bad plastics and poor packaging.

How do we stop this? But this is a GOOD start!!!

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 6

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Would be great to do it sooner

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

alternatives are probably more expensive

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

alternatives are more expensive but readily available

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

just get rid of them. people can use keep cups etc

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee

cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

very short. do it tomorrow

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 7

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

These are a significant portion of our waste and need solutions. Creating a sustainable construction industry should be a

priority.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I do not support the phase out of plastic straws. They are needed by many in the disabled community, and even an exemption system creates unnecessary and stressful barriers for accessing straws as a disabled person.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Scaling up lending schemes should be the primary option. These schemes already work effectively and make consumers own their decision to not provide their own reusable cup.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 8

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I think there needs to be an equal emphasis on education for business readiness to adapt packaging. Regulating the supply chain will be a catalyst in supporting the phasing out of hard to recycle materials

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, but simple comm's and education is necessary. For example, this submission process creates a huge barrier for people to participate in offering feedback, they need high executive functioning, high level literacy, time and energy to be involved. Business are made up of people and they will need better forms of communication than lengthy, linear processes like this.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not,

what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Same messaging around education of harmful materials. Start now with phase out.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The danger is that the market drives new alternative materials which have other harmful impacts and public don't know what to do with materials.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Most of the complexity of the issues are covered here.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Better regulations, better incentives for business, accountability for business so that the consumer is not the one having to assess all the criteria involved. Put the responsibility back up the supply chain through investment in education, regulation and incentives.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Notes

Yes that makes sense

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Incentivise businesses to serve onsite providing reusables by educating their custom base and not provide throwaway consumables. BYO cups only.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Making alternatives easy through accessibility, convenience, and education.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 -4 years.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

This is thin in content within the proposal. More thought should be put into this, otherwise much of the weighting around effectiveness will be lost. Also we need the longitudinal data to be able to draw conclusions which can influence future decision making on complex issues around waste and circular economy.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 9

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Recent research has shown that the main source of plastic pollution in the oceans comes from car tires. I submit that the government should address this issue also.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

single use coffee cups should be banned asap.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 10

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Sustainable alternatives. Strict packaging rules to eliminate greenwashing

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on available alternatives, some should be immediate and some longer term

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12mths, as per shopping bags (ie this short timeframes worked)

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

As per shopping bags

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 11

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Please add disposable coffee cups to the list

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Please add disposable coffee cups to the list

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Can we do it more quickly? Thanks

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Let's move away from all difficult to recycle packaging

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

It will cost businesses initially, but they will find alternative products

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Making it more mainstream - I already do a lot to reduce waste, and only generate 1 bag of rubbish to landfill every 6 months. But I work hard to do this, and I don't buy loads of cheap products from shops like Kmart or the Warehouse

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Please add disposable coffee cups

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Home compostable products are available. Or encourage people to use proper cups and flannels instead of wipes

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Via local councils for registered food premises

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 13

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes, Eugenie Sage's "Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment" policy is a great start. I also support Thumbs Up New Zealand's recycling transparent food and drink packaging campaign.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Mandatory is a must.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, there are several suitable alternatives to PVC and hard polystyrene on the market.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging includes reducing the volume of waste going into the oceans and landfill and reducing the number of animals dying of plastic consumption. I believe immediate reduction of plastic waste is essential to safeguard our planet.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

I do not sell oxo-degradable plastics. But there is no guarantee that oxo-degradable plastics will fragment and microbes will consume the remaining plastic fragments.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I believe the benefits will outweigh the costs, especially long-term. Building recycling infrastructure in New Zealand is an excellent idea too.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I am already onboard. I have been working towards minimising my personal impact for several years, which I share on SEA SOCIETY.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I strongly agree single-use plastic products should be phased out, as there are reusable alternatives.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Notes

Yes, Table 7: Single-use plastic items to consider for phase-out makes sense and I agree with the phasing out of the listed seven products.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Considering the costs, up to two years. Because of the volume of plastic produced annually, I would like to see the policy implemented as soon as possible.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Enforcing cafes to use compostable certified coffee cups and encouraging the public to use reusable coffee cups.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Up to two years.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

1: Penalizing companies and individuals that are not adhering to the policy. 2: Publicly endorsing companies that sell reusable alternatives. 3: Educating children further about the dangers of plastic pollution. 4: Educating the public about easy sustainable practices.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 14

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Ideally the timeframe would be sooner unless industry and government experts have identified that 2023 and 2025 are the earliest dates for these products to feasibly be phased out.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Absolutely, all forms of these materials contribute to global pollution so manufacturers must be forced to develop alternative sustainable options.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Most probably highly likely that there will be unforeseen costs associated due to the complex nature of manufacturing and supply/demand, affordability and availability of alternatives; likewise, highly likely that there will be unforeseen environmental benefits to the phase out during and post-implementation.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Plain and simple: legislation and availability. If manufacturers are forced to eliminate polluting materials from their packaging and the consumer has choices to avoid unsustainable packaging then this is the option that will be taken. Right now it is difficult to completely eliminate plastic packaging from the waste stream due to lack of options to select a greener alternative.

Manufacturers must be forced to adapt for the good of the environment whether it increases their costs or not. Unfortunately there must be a consumer cost to transition away from cheap throwaway plastic and improving our environment. Luckily this can be thought of as an investment in the planet's future and a remedy of past ignorance.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Include the other items discussed on p.50 of the consultation document as posing unacceptable environmental harm e.g. glitter is harmful so just ban it regardless of whether there are environmentally friendly alternatives or not. Microbeads were banned outright and they actually have alternative exfoliating substances. Plastic tea bags are another item which need mandatory phase out, there are already alternatives for these. Cigarette manufacturers need to be forced to transition away from plastic containing filters with the costs absorbed 100% by smokers - another excellent way of forcing the population to abandon this highly anti social and public health costing activity.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Alternative products are already in production for all of these single use items however, 2 years would be an appropriate time frame to allow industry to scale up supply to fully replace the single use plastics. Manufacturers may see this as impossibly short timeframe but they will take every minute given to them if allowed to drag their feet until a solution becomes mandatory.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

To-go cups if people have to take it away from the supplier. People thought they couldn't do without plastic supermarket bags until they were forced to bring their own bags. Now it is the new normal. Same thing with wet wipes containing plastic. Eliminate them and people won't miss them, the majority of consumers have no clue items such as wet wipes and tea bags can even contain plastic but would avoid them if armed with this knowledge.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years but given how slow legislation moves through the system, 3 years maybe more realistic (I wouldn't consider any longer appropriate even if reality dictates drafting legislation is far slower than anybody imagines).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

To reduce the need for multiple inspections and creating a separate plastic compliance team, perhaps compliance could be incorporated in the regular health inspections that food and beverage outlets must undergo to obtain their environmental health certificate.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 15

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Please phase out faster, these are a menace particularly polystyrene packaging

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Do it sooner, reap the benefits, producers will adjust , they have in other countries E.g. replacing polystyrene with corrugated cardboard packaging

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Sooner would be even better

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Unlikely

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Ban it, take it out of circulation people will adjust fine

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Sooner the better

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

People will adjust easily, just do it as soon as possible

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban both, people are lazy

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

6 months , sooner the better, they won't be missed

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Spot checks & heavy fines for selling / using

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 16

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The overall goal should be to eliminate non-biodegradable waste. Steel, aluminium and glass can be recycled. Plastic is always degraded to some extent meaning that 100% recycling is unachievable. Natural fibres and materials like wood can be biodegraded and "recycled" by nature. Packaging should never be made out of plastic.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

It should be quicker.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

All single use plastic packaging.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and

beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Be aware that some vendors may start to offer "reusable" cups at such a low price that makes them effectively disposable.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 17

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 18

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I would rather it be done quicker. Tiptoeing around the issue will leave it vulnerable to rejection by an election that sees the opposition elected.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Plastic is a blight on our society.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Immeasurable, when you consider future generations and their environments wellbeing. While there will be teething pains in regard to retail costs, it's either that or die clogged with plastic.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Immediate costs? Yeah, a bit rough. But in the long run? We save the world.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Literally just do it. Do it now.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe,

versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Reusable coffee cups, you dingle. Invest in washing machines.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Now. Do it now. Right now. Let's go.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

If the government don't follow through with it cut off their funding in other departments.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 19

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Please add in single use Candy and Gum Dispensers. le pezz or mentos containers, Also add Mixed or Hidden EPS Packaging

le: eps hidden inside cardboard or accepted Plastic layers

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Please add in single use Candy and Gum Dispensers. le pezz or mentos containers, Also add Mixed or Hidden EPS Packaging
le: eps hidden inside cardboard or accepted Plastic layers

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs # Costs being past on to customers - happens now but business will use it as a tool to get the public to disagree or submit no to the Changes Benefits # Less litter for Volunteers like myself to Collect as the replacements would have a value or be wanted by circular system # The Public would be able to put everything in a recycle bin anywhere in nz knowing it will be recycled

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

A lot of Company's are already changing

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

-

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Not sure

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If they were in Place, Cheaper and instead of the current types or packaging.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Making them a more costly Last option as in add a tax of a \$1 per cup. ie: coffee is \$5 you use a swap or keep cup cost is \$5 if you get a single use cup because your lazy or don't have one cost is \$6 Tax then gets used to set a a recycling system or more composting plants

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

-

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2023 or sooner

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Company report changes, # Public log a complaint to be investigate

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 20

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Plastic that cant be recycled must be phased out

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

We will adapt and use other means there are plenty of options over plastic, its not as if this is a problem that is unsolvable. We just will use other materials instead. We just need to make sure it doesnt put a strain on the demand for the other materials. Eg paper and wood and bioplastics. These still require land to grow these. We dont want a palm oil situation to arise because if the use of other materials. Plastic should be recyclable and recycled. Then is isnt a problem. But single use items shouldnt be plastic.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The alternatives are already in use, there are many

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

It depends. If we had all plastic able to be recycled in NZ we wouldnt need to use alternatives would we. It could be endlessly used and reused as it gets recycled. We just need the systems. But since we dont we must ban in the mean time and reduce use instead. Plastic will still be around.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I already offer a refullinservice in my businessna d I use bioplastics when it is available to purchase. I am a retailer. At home I prefer not to use plastic as it leaches into food amd has hazardous effects on health. Plastics shouldnt be used in food packaging due to health concerns.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

2 years allows business to plan and adapt.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet

wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Bring your own or dine in. Why does take away need to be a thing?

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 21

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Huge benefit to environment. Food would need to be packaged differently

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There is a lot we don't know

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Not hard - just have to think about things a little more

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Much consideration needs to be given to NZ manufacturers - they need time and money to diversify

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Need to be phased out

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please

provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I do not have the knowledge to know the cost to NZ manufacturers - their futures must be taken into consideration

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 22

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The objectives are profoundly beneficial to the environment, citizens, and industry. They are easily achievable, and they have no negative impact on environment or citizens. The negative industry impact is less important, and at worst will incur easily manageable expense changes in the short term only while businesses transition from non-sustainable and destructive materials to sustainable ones. International retail often comes with polystyrene packaging and other non recyclable materials. Future policy improvements of this type could address this source of these materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

A mandatory phase-out is achievable, realistic, and beneficial to everyone. No reason exists not to do so. So we should.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This timeline seems excessively long. A phaseout by 1 December 2020 would be more appropriate.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

These destructive materials are not necessary for any purpose. Superior sustainable alternatives exist, and should be used in all cases instead. This benefits the preservation of our environment and everyone in it.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The key high-level benefit is to provide a starting point for eliminating all unsustainable materials from use in this country, as is a mandatory requirement for this country to have a future. The costs of doing so are irrelevant. They also happen to be minor, and easily absorbed by businesses making the switch to sustainable materials.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. And improvements to them can (and will) be developed easily, which will generate economic benefits when commercialised.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Your analysis is correct.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The only requirement from a consumer level is for the materials to not be included in the items we buy. That is a primary problem for consumers at present, and needs to be removed from the supply chain entirely, to ensure our purchasing can be ethical and non-destructive.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest

other options.

Notes

Flushable, biodegradable wet wipes instead of plastic-containing-wet wipes. That's an obvious solution from a consumer, commercial, and environmental perspective. Compostable plastic coffee cup lids, and compostable coffee cups. Done.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

One with immediate effect.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Mandatory, minimum annual, government audits of manufacturers without notice (to prevent fraud). Recycling plant continuous reviews and analysis (to identify problem areas and problematic products) for strategic planning.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 23

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Needs to be more aggressive

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Needs to be sooner.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

A study needs to happen before 2025

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Should happen sooner

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

A more robust culture of plastics reduction, and bulk food buying

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Why not include disposable coffee cups?

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

6-12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 24

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I have not seen any comment or consideration given to compound packaging and the problems resulting from: non water solvable adhesive on bottle labels, security rings on PET or milk bottles and how they reduce the value of otherwise clean high value recyclable materials.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Missing for me is a focus on producer responsibility for the entire produce life cycle. I.e. the company bringing a soft drink bottle into the market, must also take responsibility of its disposal.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Avoidance is to be priority 1

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There are really good options using paper pulp products, products that can be made locally from recycled paper

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

This is the best place I found for this comment: The options considered still assume that the cost of disposal is largely worn by the tax or rate payer at the end of the product's life cycle. This is fundamentally wrong as it will not change purchase behaviour but result in higher disposal fees and therefore illegal road side dumping of rubbish. Disposal cost must be collected at the point of sale and the producer be put in charge of the disposal process. As per "Gruener Punkt" in Germany

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

disposal cost of packaging needs to be collected at the point of sale and in the case of single use coffee cups priced and charged separately. That way consumers are aware and reminded of the cost of their choice

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 25

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

I think it all should go. New options will come out of it. We existed for a long time without these items, we can do it again now that there is a need and paradigm shift.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

New industries and technologies would develop - more sustainable ones.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If not now, they would develop with the need.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

I don't manufacture, etc these plastics but know new options would be developed with the need. You don't keep doing the same thing just because that's what's always been done.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

This is a thorough and well thought out proposal. It just needs to happen. Period.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I don't believe the costs is the main issue, how do you quantify the state of the environment for our children and grandchildren? The benefits will evolve, I believe, with new industries and technologies developing.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

We already do this, it is not hard to do.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

We need to stop dragging our feet and just get it done. Many businesses are already starting to use sustainable options.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban them. Or develop fully sustainable options.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Start now. Take 6 to 12 months for complete phase out.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A government body set up to monitor it? Part of the environmental protection division? Or nothing. Goodwill. Once the mindset begins to shift, things will change more rapidly and it will become the new normal. It starts with businesses and government, I believe. That's where the focus needs to be. Things will change from that. The public has already demonstrated their desire for change on this front.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 26

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with content of the stages, but think the timeline for stage 1 should be accelerated and come in to force from the start of 2022. The alternative products are already there, so it is simply a matter of changing supplier/product for food/beverage vendors. The suggested timeline for stage 2 I agree with.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I feel the environmental benefit has been underestimated. Positive effects for biodiversity and animal welfare are not included.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

As a normal consumer, the phasing out as suggested will facilitate the move away. When purchasing most products that come in plastic, there is no option to choose which type of plastic packaging you will receive.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I'm a little confused about the implication of "does not include disposable coffee cups and their lids" - does that mean they are exempt? or just not captured by the description? (which would be confusing, as my assumption would be that they come under 'paper cups with plastic or wax lining')

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Alternatives to all relevant products are already available. 12 months gives businesses a chance to use up current stock before moving to alternatives. Changes such as these have been hinted at and encouraged for years.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest

other options.

Notes

Single-use coffee cups (with plastic lining): - Set a phase-out date between now and 2025 that takes into account the feasibility of supply. - and invest in innovation and scaling up production of non-plastic alternatives with the goal of meeting supply requirement by the phase out date. Wet wipes that contain plastic: - Set a phase-out date between now and 2025 that takes into account the feasibility of supply. - in the meantime, mandating that labels include a clear and obvious 'do not flush' message, and information to highlight that the wipes contain plastic

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

By 2025 at the latest. Alternative products already exist, but would need to be scaled up.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Again, I think the environmental benefits are understated.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

- Investigating community reports of non-compliance - Responding to media reports of non-compliance - Checking suppliers of these products are only supplying compliant products

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 27

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 29

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

You just need to break the habit - the world worked fine before plastic, it will work better going forward without these troublesome to recycle (if at all) plastics.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

While I understand folks across all areas, manufacture to consumer, will need time to adjust and find alternatives, I'd LOVE this all to be done and dusted by 2023. Sooner is better!

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Probably some stuff I'm not aware of being problematic.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All gone sooner = happier planet sooner

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

I think you need to focus on the BENEFITS over the cost. Cost to convenience and the bottom line should not take precedence over the benefit to humans, animals, and our environment.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

People are smart - surely they can do better?

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Seriously: public education cannot hurt for this. Education about supply chains, food origin, all that really needs to be ramped up and considered in a world where globalization means huge delays with things like Covid19 occur. NZ being more self sufficient is a good thing. People being more aware of the effect they have on the world is a good thing.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

My partner doesn't like the cost of the stainless steel containers I've recently bought to replace the Sistema ones we've had and that eventually warp/break/lose pieces - encouraging and promoting manufacture alongside recycling here at home could help that.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I am simply boggled that these are things considered essential by anyone.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

You could allow folks to use up the supplies they have but after than NO MORE.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Why the hell do wipes need plastic? That has always weirded me out.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Our coffee shop discounts for your own cup, and sells reusable ones as well. There is a scheme in Nelson to swap a cup, but as we just got new owners right after Lockdown, I'm not sure they are aware of it - I'll be mentioning it to them this week.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Wet wipes: as soon as in country supplies are GONE. Same with plastic line disposable coffee cups.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 30

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I would like it to be phased out much quicker. What will happen to all the PVC and polystyrene packaging over the next 3 to 5 years?

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We must use an alternative.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

It may cost more money but the health benefits for the planet and all that live on it will eventually save money.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Sooner the better

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Make refillable more available to bring prices down.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Have compostable coffee cups and collection points where they can be collected and composted properly. Wet wipes made out of bamboo or other natural material. If ones with plastic are banned then people have to use alternatives or go without.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Not sure but we just need to get on with it!

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 31

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Include an additional objective to increase knowledge and understanding in the public where plastic has its place and where it hasn't, by ongoing educational campaigns delivered by councils, waste management providers and MfE

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Given that alternatives are available today, and that some businesses have already started moving away from PVC and polystyrene, I'd like to see the stages brought forward to July 2022 and July 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Many non-food items are packaged in transparent hard plastic boxes or shells, often with a cardboard backing. The primary reason for that seems to be to be able to view the item in its packaging. This can easily be replaced by clear labelling or printing on the outside of sustainable packaging, e.g. a closed cardboard box, thus PVC and hard polystyrene packaging for non-food items should be included in the phase-out

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits would be a consistent approach to these types of plastics, and further reduction of plastic packaging used solely for convenience or marketing purposes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Where PET, HDPE or PP aren't suitable alternatives, a different approach has to be taken, e.g. using a non-plastic material, or changing the way an item is packaged

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

In line with my answer to question 6 I'd like to see this brought forward to July 2022

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

A comprehensive strategy to promote and prefer reusable items wherever possible, and to provide more opportunities to buy in bulk using own containers (may require switching back to a more serviced business model, rather than customer self-service and pre-packaging)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Given the success of the plastic bag ban, which many businesses fully implemented well before the ban deadline was reached, a more aggressive timeframe is justified. All items are either easy to replace with their alternatives or to avoid altogether

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Single-use coffee cups should be included in the list. There are already considerable shifts underway towards using keep-cups. Wet wipes have unfortunately become a real menace, no matter if they contain plastic or not. I would favour a complete ban of all wet wipes. They are a genuine convenience item that we can easily do without.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

A maximum of 24 months for single-use coffee cups (allowing them another year for the phase-out, compared to the other items covered by my answer to question 18), and a complete ban of all wet wipes by July 2022, in line with my answers to questions 6 and 11

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

In addition to the proposed CME tools, an online reporting tool should be provided to the public, to report non-compliant behaviour and provide photographic evidence. This should trigger an educational approach in the first instance, followed by enforcement actions for repeat offenders, similar to the approach taken for Covid-19 lockdown violations.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 32

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I would like to see an early replacement of large amounts of polystyrene packaging. This could at least be returnable to the retailer as a disincentive, or stockpiled so that a recycling business would become viable. It is not difficult to replace this kind of packing with card or other alternatives

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

see answer to 6.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

see answer to 6 above

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Cost in landfill space and environment. Potential to recycle in the building industry? Have we scoped how much is being used and facilitated collection?

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Being able to put it into council recycling systems; or to take large polystyrene pieces to a collection point. Compulsory re-acceptance by retailers, and labelling with type of packaging used e.g on electronics, whiteware

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I have a disabled friend who needs straws to drink. To buy these from a pharmacy would be difficult and probably much more expensive. Most severely disabled folk are on tiny sickness benefits.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

There appear to be compostable alternatives for coffee cups. Don't use wet wipes or label if contain plastic. They also cost when people try to flush them away.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

N/A

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Return to retailer would be an effective control- used in Germany

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 33

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All are a problem and we need to get it sorted and rid of it

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Better environmentally

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Hopefully people will be more safe if the environment

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Other alternatives

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 34

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

There are many reusable options and return cup schemes running currently that should include the phase out of single use coffee cups within 5 years

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

There are already ample options available to companies, this movement should be phased in quicker with a time frame of 2021 with full implementation by 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Polystyrene white-ware packaging should also be phased out as there are cardboard alternatives.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All plastic contributes to waste within the environment. We have an ever decreasing timeframe to make a meaningful difference to the environment and the damage caused by single use plastic. All packaging across the board, homewares, electronics, white-ware and food packaging that uses pvc or polystyrene should be included in the phase out

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Initially there will be product development costs but these are far less than the social, environmental and generational cost of a degraded, unsustainable environment that is polluted with plastics from oil companies

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

For a product that will never breakdown in our life time, associating a small increase in cost to the benefit of removing plastic all together is untenable. The cost of not doing anything is far greater than changes in RnD to develop sustainable alternatives

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Companies being forced in the direction of change needed, companies aren't moving fast enough even with demand and action by consumers, there seems to be a very long lag time to any change with plastic packaging. More options and reusable/refillable supply chain should be constructed in NZ

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

There are many options for reusable coffee cups and for return scheme cups that are running within the country. Single use coffee cups are not needed

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months. Bold, aggressive action is needed to clean up our environment.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Consumers are demanding change, provide an easy way for consumers to do in non-compliance and provide follow up /fines for non-compliance

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 35

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I guess I was hoping you/we could do more

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

It would be nice to do more but this is a good start

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

It would be nice to do more but this is a good start

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

It would be nice to do more but this is a good start

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

It would be nice to do more but this is a good start

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefit - Healthier world Costs - Some people didn't want to stop slavery as it would cost more to produce goods but that didn't make it right either.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Not having then in the first place

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I guess people could just stop using them

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

ASAP

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 36

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Would like to see other plastics and uses expanded in the future, an outlined staged approach

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Would like to see this expanded in the near future

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Would that include PVC piping and products?

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Businesses having to change stock, or manufactures processes/machinery

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Multi layered polypropylene, copper piping, pop starch, wave starch packaging, egg carton style packaging

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ceramic, keep cups, Again and Again, BYO mug, Stainless steel subsidise purchase and get a discount of refill. Ban wet wipes. use a cloth like we always have

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months to 2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 37

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Please design with accessibility and inclusion in mind.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Because food and beverage is only one part of the equation. If we want to be serious about making change we need to consider packaging across industries.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less of this packaging would stop filling our landfills, stopping chemicals leeching into the ground, reducing pollution and contributions to climate change.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Target supermarkets to have refillery options, more sustainable packaging and bring your own container (expanding to butchery especially)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Coffee cups should be included. These are key to changing behaviours around single-use items. Reuse schemes should be funded and supported.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

A year is enough time to change behaviours, think of the timeframe with single use plastic bags.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Support and fund reuse schemes

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months or less, single use plastic bags took 6 months, even less.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 38

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Mandatory phase out is the way to go! If you give people an option (ex many stores give a paper option for produce bags right now), but keep plastic available, you can rely on many people always choosing that because it's easier and what they're used to. If you make it a mandatory ban people will groan for a short time but quickly adjust and realize that their life isn't significantly affected.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Such a drawn out timeline is unnecessary. This is a change which has been talked about for years, and other countries have been seen to implement these rules to great effect. This announcement will not come as a shock to anyone, and requires no real lifestyle changes in the public; as such, there is no need to gradually inch regulations in. This will only waste time and materials in a problem which has a relatively easy fix that is already available. Phase out plastics ASAP (1-2 year max). If you are serious about change then you should make this a focus and pinpoint management resources to get the job done; there is simply no good excuse to drag this process out for 5 years.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

The harms of such packaging is well researched and widely known. If you are already introducing change, then why not take a hardline approach so that you can have a real effect? Plastic use has gone on for far too long already, and it is time we ditched it and started using some of the many available alternatives. Ban it all and be done with it for good.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

You have outlined the benefits well in your proposal. While there will be members of the public who grumble at first, they can and will adapt and you will find growing support once people realize how easy it is to get by without these harmful materials.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes but sooner!!! As mentioned above, this is not a new concept and there is no reason to wait. Act NOW.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

There is always more than can be added though. Several fruits and vegetables come pre-packaged in plastic, which would not be captured under the produce bag ban. For example: lettuce, mandarins, limes; these are a few I have noticed that is difficult to get without plastic. Additionally, many types of juice and non-dairy milk comes in non-recyclable tetra-pak containers. This type of packaging should also be addressed. Finally, I think disposable coffee cups should be included in the ban.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

This is not a new concept that would need time for the public to understand and prepare for. A long time frame is unnecessary and does not communicate the urgency of the issue. This can and should be done without delay. If Britain can phase out non-

electric cars by 2035 (with hopes for sooner), we can surely phase out unnecessary plastic in 1 or 2 years. The alternative options are already readily available and being used by many businesses, so there is no excuse to keep such harmful single use plastics in circulation. Stop production today and ban selling once supply runs out. Help production companies transfer into the production of compostable options, and let us move forward.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

For wet wipes I feel it is important to acknowledge the increase in use due to COVID. This should be encouraged, and suggest liquid hand sanitizer instead. Though this still comes in plastic, at least the bottles can be re-used and recycled. There is no need for the wet wipe style, and these should be banned immediately. As mentioned in the proposal, cloth wipes are an existing alternative but when people have the option for the wipes, even with proper labelling, they will continue to choose these as they are easy and convenient. Society has become addicted to convenience and the only way to change is from the top down. It starts with you. Don't waste time.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1-2 years, no longer. Start now. This is a crisis and should be treated as such.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 39

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Sooner should all be complete by 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Paper bags and cardboard type compost boxes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 40

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

This proposal becoming reality will make it easier for me and my family

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 41

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I believe there should be a broader policy to set a national recycling standard across all councils, with all single-use food packaging manufacturers required to adhere to that standard. For example, most margarine, yoghurt, containers go to landfill...

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

As above, I think this could be broader with government funding for alternative packaging innovation.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

I believe there are enough natural product alternatives now.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

There will be a small cost to consumers. This could be offset by NZ becoming a world leader in sustainable packaging alternatives. A potential trillion dollar industry.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

3 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Biodegradable lining? Use of a cup is finished within 20 minutes of purchase! Why does a wet wipe need to contain plastic at

all?

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Ban the sale of such items in New Zealand. Most operators are public-facing businesses and as seen when single-use bags were phased out the media is alerted to breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 43

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We need to act decisively and comprehensively. The time for compromise is gone.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

I can't speak for the costs, no doubt as a consumer there will be costs, and that's ok. The benefits are less waste and less pollution for future communities to deal with.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Everything can be replaced, they just cost. We need to face that cost, because at present we're just deferring cost to future generations.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Just make it an option, promote that the packaging is reusable / recyclable. I'll choose it in preference.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Do it tomorrow.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

It's not hard to take a reusable cup with you; it's not hard to use a reusable cloth. They are not essentials. Put a fee on every such item, with that fee going to environmental restoration.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

As soon as possible. One year?

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 44

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We need to act as soon as possible, no more delays!

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Don't know costs. Benefits - less waste and pollution to be dealt with.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Cardboard - explore greener options

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Make it more available, at the moment there isn't always a choice... happy to pay another 10c for better option for example.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Love to see it happen asap

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

or faster!

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Education. These didn't used to exist so we need to go back to how we did things before they existed. Have a penalty or fee on using them to discourage others. Ban wet wipes and educate people to take a cup or cloth with them.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Asap! 1 year?

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 45

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 46

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2-3 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 48

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Stage 1 could include all PVC and PS food and beverage packaging, since it's mostly being done in stage 1 anyway. The 2 year period in between is likely to cause businesses to rely on PS until it is phased out, rather than seeking alternative options. A 'cold turkey' approach forces all businesses to look at alternative options - which do exist, so a 2 year period to provide for this isn't necessary, especially since the proposed implementation isn't until 2023 (which already gives businesses 3 years to start considering alternatives).

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not,

what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If there are sustainable alternatives suitable for the purposes of packaging, then yes I support phasing out all plastic packaging. Some exceptions may include for medical purposes.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

For my family, I think it would help if reusables were featured more in media (tv, advertisements, etc.) to normalise this.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

The table should include phasing out the additional items: -all plastic bags (despite the thickness) -single use coffee cups, doesn't make sense to specifically exclude this -plastic bread tags (alternatives include heat sealing bread, compostable stickers, tying with string)

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Remove "Note: does not include disposable coffee cups and their lids" from single use cup definition. This shouldn't be an exclusion and is clearly single use.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Phasing out plastic bags didn't take a year. While it's more items being phased out, alternatives already exist.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Including these items in the phasing out approach forces people to look at other options, as opposed to now people tend to take the road of convenience by choosing single use when alternatives already exist. In considering the options discussed in the document: -a survey could be conducted with cafes that offer cup lending schemes to see how many people actually choose to borrow a cup over choosing single use. My belief is that people opt for the cheaper, convenient choice and more often than not, the cup lending scheme is overlooked. -Production of non-plastic alternatives (i.e. paper) still results in the cup going to landfill and enables 'throwaway' culture. -while public education campaigns on reusables are uncommon, existing campaigns such as recycling are generally unsuccessful. Using Auckland as an example, the council has promoted how to recycle correctly on an annual basis and the amount of recyclable materials sent to landfill has been increasing year by year. Public campaigns don't tend to work when a majority of the public value convenience over the environment. -the fourth option already notes the current logistical and technical challenges, so I don't need to elaborate there. Phasing out would likely be simpler!

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months, same as above.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 49

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

New Zealand are taking far too long to deal with all plastics. Why allow plastics to be made that cannot be recycled. Totally irresponsible

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Plastics should have been an issue years ago, especially when only 1 and 2 can be recycled!!!

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We are a small country and so have and have had enormous power to stop single and hard to recycle plastics. Too late too little!!!

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I can't find the specific details that are proposed - need more clarity and ownership of the problem

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

This is not clear - not laid out in a simple and clear form that I can find

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Too little too late!!

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

All plastic that cannot be recycled should not be made in NZ

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

2025 is far too long a timeline. Iceland did it very fast

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Should be no more than a 1 year timeline for these

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

There is no information about the environmental costs

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The invisible costs of plastic have not been identified - Nor are there proposals to remove plastic from our ocean and environment

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The availability of non-plastic items - which would come if all plastics were made illegal

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Before 2022

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

make them illegal - environmental education adverts on TV

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months - its been talked about for years!

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Need environmental statistics as well as business and individuals costs

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Including experienced people with a scientific/environmental background - with huge backup of existing research and experience worldwide e.g. Iceland, Sweden, Germany

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 50

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Delaying this phase out across two stages is too much of a delay. The environmental threats posed by these types of plastics mean we need to move as quickly as possible to remove them as quickly as possible. With the correct messaging and planning, this should be possible by 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We need to cast the net wider and

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

The environmental threats posed by these types of plastics mean we need to move as quickly as possible to remove these types of plastics as quickly as possible.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Negligible in relation to the costs to the environment and wildlife posed by continued use of these products.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

It's heartening to see that you're already considering what the ban could mean in terms of people transitioning to other hard to recycle materials. This, of course, would be highly undesirable and should remain at the forefront of the decision making process.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

It's important that alternatives aren't prohibitively expensive.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree that single-use plastics should be phased-out, but we should not stop at just the items on this list. If a plastic product can only be used once, it shouldn't be produced at all - at this stage, viable alternatives exist. The negative impacts on wildlife and the planet are too great.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Plastic cups should include plastic coffee cups and their lids - this common item shouldn't be freely available given the viable alternatives that exist.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Each item should be phased out as soon as possible, with the emphasis being on speed rather than convenience. A blanket rule for all items isn't desirable if some can move faster than others.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

They should be included in the ban. There are viable alternatives to these products, and encouraging people to use these alternatives on a voluntary basis doesn't go far enough, given the damage they cause.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Cheap and easy access to raw material alternatives to plastic + government incentives to making this transition as quickly as possible.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

These should be included in the proposed ban, along with the other items. Therefore, as per my earlier answer, this should be done as soon as possible, with an emphasis on speed over convenience.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Fines are an appropriate way to ensure businesses adhere to these rules. Please note, I don't want any of my responses to any questions published on the Ministry for the Environment's website.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 51

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Industries will always lobby to avoid change (the tobacco approach...) however the mandatory approach is the best way to counter that.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Like the lady says, "Go hard and go fast".....

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes
Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If the plastic industry are to change anything, they probably should change all at once however as the document says, some will be difficult to replace quickly. The industry should however be 'on notice' that change will have to come about.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The costs are nothing compared to the benefits. Stop the handwringing and get on with it.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The packaging industry will find the solutions in the same manner that they went away from cardboard etc. to plastics in the first place. If they can't then someone else will come up with smarter solutions. The Tesla car is a prime example.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Every step we make is a benefit and the best way to check is to compare the packaging materials of say the 1930's with today and then compare the overall environment of those times.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Mandatory regulations.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Two years max. Public pressure will push the manufacturers to beat that target anyway. Supermarket bags are a good example.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Wet wipes with plastic or other 'longlife' ingredients should be banned by the end of 2021.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Don't muck around. Ban them by the end of 2021.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The domestic market have to be trusted to conform. It will be imported products that will be tricky to monitor.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 52

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Sooner please.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

but essential to include plastic covering of posted magazines.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

far too much of this goes to landfill

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

reduction of stuff to landfills

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Having alternatives available.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 53

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There are alternatives to using these materials so there is no real justification for their continued use in any form of packaging.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 54

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We gave to stop using plastics as much as possible except for long life, high value products.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

No plastics should wind up in landfill within ten years. If so, they should be made of a different product.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

A few changeover costs to industrial users. Lots of sales from plastics manufacturers.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

There used to be alternatives. Bring them back!

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Positive outcomes likely

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

We've already moved away as much as possible.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Support research and investment

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Various existing options

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

These costs and benefits are always approximate. The benefit is priceless, definitely worth the investment

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

With a national compliance officer

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 55

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 56

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Not until we have a broader understanding of the implications of getting rid of them and how prevalent they are in the environment.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

A simplified easier to understand recycling system.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

All options for coffee cups should be implemented and upscaled. Get rid of wet wipes, plenty of alternatives.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Random inspections across 5-10% of the market

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 57

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Easier to phase out all in one go

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Culture change in terms of waste, possibly more costs for businesses to replace packaging with alternatives which may come to the consumer. Unless business encourages consumers to bring their own containers

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Culture- it becomes accepted to bring your own containers to fill (no judgement given or perceived from others by doing this)
Items that come in these containers- are other brands using different more recyclable/reusable containers

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Cup cycling, reusable cups, encouraging consumers to drink coffee in store using a mug. Ban plastic as an ingredient of wet wipes.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

5 years

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 58

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The problems are not only with recycling but end of life solutions

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

There is an overall assumption that once a product is recycled into a new product it is going to last a very long time in its new form and function. This is a dangerous assumption to base the whole premise on. The end markets in New Zealand for recycled plastic products is finite and as the volume of new plastics streams entering NZ every year exponentially grows we quite simply have neither the recycling capacity or the market size to sell recycled products to. There needs to be as more focus on the end of life solutions for waste plastics, otherwise you are merely moving the goalposts by a few years and we will be totally swamped with plastic. I see ZERO discussion in the proposal anywhere about a pathway that needs to be set for End of Life disposal of plastics. This needs to be considered in conjunction with bans, and recycling capacity in NZ or it is all a waste of time and effort. As data shows in 2018 in excess of 575,000 tonnes of resin made its way to NZ, not to mention the imported made up product and packaging, an End of Life solution is as paramount as banning single use products. You mention Pyrolysis for Tyres, why not the same for Plastics. This technology has been commercialised internationally for many years, but does not rate a mention in the plastics section of Waste stream priorities.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Once again, with the proper waste end of life guidelines these could be managed with a well set up product stewardship scheme. Again, No consideration is given to this option of Pyrolysis.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Its too far out. Be bold. Go Early and go hard. Precedent has been set here recently for this 'policy', even if it is illegal.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe,

versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 59

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I would like to see a much wider range of plastics considered for phase out, along with realisation of a sustainable recycling system for NZ

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I wonder like to see a much broader range considered.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Monitoring compliance of overseas suppliers is going to be very difficult, however this could be done through random audit type systems, aligned with a biosecurity type approach.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 61

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

It should be strictly done in one stage - by 2023 - with big campaigns over it , only once. if we have two stages, the first stage might not be taken seriously.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

yes, as soon as there are exceptions, people will get confused and 'education' campaign will be more expensive.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Initially, replacement materials might cost a bit more. Benefits are initial education for New Zealand people, they will start climbing the ladder; and of course, the environment - fisheries, agriculture and so on.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

there shouldn't be supply - or suppliers should have more tax. Hence, price point can go up a bit and reusable items which are normally more expensive, could compete.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Period products that are re-usable should have better position on the shelves and govt push - through tax. The average user throws away an astonishing 125 to 150kg of tampons, pads and applicators in their lifetime.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

easily replaceable plastic items such as plastic cutlery should be banned quickly. within a year. Not easily replaceable items such as period products, we should have a longer time frame so suppliers work on better alternatives.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

re-usable cups - same as re-usable bags. Pay extra \$1 for a coffee cup if you don't have a reusable cup. Same as grocery bags. Wet wipes should be replaced by 100% biodegradable material such as paper or bamboo.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

products shouldn't be allowed for sale - products shouldn't be available to be purchased on the market. Compliance person searches for supply of these products every month. Penalty applies.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 62

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

we could act faster!

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 63

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Can the time frames be faster. People can change quickly when they have to. There is no point giving 3-5 years as people do little to prepare until it is imminent. So go for 2022 and 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If it is not phased, it will keep being made.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Cost: Stress of having to change. Benefit: less plastic in the world!

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

The phase-out is too slow, otherwise I agree.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 64

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

It's unclear to me whether this ban includes imported products. I would like to see the ban include these imported plastics as well.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased education and promotion of alternatives and stories about those making shifts from hard-to-recycle plastics. I will always prefer to buy from eco-conscious producers and will pay more for those products

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

A move away from these plastics should come as no surprise to industry and a 12 month transition is more than fair and demonstrates the seriousness of the issue.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

investment to scale up reuse systems like cup-lending schemes Again Again and Cupcycling. public education campaigns to promote reusable alternatives. a product stewardship approach – for example; in Europe producers will have to cover the cost of waste management, data gathering, and education and awareness associated with wet wipes from 31 December 2024⁵⁷. public education campaigns to encourage reduction in use and appropriate disposal

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 65

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Cup library systems eg again again, cafes to sell reusable cups. Wet wipes- use a bidet, or compostable wet wipes.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 67

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Needs to be part of a wider, long term effort to ban & find alternatives for ALL single use plastics

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 68

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Potential financial cost to businesses of replacing packaging - but hugely outweighed by the environmental gains and the shift towards a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Taking them off the shelves - if plastic packaging is simply not available, it can't be used. Re. reusable/refillable alternatives, it is currently expensive and time consuming to do a separate shop for all our refillable items at shops like Goodfor. Would be great to see refill options introduced to supermarkets so that refilling can be done at the same time as a supermarket shop.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Increasing price of disposable cups/discount for keep cups or have-here coffees.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 69

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Both proposals should be moving forward on a mandatory phase-out basis, as we should be trying to reduce our plastic waste in any way we can.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We should be reducing waste in every way we can and if we are going to phase out one type of plastic, why not both?

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

May cost businesses and food suppliers more to figure out other ways of providing packaging, however will have a long term environmental impact.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Cardboard boxes and compostable plastic packaging products on the market now - they are just far more expensive.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Funding for businesses to provide alternative packaging, so that businesses costs don't increase and the price of our food doesn't skyrocket.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 70

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 71

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Won't have to pay to dump them and household rubbish collection cheaper as not buying so many rubbish bags (cost of recycling already incl in rates). Better for environment.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Businesses getting on board and offering alternatives and packaging their products differently

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Could go further

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet

wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

There are plenty of alternatives for single use coffee cups, I don't understand why they are not included. It's easy enough to take a reusable cup or drink instore.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Do it now

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Audits or easy way for consumers to report businesses for non compliance and then enforcement by local or central government

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 72

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Is there consideration for 'supermarket' food packaging? (Soft plastics). Can there be more support for self packaging options? Such as what exists at BinInn eg?

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

How does this relate to the building and other such industries?

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Three years is plenty of time for businesses to get this sorted.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits would be that alternative packaging options would receive more attention.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

This is a difficult area for a lot of people who believe that they can use any item as long as it can be recycled but this mindset is problematic as not all items can be recycled and if they can, it is not always efficient to do so. Educating people about how they create waste is important. We can't continue with this culture of convenient and disposable packaging. People think it is their right to get that sushi takeaway or that daily coffee and they don't understand that this mindless consumerism is detrimental. I believe the biggest practical alternative to a lot of this packaging is education. Teach people to reduce their waste.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The longterm benefits are what is important. Responsible businesses will understand this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More refillable options at the regular supermarket. Shifting the culture of disposing/recycling to reducing. Ideally, shifting the population's dependence away from fast and convenient food to natural locally grown foods. This would benefit waste and health but realistically this will never happen sadly.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe,

versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Educate people about the stupidity of wet wipes for a start. In this first world country of ours we have running water in most places that you would go with a baby. In all my years with babies I have always managed to cope without wet wipes. I can't see any other necessary use of wet wipes. So education is the key again here. As with coffee cups, people will need to learn to bring their own keep cup or do without. It requires a mind shift that I doubt will happen. People have grown to depend on these unnecessary items.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1 year.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 73

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Needs to be mandatory for enough business to make change.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We need to reduce all our plastic use not just that in food packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less waste, less toxic seepage, possible increased cost in products but that's ok to produce the change in mindset wide enough in our country.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If they aren't available we will work out alternatives.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Some families use paper towel options for a home made wet wipe and some use reusable cloths for this already

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 74

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Only very specific exceptions should be made with very good reasons.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If you ban them we will find something else to use. If not, we won't. That is why a ban is the best way to do this.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Reusables of both are reasonable for individuals in most situations. Can a wet wipe be made without plastic?

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 75

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits will be for the environment and flow on effects to well being and the economy. There will be some initial costs for industry to find suitable, sustainable and degradable alternatives.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increase the availability of refilling stations and reusable materials. Reduce the need for packaging by (re)localising production as much as possible.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list should be expanded to most non-medical single use items.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Encourage the use of keep cups, systems such as AGAIN AGAIN, and sit-down coffees.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 77

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

I believe the timeframe is too long and that these items should be phased out much sooner.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Banning these are long overdue. They are harmful to the environment and clog up our landfills. This type of packaging is often used unnecessarily and are a challenge for consumers to dispose of.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Banning manufacturers from using these materials would make it easier to move away from them for most people. The amount of packaging that comes with some products is excessive and there is no way for consumers to avoid having to deal with these apart from not buying certain products which is not always possible.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban their sale in New Zealand

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 78

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Consider larger deposit schemes & especially producer responsibility, as producers are HUGE part of this problem & it can't all be done to consumers & government to fix. Need much larger symbols on all plastic packaging.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Consider adding greater producer responsibility as detailed in Yale Environment 360 report: "It's called extended producer responsibility — product take-back," says Chertow. Governments "should say, 'We can't recycle all of this stuff. We can't pay for all the costs of recycling. We have to work with you, the producer.'"

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If there is no way to recycle a plastic product in New Zealand, make the producer of that product responsible for its end-of-life. Or mandate producers can only use products that can be recycled in NZ kerbside programmes in their products, then educate consumers how to recycle them. Implementing deposit schemes in supermarkets could drive customers to those stores, so it's a win-win for everyone.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Be bold & make an integrated solution for largest source of plastic pollution, drinks bottles. Deposit schemes can work.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Alternatives exist, so this will make producers use them.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Reusable cups & wet wipes shouldn't have plastic in them.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Teams at MfE to monitor recycling rates & whether producers are adhering to their responsibilities.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 80

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

As a child during the war we had margarine packed in the same way as butter, greaseproof paper. Why not now?

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Just the question of margarine cartons.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

As above. I have this problem with margarine cartons. but most plastics are replaceable.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Of course synthetic clothing is also a scourge. But that is for someone else to consider.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

No questions

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

No comment

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

With reservations

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Something practical has to replace all these products.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The costs may be, in part, offset by the new industries that will replace them; eg new, innovative jobs.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

As these types of plastics did not exist Fifty years ago (nor overseas slave labour) I see no reason why not.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If possible.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

I Don't no the answer but I'm sure someone does. One other problem is the planned obsolescence of stuff like this iPad. But how that can be fixed I really don't know unless there really are aliens out there who can probe the greedy megalomaniacs who produce them!

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

I have no idea.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I thought we did all that a few boxes ago. I already do except where supermarkets insist on shrink wrap plastics. Alternatively - get rid of supermarkets.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Educate the idiots who walk/drive around with cell phones stuck to their ears unable to think about their surroundings.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

But there will be ten thousand others who don't.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Notes

Sorry, you've lost me. I'm eighty one. I can only concentrate for so long.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Just long enough to wake people up. Especially the young who drop takeaway containers in the gutter then tell we older folk that we've ruined their future.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Seriously? We survived without wet wipes for Millenia and coffee cups? Oh please! And, by the way, we washed cloth nappies and our kids, amazingly, came to no harm.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Sorry, I have just given up.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Notes

How on earth would I know that? Ask the bureaucrats who compiled this sorry I have no words to describe.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

First stop finding ridiculous questions and get on with the job.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 81

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The end of the stages seem a long way away; can this phase out not be expedited?

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Incentives for more onshore recycling are needed, alongside more stringent product stewardship regulations (akin to VerpackG) to encourage producers to tackle the problem or come up with alternative packaging.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Before mandatory phase-out, the impact on consumption of stipulations that it is not recyclable and does not fully biodegrade should be measured.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

The use of single-use coffee cups should be prohibited, and "keep-cups" and BYO options promoted (by, for example, offering a discount on these options and making single-use cups more expensive in the period until they are removed). Coffee lids should be an additional charge to discourage use.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months should be sufficient if there is enough media attention, public information and incentives for habit change (see Notes in 19 above).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A producer should incur a penalty for any branded "rubbish" to encourage more recycling and disuse of non-recyclable materials.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 82

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

could you also include an objective to increase NZ's capacity for onshore recycling, if we can eliminate some of the unrecyclable plastics, this may mean there are more recyclable plastics and it seems like an opportunity to grow the recycling industry here in NZ

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

need to implement a mandatory phase out. voluntary options will be ineffective. we've already seen how a mandatory phase out had an immediate impact on use of plastic bags in supermarkets, with minimal fuss from consumers or retailers

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

see question 3

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

I think it would be good to start with this and leave it open for expansion once this is done - if expanding the scope too early would lead to opposition and delay, then it would be better to start with the low hanging fruit as it were and continue to investigate the impact of PVC and packaging in other sectors and the best ways to manage these

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

absolutely. PVC has only been around for about 150 years, we managed for 1000s of years without it, we can do so again

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I don't use or accept plastic takeaway containers or straws so that's not an issue for me; the biggest issue is packaging of items when you have no choice (eg containers or packaging of some food items). I don't want to buy bad plastics and resent having no choice but to do so, if I want to buy yoghurt or bread

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

wholeheartedly support this, the sooner the better. I pick up at least a bagful of rubbish from one strip of main road in my neighbourhood every week, and a lot of this is single use rubbish from takeaways. produce stickers are completely stupid and the bane of any home composter.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

a lot of work has already been done on many of these items and there are plenty of alternatives.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

public education is insufficient. support a combination of scaling up reuse systems, to the point they are practically obligatory, and alternatives to plastic. given our current poor recycling efforts, focusing on better recycling of coffee cups wouldn't be the best option. wet wipes - again, public education is insufficient and plenty of wet wipes say 'nonflushable' but I know for a fact that people still flush them because they don't want to put a poeey wet wipe in their own rubbish bin. They should be banned altogether, not just the plastic in them.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

as soon as possible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

tricky to balance, has to be done at a level that deters non-compliance but also encourages positive changes.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 83

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Managed before without it

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Often no choice as a consumer to receive all the packaging

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Yes get rid of them

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

asap

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 84

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The document outlines the problems with both clearly and specifically, and I do agree with them completely.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I do agree with the objectives and think they are great. It is touched on in the document that the kerbside system has limitations and challenges, and as an individual that does my best to recycle this is very evident. It is not clear to people what is acceptable is recycled, and how it is processed once it is collected from your house. I think people need to understand more about the recycling process and how the system works/ doesn't work and what the consequences are if we get sorting our waste wrong.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree in part as I understand the food and beverage is of primary concern and is where a lot of these items are used.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet

wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Public education is a very key factor.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 85

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

It should all be done faster, but can live with this if at least it is happening

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

the packaging that large companies use to send goods is unnecessary and ridiculous at the moment, they should also be part of this.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The benefits will be immense, the more (home) compostable packaging we have, the more people will start composting

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

that home compostable options are the replacements (eg cardboard meat trays - we go to a butcher that already uses these, and cardboard sushi boxes - we don't buy sushi unless its in a compostable package)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Other (please specify)

Notes

as fast as possible! There are already other options

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I think wet wipes are probably OK for medical reasons (but people need to be educated on their disposal AND how bad they are - they all say 'biodegradable ' or 'flushable' so people don't know). But coffee cups could go now! We have reusable /returnable options - just like shopping bags, people just need to use them!

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

coffee cups should go now

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 86

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

should be sooner

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

less waste going to landfill. But a better solution needs to be found for the plastic we are recycling

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

no hard at all. I already try not to buy products in packaging that is not recyclable

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest

other options.

Notes

there are plastic free wet wipes made in nz. make plastic free wet wipes the only ones available

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 87

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

i think coffee cups should be included

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

if it isn't an option you can quickly adapt to an alternative

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think coffee cups should be included

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

for coffee cups, invest and promote reusable/loaning schemes like againagain and reusabowl, promote and reward byo.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

I think they should be included in this document, especially coffee cups. There are existing reusable/loan systems in place which could be expanded and people will quickly adapt to bringing their own cup (as a lot of people already do)

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 88

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The earlier the better. Give companies time to use their remaining stock but ban any future and new products being wrappers in this

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All plastic that is single use and hard to recycle should be banned

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Promote a circular economy, remove the expensive disposal methods that are currently in place for polystyrene (it is bulky but light) and would remove some of the microplastics entering our environment

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

A lot of people already used scrunched up paper (could promote recycled paper) instead of polystyrene as protective packaging

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Have these items more available and potentially more affordable

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I would also include glitter and balloons in this (they are not necessary items at all)

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Allows time for stores and businesses to use up their remaining stock, but decreases the likely hood of more being imported/ bought

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Stop businesses from not accepting reusable coffee cups due to Covid Provide appropriate disposal areas for compostable and biodegradable coffee cups Promote initiatives that promote a circular economy

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Same as the other plastics that you have proposed: 2 years- 4 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Random checks in businesses Set up a complaints initiative so people can report if some businesses are still using these items

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 89

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There's too many types of plastic types and in order to reduce waste and pollution it will have to be streamlined

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Cost - effort and some business adaptation. Benefits for recycling, consumers and environment

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The public is under informed and confused. Only removing the packaging options is a solution

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Disposable coffee cups are currently excluded from the proposed phase-outs – they should be included

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet

wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

If these items are not phased out then they should be a levy and fund created to address their issues and help conversion away from them

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

MfE should monitor it unless the industry comes up with a credible solution.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 90

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I would like to see coffee cups and wet wipes included. There are plenty of proven alternatives in the market.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There are plenty of alternatives, people just need the push to make the choices. Companies and consumers will move on this if they have to as shown by the effectiveness of the single use plastic bag ban

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

As above, would like to see coffee cups and wet wipes included.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

I think they should be included in this phase

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 91

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet

wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban them. Please

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Ban them. Please

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Ban them. Please

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Also ban single use coffee/beverage cups.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 92

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

In addition the problems listed, expanded polystyrene is frustrating and pointless to dispose of. It takes up space, doesn't empty out of a bin easily, explodes when breaking down to smaller pieces, is totally non-reusable, and is entirely replaceable with cardboard. Even from a non-environmental perspective, I think there would be support for banning expanded polystyrene from the general public, and this should be highlighted to gain support. Expanded polystyrene is prominent beyond food containers. It is hard to buy furniture, or homeware products without an entire household bin worth of polystyrene. Buying a TV means, disposing of polystyrene in chunks over many weeks. Please don't overlook the pointless use of large pieces of polystyrene. Kerb-side recycling that puts cardboard, plastics, and metals in one bin is stupid and undermines my faith in it actually being recycled. Household separation of these items just makes sense.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Additionally, reduce frustration caused by the disposal of foamed polystyrene.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I don't see any option other than a ban by law, as being effective.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

A mandatory phase out is not achievable under current legislation, yet it is listed as such. More weighting should be applied to effectiveness. Less effective strategies will ultimately be less cost-effective if they fail to achieve results.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Phase out tetrapaks as well. They don't seem to be recyclable in many places and are annoying to use.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We are playing a losing game of catch-up with environmental protections. It seems prudent to take the most aggressive approach, and allow exemptions for items that are proven to be necessary.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefit: more effective environmental response.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I think this document overlooks the displeasure of having to dispose of large pieces of expanded polystyrene. Banning it will be a major improvement to public life, even to the most petrol-hungry, environment hating Trump supporter.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

It will mean we get a few more years of life on this planet. I think this is worth more than whatever it costs in 2025.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Banning companies from packaging everything unnecessarily in polystyrene. If formed cardboard replaces it, allow me to put it out for recycling next to the wheely bin, rather than forcing me to jam it in there with wet cans and containers.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think coffee cup lids should be banned. They aren't needed in the majority of cases. If I really need a coffee and forget my mug, I can still get one, just without a lid.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

The sooner the better. Preferably within 3 years before a change of government could interfere.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Mandatory additional cost for single-use coffee cups. Mandatory commercial composting bins at outlets selling coffee with single-use cups. The other proposed options sounds good too.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Easy online method of dobbing in offending businesses. Businesses should have to accept back any banned materials e.g. large bits of polystyrene.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 93

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

I think that the decision is currently based on limited information regarding the use of these materials outside of food and beverage use. It would be good to see further research done in this area to understand if it should be phased out too.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Access to alternative options. Our family has been trying to reduce our single use plastic and it has really only been with the advent of suitable alternatives that we have been able to do this. I should note that we are in a position to make decisions without a lot of concern for cost, and many choices that reduce single use plastic through refill options rely on us being able to pay more, travel to different locations to shop and also use the internet for online ordering. SO I don't think that at this stage there are a lot of alternatives for people who have less resources available.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

I'd like to see this all done quickly.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We use reusable cups, its great to get a discount from many cafes for bringing these along. With wet wipes we use cotton

cloths instead.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

asap

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

unsure

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 94

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We managed fine before it was produced. The reality is we have got used to things being cheap.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 95

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I like to see also the PS (number 6) lids disappear

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Using less resources, create options for other products we are able to work with, But the main target for me has always been minimise products, to improve a smaller circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I believe most products are replaceable, we just have to accept something different, and be open for a change.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

not sure on this question, sorry

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I don't think it will have a greater cost, we just have to adapt to a different method, use less plastic, and reuse more bioplastics.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I always believe it's not too complicated, people get creative when they have to. technology is moving forward, what means more different options for products.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe,

versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I like to see what is happening in Europe, reuse cups at more cafe's. In New Zealand we like to think that walking with a take-away cup is like a fashion, that is a sad thing. When you know that you get a coffee, have a keep cup.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

As soon as possible, just have to force retail looking for the best alternative.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 97

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All streams of hard to recycle items should be removed from the economy. Although food may generate the most, it still exists in packaging of most other items. 2025 is plenty of time for the packaging markets around the world to adapt.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Increased research into alternative products forced. If NZ is standalone we could have a supply issue with some items. NZ can be world leaders in change and perhaps by default suppliers may change their packaging for all markets therefore contributing to the world wide issue. Will impact on affordability for a short time while adaptation takes place.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Yes, various alternatives are already on the market. Suppliers choose these products and prohibiting them is the only solution to stopping the problem.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Overall i believe the benefits outweigh the costs.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

It will be difficult initially until the market adapts, then like anything we will wonder why we did that in the first place.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Once they are banned the market will adapt. Government could consider funding a STEM research project - creates jobs and look for alternative options - OPPORTUNITY for our country to get back into manufacturing.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

MBD and research funding at an industry level

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Through local regulatory authorities, at the boarder on import, through ISO and ANZ Standards accreditation etc.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 98

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If products which were not difficult to recycle did not have the recycling triangle labelled on their side. If all councils had the same policies regarding recycling so every time you through something out in a different district you could be aware of whether it was reyclable.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Higher GST on these products

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Three years

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 100

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Some may need to be harder and faster - plastic is killing our people, food and environment so we need to act faster. We also need to take into account the implications that these policies have on national food supply though

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Definitely support the labeling and reduction targets, but there needs to be clear "consequences" if the reduction targets aren't met. Product stewardship would be great in theory, but again I don't see how it will be monitored through regulated option. Mandatory phase out is good but as previously stated, we need to be aware the impact this has on essential business (like farms) and how we can support them to make more environmentally friendly choices while not taking away all of their profit

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I think there are other options that make the supplier and consumer more responsible for their own consumption. I see the benefit in this option though, from a govt persp.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

go hard or go home!

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More creative ways of storing things. More conscious consumerism

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More labeling as to what is/isn't recyclable,

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 101

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The objectives covered are good but they are not including a re-think of the entire reason why people have shifted to using single-use products in the first place. Objectives need to include schemes for those who will be disproportionately affected by these changes. Options and schemes need to be put in place to provide people with alternative products eg. Metal containers. There needs to be an angle of educating people on the impact that reducing their waste can have.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I dont think that "No change" should be considered an option at all. Also using multiple options at once will be the best approach.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

You need to make allowances for those with disabilities who alternatives may not be an option and make sure they will not be villainised for continuing to use these.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I think that these options will be better used in conjunction with each other. I think that there really needs to be changes made from all levels, and that businesses should have to take the initiative on themselves to start producing products with less waste involvement. An entire shift away from consumerism needs to occur too within education and the ethos of people. I feel that putting a levy cost on some items would disproportionately affect some groups in society and that is wrong. But if there was the option for people to be able to get the product without waste (eg. people are provided with containers through a scheme yet they forget them at the supermarket and have to pay to use plastic to re-fill items) then they should have to pay for this.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the stages set out but I think that these should be pushed forward so they are phased out sooner.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Medications, some pills have started to be wrapped individually in packets. Lots of layers to wrapping. Pasta packaging. Shipping packaging. Clothing items sent from overseas have alot of plastic, could maybe specify that shipments coming into Aotearoa have to reduce their packaging too.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

Im confused at what this question means? I dont think that the phase out of the first stage should be merged with the second, its better that they are in stages rather than both of them occuring later

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs - People having to buy their own containers. Government schemes providing containers to those who would be disproportionately affected. Benefits - The environment, the resources used to produce the products. Negatives - The resource and environmental cost of producing containers.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Generations before us survived so why cant we? We have fallen on plastic due to ease. Products with algae are looking to be very successful as an alternative to plastic waste. Ensuring that everybody has access to other containers such as metal ones will allow for everybody to still live their lives.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If not sooner

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

If people are not horrified by the statistics that are being shown to them about the amount of plastic waste in our environment then more research and education needs to be undergone.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

It will have greater costs and greater benefits. But the costs outweigh the benefits, it is our health and the environment who will be benefitting and that is money well spent from a governmental point of view.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Having metal containers be cheaper, these are currently unaffordable. Any alternatives should be cheaper, and this will come through more use. Once you have invested the money they do pay off in the end.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Make sure that people are disproportionately affected and those with disabilities or medical conditions are supported.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban single use coffee cups. Provide cup libraries, and places for people to dispense these, like public mall dishwashers so people can put their mugs somewhere. The mugs could have barcodes on them, so when people buy their coffee from a cafe the mug is scanned and they pay a fee on it, and when they return it to a collection point they get this money back or some money off their next coffee through an app. Reusable make up removers or clothes, like the make-up eraser or face halo. Wet wipes - reusable ones, and making sure they are just as good.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups - 2 years Wet wipes - 4 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Make sure that all proposals are overlooked. Answers from corporations should be taken on board but the public opinions should be weighted more as they reflect what the general public want and not those who this will cost in the end. Public consultation and notification of this bill should be publicised more, I had no clue about this until I had come on the website myself. Also the fact that this submission has no area for people to put forward questions of their own is biased in a way as the Ministry of the Environment is providing all prompts for the questions. The document that has been put forward with the submission questions is huge, this is also a deterrent in the first place for people to complete this submission.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 102

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Reusable options more readily available to buy and accepted in stores

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 103

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

It needs a tighter time frame within a year!! Three or more years time will be too late.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Definitely. Every day pieces of all of the above are lying on our beach. Every time I walk on public areas the above are found. Manufacturers need to be held responsible for contaminating our environment with PVC and hard polystyrene and EPS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

More pollution in already polluted waters and seas. A hard sell is required to have people understand the benefits of removing asap the above packaging immediately, 2025 is far to long.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Yes to a total ban by 2021.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NIL. Card, cellophane...

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

the benefits to our environment, our fish, our birds and our mokopuna are huge.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

All supermarkets to be banned from using any of the above plastic packaging, return everything to manufacturer.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

MUST BE QUICKER 2021

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Total ban in 12 months.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Possibly a small R&D fund that could support businesses, also fines.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 104

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Hemp and corn starch or plant protein plastics.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Cheaper, biodegradable pots for planting native trees. Glass, cardboard packaging with wax or plant based inner linings. Hemp fiber bags for potatoe chips etc. perhaps

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

People could have their own fold up cup. Or a cardboard cup with an organic lining, plastic alternative if such a thing exists yet. Wet wipes seem a lot easier to solve. Is there an issue with them just being cotton or hemp?

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Inspectors and manufacturing plant and scientific testing of products.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 105

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I don't understand the maths used in Table 3 (specifically column 6 - total should be $6+2+2+2=12$, column 7 - total should be $3+2+2-1=6$, and column 8 - total should be $-3-1+2=-2$). Column still is first and column 7 is second.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Why are soft bread bag plastic tabs not explicitly mentioned?

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

People are busy and they can't possibly have time to understand there are various types of plastic. People will always contaminate recycling not because they are bad but because they make mistakes. All hard to recycle packaging needs to be eliminated.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Good start, but there is far more.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 106

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Oppose

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I do not agree with the description in the document as I believe that no specific issue exists with plastic that the Ministry deems "hard-to-recycle" or to be single-use, in that they are no more "problematic" than any waste product that is disposed of improperly, whether they may be more difficult to currently recycle in New Zealand or not. I don't believe that single-use products made out of plastic use more resources to produce them than single-use or even certain reusable products made out of alternative materials (such as reusable or paper bags). I believe the benefits of the use of many of these plastic products, such as, hygiene reasons, as further highlighted by the current pandemic, outweigh any problems that improper disposal of them could cause. I believe it should be up to the educated consumer to decide if they want to "rethink" plastics and they are already empowered to reject products containing plastics if they wish to do so.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I do not believe that the consultation document outlines how "reducing hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use" items" impacts "on our resource recovery system", as stated in the objectives for the policy, more than any other non-recyclable item that enters the system. I believe without single use plastics items the "resource recovery system" or in other words, recycling schemes operated by local councils would not be viable, financially or otherwise. I do not believe that the objectives identified will in any way reduce the amount of waste from single-use items, instead it will just force them to be constructed out of less suitable alternative materials and ones that are not recyclable such as wooden disposable cutlery.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I believe the benefits that were not discussed in the consultation documents of the use of these types of plastics products, for example hygiene reasons, outweigh the problems identified with the improper disposal of these items.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I believe the existence of any criteria used to determine that banning the products constructed by the plastics in question will "shift away" from them is completely frivolous. However in the criteria used it is unclear how the ban is "Achievable under current legislation". Additionally I believe the cost criterion for the no change option should have been "No", as there will be no change, and that the cost of the ban should be "Yes", as it has the potential to cause more than minor price increases for businesses and consumers who currently use these plastic products.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The assessment of the options has not taken into account the benefits of products made out of these plastics (i.e. why they are in wide use) compared to alternatives (if any) to them.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I do not believe these packaging materials should be banned as no suitable alternative exists for all products in all circumstances. I believe this one size fits all approach will harm consumers and business.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I would exclude out all food and beverage related items, and polystyrene packaging materials as no suitable alternative that has all the properties of these items exist.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No because suitable and hygienic alternatives do not exist.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

I expect costs to business to increase and being passed onto consumers as PET and PP containers are generally more expensive and need to be made out of thicker material. I believe that banning these materials could also lead to an increased incidence of damage during cartage, leading to more waste and increased costs to business. Banning polystyrene packaging could create food safety issues and lead to costs relating to those. I believe that banning products such as straws, wet wipes and other items made out of these materials that are used to aid disabled or infirm persons is inconsistent with the Bill of Rights Act.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

As identified in the consultation document, alternatives to certain "hard-to recycle" packaging exist, however I don't believe they provide suitable specifications in all circumstances. I don't believe that any suitable and hygienic alternative exists to the temperature keeping properties of polystyrene, nor any alternative packaging material that is as durable as polystyrene.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I believe it is unnecessary to ban oxo-degradable plastics all types of plastics will eventually degrade into micro-plastics over enough time, oxo-degradable plastics just degrade faster. While oxo-degradable plastics may be infeasible to recycle, most products made out of them would not usually be recycled anyway as soft plastics are not accepted by local council recycling schemes in New Zealand. Switching to alternative plastics will not increase the recyclability of these items. When used as garbage bags, oxo-degradable plastics are supposed to break down more rapidly than conventional garbage bags, allowing the contents inside to decompose faster in the landfill, freeing up landfill space.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The issue of hygiene gained from the use of these products has not been identified in the consultation document, nor the benefits of the current products.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Highly likely as the consultation document has not provided details about the costs of alternative products nor the benefits of the current products.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Do not agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items (please comment below)

Notes

I do not agree with the proposed ban on these items, as all these items serve a functional purpose and it should be up to an educated consumer taking into account all their personal circumstances that exist, as to whether they wish to use these items or not. I believe that the phase out of single-use plastic produce bags is dangerous and will lead to increased incidents of cross contamination, food poisoning and disease, especially when combined with reusable bags for groceries which can also harbor dirt and bacteria. Plastic produce bags are used for more than just carrying items, they reduce the likelihood of food-borne contamination with other food products such as fruit and meat, as well as bacterial contamination in the supermarket environment itself. It is an issue of hygiene and sanitation, not of waste. I additionally believe that banning single-use plastic produce bags is inconsistent with the Bill of Rights Act, as it is detrimental to people with compromised immune systems or impaired mobility. I also believe that banning single-use plastic cups and lids will lead to increased littering of thicker plastic bottles and increased costs to consumers and business.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Other (please specify)

Notes

Never, not until suitable alternatives that provide the same function, versatility, hygiene and safety.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I think the use of these products should be encouraged for hygiene reasons. The paper cups may be a suitable alternative if they do not contain harmful chemicals and do not disintegrate when used.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Never

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please

provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The consultation document has not in any way explored the cost of banning these items including the hygiene issues that it may cause and the issues that exist in regards to the use of these items by persons with disabilities. I believe that the phase out of single-use plastic produce bags is dangerous and will lead to increased incidents of cross contamination, food poisoning and disease, especially when combined with reusable bags for groceries which can also harbor dirt and bacteria. Plastic produce bags are use for more than just carrying items, they reduce the likelihood of food-borne contamination with other food products such as fruit and meat, as well as bacterial contamination in the supermarket environment itself. It is an issue of hygiene and sanitation, not of waste. I additionally believe that banning single-use plastic produce bags is inconsistent with the Bill of Rights Act, as it is detrimental to people with compromised immune systems or impaired mobility. I also believe that banning single-use plastic cups and lids will lead to increased littering of thicker plastic bottles and increased costs to consumers and business.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 107

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The Government gave a good description of the problems the targeted plastics can cause. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku. We urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material types used, and to propose more concrete policy & regulatory actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. We urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers key actions we'd expect to see. We have two concerns: There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time, e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. The list is missing some key policy options that could really help grow reuse - deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and environment

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bag

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Encourage reuse systems, charging for takeaway cups, encourage sitting in, and only have compostable cups available where there is a place to dispose of them that will go to a commercial compost. Wipes, only those which are plastic free available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

na

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2023

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 108

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 110

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Some PVC is good eg plumbing pipes etc

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Some PVC is good for certain uses

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1 year

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 111

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Needs to be done ASAP

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Better environmental protection

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

No tax on items and increased tax on harmful items

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Reduced price for keep cups

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

ASAP

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 112

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less bad waste

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

3 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Clearly stated alternatives in cafes and maybe on tv ads. For example, a jam jar with an old sock around it.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 113

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Central Government

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Let's get back to glass. The world used glass before, we can do it again!

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Glass bottles

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 115

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It makes sense to phase out all of a type

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 116

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less environmental pollution and, hopefully, less space taken up in landfills.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The cost benefit may not immediately be economic, but certainly it will be a future generational benefit as it will save precious resources and reduce pollution of land and ocean.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Go back to old-style recyclable packaging: paper, wood and glass. It's not rocket science. It just needs buy-in from big business and political will by a strong, environmentally concerned government.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

No-one could complain if it was phased out over 2 years. That is plenty of time to find replacement materials.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

These could be phased out even sooner, say, over a year. It is already being encouraged by environmentally-aware cafes.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1 year (see note above).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Fund an increase in staffing for the Environment Ministry and have Compliance Officers trained and employed by the Environment Ministry.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 117

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

No more plastic imported and worldwide pressure to stop manufacture of plastic. This will increase the value of plastic so that retrieving and recycling plastic is economic and necessary.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

No more plastic imported and worldwide pressure to stop manufacture of plastic. This will increase the value of plastic so that retrieving and recycling plastic is economic and necessary.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

No more plastic imported and worldwide pressure to stop manufacture of plastic. This will increase the value of plastic so that retrieving and recycling plastic is economic and necessary.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

Polystyrene should be banned. Some plastics are very recyclable and New Zealand recyclers should be incentivised. No plastic for manufacturing should be imported. It should be compulsory to use what is available here.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

No more plastic imported and worldwide pressure to stop manufacture of plastic. This will increase the value of plastic so that retrieving and recycling plastic is economic and necessary.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Yes but need to expand further. Also suggest replacement. Need edible food wrap and packaging. Cardboard for freightng.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Sooner the better

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Replacement packaging could be a similar price in time. Unknown cost of managing recycling of all other plastics.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

They are recent in history

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Not known

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

If NZ leads the way some of the solutions may be marketable.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Manageable with alternatives

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

No more plastic imported and worldwide pressure to stop manufacture of plastic. This will increase the value of plastic so that retrieving and recycling plastic is economic and necessary.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Advise replacements.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

So long as replacement alternatives are available.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban them immediately. BYO cup. Plastic wipes and nappies are rubbish

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Immediately!

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 118

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Heaps less rubbish in the environment

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If alternative environmentally friendly products were available in shops, ie, paper courier bags at Post Shop

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 120

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

PVC packaging should have been banned many years ago, and companies using the product should have been more responsible and not used PVC. Too many people burn plastics to get their lounge fires going and often PVC plastic is used - this releases lethal dioxins into the air. Polystyrene corrodes into tiny, air-borne particles and should have been banned years ago. however PVC and polystyrene have important applications in the building and other industries. PVC plastic plumbing, with its flexibility and long life and accessible pricing, is too valuable to replace right now, but when house and industrial fires occur huge volumes of dioxins are released. Polystyrene insulation is a valuable commodity also, and which has only recently been introduced to the housing market. alternatives need to be considered at some future stage. There must be an immediate and outright ban on oxo-degradable plastics. it is unconscionable that such a heinous product was ever introduced. .

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The mandatory phase-out is too slow. In Westport, New World supermarket phased out polystyrene meat trays some time ago and now uses much more user-friendly PET trays. Deposit returns and product stewardship need to be exploited/ implemented as well.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

We cannot ban them soon enough

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Notes

I can't understand the sticking point with straws. When I was a kid we had paper straws and they worked well on a single-use basis. Seriously though, healthy humans do not need straws but if frivolity dictates then paper is good.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

the sooner they are gone the better

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

There has to be innovators that will just into the well of banned plastics and produce packaging that will be both user-friendly and environment-friendly. Finally NZ Post is producing packaging that is friendlier to the environment. it has been a long-time scandal that NZ Post has provided only plastic packaging bags. when I was a kid we always wrapped with brown paper, then suddenly that wasn't good enough any more and it had to be pre-paid plastic bag - uggh!

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

there will be innovative companies replacing the banned packaging, just like with NZ Post.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

But sooner please

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

To users of oxo-degradable plastics - owo could you have ever consciously bought into such environment-destroying packaging?

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

It should be the company's responsibility to ensure that their packaging is environmentally responsible. If it is not those companies should be avoided.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

All such companies should embrace more responsible packaging.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle

plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More education could help in choosing to re-use. A big problem in our contemporaneous society is that both parents in a family often work now, which leaves little to no time for home economics and science, hence the overdependence on packaging. If one parent was at home, more home-cooked meals would happen, hence less packaging, possibly more home pickles, relishes etc. Eating out of a home garden, being creative with flax etc for containers and myriad other uses, making cleaning and hygiene products from basic ingredients, etc etc. This could be a part of children's education. We are a throwaway society and our habits have to be changed, or wound back to a simpler time, in order to reduce waste and obtain more value from which we already have.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Fruit and vegetable stick-on labels - how they ever became an industry standard beggars belief. ALL such labelling must immediately become biodegradable, including the inks which must be non-toxic. Lately I have been finding 'paper' bags with a very fine lining of plastic - ugh!. These must be banned immediately. many 'paper' cartons also have a fine plastic lining and these must be banned also.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Notes

What could replace single-use cutlery? There is a definite need for single-use cutlery. Ok, I see bamboo as a suggestion - great! Bamboo is becoming a great alternative to some plastic uses, as is hemp - roll on product invention using these two very, very valuable plants. Single-use product bags - you seem to have forgotten the humble paper bag - it was always useful before plastic manufacturers pushed their product to replace paper. Now many places have reintroduced paper bags and it is wonderful, not least because my neighbours will have paper instead of plastic to light their fires with.. we must strive to be as organic as possible, using plants for our needs in every conceivable situation. What happened to CELLOPHANE? it is now plastic! - ugh! as a kid I loved cellophane, the way it crinkled when crushed, the way it would crinkle up in water, its organic feel. CELLULOSE is a wonderful and valuable product that has been pushed aside by 'fantastic' plastic manufacturers. It needs to be reintroduced. Paper milk cartons should never have been allowed for general use. I was told that washing glass milk bottles was time-consuming and costly and a waste of water. However, all recyclable items need to be rinsed if not washed out also, and a little contamination of a recycling bale is very costly. Milk in re-use glass should be re-introduced as the standard for milk circulation, it would provide jobs, especially for schoolkids. For some time now, many people embrace access to milk in glass, resulting in an upsurge. That momentum needs to accelerate.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Notes

I think 18 months would be as long as needed. Such a ban has been in the pipeline for a very long time (MP Nandor Tandos got the ball rolling with isi Waste Minimization Act) and lately many businesses have pre-empted by replacing much toxic packaging with better alternatives. The final push to eliminate the toxicity need only take 18 months at most.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Just because the Beehive is addicted to barista coffee doesn't mean that throwaway coffee cups can be excluded from the extant banning proposal. there are biodegradable wet wipes.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

if I may speak for such businesses they need a more responsible attitude to the end-use of their items

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Right now

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Notes

Many businesses have pre-empted this phase-out. If they can do it, they all can.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Local government can play a major role. It can look at the waste stream, including illegal dumping, then identify the pitfalls. Dob your neighbour in works - if the local supermarket or greengrocer is not complying, a simple call to a 'dirty-plastic' hotline could have a 'dirty-plastic' officer visit the premises. 'Dirty-plastic' officers could be a subsidized local government part-time employee. I hope my input is of some value. I am an original decrier of the increasing use of throwaway plastics and I welcome this new Bill. as a young person I hated the idea of home economics bu time has shown me that it is the only way forward, by creating many domestic products from basic ingredients. BTW the tiny windows supplied for writing responses to questions (it would be nice to see a whole paragraph at once) makes it very hard to edit so I am sending my raw responses. I hope they make sense.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 121

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, although I'd prefer it if it was faster.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The MAIN thing that would help NZers embrace reusable & refillable packaging is if Government gave reusables some love through the power of regulation, policy & investment. This would help reuse systems compete against single-use, & catapult reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles. The Government has suggested it could do some public education about sustainable packaging... Thanks Government, but heaps of NGOs & community groups do this mahi already! We need you to back us up by focusing on your unique superpowers of regulation, policy & investment.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, we have three points that we feel strongly about. 1. We don't support banning plastic straws. A plastic

straw ban would be discriminatory. Some people need a plastic straw to drink. Reusable alternatives work well for some people, but not for everyone. The Government has suggested exemptions for people that need them, but it's hard to design exemptions that aren't stigmatising. At the very least, there must be adequate consultation & agreement with the disabled community before we can support banning plastic straws. 2. We're astounded that the single use coffee cup (SUC) is not on the ban list. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. For takeaways, reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. We know of over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... and they're thriving. Proving that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. A ban on SUC combined with Govt support for reuse schemes can provide security for take-out only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies.. As with all items that involve access to liquids in a hospitality setting, we suggest Govt liaise with the disabled community to seek guidance as to how reusable alternatives can be widely available for all. We urge the Government to take the plunge & ban all disposable coffee cups & lids. We believe they are amongst the most straightforward items to phase out - practically, and due to the increasingly negative public perception towards them. 3. We'd like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS. Like soy fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead. We would support the Government introducing place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet e.g. reusables only for dine-in contexts; central city single-use-free zones; no bottled water & throwaway serviceware on university campuses & in Govt buildings.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, we don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. We do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see our answer to Q16). We also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses (particularly takeaway only vendors), and to undertake community engagement.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

The most impactful thing the Govt can do is use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility & availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Note that accessibility includes affordability. Many of these actions can happen under s 23 of the WMA/without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. Regulatory & legislative actions include disposable coffee cups in the proposed ban list as this will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with the alternatives faster. Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California) Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. A disposable coffee cup levy and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. A Deposit Return Scheme for BOTH disposable coffee cups, & reusables offered through a reuse scheme. A DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all hospitality outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash and reuse returned reusable cups. Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. Collaborative, practical policy actions Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings) Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design

principles & are accessible for everyone in the community. Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Our thoughts on the Govt suggestions... The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. We support this alongside regulatory & policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to the growth of reuse schemes. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. Investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups is not a good use of public funds. Better to put this money towards stimulating a reusables network. We urge the Government not to use its finite resources to reinvent the wheel & run a public education campaign about reusables. Loads of NGOs & community groups already do this mahi. We need Government to back our efforts with its unique policy & regulation-making superpowers. We need Government to champion and amplify the positives of truly circular reusable options!

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Disposable coffee cups products should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025. Accessible alternatives exist. Were the Govt to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19) we see no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive; we agree with them all. We appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. We like how the Government has recognised that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. However, we are very surprised that this list does not acknowledge how a plastic straw ban could negatively affect individuals who need a plastic straw to drink. And the extra potential benefit offered by the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable alternative products (i.e straws, co-designed with the disabled community) to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes reduce waste & costs for local government & ratepayers. They also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 122

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Complete ban on single-use cups of all kinds. We have two single-use cup-free cafes and encourage customers to sit in, borrow or BYO cups.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

See above - educate, create a new social norm and offer alternatives.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months MAX

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 123

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All plastics should be included

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Replacing these with alternative materials will cost, but this will force packaging and distribution companies to rethink their ways of doing things

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Remove these hard-to-recycle packaging from supermarket shelves, and replace their contents by presenting them in bulk. Promote the usage of customer-brought containers to fill at deli and fish counters.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Compostable cups and multi-use/reusable/washable cups. Phase out wet wipes completely.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 125

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes but the timeline is too slow!

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It isn't just the food industry creating waste

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less waste in our environment and in our landfills

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

In the food industry there is no need for single use plastics - dine in or byo if you need to take away. Produce should be in season and local, not packaged for longevity

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

They are so ubiquitous, sometimes you can't buy a product without a plastic wrapping, so banning them would make it easy to avoid!

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Why are single use coffee cups not included? They are responsible for the most litter I see in cities and on the side of the road. Having your latte to go is not a necessity, and if you think it is, byo cup!

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

There are endless options for coffee cups and I cant believe they are not already on the list. Number one: drink the coffee at the cafe. It is not essential to drink a coffee on the run, this is a part of NZ culture that differs from the rest of the coffee drinking world. If someone is in a hurry, byo cup, reusable return schemes, mug libraries etc work well.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

For coffee cups: now!! We don't need them.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 126

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

building construction waste is an issue and therefore we must consider pvc and eps used in buildings.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We just have to look at what our grandparents used ie glass and paper.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

but we should not phase our compostable packaging that does not generate microplastics.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 127

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We need to increase the access individuals (and businesses) have in alternatives that are available to them - if there is more support they may be more inclined to reuse and refuse single use.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Mandatory reusing and recycling options need to be stated

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

Top layer of the hierarchy needs to be considered first - refusing! more support given to that layer of the problem

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Banning is great but realistic options need to be in place to support the ban being effective, more thought needs to be given to this

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Timelines are too slow! They need to happen sooner before the effects of single-use plastics on the environment worsen

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not,

what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

In order to successfully do this reusable systems need to be in place - reusable bowl borrowing systems, plate librarys etc - this would help these being phased out in phase 2

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less waste, more support for individuals and businesses in reducing their waste in all aspects - through the knowledge of how easy it can be

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There are an array of alternatives to replace this packaging - however the government needs to back these alternatives up to allow more businesses to get on board

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Greater benefits as more reusable schemes will be created - resulting in more jobs and more support for local businesses

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I already refuse a lot of plastic packaging - but I know for friends and families cost can be a factor, if it was funded more and more accessible for everyone it would become a more viable option for all

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Single use coffee cups need to be on this list, they contribute to most of our waste it's such a simple replacement as well - there are various other reusable cup options available.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Single use coffee cups and their lids, and single use plastic cups should not be exempt from the list - they are just as damaging if not more due to their high use

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

12-18 months is achievable for all items

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Backing up the reusable coffee cup systems in NZ, funding to help support these systems - introducing a levy fee for using these single use, making it the more expensive option

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1-3 years depending on how well other systems are established - it needs to happen sooner rather than later before it is too late

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Positives should be discussed more to encourage businesses and individuals to get on board with the proposed changes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Timelines should be strict and compliance should be followed up with, there should be penalties for businesses unnecessarily using single-use plastics and not following the banning out scheme.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 128

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected

party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Agree We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Yes with changes We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not

containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 129

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

It should be noted that the concept of recycling plastic and the numbering systems used and an invention of the plastics industry themselves and thus are a successful tool used to justify continued use and production of plastics.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Overall they are good, except that relying on 'volunteer' motivations is unreliable and slow to change.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes
Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

It must be context dependant. Health and safety concerns must be considered too.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs will include having to find alternative materials to make current PVC items, such as piping. Health and safety must therefore be considered. The benefits are numerous.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Claiming that plastic is degradable is misleading to many customers and users.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

greater benefits from the innovation and long term health benefits of removing more plastic from our lives.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

All unnecessary single-use plastic should be banned. Unless requiring for medical purposes etc, single-use should be banned. Easy recyclability should be a minimum standard.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Promoting keep-cups and personal coffee cups as an expectation of customers, providing a financial incentive to do so. i.e a discount. Only give cardboard/paper cups if people don't have their own reusable cup when having takeaway drinks- an incentive to use your own.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

MfE should create a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 130

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The staging needs to be brought forward by 12 months minimum to reduce the continued impact on the environment. There is a growing number of companies already committing to these types of initiative voluntarily so there is still enough time for the rest of the businesses in these industries using these plastic products to pivot by 2022 and 2024.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes
Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

In part - there needs to be some pressure from a regulatory point of view or incentives to increase the cost-benefit of alternative products such as in construction.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

We should be rethinking our approach to plastic in all elements of their use rather than just targeting specific industries.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Ability to do this without being made to feel like you are a nuisance because you'd like your takeout food in the reusable lunch box you brought in with you. The size is usually compared with whatever the throwout plastic option is and it's a bit over the top the responses sometimes. This change in attitude would make it more pleasant to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging. Normalising the alternatives and reusable/refillable items anywhere you buy something would help - there has been some degree of this with the plastic bag ban but you still hear the odd negative comment about it.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

3 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

These options for single-use coffee cups seem like they will provide the most benefit investment to scale up reuse systems like cup-lending schemes Again Again and Cupcycling, who partner with cafes to offer customers a 'loan cup' from a fleet of reusable cups for a small refundable deposit investing in innovation and scaling up production of non-plastic alternatives. For example, a New Zealand based supplier recently launched a 100 per cent paper cup and lid (developed overseas) that is suitable for hot drinks public education campaigns to promote reusable alternatives (this is getting more popular as it is becoming trendy with a large number of cool options on the market - the main issue is forgetting it!) Wet wipes - all the options outlined seem like they will contribute to reducing the use of plastic wet wipes.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2025 - there are already alternatives for both of these products, it is about changing habits

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Yes - there is always someone that will not comply if they think they can get away with it

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 131

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This needs to include all single use packaging, plastic isn't the sole problem

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. We urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Notes

We support banning all the items listed (except for plastic straws - more on that later). Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, we urge the Govt not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead multi-task like a boss & take forward more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too! A 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Govt can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

I think the phase out needs to happen faster than the proposed times. New Zealand is a small country with a small population and no ability to deal with this waste ourselves - not only do we not need 5 years to make a phase out happen, we don't have any suitable way of dealing with this waste over this period.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse

systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. We also call for Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There's an extra benefit to banning the targeted plastics that the Government's missed. This benefit is the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems not only reduce waste, they also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. More reuse schemes & more reusable packaging will also mean less throwaway packaging overall (not just targeted plastics). This will = even more cost savings for local government & ratepayers

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The MAIN thing that would help NZers embrace reusable & refillable packaging is if Government gave reusables some love through the power of regulation, policy & investment. This would help reuse systems compete against single-use, & catapult reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles. The Government has suggested it could do some public education about sustainable packaging... Thanks Government, but heaps of NGOs & community groups do this mahi already! We need you to back us up by focusing on your unique superpowers of regulation, policy & investment

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, we have three points that we feel strongly about. 1. We don't support banning plastic straws. A plastic straw ban would be discriminatory. Some people need a plastic straw to drink. Reusable alternatives work well for some people, but not for everyone. The Government has suggested exemptions for people that need them, but it's hard to design exemptions that aren't stigmatising. At the very least, there must be adequate consultation & agreement with the disabled community before we can support banning plastic straws. 2. We're astounded that the single use coffee cup (SUC) is not on the ban list. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. For takeaways, reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. We know of over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... and they're thriving. Proving that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. A ban on SUC combined with Govt support for reuse schemes can provide security for take-out only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies.. As with all items that involve access to liquids in a hospitality setting, we suggest Govt liaise with the disabled community to seek guidance as to how reusable alternatives can be widely available for all. We urge the Government to take the plunge & ban all disposable coffee cups & lids. We believe they are amongst the most straightforward items to phase out - practically, and due to the increasingly negative public perception towards them. 3. We'd like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS. Like soy fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, we don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. We do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see our answer to Q16). We also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

We already have lots of customers that bring their own cups etc, and we offer initiatives where we give away jars with fabric around them to customers for coffee, and run a borrow bowl scheme. We would need an option that is appealing to our 'no bullshit' customers. These are the ones that are on their way to work, don't want to fluff around with one of our jars because it seems 'too difficult', just want their coffee and to run - these people are going to be the hardest to appeal to. Having a cup library with a lid where you take the customers order, make their coffee in one of these cups, have our brand or something obvious on them so people know where to return them, and pass the cup to the customer and say when you're next in the neighbourhood drop the cup back in. Otherwise, a universal system where all cafes accept one of a few brands so people can drop their reusable cups into any accepting cafe and each place takes responsibility for sanitising and putting back out. There would probably need to be an app or something collaborative so local cafes can reach out to this company or other cafes if they're running low (we might get people returning the cups less as we're a neighbourhood or 'destination' cafe as opposed to those in town or the CBD).

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 - 18 months for single use coffee cups for instance, but we understand some other things may take longer. We think 2023 would be ideal, but no later than 2025.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive; we agree with them all. We appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. We like how the Government has recognised that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. However, we are very surprised that this list does not acknowledge how a plastic straw ban could negatively affect individuals who need a plastic straw to drink. And the extra potential benefit offered by the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable alternative products (i.e straws, co-designed with the disabled community) to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes reduce waste & costs for local government & ratepayers. They also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 132

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

nothing- it is easy

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

All single use plastic items should be phased out

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

people should own keep cups and if they don't have one on them they cant buy a coffee.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1 year

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 133

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Please do both. Moving away from plastics is now urgent in terms of conservation and environment.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If the goal is to stop polluting our environment with an ever-increasing pile of waste, it's a no-brainer to include PVC and hard polystyrene as well.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The longer we wait to do this, the higher the cost to us all - damage to environment and our food chain.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There may not be alternatives currently in use, but there WILL be as soon as the ban is notified. We are quite capable of inventing other ways to package or, in some cases, to forgo packaging.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

A combination of alternatives - both in packaging and in alternatives to packaging (reuse, refill, unpackaged). We don't need a lot of the packaging that is currently used.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I would agree more if the timeframe was shorter.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 134

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assisting communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups - increasing accessibility of reuse systems, including options for sterilisation so businesses can provide reusable options rather than relying on BYO systems. Levies on use of disposable. Wet wipes - ban the word 'flushable' on packaging, increase education around the issues relating to wet wipes and waterways, increasing awareness of reusable alternatives and their ease of use and cost benefits.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

ASAP - 2022

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 135

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku. We urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of material type, and then propose more concrete policy actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. We urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of: Increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, & will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

CONCERN 1 There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time. E.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. CONCERN 2 The list is missing some key policy options that could help grow reuse. E.g. deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets & "reusables only" for dine-in situations. Did you know that there are international examples of disposables being banned in some public places, Government offices & university campuses?

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

We suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy. Some criteria need broader definitions: "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse. "Achievability" should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. We also suggest new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

But, we urge the Government not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead to multi-task & take forward more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too! A 'ban only' approach probably won't be

enough to lift up the best alternatives. Plus, it leaves the Government without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Government can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, & reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Right now, the world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. We need to reverse these trends, fast. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. We suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Using our democracy isn't only about speaking up when we disagree. It is also about giving our consent and approval when we feel the Government gets it right. So, we're thanking the Government for creating what we think is an expansive & ambitious list of products for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

Question 8 of the submission is out of scope for Takeaway Throwaways. But please check the rest of our submission guide page on our website to connect with resources from your wider zero waste community for pointers on responding to this question.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Question 9 of the submission is out of scope for Takeaway Throwaways. But please check the rest of our submission guide page on our website to connect with resources from your wider zero waste community for pointers on responding to this question

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

But the best alternatives are reusable, refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Government wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why? QUESTION 10 DO WE AGREE? Yes, in part. Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. For example... • Invest in reuse systems • Levy single-use items • Implement Deposit Return Systems on all food & beverage packaging • Mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts • Introduce mandatory reuse quotas/ targets • Implement mandatory recycled content regulations We also call for Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. Thank you (Government) for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics - we wholeheartedly support this. The EU are banning them by July 2021 - Just sayin'. SOONER!

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical

alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

out of my scope sorry

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

We appreciate that the Government has recognised the potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers & the cost savings for the wider community from simplifying our waste & recycling streams. We also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. Overall, we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits – human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phaseout of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer. QUESTION 13 DO WE AGREE? Yes. The Government has drawn up a comprehensive list of costs & benefits. We agree with all of them. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here?

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There is an extra benefit to banning the targeted plastics that the Government has missed... The opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems not only reduce waste, they also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. More reuse schemes & more reusable packaging will also mean less throwaway packaging overall (not just targeted plastics). This will = even more cost savings for local government & ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The main thing that would help New Zealanders embrace reusable & refillable packaging is if the Government were to give reusables some love through the power of regulation, policy & investment. This would help reuse systems compete against single-use, & catapult reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles. The Government has suggested it could do some public education about sustainable packaging. Thanks Government, but heaps of NGOs & community groups do this mahi already! We need you to back us up by focusing on your unique superpowers of regulation, policy & investment.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

WE'RE ASTOUNDED THE SINGLE USE COFFEE CUP (SUC) IS NOT ON THE BAN LIST. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. Reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups... • SUC surcharges • Jar swap systems • Mug libraries • BYO discounts • Retailing reusable cups We know of over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... And they're thriving. This proves that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. A ban on SUC combined with Government support for reuse schemes can provide security for takeaway only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies. These companies are aware of the changing public perception to disposable cups, & are positioned to diversify. I personally own one of the few cafe that is SUC free. People have been extreemly suppertave and it NEED to be the NORM. Im also sick of seeing cups'single use' cups littereing the road side. WE'D LIKE TO SEE MORE HARMFUL THROWAWAYS ADDED TO THE BAN LIST. The harmful throwaways we'd like to see added to the ban list. • PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS Are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead. • SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS Like soy fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. The Government should introduce place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet. For example: • Reusables only for dine-in contexts • Central city single-use-free zones • No bottled water & throwaway serviceware on university campuses & in Government buildings. To recap We fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, we suggest that the Government... • Removes plastic straws from the ban list. • Adds single use coffee cups to the ban list. • Adds more harmful throwaways to the ban list.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. Why? Because all these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. • They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment. • They contaminate recycling & organics collections. • They're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. Additionally, the plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws, we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. HOWEVER... .. poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted & included in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. The submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Government isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, we don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. Other reasons why we do not fully agree with the proposed definitions in table 7 are... • We do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see our answer to Q16) • We do not support exempting singleuse cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. This exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. • The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We believe the most impactful thing the Government can do is use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility & availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Note: accessibility includes affordability. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options. QUESTION 19 Takeaway Throwaways focuses on serviceware, so we will only discuss disposable coffee cups here. For discussion of options for wet wipes, please check the rest of our submission guide page on our website to connect with resources from your wider zero waste community for pointers on responding to this question. REGULATORY & LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS • Put disposable coffee cups on the ban list. This will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage w/ alternatives faster. • Mandate reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California) • Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups to inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. • A 'latte' levy and/or producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. • Update food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. COLLABORATIVE, PRACTICAL POLICY ACTIONS • Invest in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. • Work with MOH, MPI & hospo owner/operators to create official guidelines for reusable serviceware so that businesses & the public feel confident about the safety of reuse. • Introduce well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Government buildings) & phase-out disposable cups from public procurement REGULATORY & LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS A Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) • Introduce a DRS for ALL takeaway coffee cups dispensed by outlets, whether they are disposable cups OR reusable cups offered through a reuse scheme. • In a DRS, the customer pays a small deposit on top of the purchase price of their drink. They get the deposit back if they return the empty cup. • Deposits are already used for cup reuse schemes. A DRS for ALL takeaway cups would reduce litter & recycling contamination & level the playing field between reuse & single use. • DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash & reuse returned reusable cups. • Ensure that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design principles & are accessible for everyone in the community. We note that many of these actions can happen under s 23 of the Waste Minimisation Act without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. The Government have their own suggestions for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining). This is what we think of their suggestions... • The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. We support this alongside regulatory & policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to the growth of reuse schemes. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. • Investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups is not a good use of public funds. Better to put this money towards stimulating a reusables network. • We urge the Government not to use its finite resources to reinvent the wheel & run a public education campaign about reusables. Many NGOs & community groups already do this mahi. We need Government to back our efforts with its unique policy & regulation-making superpowers. We need Government to champion and amplify the positives of truly circular reusable options.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

We invite the Government to consult with the 50+ hospitality businesses who are SUC free, and the organisations and small businesses around NZ that support their work such as: • UYO (Use Your Own) • SUC-free Wanaka • Again Again • Cupcycling • Good to Go Waiheke • Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project • Wanakup These businesses & groups report that the availability of reuse systems and cup loan schemes (and customers who BYO!) enables businesses to move entirely to reuse. And, many more businesses would be willing to ditch the disposables if they knew all outlets were going to be in the same boat - something a ban could achieve. Again, my business is SUC free and it works! People byo, use our mug library or purchase a reusable cup or better still sit in and have a break. Being on State highway 1, we encourage people to stop and take a break and refresh. it works. honestly!

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Disposable coffee cups should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025. Accessible alternatives exist. Were the Government to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19), we see no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. We like how the Government has recognised that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phaseout of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items. QUESTION 22 DO WE AGREE? Yes, in part. The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive; we agree with them all. However, we are surprised by two things: • We are surprised that this list does not acknowledge how a plastic straw ban could negatively affect individuals who need a plastic straw to drink. • And we are surprised by the lack of mention of the positive opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable alternative products (i.e straws, codesigned with the disabled community) to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes reduce waste & costs for local government & ratepayers. They also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for noncompliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, which goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 136

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

This needs to happen sooner

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

This needs to begin being phased out immediately in all areas

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Having these eliminated from the supply/consumer chain

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

must not contain non-biodegradable plastics in any of these, use alternatives

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1 year

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please

provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 137

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There are many businesses that will not make a change from their chosen method of packaging until they are required to. I expect they choose the single-use and/or hard to recycle plastic packaging purely to add as much as they can to their profit margins. St Pierre's Sushi is one prime example. I hate to think how many non-recyclable single-use plastic trays they are responsible for every single day in this nation. It is great sushi so I expect it is a lot. The only reason I don't eat it is because of their attitude to packaging. I have been in touch with them to raise my concerns, and they say they are looking into options but I expect they will not do anything about it until they are forced to. Until all businesses in New Zealand are required to compete on an even basis in regards to packaging some just won't make the move to a better environmental choice. I know there are many restaurants that still offer the foamed polystyrene containers for takeaways or 'doggie bags'. With food waste also being an issue (as noted in your report) I am reluctant to leave uneaten food behind but then when offered a foamed polystyrene container I end up with a whole new dilemma. If I knew they could not give me a single use container as an option I would be in a win-win situation.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

My only hesitation is whether the main objective goes far enough. • Should it go further to be significantly reducing the amount in existence rather than just in use • In fact, upon reading the report further, I would challenge you to align with the vision of the Global Commitment with a main bold objective to "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items by ensuring plastic never becomes waste".

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

If you are only going to go with one option for now then yes, I think the mandatory phase out (ie. ban) is the right one. However, I would like to see Product Stewardship working alongside the mandatory phase out/ban so that progress can start to be made

in regards to reducing/eliminating plastic products not covered by the ban. After all, as implied in the report, reduction of waste (all waste) is really the ultimate goal.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I don't think it is quick enough • Many businesses have already made efforts to make better environmental choices for their packaging. Those that have chosen not to would be very naïve to have not seen this coming and only have themselves to blame for not taking steps to prepare. Many will take as much time as you give them. A wise man once said to me "the biggest driver for change is to show impact". We need to see impact fast. The faster the better. • Surely they will pass on the costs of change to the consumer anyway, but we will be getting something for our money (better environmental outcomes) so just do it. Rip it off like a plaster. • The report states at page 17/18 that "PVC is a problem for recycling high-value PET (1) and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. By sight, PVC is not easy to distinguish from PET. This makes it difficult to separate from clear PET for further processing. It only takes a small concentration of PVC (0.005 per cent by weight) to significantly reduce quality in a batch of clear PET, and to devalue the recycled material. PVC interferes with our ability to recycle the full amount of PET that households place in recycling bins". So surely the faster we phase-out PVC the sooner we get more PET recycled. Win-win. • Like Labour's approach to Covid-19. Go hard, go early. Get results.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Notes

I would not want you to leave out any of what you already have stated. I want to ensure the following items are included and since I don't know what they are made of I am not sure that they are: • St Pierre's Sushi containers • Glad wrap/cling film (won't many just change to this if other options are taken away?) • The wee soy sauce fish/bottles that come with sushi and other takeaways • The small wasabi packets. • The triangle sandwich pouches/containers. • Single serve yoghurt containers.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

No comment as I do not have the right knowledge to comment, but thank you for asking the question so those that do can provide the information you need to make the decision.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes with the only possible exception being: • Straws - if we still need them available for medical reasons. I would not choose to comment for those who need straws to be able to consume nutrients but if they are happy that there are non-plastic alternatives that work for them then yes to these as well.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree these all need to be phased-out and I would not exempt disposable coffee cups and their lids because: • It creates confusion and a loop hole – if I call it a coffee cup can I keep using a single use cup and lid? • As set out in the report disposable coffee cups are a big issue. Keep them in so people have to work towards a solution, just give it a longer timeframe if the solution is more complex. Taking it out separates it from all the other single-use products that are a big issue and really it shouldn't be. • Just like banning single use plastic bags proved, people will adjust. If they are that dependent upon coffee surely they will learn quickly to bring their own cup, or make one at home before they leave if that is what it takes which just gives more incentive for businesses to adjust.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I am confused by this exemption to single use plastic cups and lids: "Note: does not include disposable coffee cups and their

lids". I don't get whether it is the "disposable" nature of the cup/lid that exempts it, or the fact is for coffee. "Disposable" is not defined in the glossary of the report. I would have thought a single use plastic cup and/or lid is also a disposable cup and/or lid.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Notes

As set out at question 6 please make the timeframes as tight as possible • Many businesses have already made efforts to make better environmental choices for their packaging. Those that have chosen not to would be very naïve to have not seen this coming and only have themselves to blame for not taking steps to prepare. Many will take as much time as you give them. A wise man once said to me "the biggest driver for change is to show impact". We need to see impact fast. The faster the better. • Surely they will pass on the costs of change to the consumer anyway, but we will be getting something for our money (better environmental outcomes) so just do it. Rip it off like a plaster. • If disposable coffee cups and lids requires a more complex solution then give this one a longer timeframe, but do not exclude it. Just like banning single use plastic bags proved, people will adjust. If they are that dependent upon coffee surely they will learn quickly to bring their own cup, or make one at home before they leave if that is what it takes which just gives more incentive for businesses to adjust .

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 138

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Bring it forward, we need to act now

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

The problem does not matter on the source or industry, it needs to be across the board

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Our natural environment and human health will benefit

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Unsure

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased access to vege co-ops and bulk food suppliers to eliminate that food packaging

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Options exist

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Now / ASAP. Options exist and desirable behaviour change is already evident with the uptake of reusable coffee cups

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Active monitoring of stores including \$2 dollar shops, asian food markets, takeaways to ensure compliance is enforced. Make an example of those who are non compliant (in media etc) with prosecution and fines.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 139

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Central Government

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use itemsthrough significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systemsthat support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communitiesto use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunitiesthat reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Yes The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 140

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government gave a good description of the problems the targeted plastics can cause. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes, in part. The options list covers key actions we'd expect to see. 2 concerns; 1. There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time. 2. The list is missing some key policy options that could help grow reuse.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria & weightings make sense & help us understand the Government's reasoning behind the proposals. We suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support banning all the items listed (except for plastic straws - more on that later). Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, we urge the Government not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead to multi-task & take forward more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too!

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. But, the timelines proposed are too slow. Think of all the targeted plastic items that could enter our environment before 2023 and 2025.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, water-ways and marine environment - damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. A small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation. However due to the harmful properties of plastic in the environment, we would support it being replaced as a packaging material. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We fully support the vision on P40 of "more reusable or refilling alternatives to single-use plastics. There is an opportunity for New Zealand to rethink the use of some plastic packaging altogether, and to design innovative reuse models." We also support the statement that "packaging with recycled content is preferable to new plastic (where feasible)".

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There is nothing good about oxo-degradable plastics, and we wholeheartedly support a ban and thank the Government for acting on them. We would prefer to see a quicker ban due to the harm created by these plastics and the green-washing involved. By far the majority of companies we have come across who have been supplying these to the public were under the misapprehension that they are better for the environment. Oxo-degradable plastics also contaminate recycling plastic streams. The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to be a priority and for it to happen by June 2021, which brings us in line with overseas jurisdictions, such as the EU, that will phase-out oxo-degradable plastics by 2021.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The consultation document sets out a comprehensive list of the costs and benefits to various sector groups of the mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. The phase-out of targeted plastics will have additional benefits for: indigenous communities, fresh water quality, ecosystem health, air quality, human health, climate, future generations. It may also be valuable to supplement the cost/benefit approach included in the document with a holistic lens. The current cost/benefit approach perceives the 'environment' as an "affected party" separate to, and distinct from, our own human survival. Current and future generations - and indeed the economy - can only thrive within the planet's limits to stay in balance. Taking action on plastics is an essential step towards preserving the functional ecosystems required to sustain life.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit currently missing is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. This would have a positive job creation impact, as well as reducing waste. Preliminary studies indicate that reuse systems produce far more jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. This is also expected to be the case for reusable packaging systems, with commentators noting that these increased jobs are also more likely to be localised and geographically dispersed,⁵ which meets provincial development goals. The growth of reuse schemes and shifting social norms will also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging (not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More transparency, more onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed. This would increase public confidence and engagement in the recycling system, creating a positive flow-on of reduced contamination. It would also allow for better packaging choices by designers, who can integrate end-of-life options (e.g. closed loop recycling) into design choices of materials. Mandatory recycled content is a key regulatory lever to assist with pull-through of recycled plastics in the economy and better design. Standardised collection of materials and investment in recycling education and community engagement would help more people to use the recycling system correctly, reducing contamination, which can result in recyclable materials going to landfill. Government regulatory policy and investment is needed to move reusable alternatives from the niche to the mainstream. We note that it's already possible to BYO reusable containers and tableware for takeaway food and drink. In many cases, washable crockery is a realistic alternative instead of disposables. A handful of reuse schemes exist for reusable takeaway packaging, such as Again Again, CupCycling and Reusabowl. The issue is not a lack of ideas or models, but barriers to scale and normalisation of these systems within an entrenched linear economy, and lack of adequate incentives to ensure uptake of reusable alternatives when they are available.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Ensure adequate consultation with the disabled community regarding straws. Extend the list to include; Disposable coffee cups & lids, plastic lollipop sticks & wrappers, single serve pottles sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries, coffee pods containing plastic, teabags containing plastic, single use plastic water bottles, balloons and balloon sticks, glitter & plastic confetti, complementary plastic toys, chewing gum containing plastic. Beyond the single-use items proposed in the document, we would support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes, and other disposable sanitary products, and to reduce the harm from industrial and commercial use of plastics like fishing nets, plastic wrap and strapping used in freight, and plastic building wrap used in construction. We also urge the Government to implement a regulatory plan to address cigarette butts. According to the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, cigarette butts account for 78% of all items littered in New Zealand and are the most commonly found item in beach litter clean ups. Globally, cigarette butts are thought to be the most littered item on Earth.⁸ The consultation document mentions cigarette butts in passing (p.50) but offers no plan because there may not be plastic-free alternatives. However, measures other than a phase-out could be implemented under s 23 of the WMA, such as mandatory on-pack labelling to increase smokers' awareness that butts contain plastic and appropriate means of disposal, or fees on filters put on the market to cover estimated clean-up costs.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics in the proposed phase-out, and applaud the Government for taking this step. As the consultation document notes, many of these products are not certified, and/or not home compostable nor marine degradable. Those that are certified compostable often don't end up in the right place to be composted (pp48), potentially contaminating recycle streams or

emitting methane when disposed of in landfill. Furthermore, as with any single-use product they embody wasted energy and resources. For all these reasons, we support their inclusion in the phase-out proposal.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups The Packaging Forum estimates that New Zealanders use 295 million single-use coffee cups a year. The overwhelming majority of single-use coffee cups are landfilled or escape into the national environment. Coffee cups are non-recyclable due to the waterproof liners and coffee residue, and they are a common contaminant in the cardboard recycling stream. Compostable cups rarely make it to a commercial composting facility where they will safely break down. Coffee cups are also light and prone to escaping into the environment. The fully detachable lids increase the potential for harmful plastic litter. We believe that the expertise to create reusable infrastructure and accompanying community engagement is already well established in New Zealand. Virtually all outlets already accept BYO reusables, and most outlets have in-house ceramic options if people forget their cup. There are a growing range of reuse schemes/cup loan systems. Some towns, such as Wanaka, have a vision of being free of single-use coffee cups by 2022. Nationwide, a growing number of cafes (over 50 that we know of) have eliminated single-use cups entirely by implementing strategies to encourage customers to “sit, borrow or bring”. They have implemented a combination of incentives such as discounts/surcharges, retail of ‘keep cups’, adoption of homegrown/national reuse systems (e.g. Again Again and informal cup loans), invitations to BYO, education around the issue and importantly, encouragement to build community by making time to stay. We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems), and compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging (these labelling requirements should be mandated under s 23(1)(f) of the WMA). Before a ban is phased in, we would also support fees being attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs (which can be considerable when they block pipes and form fatbergs). Currently the community is covering these costs through Council. It would be more appropriate to attach this cost to producers and consumers through a fee. This is different to a levy as it’s related to the cost of managing the product and could be achieved under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA. A ban on advertising for wet wipes containing plastic would also be appropriate. An alternative pathway that could be helpful would be to declare disposable sanitary products (which would include wet wipes) as a ‘Priority Product’ - this would enable a considered, wraparound approach to a multitude of similar products at once.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

A combination of regulation to disincentivise single-use and build a reuse culture, community engagement, and reuse infrastructure would enable the transition away from single-use coffee cups.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable (e.g. by Jan 2022).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The community will assist in monitoring if they are able to report breaches of the mandatory phase-out to MfE, similar to the plastic bag ban. In light of the far wider scope of this particular phase-out proposal and the breadth of actors in our economy and within our communities who are likely to be affected, we support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. We also believe that appointment of enforcement officers under s 76 would be appropriate in this case.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 141

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We need to start thinking about it, and acting now before there is anymore damage to our country.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There is also too much packaging around things like tools, cosmetics and other much used items.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs, manufacturers may have to change their machinery and look for other ways to package their products. Benefits, Our waterways would be cleaner, less environmental damage all round. Less garbage on roadsides etc. A cleaner greener world for our children and grandchildren.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Its an unknown area, so both costs and Benefits can only be estimated.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Buying items in containers which can be recycled. I already use reusable/refillable containers where I can.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Wet Wipes made from biodegradable material, and banning plastic ones from sale.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 142

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

consistency

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

increasing recyclability of waste and reducing microplastics contamination in our environment

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

this will depend largely on supplemental policies to promote uptake of reuse infrastructure

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

see Nr.14

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Please include for phase out so called "bioplastics" which in fact can be just as harmful as other plastic

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

policy measures to inform consumers better and support companies to do the right thing

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1-2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

same as the single use plastic bag ban

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 143

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree with the proposal and am very happy to see New Zealand adopting existing ideas on reducing the plastic-impact on the environment

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I feel the objectives mentioned are a good first step in feasibility and positive environmental impact.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The options considered keep in mind that unfortunately not everyone of the population cares about the environment / plastic pollution. Thus a less drastic approach is the better start to hopefully slowly get everyone on board to a plastic-free future.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

A mandatory phase out over the course of a few years will give the industry time to adjust, while still ensuring no new hard to recycle plastics will be brought into the stream in the future.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

While the environmentalist in me would like to see the phase-out happen faster, I understand that suppliers / producers need more time to adjust. I support the proposed time-frame.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefit will be the environment. The cost will be the burden on the industry to find alternative ways of packaging their products. These costs will likely be passed onto the customers. However I feel the costs for recycling the packaging should have been included for a long time, so it's only fair to start that now.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Once the industry is forced to shift away from hard-to-recycle packaging they will find / develop new ways. Molded Cardboard

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Their 'pseudo degradation' places a huge strain on the environment by ending up in eco-systems. Banning these plastics will be big benefit to all animals.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I agree with the proposed ban, however I would also like to see a bigger incentive to replace plastic coffee cups with reusable cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

As stated in previous points, in industry will take time to adjust.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 144

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Get rid of all plastic as soon as possible we are running out of time

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. We urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Reusable only

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Anything with plastic in it ban it

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes mandatory phase out

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Time frame needs to be quicker These items need to stop being made Use up what there is and no more

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Anything with Plastic = no

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. We also call for Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Needs to be quicker

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Phase out all plastic Benefit is the earth may not heat up as fast

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

You banning it so only alternative options are available

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Notes

BAN SINGLE u se coffee CUP

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Other (please specify)

Notes

ASAP ASAP ASAP

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

As soon as is possible Compostable wet wipes as alternative

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

ASAP coffee is not a NEED bring ur own cup with you

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 145

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support the comprehensive description of problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items, as well as the fact that the phasing out of these products will bring us in line with international best practice which is important if NZ wants to be considered a world leader in sustainable practices and being "clean, green" and as marketed to international tourists, "100% Pure". Additional consideration of the wider impacts of the economic and regulatory systems surrounding these materials as well as the materials themselves would aid in designing a regulatory response for them. In my opinion, other single-use products (particularly plastics which are considered easier to recycle) should also be considered as part of this regulatory response, as several factors can cause issues with recycling these products. For example, food- or otherwise- contaminated products, product design (using a mix of different types) and lack of access to a nearby recycling bin or lack of knowledge about recycling mean these recyclable products often end up in landfill instead of being recycled. Furthermore, NZ relies on overseas markets to recycle some of these materials, where it is not always possible to ensure they are safely recycled, and also means we rely on these overseas markets' demand, leaving us vulnerable to stockpiles of materials taking up valuable space or worse, ending up in landfill, when demand drops suddenly.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives are necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy, which should be the ultimate goal. These objectives must however also be supported by regulatory measures, policy and investment to encourage reuse. Support for infrastructure and community engagement is crucial to allow reuse to replace single-use. Access to reusable alternatives and systems to support their use (for example washing facilities) are an important factor in transitioning behaviour to reuse and move away from single-use. As mentioned by the Zero Waste Network in their joint submission (see <https://zerowaste.co.nz/assets/ZWN-Hard-to-recycle-and-Single-use-Plastics-Submission-2020.pdf>), the main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." (Zero Waste Network, 2020) I also agree with the Zero Waste Networks recommendation that a secondary objective be added as follows: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer." (Zero Waste Network, 2020)

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list is comprehensive and considers a range of measures. Again, additions of following options could strengthen this section, as proposed by the Zero Waste Network (see <http://therubbishtrip.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Joint-Submission-of-Zero-Waste-Community-on-Govt-Plastic-Ban-Proposal.pdf>): "- mandatory targets for reuse/refill on specified items - deposit return systems for takeaway serviceware to ensure that they are in a recyclable condition (i.e., clean) and put in the correct recycling bins - mandating reusables in dine-in settings (as done by the Berkeley Ordinance) - levies on targeted

single-use items - guidelines for the durability, repairability or modularity of products - applying fees to cover estimated costs for clean-up and disposal of items not proposed for a ban, but are still problematic (e.g. cigarette butts, wet wipes and takeaway packaging)" (Zero Waste Network, 2020)

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More focus could be placed on the degree to which each option lines up with the strategic direction of the proposal, ensuring that most weight is given to the outcomes that most line up most with the strategic direction of the proposal.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support the mandatory phase-out of all items listed. I would however like to see provisions made for exceptions for straws which may be necessary for certain people with disabilities who could be disadvantaged by a complete ban. If there is no reusable alternative suitable for such people, they should be granted an exemption on the ban of plastic straws. As mentioned above, encouraging and facilitating reuse alternatives alongside a mandatory phase-out should also be included in the approach, as this would support the move towards reuse.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree with the phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging and with the two-stage approach. I agree with the Zero Waste Networks suggestion however, to speed up the time frames for these stages, as this is a very urgent matter. They suggest: "PVC trays being phased out by June 2021: PVC trays are especially problematic for the recycling industry as they are the main contaminants of onshore clear PET recycling, and are easily substituted by clear PET trays. All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023" (Zero Waste Network, <http://therubbishtrip.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Joint-Submission-of-Zero-Waste-Community-on-Govt-Plastic-Ban-Proposal.pdf>)

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and hard polystyrene are used in other consumer packaging (outside of food and beverage packaging). As a result they could easily become contaminants in recycling streams of packaging that is easier to recycle. It is therefore better to phase out all such packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Phasing these types of packaging would bring following benefits: - no contamination of recycling streams from these products - eliminating the risk of these products ending up in our precious natural environment, where they cause great damage to our marine and bird life - replacing these products with recyclable or better reusable packaging options would bring NZ closer to a circular economy which will bring enormous benefits for sustainability and conservation efforts Avoiding potential initial costs for manufacturers when switching to recyclable or reusable packaging cannot justify continuing to produce these harmful plastics,

as the likely enormous environmental costs of not phasing them out are so much greater and wide-reaching.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This is a great opportunity for Kiwi ingenuity and for NZ to develop world-leading reuse schemes and systems. In addition, there are already many packaging options in existence that are much easier to recycle than PVC, polystyrene and EPS. The ideal alternative (which is certainly achievable with regulation and policy which supports these systems) would be to encourage and develop reuse/refill systems wherever possible. If not reusable, then any packaging's end-of-life options should be thoroughly researched to avoid unintendedly causing new problems of recyclability or disposal. The Zero Waste Network provides a good example: "For example, banning EPS appliance packaging is likely to boost use of moulded cardboard packaging. Research should be done to identify the best practice end-of-life solution for moulded cardboard packaging (i.e. recycling or composting). The research should be widely disseminated to packaging suppliers and product designers so that appropriate choices of glue, coatings and/or colourings are made to align with the end-of-life solution." (Zero Waste Network, 2020, p.8). Ideally the end-of-life (recycling) of any single-use packaging should become the manufacturer's responsibility, via a deposit scheme (such as the Pfand system used in Germany for example), which encourages consumers to return their packaging to collection points (which must also be easily and widely accessible, for example placed at supermarkets). As the Zero Waste Network (2020) mentions, clear labelling is also very important, so consumers know what they are purchasing, and how/where to recycle or dispose of the packaging appropriately.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

These plastics are no better for the environment than non-recyclable, non-degradable plastics, and also contaminate recycling streams. They seem to be mainly an avenue for green washing without offering any real solution to the plastic problem. I agree with the Zero Waste Network's (2020) recommendation to phase these out by June 2021, in line with the EU's planned phase out of these products.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

In addition to the list of costs and benefits listed in the consultation document, the Zero Waste Network has correctly identified additional benefits as follows: "- Indigenous communities: reducing plastic pollution may reduce degradation of the natural (including marine) environment which has impacted on customary practices. Fresh water quality: microplastic contamination of drinking water is already occurring. Ecosystem health: microplastics are being found in all ecosystem compartments, including within organisms, so far examined. Their impacts range from the individual level to the ecosystem level. Air quality: microplastics are increasingly being found in the air of both populated and remote locations. Human health: The 2019 report Plastic & Health: The Hidden Costs of a Plastic Planet found that significant, complex, and intersecting human health impacts occur at every stage of the plastic lifecycle. Climate: Reducing single-use plastics will reduce our reliance on virgin plastic resin, and therefore on fossil fuels. In 2019 the lifecycle of global plastic production - from extraction to disposal - was equivalent to the impact on the climate of 189 500MW coal-fired power stations. Emissions from plastic emerge not only from the production and manufacture of plastic itself, but from every stage in the plastic lifecycle - from the extraction and transport of the fossil fuels that are the primary feedstocks for plastic, to refining and manufacturing, to waste management. Acting to reduce single-use plastics and increase recycled content will also help New Zealand meet its international and domestic climate change obligations. Future generations: Reducing targeted plastics helps to reduce degradation of ecosystems essential to the wellbeing of future generations and non-human species." (Zero Waste Network, 2020, p.9-10)

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

As mentioned above, another benefit is the opportunity for Kiwi ingenuity to develop more sustainable packaging in the form of reuse/refill systems, at the same time creating more jobs and supporting a move away from all single-use packaging, which will

further reduce costs of disposing of single-use items.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Support from government in the form of regulation and policy which incentivises/mandates implementation of widely available reuse/refill systems and/or recycling, along with ease of access to these systems (e.g. affordable for consumers of all socio-economic backgrounds, widespread collection points, onshore recycling facilities), and wider education on the importance and benefits of reuse/recycling, both for producers and consumers. Some of these reuse systems are already emerging (such as for reusable coffee cups and takeaway containers), but they require some assistance and government regulation as well as wider education to speed up their adoption in the mainstream.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

As mentioned earlier, special consideration should be given to plastic straws in the case of people with disabilities who may not have a viable alternative. I also support the following items being included in the list of single-use plastic items to be phased out: - Single-use plastic water bottles - Reusable water bottles are becoming more and more widespread, and we have widespread access to good quality tap water, so the need for bottled water in single-use plastic bottles is minimal. If for any reason people insist on buying water instead of drinking tap water, reusable bottles with a deposit scheme could be an alternative, or perhaps refill stations. Hospitality providers are increasingly joining a network of refill providers, offering to refill reusable bottles for free, which is particularly helpful for tourists and travellers, who are likely the biggest consumers of single-use plastic water bottles in NZ, often purely for the sake of convenience and lack of easily accessible alternative options such as refill stations - Disposable coffee cups and lids - Reusable coffee cups are widely available, and cup loan schemes (where people who perhaps don't want to invest in their own reusable cup or have forgotten to bring theirs, can use one provided by the cafe, for a small deposit, which is returned when they bring back the cup the next time) are being adopted by more and more hospitality businesses. This type of scheme could be expanded country-wide. Similar to the ban of plastic shopping bags, the change in habit would quickly be accepted and become 'normal', if disposable coffee cups and lids were banned. - Single-serve packets of condiments and toiletries - these were one of the most common items of plastic found in the clean up of the Fox River landfill spill, and are absolutely avoidable. Many hospitality businesses are already seeking out alternatives, and a mandatory phase-out of these items would ensure a faster adoption of alternatives. - Single-use plastic coffee pods - There are already reusable alternatives available for these pods, and the frequent nature of their use means a large amount of single-plastic would be avoided by phasing-out the plastic (and/or any other single-use versions) in favour of reusable options. - Plastic lollipop sticks, cotton bud sticks and candy wrappers - Again, there are more sustainable options available for these items, and they pose a significant danger to wildlife if they escape into the environment. - Balloons - These also pose a major threat to wildlife when they end up in the natural environment, and due to the nature of their intended use (often at outdoor events and celebrations) are highly likely to do so - Plastic glitter and confetti - The small size of these products as well as their frequent use at outdoor events and celebrations, makes them a major threat to the health of our wildlife. They could very easily be mistaken for food and ingested by small animals, introducing them to the food chain and causing widespread casualties - Plastic containing chewing gum - Again, this product has a high likelihood of ending up in the natural environment, in large part due to a lack of knowledge on the part of the consumer that these products even contain plastic. Unknowingly, they may not think to dispose of them in designated rubbish bins (or not be close to one), and think it won't cause harm if just disposed in nature. And there are biodegradable alternatives available, so the plastic-containing versions should be phased out. - Wet wipes containing plastic - biodegradable alternatives should be found, as these products cause significant damage both in the natural environment, and costly maintenance of waste water/sewerage systems. A lack of consumer education is partly to blame for this, and at the very least clear labelling should be introduced until more sustainable alternatives are introduced, so consumers are aware which products contain plastics, along with accurate information on how to best dispose of them. - Disposable sanitary items - due to the frequent use of these products by a large part of the population, they cause a significant amount of plastic waste which fills up landfill or ends up polluting the environment. There are already reusable alternatives available, which should be brought into mainstream use with assistance from government education via education and schemes to increase accessibility for those who are on lower incomes (e.g. government subsidy available for those who need it). - Cigarette butts - the consultation document provides no plan for dealing with the significant pollution problem caused by cigarette butts (which are one of the most commonly littered items), as there may currently be no plastic free alternatives available. Further research should be done into possible alternatives, however at the very least consumer education should be increased, perhaps in the form of clear labelling indicating plastic content and how they should be disposed. The Zero Waste Network (2020) also suggests increased fees on filters which could then be used to fund the clean-up costs, which I support.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I agree with the changes suggested by the Zero Waste Network (2020) in response to this question: - The definition for single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined, paper single-use tableware -The definition for single-use plastic produce bags should be amended to include the plastic netting bags often used to package pre-packed amounts of

smaller fruit such as mandarins, lemons etc. This type of packaging can pose a serious threat to our wildlife if it ends up in our environment, birds or other small animals can get caught in these nets, leaving them injured and/or unable to move and find food, thus leading to a slow and miserable death. These types of packaging are also unnecessary and could feasibly be replaced by alternative, plastic-free packaging.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

As soon as possible for all products. In accordance with the advice of the Zero Waste Network (2020), 12 months for all products except single use coffee cups. Their suggestion of 2 years for single-use coffee cups makes sense, as this time would be needed to implement/expand reuse systems all around NZ

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

For reducing the use of single-use coffee cups, policy and regulation can help to widen the introduction of reuse schemes which allow consumers to borrow a reusable cup from retailers for a small deposit, which is returned when they bring it back. This is a viable alternative for those customers who forget or don't want to purchase their own reusable cup. Wet wipes should be transitioned to an alternative which does not include plastic. Until this is possible these products should include clear labelling to educate consumers and ensure they are aware of how to best dispose of them after use (i.e. not to flush them).N/

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

As suggested by the Zero Waste Network, a period of two years for a phase out would allow for the necessary implementation of alternatives for these products. In the case of disposable coffee cups, the alternatives already exist in the form of reusable cups both for private use as well as up loan schemes. These just need to be expanded across the whole country, and use of these can also be further encouraged by public education. For wet wipes, until plastic free alternatives can be switched to, clear labelling informing consumers of their plastic content and appropriate disposal should be mandatory, and this is something that should be implemented immediately.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

In addition to the benefits listed in the proposal, the added opportunity for innovation and employment opportunities created in developing alternatives to the products which will be phased out will be of benefit to the community as a whole.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The government should create a strategy for the monitoring of compliance and should give the agency responsible the powers to enforce the changes.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 146

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Start Stage 2 a year earlier, by January 2024.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, we want to get rid of all of this asap. By including export and import of food we can show the rest of the world that it's possible to do this.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits far outweigh the costs. Current cost analysis does often not take into account the long-term effects on the environment and clean-up costs.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The benefits to the environment and therefore to our whole food chain and survival for example are immeasurable.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Reduced unnecessary packaging of food products

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

No exemption for single-use plastic cups made from recyclable plastics

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Public education and much clearer labelling on products and point-of-sale

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Could include a 'Consumer hotline' to highlight issues of non-compliance.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 147

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Would love to see plastic bottles as single use plastic items too

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I also think companies should be taxed if they are using plastic so they will have an incentive to move away from it

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think it needs to be sooner 2022 and 2024

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes
Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

the quicker we phase it out the better

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Cost would be to the companies changing their packaging, benefits would be less waste in waterways

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Should be earlier Jan 2022

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I already use lots of refillable/reuseable options but the general public wont change unless companies change, they have to take the leadership

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Agree with everything but need additions of single use drink bottles (for water and coke etc) plus wet wipes and chip bags (chip bags can be made compostable now)

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

- Biocups or compostable coffee cups - Wet wipes and chip bags should be banned unless compostable

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Companies should have to send in a form with changes to their stock and also consumers should be able to email in with companies that don't comply and pay a hefty fine (not something small where businesses like McDonalds would still benefit from polluting even with the fine)

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 148

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: less unnecessary plastic going into the environment, reduces waste that is hard to recycle. Costs: Not sure.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

It can be done using paper/cardboard.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I believe that most of what has been discussed is sound. Plastic straws are necessary for some people with disabilities, but those may be able to be purchased as an option which can be used more than once, rather than the single-use variety. Additionally, the agricultural wrapping may cause some disturbance (cost) in the agricultural sector, as new materials will be needed to replace it. Another potential possibility is that some brands may appear on the market which are plastic-free and compostable and may capitalise on this new gap in the market, which may end up causing people to have to pay a lot more. This would have to be regulated so that replacements are feasible for households may not be able to afford a good increase such as this. It should be kept accessible, but environmentally friendly in keeping with the initial kaupapa.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

We already live constantly trying to avoid any plastics, which is so difficult! The best way to do it is by having none of it available, so that there is no unwanted trash that we can't recycle. Make it literally impossible to get our hands on and force other options.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I would add wet wipes, plastic drink bottles (both single-use that come filled with a drink, as well as those which we buy to refill - the alternative could be metal bottles for refilling), courier bags (to be replaced with cardboard or compostable ones), chip bags, and cling-wrap, baking paper, and perhaps consider regulating clothing with high amounts of elastane or other non-biodegradable materials in it. It would also be really fantastic to have an alternative to tetrapack milk and juice containers.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Encourage cafes etc to give discounts to people who bring their own, reusable coffee cups. The issue here could be a resurgence of Covid-19, but that is the worst-case-scenario. As for wet wipes, take all wet wipes which contain plastic off the market, as there are biodegradable alternatives. I don't know if it will go down the way I imagine, but you would hope that those specialist products such as biodegradable wet wipes (which are currently more expensive than the non-biodegradable kind) would reduce in price due to demand, but it could very easily swing the other way because there is no alternative.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

I am not one of these businesses.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Through an Act of Parliament, through border-checks for imported goods, and maybe having a place where people can call or contact if they find a business which is not complying and they can get a compliance officer to visit the business and ensure future compliance with a series of warnings before eventually incurring a fine etc.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 149

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

There is a bigger problem around overall single plastic production both nationally and globally. Governments need to be bolder in simply banning all single use plastic production other than for those items which can actually be easily and economically recycled (not wishcycled). Industry will always take the line of least resistance when it comes to cost minimization. Banning within say 3 years will be extremely challenging to industry to find alternatives, but we seem to have forgotten the maximum of "necessity is the mother of invention". It is time to simply turn off the taps, and stop trying to mop up the overflowing bath tub.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

See previous comments.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Needs to be faster and more wide ranging.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

See above comments.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

See above comments. The policy initiative needs to be bolder and more wide ranging to capture the majority of single use packing used unless the manufacturers can prove that the product is able to be effectively and economically recycled in New Zealand, and not simply shipped off to some poor third world country.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Huge benefits for the environment and global wildlife.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If the industry are forced to find them by a wide ranging ban, then I am convinced they will find them a lot faster than they say they can.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

See above comments

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

See above comments

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

See above comments

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Simply force the manufacturers to stop the production in the first place .Shifting the problem of disposal or recycling onto the

customer or rate payer at no cost to the industry will never be an effective solution.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

See above comments

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

3 years

Notes

See above comments. Alternatives must be found within 3 years or stop selling the product the packaging contains will result in a massive shift in industry attitudes, which is well over due.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Simply ban their production / sale. Easy.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

That it becomes illegal in 3 years time. Simple.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

With respect to those items, 1 year.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Large fines or imprisonment for offenders.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 150

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part. This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use itemsthrough significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systemsthat support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

It is necessary to move away from items from which the end-of-life is problematic for us and generations to come. We need to transition into a future where the end-of life of a products is designed into the products and create a circular model. If we can shoot people into space then surely we can come up with some workable solutions for the items that we use at the end of

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

As long as it aligns with the zero waste hierarchy

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes in part We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Yes However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

So many organisations we work with have massive issues with polystyrene as a waste stream; it can only be landfilled or worse. It also often contaminates recycling streams through wish cyclin. Can you please add it in stage 1?

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

there are only environmental benefits by phasing out all mentioned packaging goods. or as the ZWN states: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

the sooner the better, it causes nothing but problems.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

It is necessary to internalise the environmental cost in the cost of a product. Without doing so the true cost cannot be determined and producers will remain to have economic leverage which is false..

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Agree We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets. 17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change? Yes with changes We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, b

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Yes with changes We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (including plastic based fragrances) as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems as well as littering along road sides) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 151

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 152

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Unsustainable and less waste

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 154

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes I do. I am proud to see New Zealand taking steps to make real tangible change. I would like to make sure that proper regulations are in place to support this to make sure change takes place and in the correct way.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, the combination of these options are an amazing progression towards the avoidance of hard-to-recycle-items and single use plastics.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support the mandatory phase out of the items listed. I believe that making it mandatory is the only way we will see real change. People adapt very quickly (eg plastic bag ban) and it is the only way to ensure proper take up. Proper regulations around this, and full support for alternatives, will be an important part of the success of this decision. I think it would be a good option to issue exemption cards for those who require items that will be banned (eg straws for those who need them to drink) that will allow holders to be exempt from the bans.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I definitely agree, but would support a short time frame to roll this out. 2025 is five years away... that's far too far away, let's get moving, we and the planet don't have time to waste.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This list is great - well done.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Let's get rid of it all as soon as possible. It contaminates other recycling, hindering other recycling efforts.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Absolutely.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Let's get this done asap.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Very likely I think. It will prompt innovation and new ways of doing things, all while working towards a better good. It also sends a message around other single use items that they are not ok - both within NZ and around the world.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Better alternatives. Making the alternatives the norm/more acceptable. Also, Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I support this list. As mentioned before I think it would be necessary to have proper regulations around this, and for a system that allows some people to be exempt (eg those with a condition that necessitates single use items) such as an official exemption card. That said, I am astonished at the omission of some items. And slightly heartbroken by the missed opportunity. The following should not be exempt from the ban: - Single-use coffee cups & lids - Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I also support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Yes, however I would like to see some changes. I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings. Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups. Momentum is important - the sooner the better. 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. There are plastic-free options on the market currently which shows that this is perfectly achievable. In the meantime, I would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems). Education is so important. Most people are unaware of the impact of their habits, and many are willing to make a change once they are aware. -

compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

This list is great. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 155

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

phase out should start ASAP and be illegal to use/sell within 6 months of policy

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

yes for sure

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Plastic free oceans, improved hormonal health in all humans (xenoestrogens), reversed extinction predictions of species, overall environmental benefit

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Stainless steel, glass, eco home compostable packaging

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

they are still a 'plastic' and require resources to produce, and the right enviro to break down. they are not compostable or recyclable so do not benefit the enviro after use. they break down to harmful microplastics

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

yes stainless steel, paper and glass

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

plastic tax and policies to ban plastics (eco alternatives only way)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

sooner the better. #1 the earth is screaming for change, we NEED to phase them out asap. There has been a movement for

the past few years of plastic bags being phased out and now covid19 that our communities are aware that change is needed and acting fast and hard is needed and will be accepted

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

stainless steel, glass, paper/cardboard

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

reduced pricing/subsidy for eco alternatives, education and awareness around different materials, higher profits for being recognised as being eco friendly, laws that prevent plastics being used (no other option)

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months, 18 months TOPS

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Shared with the public, local enviro groups and government

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 156

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

These options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy. These are items that are often found in local litter cleanups along roadside and in our estuaries

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023 There are numerous alternatives to these types of packaging already widely available on the market, there is no reason why these stages could not be implemented sooner.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, a great inclusive list

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams (most of the general public, including many businesses, are ignorant to what is recyclable), so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils. The only costs that should be considered are those of NOT phasing out these items. Economic cost means nothing in comparison to what it will cost us to continue to negligently abuse our ecosystems.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Absolutely, many already on the market being used by ecologically conscious businesses and manufacturers. Often a bit of creativity can mean we can re-use waste product to meet these needs - popcorn, cloth offcuts, mushrooms!

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware : We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings as these are confusing to consumers and often contaminate waste/recycling streams (or are thrown out into the environment under the assumption that they are fully natural!) ● Single-use plastic produce bags : We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags as there are alternatives readily available

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around

reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 157

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Take away all micro plastics and eliminate all potential causes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 158

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, & reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The two stage proposal makes sense as some forms of plastic are more difficult to phase out than others. The timeline however is too slow. PVC trays should be phased out by July 2021. Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out. Good job!

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

EPS is not widely able to be recycled so ends up often as plastic litter that gets into our waterways. It does not break down so it persists in our environment for hundreds of years harming our environment. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils. PVC often contaminates the recycling stream, phasing it out will help produce a higher PET to reprocessors.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker, the better! Phase out by June 2021. Great to see a proposed blanket ban of these.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Reuse schemes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Plastic straws can be vital to those in the disabled community and the Government should consult with those groups and organizations before deciding whether or not these should be phased out. If they are to be phased out, another solution will be needed for people who require plastic straws. I do not support excluding single use coffee cups from the ban or excluding plastic cups and lids made of plastic 1,2 and 4. I support the list being extended to include: Single serve pottles, sachets and containers for condiments Coffee pods containing plastic Single use plastic water bottles Balloons and plastic glitter

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. Single-use plastic tableware: Alter the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings Single-use plastic produce bags: The definition could be broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

- investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' in dine in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet Wipes: compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Single use Cups: 2023 Wet wipes: 2022

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and I agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 159

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected

party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not

containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 160

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Single use items are part of a larger issue: that we are a throw-away society rather than a circular one. I agree with the problems with these items. We also need to keep the larger goal in mind, of a cultural shift to sustainable behaviour. The Government can choose to play a crucial part in this.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Its a great starting point! It does need to be combined with policies that encourage and support a shift to a re-use mentality, rather than replacing plastic with other single-use items.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I think a combined approach would be most effective- eliminate the difficult plastics but also encourage re-use and other circular systems at the same time. Ideally the Government would be stimulating research into sustainable alternatives ASAP

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I do think we need to be taking a long-term perspective, putting things in place now to 'turn the ship' towards a sustainable circular economy. It takes time to change a culture, and they say we are running out of time.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think there is too much time pressure on the environment to wait til 2025. We need to move faster. I think Industry could keep up if given the right encouragement.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

It is exciting to think these could all be gone very soon!

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It does seem logical to include it all at once.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Huge environmental benefits, and benefits for easier recycling. Doesn't a re-use system create more jobs, as well? There will be cost adjustments for industries, but as it will apply to all industries, they will quickly adapt to the new norm, or risk losing their market share..

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Why not go straight to the re-use, refill return-type systems as the first option. Other options such as legislating for plastics with a high recycled content, and designing for minimal packaging, are also more desirable than new single use plastic.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Absolutely!

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The importance of a phase-out of plastics cannot be over-stated. The cost to our world at every stage of the plastic cycle is becoming more and more apparent, should we choose to acknowledge it. Any costs to phasing out plastic should be seen as an investment in our long term health and sustainability.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

As above

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Supporting regulations and laws that encourage businesses to provide the option of refilling/reusing. I already use Bin Inn to

buy as much as I can, as it is the best way I can find to avoid plastic packaging. I choose glass or paper alternatives where they are offered, but there is very little alternative for some items.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Yes!

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

There are other easily replaced items that could also be included, such as plastic-lined tea bags, single-use takeaway cups, single use coffee pods, plastic lollipop sticks.. items that are not necessary or already have alternatives available.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I was surprised that disposable coffee cups weren't included, as I think the general public are already aware of them as an issue, and are responding by using keep-cups. I think they would be an ideal issue to tackle as part of the educational side of needing to change. Keep cups are very 'on-trend', and this could be a great re-education opportunity. There are already places that don't offer single-use cups. They would have some very good suggestions I am sure.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A way for the public to easily report breaches. Also some sort of monitoring or checking system with compliance officers or similar.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 161

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes but would include all single use plastics unless we actually recycle every single piece of plastic here in NZ and not ship it

overseas or put it in landfill.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less waste going to landfill, more opportunity to encourage companies to use recycled materials

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Making it cost effective for people and making things mandatory ie the ban on plastic bags

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban them like plastic bags

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee

cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

4 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 162

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

It will take an extremely long time for mid to big size companies to change their packaging. This proposal is putting the focus back on companies to change their packaging, hoping that market forces, and consumers will all be on the same page globally. I say this because of the amount of products that we import from overseas. The government needs to be more creative and invest in industry to help recycle plastics. This includes supporting councils that place more focus on other community and regional projects.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Where is the support and initiative to support a recycling industry, and create jobs as well? The mantra of reusing and refusing is going to take an extremely long time (in my view) to indoctrinate in New Zealand. I believe there needs to be another strategy as well as what objectives have been written in the document Reducing the impact of plastics in our environment.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

As mentioned above, this relies on companies who produce and use of plastics to seek better options, which will be directed by market consumer forces globally, not just nationally. Profit is king, and therefore the movement of change will be slow.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Cardboard - investing in new technology to reuse cardboard and paper.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

You have lead boldly and make this a requirement. Government is extremely slow to take action on commercial initiatives, that are dictated by consumerism. Action needs to be deliberate and impactful, not slow and lack of direction.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

People have to change their shopping practices. Businesses have to adapt or close. New technologies can be developed in New Zealand with support from government and industry.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

packaging for compost and other garden products such as fertilisers

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The benefit will be new industries around the development of reuseable products. It will mean developing new ways of retailing. It will mean new ways of food storage.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Incentivise - there are already companies offering to recycle products. This needs to become easier for small towns which don't have the drop off points for collection of products to be recycled.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Make it mandatory to only serve cups that don't have any type of plastic lining.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months. We have had so much media coverage of the harmful impacts of these products that industry should have already started to move towards better products.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Have people go around companies and audit their waste. Or randomly have companies send a sample of their bulk waste to a centre for analysis. There will need to more than one approach to plug the loopholes companies will find.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 163

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I think the sooner we can be rid of damaging plastics such as PVC and hard polystyrene the better, we're fighting against time, the time to act is right now.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

It will force us to resort to new methods of packaging will present it's own challenges, but this is not to be avoided, with the bigness of the issue we are facing we need to act to stop the production of these products asap as to stop the continual growth of the issue of pollution

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

through making byo containers are more normalised thing to do at supermarkets and cafes etc. I think it's going to be an adjustment for sure but one we can't avoid.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

greater education about alternatives, normalising behaviour such as carrying around keep cups, or having a bring cup back policy

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

within two years as it needs to happen soon.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 164

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Plastic is just one part of our single use throwaway society. There should also be consideration of the impacts created when a single use product is made. Carbon Dioxide, transport, use of oil to produce plastic.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Mandating recycled content in new products. Reusable culture should be an objective as part of mitigating climate change.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Increase in reusable s policy, including incentives and inspiring (rather than requiring)

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Blended options my have been better. Movements away from plastic may be similarly harmful; this happened with the plastic bag ban where more harmful options were popularised. A blended approach could include a levy on the alternative items (e.g. each retailer must charge a 20c levy for each compostable bag used). This would incentivise a reuse system.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Timelines could be much faster

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

There are many more types of plastics beyond food and beverages

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Absolutely

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Great opportunity for innovation and NZ industry to grow

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There are so many out there, not least reusables

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Will certainly have great benefits than discussed. This is a huge win for our people, businesses and environment

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Clear regulation, in a similar way to the plastic bag ban

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Single use coffee cup ban must be on the list. Single use condiments and plastic lollipop sticks should also be included

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

2 years would be ideal for the necessary innovations, regulations and investments

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

For coffee cups; reusable schemes, encouraging eat-in, popularity of bring your own cup. For wet wipes: showcasing of alternatives, how this makes more sense, contains less chemicals for parents

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months. We could do this very quickly, there has already been so much work done on this so it would be able to be enacted quite quickly.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

More detailed understanding of the stigma of the exemptions for plastic straws for disabled people. Consultation with this community is necessary.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Quite tightly, this is a culture change, and will require a level of enforcement.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 165

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government gave a good description of the problems the targeted plastics can cause. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku. We urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material types used, and to propose more concrete policy & regulatory actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. We urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers key actions we'd expect to see. We have two concerns: There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time, e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. The list is missing some key policy options that could really help grow reuse - deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria & weightings make sense & help us understand the Government's reasoning behind the proposals. We suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy. Some criteria need broader definitions: "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse. "Achievability" should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. We also suggest new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support banning all the items listed (except for plastic straws - more on that later). Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, we urge the Govt not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead multi-task like a boss & take forward more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too! A 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Govt can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. But, the timelines proposed are too slow. Think of all the targeted plastic items that could enter our environment before 2023 and 2025. Right now, the world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. We need to reverse these trends, fast. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. We suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Using our democracy isn't only about speaking up when we disagree. It is also about giving our consent and approval when we feel the Government gets it right. So, we're going to be thanking the Government for creating what we reckon is an expansive & ambitious list of products for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, water-ways and marine environment - damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. A small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation. However due to the harmful properties of plastic in the environment, we would support it being replaced as a packaging material. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in'

contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. We also call for Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you, Government, for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics - we wholeheartedly support this. PS the EU (and others) are banning them by July 2021 - just sayin'...

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The Government has made a comprehensive list of costs & benefits. We agree with all of them. We appreciate the recognition of potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers & for the wider community from simplifying our waste & recycling streams. We also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. Overall, we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits - human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There's an extra benefit to banning the targeted plastics that the Government's missed. This benefit is the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems not only reduce waste, they also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. More reuse schemes & more reusable packaging will also mean less throwaway packaging overall (not just targeted plastics). This will = even more cost savings for local government & ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The MAIN thing that would help NZers embrace reusable & refillable packaging is if Government gave reusables some love through the power of regulation, policy & investment. This would help reuse systems compete against single-use, & catapult reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles. The Government has suggested it could do some public education about sustainable packaging... Thanks Government, but heaps of NGOs & community groups do this mahi already! We need you to back us up by focusing on your unique superpowers of regulation, policy & investment.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, we have three points that we feel strongly about. 1. We don't support banning plastic straws. A plastic straw ban would be discriminatory. Some people need a plastic straw to drink. Reusable alternatives work well for some people, but not for everyone. The Government has suggested exemptions for people that need them, but it's hard to design exemptions that aren't stigmatising. At the very least, there must be adequate consultation & agreement with the disabled community before we can support banning plastic straws. 2. We're astounded that the single use coffee cup (SUC) is not on the ban list. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. For takeaways, reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. We know of over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... and they're thriving. Proving that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. A ban on SUC combined with Govt support for reuse schemes can provide security for take-out only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies.. As with all items that involve access to liquids in a hospitality setting, we suggest Govt liaise with the disabled community to seek guidance as to how reusable alternatives can

be widely available for all. We urge the Government to take the plunge & ban all disposable coffee cups & lids. We believe they are amongst the most straightforward items to phase out - practically, and due to the increasingly negative public perception towards them. 3. We'd like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS. Like soy fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead. We would support the Government introducing place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet e.g. reusables only for dine-in contexts; central city single-use-free zones; no bottled water & throwaway serviceware on university campuses & in Govt buildings.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, we don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. We do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see our answer to Q16). We also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see our answers about this in Q17).

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Our suggestions for reducing disposable coffee cups The most impactful thing the Govt can do is use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility & availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Note that accessibility includes affordability. Many of these actions can happen under s 23 of the WMA/without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. Regulatory & legislative actions Include disposable coffee cups in the proposed ban list as this will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with the alternatives faster. Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California) Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. A disposable coffee cup levy and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. A Deposit Return Scheme for BOTH disposable coffee cups, & reusables offered through a reuse scheme. A DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all hospitality outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash and reuse returned reusable cups. Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. Collaborative, practical policy actions Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings) Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design principles & are accessible for everyone in the community Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Our thoughts on the Govt suggestions... The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. We support this alongside regulatory & policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to the growth of reuse schemes. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. Investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups is not a good use of public funds. Better to put this money towards stimulating a reusables network. We urge the Government not to use its finite resources to reinvent the wheel & run a public education campaign about reusables. Loads of NGOs & community groups already do this mahi. We need Government to back our efforts with its unique policy & regulation-making superpowers. We need Government to champion and amplify the positives of truly circular reusable options!

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Disposable coffee cups products should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025. Accessible alternatives exist. Were the Govt to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19) we see no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable (e.g. by Jan 2022).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive; we agree with them all. We appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. We like how the Government has recognised that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. However, we are very surprised that this list does not acknowledge how a plastic straw ban could negatively affect individuals who need a plastic straw to drink. And the extra potential benefit offered by the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable alternative products (i.e straws, co-designed with the disabled community) to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes reduce waste & costs for local government & ratepayers. They also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 166

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

It is easy, people just need to look for alternative products that are not packaged in plastic - there are plenty out there & more will come if changes are made.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Just like removing single use plastic bags the general public accepted the changes & supported them. People just need to have the change made & then adjust to it either using paper options or reusable cups they bring from home. Most people understand we need to make important changes for the environment & will accept sensible changes if needed.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 167

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Initial note: I am writing this as a parent of a newborn. I therefore don't have a lot of time and have relied heavily on the Zero Waste Network's submission guide (although my submission differs on some points). Please don't use my use of the guide as an excuse to discount my submission. On the contrary, please take the fact that I sacrificed valuable sleeping time to fill in this submission while caring for a newborn as an indication of how passionate I am about getting rid of plastic waste and giving my child a better world to live in. Thank you. This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

These options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed. I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. I suggest: - PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 - All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 - Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so I would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

However, a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please

provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: - Single-use coffee cups & lids - Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: - Plastic lollipop sticks - Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries - Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic - Single-use plastic water bottles - Balloons and balloon sticks - Glitter and plastic confetti - Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings. Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups The most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy, and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC-free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes Given that a viable plastic-free alternative already exists, there is no good reason not to phase out wet wipes containing plastic immediately. I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable, i.e. June 2021.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 168

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Straws for disabled people would need to be an exemption

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Discounts for bring your own cups,

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 169

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Note: just over 6 weeks ago I became a dad. It is so clear to me how important it is that we do the best we can to protect the environment for future generations. Reducing single-use plastic and hard-to-recycle plastic is an important part of this. --- This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "Reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "Make affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

These options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed. I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented

alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. I suggest: - PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 - All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 - Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so I would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

However, a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected

party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: - Single-use coffee cups & lids - Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: - Plastic lollipop sticks - Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries - Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic - Single-use plastic water bottles - Balloons and balloon sticks - Glitter and plastic confetti - Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings. Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups The most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage

systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy, and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC-free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes Given that a viable plastic-free alternative already exists, there is no good reason not to phase out wet wipes containing plastic immediately. I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable, i.e. June 2021.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 170

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

More plastics could be identified and removed

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Mandatory phase out will encourage development of solutions.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Again, phasing out of cheap alternatives may increase costs for consumers for these products but is a necessary step in reducing plastic waste

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs to consumers for these products, although these are simply externalities that have been previously excluded from, the price of these products

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

While alternatives do not exist for all products, and in some cases are expensive, the cost is currently being borne by the country in terms of waste disposal and environmental degradation

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Benefits. Improving NZs image as clean and green always beneficial for the strength of our export markets and tourism

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Definitely need a reasonable time frame for manufacturers to adjust

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 171

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 172

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Doing things gradually generally works better

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 173

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The objective should also include supporting reusable systems, by making them more accessible, affordable and equitable.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

These options can be blended to achieve more effective and quicker change.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support the mandatory phase out of all the items (except plastic straws). I think that various aspects of options 2,4,5,7 could be brought forward in conjunction with the mandatory phase out to reduce our overall reliance on plastic materials (such as those proposed to not be banned, which can still have negative impacts on the environment).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

As soon as possible is best to minimise the environmental impact of plastics.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

To truly support a circular economy, we need to extend the ban of these problematic materials across all industries.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: Reduced landfill waste, reduced contamination of environments, reduced contamination of recycling streams. Costs: Industry has to find alternatives, costs may be passed on to consumers.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

na

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

na

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Developing a reusable culture across the food industry through infrastructure (e.g. washing facilities) and normalising reusables. Make reusables more affordable and accessible.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with everything except for plastic straws. Banning plastic straws for able-bodied people will likely make it more difficult and expensive for disabled people to access these. The list should be expanded to include single use coffee cups and lids, single use plastic cups and lids made from plastics 1,2,5, plastic lollipop sticks, single-serve pottles for condiments and toiletries, teabags and coffee pods containing plastic, single-use plastic water and juice bottles, glitter and confetti, complementary plastic toys.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months where possible. For items that require consultation/infrastructure, then longer.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Scale up reuse systems, such as washing/sterilisation facilities. Have deposit return schemes for takeaway cups. Fund local community groups that support a reusable cup culture e.g. grey lynn cup project, and groups that wash and supply crockery at events. Fund community groups to teach communities about alternatives to wet wipes. Fund engagement around what happens when you flush wet wipes. Make it compulsory for all wet wipes to label "DISPOSE IN BIN. DO NOT FLUSH", next to a picture of a clogged pipe. Similar to cigarette warning signs.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

na

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2022/2023

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support the recommendations of MfE in the consultation document for monitoring and compliance of the regulations.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 174

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

But you could always aim to be more ambitious and set goals to completely 'avoid' the impacts/use of plastics, rather than just 'reduce'.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Mandatory phase out is the best way to ensure these products do not continue to adversely impact our environment. The other options should be considered for products such as appliances, cars, etc. (i.e. product stewardship, taxes, etc.).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

It should be done as soon as possible. Also there should be no exceptions for any products (e.g. those you've suggested around exporting seafood) - companies will just need to find an alternative.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

But it should be as broad as possible - i.e. we need to phase out all plastic eventually, except perhaps those for medical purposes and those we can genuinely recycle multiple time (or that are long-lived products - e.g. reusable things). We cannot afford to continue producing plastic and sending plastic to landfill (or having it end up in our oceans).

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

As above, we cannot afford to do less. We must do everything we can to reduce our environmental impact.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Whatever the costs are they will be exceeded by the long-term cost of doing nothing. We must act as fast as we can and do all that we can to remove plastic from our environment. The benefits of phasing out plastic will be HUGE - we'll be world leading so it'll be good for our image, we'll create benefits to health and wellbeing, benefits to wildlife, etc.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There are. We've survived thousands of years without plastic. We can do it again. And where we haven't got an alternative we'll just have to find one or cope without it.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If anything it should be sooner.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

As above, the long term costs of not doing anything will be significant. We must act to reduce the impact of plastic on the environment.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

It's extremely likely that the benefits will be much greater than those MFE describes. Long term for the survival of our species and every other species it'll be huge - which just cannot be quantified. Also, we cannot even imagine how innovative we'll be within the limitations we set - we often find we perform best when given difficult constraints to work within. Also huge benefits for mental wellbeing etc knowing that we're actually doing something to change the future and protect future generations.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If companies stopped producing the plastics and started using alternatives. If the hard to recycle plastics just weren't available to the public. If supermarkets stopped selling products in hard to recycle plastics. If recycling facilities were more consistent and readily available across the country. If more people understood what can be composted, recycled, etc. If it cost more to throw out rubbish and cost much less to recycle and reuse (especially electronics etc) If we had on-shore recycling facilities If government put more pressure on industry to change.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

But it could be extended further - e.g. more types of plastic bag should be phased out. Wet wipes with plastic in them should be phased out. Plastic pens that can't have ink changed should be phased out - all those kinds of products! We should also consider what we're going to do about single use nappies... they're a huge problem that will require some real work to figure out (because of equity issues with those on lower incomes not being able to use reusable, issues around hygiene and convenience, etc)

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

The plastic produce bag definition should be widened to include bags that are similar that are made for carrying other things. Plastic cups should be phased out entirely, as it is unlikely they'll actually be recycled when used at an event or anything. Those 'thick' ('reusable') plastic bags with handles that some supermarkets sell should also be phased out.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

As short as possible. We haven't got time to waste. We did it quickly with plastic shopping bags, we can do it again.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

They should be phased out - we'll just have to find an alternative.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

24 months at most

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

As above, the benefits over the long term cannot be quantified - they are priceless!! We're talking about saving species (including ourselves) from extinction.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Education will be a key first component. There should also be a mechanism for members of the public to report non-compliance. There should be a dedicated team at MFE that focuses on compliance and monitoring, as well as a team that's working on endorsing alternatives and publicising those with companies, industry, and the public. There should also be joint

working groups to identify/develop sustainable alternatives to these plastics and promote compliance amongst industry/business.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 175

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

All non-medical/health plastic packaging should be phased out (e.g. around furniture, electronics, toys, utensils, etc.)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

The phase out should also include all things that are being phased out international (noting some of these are already in the MFE proposal) - i.e. straws, cutlery, stirrers, plastic tableware, microbeads, plastic bags, cotton buds, balloon sticks, teabags, toys in fast food. Teabags are particularly noteworthy as there seems to be an increase in the use of synthetic teabags in 'boutique' tea brand single use products. Teabags are also extremely problematic because people think they are compostable and put them in the compost, meaning there is a lot of plastic entering our environment. We should also phase out single use plastics used in conservation (e.g. 'chew cards') made of plastic core flute. Plastic core flute should also be phased out as it's unlikely to be recycled (and is used extensively in real estate).

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 176

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Urgent action needs to be taken to mitigate global plastic pollution. Drastic steps need to be taken and they need to be taken now.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits would be taking a big step towards reducing pollution to our natural environments. There are costs, as sustainable alternatives tend to be more expensive and harder to source, and the market for these options is currently not able to keep up with the demand of consumers. But consumers need to be forced to make conscious and subconscious decisions to choose more sustainable materials.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There are alternatives, but they are currently more expensive to produce and purchase. However, they need to be invested in. Time, money and effort needs to transfer from the plastic industries into sustainable companies.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Items include "plastic" bags, sheets and bottles. Reusable materials made of metal or cotton and hemp are great alternatives for products, depending on what the product is and it's main function.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I think it is likely that there may be more costs than discussed, as it is a complex issue and not something that can be solved overnight, especially with the rapidly changing modern world we live in. But we have to start somewhere and the benefits will become more obvious long term.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Stop making plastics convenient to purchase, limit them in supermarkets. Make them expensive, tax the plastic industry. Make our main options more sustainable, make them cheaper. Force the consumer to barely have a choice, to make it easy to choose a sustainable option.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Reusable glass and metal coffee cups are not a rare thing. They are becoming more and more common, they just need to become the default.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Ideally we would start immediately but otherwise I would say around 2 years.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 177

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Needs to have a wider range of items phased out

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Needs to be a longer time frame for all items

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Easier accessibility and cheaper alternatives (so bulk item cheaper than buying in store with packaging)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Wet wipes should be included and made compostable, and takeaway containers

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Compostable cups and wipes

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Auditor with large companies to see if they comply, and have a date to have it fixed by and information to help them where they can get alternatives.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 179

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. I suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so I would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected

party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware : I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings. ● Single-use plastic produce bags : I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Other (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups: I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes: I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing

plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups: With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes: I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and I agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 181

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I submit this response to the Ministry for the Environment's proposal to ban hard-to-recycle plastics. In short, I believe this proposal is a step in the right direction to taking a stand on our ever-increasing plastic use in Aotearoa, and focuses on changing mindsets on how we use single-use plastics in particular. However, I believe this is not enough, and as a voice representing the youth of Aotearoa – the generation that will be most affected by the choices made now- I believe we need to do more. This is a good start, but we are not leading the way in sustainable waste management, despite our clean green image. We must do more and invest more into shifting attitudes towards a sustainable environmental future, instead of merely a sustainable economic future. Our environment is our livelihood, our backyards, our recreation, our economy. I agree with the objectives of this proposal and hope they are achieved. But the youth are speaking: we want environmental change, not climate change. Now is the time to act, and as the representatives of Aotearoa, we hope you do.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

3. I agree these are the correct points to consider, but don't agree that they will be successful without significant public education and outreach. These options do not explicitly state this as a drawback here.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

5. I agree that the mandatory phase out option shows the most promise. However, I don't believe this is the be-all end-all solution, and likely a more effective solution will be a combination of several of these methods, particularly if working towards the recyclable plastics goal by 2025. I also believe it relies too strongly on consumer change, and puts less pressure on producers. Increased government incentives needs to be established immediately within companies and businesses to push towards a minimised plastic future. We also need to think about utilising technology and organically biodegradable alternatives to plastics, instead of simply other plastic alternatives.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

6. I agree with the proposed phase out of these items, but don't believe it's enough to meet the goal of moving Aotearoa towards 100% reusable, recyclable or compostable packaging by 2025.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

8. Yes, I believe all PVS packaging should be considered to be phased out. This will make it easier and more consistent for consumers, and make a greater difference towards a plastic free future.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

9. I believe the benefits would outweigh the costs, even if not immediately, they will over time. There are many alternatives to PVC and polystyrene packaging and the ban of the plastic bags have proven the ease at which we can phase out other products with enough consultation, warning, education and alternatives. There may be social, economic and inconvenience costs, but the benefits of a cleaner environment is invaluable.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

10. I believe these are practical, but not the best step. We are replacing plastics with other plastics here, and not addressing other issues such as the oil and production required for plastics in general, the cost of infrastructure to break these down, or the fact that littering of these items will continue. The better option is to put more resources behind innovative biodegradable technologies, incentivising product packaging that can be recycled in home composts and taxing products that are difficult to dispose of, installing clear labelling, not only in regards to recycling products but also to distinguish the difference between home and commercial composting ability of products. We need to make a firm shift and sacrifice more in terms of reducing plastic options overall, now, for the future.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please

provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

13. I believe long term we will discover greater benefits than we imagine here. Plastics are imbedded into our society, not only culturally but also in the air we breathe, the land we walk on and the oceans we swim in. They are inescapable, the benefits of greatly reducing them now, along with the associated effects of producing them, will produce immense benefits for future generations.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

14. One of the biggest obstacles in a large-scale shift from plastic dependence is the ingrained attitude we have towards plastic convenience. I believe it begins with education, at schools and at homes, improved labelling on recycling bins with numbers of what can be put in there, the establishment of large scale home composting schemes and infrastructure put in for commercial composting areas, promotion of alternative products and tax-free incentives for purchasing these products/ taxes for purchasing plastic products. There are hundreds of organisations doing it right in New Zealand (bulk food businesses, cardboard home-compostable packaging takeaways, companies like Bostocks and Proper chips which are producing home compostable packaging, etc) which we can learn from. Communities cannot do it alone, we require government incentives to encourage attitude changes to our daily purchases in order for us to take the effort to think about making a change.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

15. I think it's a good start, but there are many more products we could add to this list: sanitary items, diapers, cigarette butts, etc... this is only the start and is nowhere near enough to make a long-standing difference to plastic production and disposal in Aotearoa

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

18. 12 months or less, with clear communication and alternatives, as seen from COVID-19 response, this is possible!

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

19. I believe a mandatory ban on single use coffee cups is the most effective method, with clear warning and alternatives in place. Good incentives need to begin for businesses now, with the replacement of dine-in or keep-cup using being substantially cheaper, as well as the implementation of home-compostable packaging with compost bins present on site.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

20. I believe 12 months is more than sufficient time for the phase out of coffee cups as we are already making this transition, and there are many alternatives already available. The phase out of this product alone would make a substantial difference to our plastic disposal and one that can easily be achieved. For wetwipes, we could only produce and sell products that are plastic free and fully biodegradable and increase education about proper disposal.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months or less, with clear messaging and alternatives encouraged

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

More investment into environmental compliance is required, and incentives for citizens and businesses to take it seriously. As stated before, it begins with an attitude change - our response to COVID-19 has proven we have the ability to act as a nation towards a common goal - we are faced with a climate crisis here and this is only the first step in overcoming it.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 182

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Tuatahi ka mihi ki te kaupapa nei, arā, he whakaiti i te whakamamae i a Papatūānuku, a Ranginui me ō rāua uri. Kia kaha tonu tātau ki te titiro ki te pikitia nui, me te raru nui, koia tērā ko te whai i te taara ahakoa pēhea, anō nei he atua te taara, he rauemi a Papatūānuku. Kātahi te pōhēhē nui ko tēnei. The consultation document describes comprehensively the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items. We appreciate the research that has gone into preparing the document. We support the overall proposal, which will better align us with current international best practice to reduce hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items. We appreciate that this consultation is focused solely on plastic products. In addition to the impact of the targeted plastic materials, we note that many underlying problems stem from the wider economic and regulatory eco-system through which these and other materials flow. Considering these wider problems is useful when determining regulatory responses, such as the present proposal. For example, all single-use products (not just plastic) involve waste in terms of energy, resources and landfill space, which is harmful to Papatūānuku, and keeps us stuck in a linear economy. We would support the Government proposing additional regulatory measures for 'creating a culture of reuse' (p.20) that cuts across material types, alongside the proposed phase-out of single-use plastic items. Reuse systems will significantly reduce the climate change impacts of Aotearoa's packaging system. For example, Life Cycle Analyses (LCAs) comparing recycled and reusable plastics systems reveal that the high energy inputs needed to process virgin plastics greatly exceed the energy required for recycling process steps, and that reuse processes use significantly less than recycling (Ross & Evans 2003). The document also defines materials as hard to recycle for technical reasons, like PVC or PS (pp. 14-15). However, many other plastic types (even ones that are technically easier to recycle, like PET) may still be hard-to-recycle in practice because of: Page | 2 suboptimal collection systems (e.g. commingling or contaminated public place recycling) over-reliance on off-shore markets (including markets where we cannot be certain materials will be safely received and processed) inherent product design flaws (e.g. pigmented/coloured plastics or use of nonrecyclable labels, tear off tamper wraps, multi-pack packaging, composite products and soft plastic pouches). the use to which a product is put, e.g. take-away containers and cups, even if made of easier to recycle materials like PET, are generally too food contaminated to recycle and used away from home where recycling bins are less accessible. Furthermore, the low price of virgin plastic resin vis-a-vis recycled resin creates economic barriers for keeping even 'easier to recycle' in a closed loop packaging system, which brings into focus the environmental harm caused by our continued reliance on virgin plastic (such as continued resource extraction and climate impacts). So, a broader framing of the problem would allow for these wider issues to be considered and tackled, which will likely require more than a simple ban. The present proposal should be part of comprehensive Government policy targeting reliance on both single-use products in general and on virgin plastic resin. This would include specific regulation and investment to disincentivise single-use and create a reuse culture, and to increase the use of locally-sourced recycled resin through appropriate collection methodologies, mandatory minimum recycled content legislation and a cap and levy on virgin plastic.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objective of reducing the amount of hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics in use through eliminating certain problematic items and materials is not only a correct objective, it's a necessary condition for a circular economy. However facilitating reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics and plastic pollution, and to avoid or mitigate perverse outcomes of the proposed ban. The proposed policy of reducing single-use and hard-to-recycle plastics must be supported by regulatory measures, policy and investment to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, and support infrastructure and community engagement necessary for reuse i.e. accessible, reusable alternatives and systems to support them (e.g. washing facilities). This would allow solutions to move higher up the waste hierarchy, rather than incentivising the switch from one single-use material to another. Page | 3 Furthermore, reducing the impact of hard-to-recycle plastics on our resource recovery system and the environment must surely include the objective of shifting producers away from a reliance on virgin resin towards recycled resin so that we can close the loop in our plastics economy and reduce the amount of new plastics entering New

Zealand. We believe the main objective should be amended as follows: reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, and increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, of safe recycled content in packaging and of the systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. An additional secondary objective should also be added: make affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while assisting communities to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer. These amendments to the objectives would strengthen the proposal's ability to advance New Zealand's commitments under the New Plastics Economy Global Commitment, which the consultation document states (p.22) is an outcome of this proposal. In this, Government signatories have committed to implementing "ambitious policies" for "encouraging reuse models where relevant, to reduce the need for single-use plastic packaging and/or products"¹. A pathway towards these ambitious policies is appropriately included in the present proposal's objectives. We note that regulations such as those available under s 23 of the WMA or through Parliamentary legislation, are needed to make the New Plastics Economy commitments (including reuse and recycled content targets) mandatory, not voluntary.² 1 Full text: ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/13319-Global-CommitmentDefinitions.pdf. 2 The need for legislation to back up the New Plastics Economy Commitments is discussed on pp.30-31 of Alice Delemare Tangpuori, George Harding-Rolls, Nusa Urbancic and Ximena Purita Banegas Zallio (2020) Talking Trash: The corporate playbook of false solutions to the plastic crisis (Changing Markets Foundation). Accessible at talking-trash.com/wpcontent/uploads/2020/09/TalkingTrash_FullReport.pdf.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list is thorough and considers a range of important measures. We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban. For example, an approach that combines the proposed bans with levies/fees, ecolabelling, measurable targets, deposit-return, take back schemes, and community engagement. We also support the use of additional regulations such as mandatory minimum levels of recycled content to ensure that we do in fact recycle all the 'easier-to-recycle' plastics still permitted after the proposed bans. The EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics, and the plastics and packaging and single-use plastics chapters of the recently released Irish National Waste Policy, provide useful examples of blended approaches. In addition to the options listed, we would support including additional measures to support the uptake and scale of reuse, e.g. - mandatory targets for reuse/refill on specified items - deposit return systems for takeaway serviceware to ensure that they are in a recyclable condition (i.e., clean) and put in the correct recycling bins - mandating reusables in dine-in settings (as done by the Berkeley Ordinance) - levies on targeted single-use items - guidelines for the durability, repairability or modularity of products. The Government could also consider the further Option of applying fees to cover estimated costs for clean-up and disposal of items not proposed for a ban, but are still problematic, such as cigarette butts, takeaway packaging and wet wipes. These types of fees to cover clean-up and disposal costs differ from a levy and should be possible under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA).

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However, more weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction. This would ensure that the highest ranking outcomes are higher up the waste hierarchy e.g. reduction and reuse solutions. We would also support criteria that assesses how well an option protects against unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Mandatory phase-outs are a clear, simple way of eliminating harmful plastics. We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). However a 'ban only' approach can sometimes lead to the swapping of one single-use material for another. A 'ban only' approach also doesn't fix the problem of our reliance on virgin plastic resin. Even if we shift to only using 'easier to recycle' plastics, this doesn't ensure that those products are actually recycled or recycled back into the same kind of product. We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products. This blended approach would result in less waste, a lasting shift in social norms and behaviour change, and stronger markets for recycled resin. We support the Government moving ahead with reduction targets for any plastic packaging items that are not banned, which would require transparency from producers, importers (such as supermarkets and retail chains, food chains, manufacturers and exporters) about the volume of plastic they use in order to measure plastic reduction over time.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging, for the reasons given in the consultation document. The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021: PVC trays are especially problematic for the recycling industry as they are the main contaminants of onshore clear PET recycling, and are easily substituted by clear PET trays. All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023 The world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years,³ and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. ⁴ Furthermore, plastic production is a direct product of fossil fuel extraction - the leading contributor to CO2 emissions and rising temperatures. We have wasted time in not recognising these problems for many years, so we must now act decisively to reduce what plastics we can from our economy.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, water-ways and marine environment - damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. A small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation. However due to the harmful properties of plastic in the environment, we would support it being replaced as a packaging material. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We fully support the vision on P40 of “more reusable or refilling alternatives to single-use plastics. There is an opportunity for New Zealand to rethink the use of some plastic packaging altogether, and to design innovative reuse models.” We also support the statement that “packaging with recycled content is preferable to new plastic (where feasible)”. We agree with the list of examples of practical alternatives set out in Table 5. As stated in Q2, we would like to see additional regulations and policy to support the scale and uptake of reusable alternatives, mandatory recycled content and sustainable product design where designing out waste is top priority. Sustainable product design would consider the end-of-life options for a material, preventing any unintended consequences from the targeted phase-out. For example, banning EPS appliance packaging is likely to boost use of moulded cardboard packaging. Research should be done to identify the best practice end-of-life solution for moulded cardboard packaging (i.e. recycling or composting). The research should be widely disseminated to packaging suppliers and product designers so that appropriate choices of glue, coatings and/or colourings are made to align with the end-of-life solution. Clear labelling is also essential so that customers know what they should do with the packaging after use. Durable, reusable appliance packaging should also be explored.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There is nothing good about oxo-degradable plastics, and we wholeheartedly support a ban and thank the Government for acting on them. We would prefer to see a quicker ban due to the harm created by these plastics and the green-washing involved. By far the majority of companies we have come across who have been supplying these to the public were under the misapprehension that they are better for the environment. Oxo-degradable plastics also contaminate recycling plastic streams. The quicker we get rid of these, the Page | 9 better, so we would like the phase-out of these to be a priority and for it to happen by June 2021, which brings us in line with overseas jurisdictions, such as the EU, that will phase-out oxo-degradable plastics by 2021.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The consultation document sets out a comprehensive list of the costs and benefits to various sector groups of the mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. The phase-out of targeted plastics will have additional benefits for: Indigenous communities: reducing plastic pollution may reduce degradation of the natural (including marine) environment which has impacted on customary practices. Fresh water quality: microplastic contamination of drinking water is already occurring. Ecosystem health: microplastics are being found in all ecosystem compartments, including within organisms, so far examined. Their impacts range from the individual level to the ecosystem level. Air quality: microplastics are increasingly being found in the air of both populated and remote locations. Human health: The 2019 report Plastic & Health: The Hidden Costs of a Plastic Planet found that significant, complex, and intersecting human health impacts occur at every stage of the plastic lifecycle. Page | 10 Climate: Reducing single-use plastics will reduce our reliance on virgin plastic resin, and therefore on fossil fuels. In 2019 the lifecycle of global plastic production – from extraction to disposal – was equivalent to the impact on the climate of 189 500MW coal-fired power stations. Emissions from plastic emerge not only from the production and manufacture of plastic itself, but from every stage in the plastic lifecycle – from the extraction and transport of the fossil fuels that are the primary feedstocks for plastic, to refining and manufacturing, to waste management. Acting to reduce single-use plastics and increase recycled content will also help New Zealand meet its international and domestic climate change obligations. Future generations: Reducing targeted plastics helps to reduce degradation of ecosystems essential to the wellbeing of future generations and non-human species. It may also be valuable to supplement the cost/benefit approach included in the document with a holistic lens. The current cost/benefit approach perceives the ‘environment’ as an “affected party” separate to, and distinct from, our own human survival. Current and future generations - and indeed the economy - can only thrive within the planet’s limits to stay in balance. Taking action on plastics is an essential step towards preserving the functional ecosystems required to sustain life.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit currently missing is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. This would have a positive job creation impact, as well as reducing waste. Preliminary studies indicate that reuse systems produce far more jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. This is also expected to be the case for reusable packaging Page | 11 systems, with commentators noting that these increased jobs are also more likely to be localised and geographically dispersed,⁵ which meets provincial development goals. The growth of reuse schemes and shifting social norms will also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging (not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More transparency, more onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed. This would increase public confidence and engagement in the recycling system, creating a positive flow-on of reduced contamination. It would also allow for better packaging choices by designers, who can integrate end-of-life options (e.g. closed loop recycling)

into design choices of materials. Mandatory recycled content is a key regulatory lever to assist with pull-through of recycled plastics in the economy and better design. Standardised collection of materials and investment in recycling education and community engagement would help more people to use the recycling system correctly, reducing contamination, which can result in recyclable materials going to landfill. Government regulatory policy and investment is needed to move reusable alternatives from the niche to the mainstream. We note that it's already possible to BYO reusable containers and tableware for takeaway food and drink. In many cases, washable crockery is a realistic alternative instead of disposables. A handful of reuse schemes exist for reusable takeaway packaging, such as Again Again, CupCycling and Reusabowl. The issue is not a lack of ideas or models, but barriers to scale and normalisation of these systems within an entrenched linear economy, and lack of adequate incentives to ensure uptake of reusable alternatives when they are available. Accordingly, sustained policy interventions and investment are required to level the playing field between single-use and reuse. A blended policy mix could include levies on single-use items and delivery systems (which will encourage uptake of reusable and refillable models), deposit return systems on food and beverage packaging, mandating reusable serviceware in certain situations, and reuse quotas/targets. Money must be made available for the infrastructure needed to make reuse work (e.g. reverse logistics and sterilisation), with a preference for locally-based infrastructure to reduce emissions and increase community engagement. A coordinated universal design approach is needed to ensure reusable alternatives are accessible for everyone in our community (taking into account potential barriers, such as cost or disability).

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, (including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastic counterparts), except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. Some people with accessibility needs require a plastic straw to drink. While some reusable alternatives work well for some people, for others there may be no reusable alternative that is suitable. We also support extending the list to include these other single-use plastic items: Page | 13 Disposable coffee cups & lids: We would like to see coffee cups and lids included in the mandatory phase-out as discussed in Q19. Plastic lollipop sticks and wrappers: These present a similar hazard to plastic cotton buds and can easily be replaced by cardboard sticks. Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries: For example, soy fish, pottles with peelable plastic lids for jam, butter and other condiments, sachets of sauces, condiments, sugar and toiletries. One of the items commonly picked up by volunteers cleaning up after the Fox River landfill disaster were single-use sachets from the accommodation and hospitality providers in this popular tourist destination. Some hotels are already voluntarily phasing out these single-serve items. These types of products have been earmarked for banning by the Irish Government in their recently released National Waste Policy (p.33). Coffee pods containing plastic: Single-serve coffee pods made of any material are hard-to-recycle because each pod contains coffee grinds that must be removed before recycling is possible. We would support a phase-out of all single-use coffee pods (reusable pods exist), but for the purposes of this consultation we call for those containing plastic to be included in this mandatory phase-out list. Teabags containing plastic: Many teabags contain plastic (either in the bag itself or the adhesives that hold the bag together). This is not common knowledge and many people put used teabags in their compost bins. Consequently, teabags containing plastic present a similar concern for potential plastic contamination of soil as plastic fruit stickers do. The consultation document has earmarked fruit stickers for a ban; for consistency's sake, teabags containing plastic should be included on the list for mandatory phase-out too. Not all teabags contain plastic, so alternatives clearly do exist. In addition to potential microplastic contamination of soils, plastic in teabags is also a health concern as the plastic and additives may be released into the tea while it's steeping. Single-use plastic water bottles: In New Zealand, we have widespread access to potable water from the tap, so bottling water in plastic and transporting it around the country and the world needlessly creates harmful emissions and waste. Single-use plastic bottles are an inefficient and environmentally harmful way to provide access to potable water, which could be replaced by public fountains or bulk, reusable containers. Initiatives like Refill NZ are gaining traction, but we need to see Government leadership in banning or at least imposing on single-use plastic water bottles to make a real difference in the volume of plastic water bottles used. This would also benefit the tourism industry, by reinforcing New Zealand's brand Page | 14 as one of high environmental standards. Exemptions could be designed for civil defence and emergency situations. Balloons and balloon sticks. 6 Glitter and plastic confetti: Plastic-based glitter is used in a wide range of cosmetic products and art supplies. Prior to voluntary bans in the UK, early childhood centres admitted to using kilos every year. Similarly, mardi gras and music festival organisers are phasing out the use of glitter for environmental reasons, particularly as there are plenty of environmentally-friendly options on the market. As a microplastic, glitter shares similar environmental impacts to other microplastics (although its sharp edges may cause more physical damage to smaller creatures when ingested) and therefore, it is not always distinguished from other microplastics in peer-reviewed scientific publications. Complementary plastic toys on children's magazines and with fast food. Chewing gum containing plastic - most large branded chewing gum contains plastic and causes up to 100,000 tonnes of plastic pollution globally every year.⁷ Beyond the single-use items proposed in the document, we would support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes, and other disposable sanitary products, and to reduce the harm from industrial and commercial use of plastics like fishing nets, plastic wrap and strapping used in freight, and plastic building wrap used in construction. We also urge the Government to implement a regulatory plan to address cigarette butts. According to the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, cigarette butts account for 78% of all items littered in New Zealand and are the most commonly found item in beach litter clean ups. Globally, cigarette butts are thought to be the most littered item on Earth.⁸ The consultation document mentions cigarette butts in passing (p.50) but offers no plan because there may not be plastic-free alternatives. However, measures other than a phase-out could be implemented under s 23 of the WMA, such as mandatory on-package labelling to increase smokers' awareness that butts contain plastic and appropriate means of disposal, or fees on filters put on the market to cover estimated clean-up costs.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics in the proposed phase-out, and applaud the Government for taking this step. As the consultation document notes, many of these products are not certified, and/or not home compostable nor marine degradable. Those that are certified compostable often don't end up in the right place to be composted (pp48), potentially contaminating recycle streams or emitting methane when disposed of in landfill. Furthermore, as with any single-use product they embody wasted energy and resources. For all these reasons, we support their inclusion in the phase-out proposal. We recommend the following alterations or clarifications of the proposed definitions: ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings (similar to the plastic cups and lids definition). ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags that fruit and vegetables are commonly pre-packed into. ● Single-use plastic cups and lids: We do not support exempting single-use plastic cups made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 from a ban. Although these cups are technically recyclable, they are mostly used away from home, and are likely to enter the recycling system unwashed via public recycling bins. Any unwashed cups that contain milk products or smoothies are considered contaminated and will not meet quality standards for recycling. At best, these plastics will be pulled out from the recycling stream and discarded, at worst they can result in the entire contents of the bin going to landfill. Even if the cups are clean enough to meet quality standards (e.g. if they contained water or soft drinks), public recycling bins are often heavily contaminated, resulting in the contents of many going to landfill. For this reason, we recommend defining recyclability not just by the type of plastic, but also by the likelihood of it being recycled given existing collection and processing systems. Page | 16 If the exemption goes ahead, we recommend that lids not be included in the exemption as their size effectively makes them 'hard-to-recycle' items in most kerbside systems that rely on automated MRFs for sorting. Furthermore, they are detachable so can easily be lost to the environment. ● Single-use coffee cups: We would support disposable coffee cups being included in the proposed phase-out (as discussed in our answer to Q19). ● Plastic straws: Table 7 notes that an exemption will be considered to allow access to plastic straws for disabled persons and for medical purposes. If plastic straws are banned, an exemption is essential to ensure those who need a plastic straw to drink can still access them, but we note that exemptions can be stigmatising, especially if poorly designed or resourced. We are concerned that the potential exemption has not been drafted in time for this consultation. We seek assurance that the Ministry will ensure active and wide participation of the disabled community in the drafting/design of such an exemption before determining whether or not to ban plastic straws.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups The Packaging Forum estimates that New Zealanders use 295 million single-use coffee cups a year. The overwhelming majority of single-use coffee cups are landfilled or escape Page | 17 into the national environment. Coffee cups are non-recyclable due to the waterproof liners and coffee residue, and they are a common contaminant in the cardboard recycling stream. Compostable cups rarely make it to a commercial composting facility where they will safely break down. Coffee cups are also light and prone to escaping into the environment. The fully detachable lids increase the potential for harmful plastic litter. We believe that the expertise to create reusable infrastructure and accompanying community engagement is already well established in New Zealand. Virtually all outlets already accept BYO reusables, and most outlets have in-house ceramic options if people forget their cup. There are a growing range of reuse schemes/cup loan systems. Some towns, such as Wanaka, have a vision of being free of single-use coffee cups by 2022. Nationwide, a growing number of cafes (over 50 that we know of) have eliminated singleuse cups entirely by implementing strategies to encourage customers to "sit, borrow or bring". They have implemented a combination of incentives such as discounts/surcharges, retail of 'keep cups', adoption of homegrown/national reuse systems (e.g. Again Again and informal cup loans), invitations to BYO, education around the issue and importantly, encouragement to build community by making time to stay. We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Effective policy options (many of which are possible under s 23 of the WMA or without the need for new Parliamentary legislation) include: ● Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers ● Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings, museums and galleries, coasts and national parks) ● A deposit return scheme for both disposable coffee cups and reusable alternatives offered through a reuse scheme (e.g. Again Again) plus mandating that all outlets dispensing takeaway cups (whether disposable or reusable) take back empty cups (for appropriate disposal or reuse) - achieved under ss 23(1)(c) and (e) of the WMA. ● Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow universal design principles and are accessible for everyone in the community. ● Investing in the

infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. ● Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Page | 18 ● Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. ● Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives and where they should be disposed of (i.e. in rubbish bins, unless a commercial collection facility is available for compostable cups) ● A ban on branding of disposable cups (under s 23(1)(d)) ● A levy on disposable coffee cups and/or producer fees under s 23(1)(d) to cover the estimated costs associated with disposal or clean-up. ● Inclusion of disposable coffee cups in the proposed mandatory phase-out list because this will stimulate solutions. The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. We support this happening alongside regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. We do not believe that investing in expensive systems to downcycle or compost cups is the best use of public funds. It would be more efficient to invest this money in stimulating the scale and uptake of a reusables network. Local community engagement and collaborative solutions are more impactful in terms of creating lasting behaviour change than high level national education. Funding support to NGOs and community groups already working to educate and engage on the ground would be the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems), and compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging (these labelling requirements should be mandated under s 23(1)(f) of the WMA). Before a ban is phased in, we would also support fees being attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs (which can be considerable when they block pipes and form fatbergs). Currently the community is covering these costs through Council. It would be more appropriate to attach this cost to producers and consumers through a fee. This is different to a levy as it's related to the cost of managing the product and could be achieved Page | 19 under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA. A ban on advertising for wet wipes containing plastic would also be appropriate. An alternative pathway that could be helpful would be to declare disposable sanitary products (which would include wet wipes) as a 'Priority Product' - this would enable a considered, wraparound approach to a multitude of similar products at once.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

A combination of regulation to disincentivise single-use and build a reuse culture, community engagement, and reuse infrastructure would enable the transition away from single-use coffee cups. We invite the Government to consult with the hospitality businesses, collaborations, and social enterprises working in this space in Aotearoa to hear what has made their projects successful, as well as ongoing barriers and opportunities, such as: ● UYO ● SUC-free Wanaka ● Again Again ● Cupcycling ● Good to Go Waiheke ● The Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project ● Takeaway Throwaways ● Wanakup In relation to wet wipes, a collaborative effort with an educator such as Kate Meads who has long advocated and supported public transition to reusable alternatives, could be appropriate.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable (e.g. by Jan 2022).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. We appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used, and the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste and litter. An unconsidered cost of the proposed mandatory phase-out of plastic straws is potential discrimination against individuals who need a plastic straw. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. Reuse schemes reduce waste, costs for local government and ratepayers, and create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. These jobs are also dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The community will assist in monitoring if they are able to report breaches of the mandatory phase-out to MfE, similar to the plastic bag ban. In light of the far wider scope of this particular phase-out proposal and the breadth of actors in our economy and within our communities who are likely to be affected, we support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement

strategy. We also believe that appointment of enforcement officers under s 76 would be appropriate in this case.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 183

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I think we ought to tax importing goods containing hard to recycle plastic entering the country

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We still need more policies to effectively opt put of hard to recycle plastic especially with entering/import goods

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Food industry is not the only industry producing hard to recycle plastic. It needs to be a global policy

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Environmental justice, drop of pollution level, positive impact on marine ecosystems

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Fungi/algae/bamboo/natural basef based packaging

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

We could be an example for the world

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Stronger environmental ethics supported by government policies

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Eco cups

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Government funding

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 184

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

take it all oput and replace with nz grown hemp

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

we should grow and use hemp

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The earth will continue to suffer

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

HEMP, grwon in NZ

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

HEMP

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

unsure

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

mainstream adervtising

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

replace with HEMP products

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

hemp

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 mths

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 185

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This is a long overdue process, though i understand that it takes time to implement progressive change, especially in the realm of getting rid of single use plastics

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Can the dates not be moved forwards? i understand there has to be some infrastructure in place for alternatives (as well as changes in industry protocol), but the problem of single use plastics, i believe is a very pressing one.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

We can start looking at more environmentally suitable packaging i.e. hemp packaging, it can do anything plastic does, but will biodegrade within 3 months rather than 1000 years.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Hemp packaging

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Creating the infrastructure to start creating an alternative, as well as working closely with distributors in regards to selling the items in a way where health and safety is not an issue.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

This is difficult, as it comes down to the consumers decision to either use or not use. To stop the use of single use coffee cups would mean people have there own vessel to use, or have a coffee in the cafe. Obviously that can be problematic when people are on the go, we need to change the system of how we do life where we are not always on the go so to speak, which is easier said than done. We have created a right quagmire of problems for ourselves due to the rat race of life :(

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 186

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Notes

Yes We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Yes However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by end of 2022 2023 and 2025 is just too far away these changes need to be made sooner if we want to have an impact soon enough.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable

packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Agree We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets. 17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Notes

Yes with changes We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 187

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Plastic is a huge problem in our environment. You have described the problem of hard-to-recycle plastic packaging well, but I feel this policy as a move toward lowering the usage of hard-to-recycle plastic, falls a bit short. Every effort should be made to discourage the use of ALL unnecessary plastics. This will be a radical change to our society, but I believe a radical change is what is needed now to prevent future environmental degradation.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy documents good objectives which are a step in the right direction. However there must be stricter measures in place to encourage manufacturers to come up with other options for packaging besides plastics. We should be working toward eliminating as much plastic packaging as possible, not only the hard-to-recycle plastic types. Why do we need a plastic see through window on a cardboard box of pasta? That should be banned, regardless of what type of plastic is used. We will have to learn to trust non-see-through packaging. Why do we need plastic stickers on fruit? How about food safe stamps? Or cardboard tags? All non-necessary plastic has got to go. Preference should be given to manufacturers who can supply products in packaging without plastic. It's impossible to purchase toilet paper for a home from the grocery store without also buying plastic packaging. The only way to get non-plastic toilet rolls is by purchasing online. It should be easier for people to choose plastic free options. New Zealand should be leading the world in this effort.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I think you have considered the right options however I think the proposal should be doing more. Yes you should, as suggested, move away from hard to recycle plastics. But at the same time you should also ban the importation of items packaged in these plastics, and give preferential treatment to items who wish to be sold in New Zealand if their packaging is not only recyclable, but renewable. You should also implement a mandatory product stewardship scheme and make manufacturers responsible for cleaning up their chosen packaging material. And as well, we should be implementing mandatory labelling for packaging including labelling for products online or at a shop (which could be done on the shelf as opposed to on the product) clearly stating the materials used to package the product and what will happen to them after they are no longer in use (e.g. cardboard - recycled or landfill; type of plastic - landfill, there is no facility within NZ to recycle this type of plastic, or: the manufacturer will accept this packaging for reuse, etc.)

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Cost should not be double weighed in the criteria evaluation. The new Health and Safety act does not consider cost as an option to prevent the implementation of something that will keep people safe. This is a matter of the continued existence of the species on the planet! If we don't make some very strict changes now the future is going to change a whole lot more for those

who come after us. The government should not shy away from more expensive options at such a crucial time.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

See two previous comments above. We need to be doing more, now, while we still can. Your argument that labelling is impractical on items such as straws could be avoided by labelling the box of straws, or the container in which the straws sit. I think having reminders so people think about what will happen to the "stuff" they collect is a really good idea. And product stewardship could be done with appropriate products, as you say. Although maybe there are some products that really should disappear. The cotton bud hasn't been around forever, I'm sure we could survive without it, or only allow those with wooden sticks to be sold! More action needs to be taken now.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Too slow. Your proposal allows five more years of polystyrene and three more years of PVC waste to collect in landfills, tips, the ocean and the beach. Necessity is the mother of invention - yes it might be hard to find new packaging materials for expanded polystyrene but if manufacturers want to see their products in New Zealand, they'll find a way!

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, you've made a good start. I'd like to see the phase out expanded to include all unnecessary plastic packaging for all items, not just food and beverage.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Regardless of the length of its life-cycle, PVC plastic is going to be around for a very, very long time. It needs to be phased out along with the rest of the plastic items.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs for materials would likely increase. There might however be a market for recycled plastic items, such as downspouts, which could increase revenue and options for the easier to recycle plastics.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Depends on the amount of the cost that is passed along to the consumer. Personally, I believe food prices in New Zealand are already ridiculously high. An increase in costs because a supplier has to change packaging and is unwilling to lower their profit margin could be devastating to a low income family struggling to purchase food at the current prices.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The availability and cost comparability of items not using hard-to-recycle (or even easy -to-recycle) plastic packaging. Toothpaste that comes in a glass jar? It's possible to find it but you'll pay more for it and have many fewer options. A move away from plastic could give retailers opportunities to provide "filling stations" for items like liquid laundry detergent, deodorant or maybe even toothpaste.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Why are disposable coffee cups and their lids exempted from this list? To the list I would also add: cardboard packaging with a plastic window where the plastic cannot be recycled. I agree with everything else listed.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

(or sooner!) Get this regulation into force as soon as possible. I can think of no single use item that could not be substituted for a recyclable or reusable one immediately. We have become too accustomed to a culture of immediacy and ease. We could live without these items starting tomorrow.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

People might have to sit down for the length of time it takes to drink a cup of coffee from an actual cup! The options suggested in your consultation document - lend-a-cup schemes, reusable cups that people bring to the cafe with them, investment in the development of non-plastic alternatives and public education campaigns should all be implemented. I don't think there is a strong connection between having a cup of coffee "to-go" and nearly 300 million coffee cups in landfills. As for wet wipes that contain plastic - if available, use those that don't, or washable rags. Wet wipes never used to be a "thing," although they're convenient, like coffee cups, people can live without them.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years, at most.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Monitoring of products entering the country. Registers for packaging options from manufacturing. Checks at manufacturing plants that required packaging is being used. Ability for members of the public to report items purchased that do not meet the requirements set out in the Act.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 188

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

absolutely because the majority of plastic waste is from commercial and industrial production in the building and manufacturing sectors. large corps should be scrutinised when using these materials in there products, there is always alternatives.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

less waste for future generations to clean up behind us.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

there is always another option when you look hard enough and invest into alternative technologies.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

no discussion necessary . the less plastic waste we create now, the less our future generations will have to deal with and the less our environment must struggle with.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

the Suppliers and supermarkets are the options we are given . for example in a town with only one supermarket i.e kaikoura. there is no choice if buying your products with these plastics as there is only one option. there is no facilities or option to recycle them at the local recycling centre so everything that is supplied goes to landfill. the bottom line is the suppliers , when the consumers have a better options , they make better choices.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

be in a habit of having your own mug and take an alternative to babywipes. not being lazy.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

affordability and easy access to different options, possible govt subsidy towards using more environmentally friendly options

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

the sooner the better

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

access for the public to read and review answers

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 189

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use itemsthrough significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable

packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 190

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There are better alternatives and we should do all we can to reduce environmental harm

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The cost is merely an inconvenience to the business to source an alternative product which may result in a small price change for the consumer however the benefits to the environment will be positive and immeasurable

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There may be unforeseen costs however i am confident that the shift will bring an overall positive change in industries and be better for the earth

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Making it inaccessible. It is used merely as a convenience out of habit it is not a necessity.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe,

versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

2 years seems like an adequate timeframe it is as soon as possible yet also provides ample time for businesses to source alternatives and consumers to change their consumption habits

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Creating an incentive for businesses to move away from these plastic containing products, provide clear packaging on label to ensure consumers are aware which products contain plastics and which don't and promote keep cups.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Having an organisation which the public can report too and have an organisation to enforce the rules during the first few years of the phase out

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 191

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Cost would be having to find alternatives to these materials that are just as effective. Benefit would be significant reduction of proportion of waste being plastic as well as reduction of impact that manufacture of these plastics have on the natural environment.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Obviously there is always a cost of convenience and efficiency at the beginning having to find an alternative - how high this cost is will depend on the organisation of this phase-out - , but once this is settled, there shouldn't be any significant long term cost whereas there will be a notable long term benefit.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Simply taking away these easily-accessed plastics while immediately providing alternatives of a similar price.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Same cups but with no lid and instead a rimmed lip that prevents spillage. If a lid is absolutely necessary, a perforated paper/card lid may be of use.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1.5-2 years. As soon as an alternative design is found, the process should begin and not before.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Public responsibility/monitoring where citizens should feel the need to report use of such plastics (which shouldn't have even been obtained in the first place). Businesses found to be using or distributing these plastics should then be fined.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 192

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Availability is more of a factor than cost. The fact that supermarkets in key locations (such as New World Metro in Wellington Railway Station) are stocking deodorant in cardboard packaging makes it easier to initiate or sustain behaviour change in every day habits.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 193

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items. This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. however, the problem isn't just about plastic, it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy and the resources and emissions created in making an item to be used just once. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms papatūānuku. I want the Government to consider the broad lifecycle impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of material type, and then propose more concrete policy actions it will take to create a culture of reuse. The current social norm and selfish privilege of single use convenience in our current NZ culture is inconsistent with natural system boundaries we must live within and our responsibility to future generations.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I believe MfE have mostly identified the correct objectives. I agree that reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, & will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree that the options listed for shifting away from hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics are the correct options to consider. I believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban, i.e. concurrently implementing complimentary policy - banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. The list is missing some key policy options that could help grow reuse. E.g. deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets & "reusables only" for dine-in situations.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree MfE have identified sensible criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items. More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy. In addition some criteria need broader definitions - "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse and "Achievability" should consider

more than whether new legislation is needed. Criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes would also benefit decision-making. There needs to be clear guidance to qualify availability of alternatives, as well as what defines reusable to limit unintended consequences.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree in part with MfE's assessment of the options. I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed. I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options such as like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements, implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives, increase recycled content in products and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items and reduce unintended products entering the market.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages, however the proposed time-frames are too slow. Where possible we should align with international best practice, the EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. We suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe MfE has identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

I agree the proposal should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging). This is because PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025 include the increased potential to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS) currently available. I would also like to see Government oversight to ensure packaging products, recycling and reuse systems are designed to be accessible & to minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023. The quicker we get rid of these, the less environmental harm. As there are readily available alternatives this phase-out could and should be done by June 2021 in line with EU bans. In addition need to specify photo (UV) degradable plastics be included.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think MfE has identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics, although a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I believe an additional benefit to phasing out the targeted plastics is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would make it easier for me to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives. Regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement would also help. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about exemptions should take place. I do not support exempting single-use coffee cups & lids, or single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 from the phase-out. Bearing in mind that these types of single use items have only become popular over the last decade or two, are unnecessary and there are readily available reusable alternatives. I would also like to see additional single use items added to the ban including: balloons, ice block & lollipop sticks, plastic coffee pods and single serve condiments like soy sauce fish, pottles for jam/butter, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. The Government should also introduce place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet, including • Reusables only for dine-in contexts • Central city single-use-free zones • No bottled water & throwaway serviceware on university campuses & in Government buildings There needs to be clear guidance to qualify availability of alternatives (already in-market or available for swift entry), as well as what defines reusable, in order to limit unintended consequences

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Yes, I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. I suggest altering the proposed definition single-use plastic tableware to include paper bowls/containers with plastic or

wax linings and that the definition of single-use plastic produce bags is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

I believe 12 months is an appropriate phase-out period except for single-use cups. For single-use cups, two years would allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives for single use coffee cups. There are readily available alternatives available to coffee cups. In regards to wet-wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable and in addition redefining 'flushable' in the NZ context to ensure that wet wipes are not disposed in the sewer system. In addition to banning disposable coffee cups, which will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with alternatives faster; I would like to see the government: - Mandate reusables for dine-in customers, - Make labelling on disposable coffee cups compulsory to inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. - A levy and/or producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up/disposal. - Update food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

I consider that with formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, some towns could become single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree MfE has identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy for the phase-out proposals. The potential for noncompliance with this type of ban is high, therefore I support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers to police this ban. There should also be an accessible process established to enable the community to report breaches directly to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 194

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Suggest adding plastic in teabags

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Need to be fair to all industries

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Potentially greater costs for retailers to replace this packaging, but the "pain" is likely to be worth the effort

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The need for regulation should be considered, there are disadvantages to additional regulation and the need for additional regulations should be carefully considered.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Unsure

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Plastic produce bags - suggest removing the reference to handles - this leaves a loophole open and isn't relevant to the definition/use of the item.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Agree with many of the re-use and sustainable options described in the document, but there is the need to work with the industry to drive/encourage innovation

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 195

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

all industry packaging needs to be looked into

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There is a great number of goods being delivered with huge amounts of packaging - if you leave this out it would be detrimental to the impact of the phase out - also the popularity of delivered goods is increasing

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 196

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Would like to see ban extended towards materials like polystyrene as imported packaging materials as well as it has long been felt for many applications there are many useful alternatives or substitutions that may be used.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

May wish to further specify especially with food containers aspects like colour of plastic as well as I understand even if #1 or #2 plastic maybe recycled, if it is of certain colours, it may be more difficult to recycle.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Could this timetable be shorter or incentivised somehow to get more rapid progress?

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not,

what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Good that all biodegradable/compostable plastic containers are covered in this as they often contaminate recycling processes. Hopefully this also includes "bioplastic" made of other materials for the same reason as well. Would encourage those to be banned also so they do not contaminate other conventional material streams.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Generally agree except where food container items may be concerned and also where a plastic material may be readily swapped out for an environmentally questionable alternative (i.e. a plastic pack vs. a paper product might encourage deforestation or involve a paper product being coated with some plastic substance that would render it unrecyclable anyway; careful consideration should be made for unintended consequences of material substitution)

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Perhaps a government and industry coordinated reusable "Kiwi-pac" option could be set up to incentivise a more sustainable option. People could sign up, receive a reusable set (or some kind of discount or other incentive towards getting one) and every time they bring it and use it they get some kind of discount, bonus, credit, or other incentive on the food/items they would typically consume. Kiwi-pac might include things like a standard size lunch box, keep cup, drink bottle, metal straw, reusable cutlery set, etc. all with the person's name on it to encourage "ownership", or could otherwise be customised with favourite colour, a pattern, or some other personalised demarcation. Perhaps the items could be designed by iconic Kiwi designers/companies to add to the appeal as well.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Generally agree except where hygiene items may be concerned (durability is important) and also where a plastic material may be readily swapped out for an environmentally questionable alternative (i.e. a plastic cotton swab vs. a wooden cotton swab might encourage deforestation for the paper pulp; careful consideration should be made for unintended consequences of material substitution or we will just be facing other problems down the track)

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

How about no stickers on fruit and instead some kind of subtle etching or non-toxic rub-away or edible marking if absolutely required? Unclear why we need stickers on half the fruit out there anyway when people know what a kiwi or banana is.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

If we can go hard on plastic bags and people change behaviour, we can definitely widen the scope to other areas.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Encourage dine in with reusable cups, make keep cups mandatory for takeaway purchases (i.e. didn't bring your keep cup? Well you can buy one today so you definitely have it the next time around), and also ban wet wipes for anything other than use in a medical context.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

ASAP

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 197

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Agree option 6 preferred, but recommend simultaneously option 7 be adopted as a mandatory requirement for remaining plastics (this is being widely adopted worldwide). Option 8 should not be considered.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Cost should not be double-weighted. For example, in food packaging the packaging cost is very small compared to the total cost of the entire goods item being sold - so a price increase in the packaging is of minor impact and should not stand in the way of achieving the required environmental outcome.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Option 6 & option 7 should be simultaneously adopted. Mandatory recycled content is a simple, yet particularly effective, way to drive the huge range of behaviours required to make an enduring impact. Understanding the WMA reform is required to achieve this, it should be prioritised, and could be signaled now. This type of signal - if delivered authoritatively can have an immediate effect whilst allowing time for the final mechanics to be devised and implemented.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Should also include PVC bottles (e.g. Sunlight Liquid 2 litre dish wash detergent bottle is PVC, while smaller sizes are PET)

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is widely used in retail blisters (e.g. hardware & electronics). This should cover imported products as well as locally packed items. Consider pharmaceutical - it may require separate treatment (e.g. medicine bottles, pill blisters).

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits will include cleaning up the recycle stream and reducing plastic to landfill. There will be costs. There is a danger that some producers may switch to non-plastic alternates which are still environmentally undesirable (e.g. soft plastics).

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There may be some product compromises involved (e.g. slightly less shelf life, functional differences - such as snap-off features, ease of opening). For example a tear-off lid may have to be replaced with a screw cap, a snap-off feature may have to be replaced with a bend & tear. At some point there are bound to be some convenience sacrifices required in order to exit the linear solutions that have been adopted and get to genuine circularity with these products.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Make recycled content mandatory - so that our customers will accept any small cost increases associated with the change. Also, consider labelling products to state recyclable (or not recyclable) in NZ.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Coffee Cup lids made from PP could be exempt. Mixed plastic items (e.g. cardboard containers with a plastic window) should be designated as "plastic" for the purposes of these regulations and the whole pack subject to the same requirements as wholly plastic items. Plastic-coated cardboards & papers - same (e.g. cardboard meat trays are now in the supermarket - Salmon is one example - and this type of meat tray is now launched in Woolworths Australia for red meats)

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Big brands will stall for time - we must see this initiative prioritised.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Waste to Energy would seem the only viable disposal method available. Without that we have to make the hard call and implement a ban. People are lazy - any weakness in this area will be exploited. We never had these products in the past - for heaven's sake wipe with a cloth, and drink from a normal cup - its not hard!!

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

No more than 18 months.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Notes

Most of these costs to consumers are minor (i.e. individual product costs). Government can consider assistance with capital costs for industry to reset if desired.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Industry should be required by law to make statutory declaration about compliance with these regulations - with regular audits taking place to ensure compliance, and heavy penalties for non-compliance.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 198

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Agree in principle with rationale that harder to replace / substitute PVC PS packaging warrants phased approach.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Agree overall benefits in terms of recycling impacts / environmental impacts justifies the phase-out.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Given time, the market will adapt. The government should remain vigilant for unanticipated perverse outcomes and be prepared to regulate further or intervene in other ways if necessary.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Decisive action is warranted. There will inevitably be impacts and some costs, but these are justified given the problems associated with these materials.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The government should provide advice and reasonable assistance to affected organisations.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

The proposed phase-out is completely justified given the huge impacts of plastic waste on the marine and terrestrial environments. The move is consistent with other leading jurisdictions, such as the EU and also aligns with NZ's 'clean green' image, which helps our reputation in terms of trade and tourism. Consumers will quickly adjust.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

We believe an 18 month time frame is sufficient to allow the market / consumers to adapt. 18 months is also long enough to allow affected companies to make plans for alternative business practices / product lines. Possible longer time frames may be considered if well reasoned / well justified positions are presented by industry stakeholders, so long as these are not simply an attempt to defer any imposts.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Wet wipes containing plastic should be phased out and quickly. The impacts on the environment and waste water infrastructure easily justify this. Further, many consumers would simply not be aware of the environmental externalities and direct costs associated with blockages in sewerage systems. Many people are likely simply unaware these items are not biodegradable and not flushable. On coffee cups, alternatives are available (such as 'keep cups'). However, we recognise that there is still a need for 'take away' cups. A small levy is one idea to encourage the public to use 'keep cups' or similar products. The government should actively consider ways to support the development and commercialisation of appropriate alternatives.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Wet wipes - 12 months is ample, but should be accompanied with a government advertising campaign explaining why the measures are being taken and what alternatives are available. Coffee cups - perhaps 24 months - long enough for alternatives to be rolled-out.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

NZ stands to benefit from decisive action in terms of maintaining our 'clean / green' image.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Reasonable and proportional penalties should apply. Importantly, once the measures have come into effect, they should be enforced.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 199

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

An eventual reduction in wildlife mortality and ecosystem integrity, an increase in visual amenity and public understanding and again setting an example to the world of New Zealand as a can-do nation leading the way in environmental recovery and human rights.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Yes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The benefit of even these initial steps will have ongoing and widespread consequences internationally for our ecosystems, species and societies.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Mandatory regulation

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe,

versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

return cup programs, cotton, paper or other single and multiple use wipes or just use water

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Mandatory phase out and provision of subsidised alternatives

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months as a goal at least

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Through councils, food and health authorities, community phone in, industry groups

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 200

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

there are still have some plastic bag at supermarket, and i think all the plastic bag should to change to the oxo-degradable plastic. I understand that may be cost a lots, but our environment is priceless.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

we need push it up.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

like the meat and vegetable during the packaging.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

oxo-degradable will cost lots of money, maybe the people or company still wants to choose the cheaper one.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

phasing out the plastics will cost a lot for now, because some of the factories will be cost more money to update the machine. but the government will save money for treating the plastic waste.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

To understand that using the plastic bag is not take the positive effects to the government, and the company also need to spend more time and cost more money to find the treatment.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

If the people using their own coffee cup, they will get the discount for the coffee. Or to upgrade the coffee cup, to reducing using the plastic.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

using the dry paper towel to instead of the wet wipes.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

should be as soon as possible, but it take time to process. within 3-5 years are suitable.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

making the legislation. and some education.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 201

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Prefer earlier complete phase out

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

I can't see a negative as commercially viable alternatives exist. How existing products in the supply chain are managed during the phase out is important.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Information, a complete ban so that we don't inadvertently use those products.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Prefer phase out to be brought forward.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

re-usable cups (it is purely a behavioural issue), biodegradable starch cups, drinking in, fibre based wet-wipes (e.g. bamboo, hemp, paper)

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 202

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The proposed policy should be supported by a comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement while assisting communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, but the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non-food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that do not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable

packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities, and better-designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee

cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 203

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 204

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Hopefully those timelines don't move or get extended out for any reason including Covid

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Very happy to see plastic produce bags included

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It might be clearer to do one shift vs breaking it up, I feel it might add confusion to the conversation i.e. this is included and this is excluded. Might help people draw the connection between how much of what we consume is plastic, and what forms it comes in.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The building industry has a significant impact on the environment. I feel like a shift to thinking about building materials and sustainable options is gaining momentum. Including this in the transition I believe will only build on that momentum and attention, and it makes it enforcable plus shows government action and support in that area of climate change.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I'm not qualified to reccomend other products, however I imagine careful deconstruction and reuse of existing PVC in demolition would become more of a thing. Carefully undoing houses and picking things out for re-use or second hand sale is a great practice to get into.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

No I don't sell those plastics

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

To me yes, but I don't know I have a comprehensive understanding on this topic

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There will be costs, yes. But the benefits will outweigh them in the long run, and also in terms of keeping our tourism economy and clean green image. NZ is quite a focus internationally at the moment, for such a small country to be implimenting hard and leading initiatives like this the benefits reach from economical, social, environmental and quality of life. Plus, this direction is how we HAVE to move to meet Paris Agreement and C40 targets - so to me it's not a question it's a case of actually getting it in place (among other things).

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Nothing - we will adapt as need be. Oh I know mum uses plastic produce bags because she uses them for cleaning up dog poo when walking our dog. Perhaps an alternative for cleaning up dog poo?

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Single use items like cutlery, plates, produce bags ect - phased out in 18-months. I'd say 12 ideally, but given the place the world is in right now and Covid-related challenges and priorities, 12 months might be too short. Needs to be done and I feel there are alternatives. PVC and polystyrene and produce stickers - 2 years. Business need to think of alternatives and new materials to be developed. May need to change building code and production lines and setup

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Encourage more dine-in options vs takeaway (have your coffee in the cafe and enjoy it) Obviously more reusable cup focus Workplace focus - lots of people in the habit of having one on the way to work Reusable cup takeaway trays for multiple cups (our team has one to do team coffee runs with reusable cups) Support to cafes and businesses who need to make these changes Compostable items HOWEVER if commercially compostable then these facilities need to be provided on the street Awareness campaigns with statistics to educate people (many think they can be recycled as they are) Wet wipes - refillable spray with compostable napkins or hard duty napkins soaked in cleaning product. Difficult though because Covid principals and hygiene conflicts with this for health and safety reasons.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

na

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

On small scale - perhaps random checks by walk-byes in malls and businesses who need to be adhering to these rules Perhaps a number or email addy people can use to report those not following the rules - although that would be timely to manage. Unless it was a short simple form that had tick boxes and an address field and business name field so that people weren't actually writing emails. Plus an auto reply to say it's been recorded so personal replies aren't needed.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 205

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All of these plastics are ending up in our environment and this needs to stop.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: Protecting our terrestrial, fresh water and marine environments Costs: Costs of products will likely increase but currently manufacturers do not pay the costs of the waste recycling or pollution remediation.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

In the long run the benefits will outweigh the initial monetary costs.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Simple and clear information/promotion of alternatives or new ways of doing things.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Other (please specify)

Notes

I do not know enough about the ease or difficulty on phasing particular products out so I'd prefer not to choose a length of time. The sooner the better however.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I think you should consider phasing these out quickly. Getting a disposable cup is not expensive to an individual who buys coffee out and habits form quickly. If there are already alternative wet wipes without plastic these should be phased out quickly as they cost the rate payer large amounts of money by effecting the wastewater system.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 206

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

More investigation into all packaging is needed

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cupshase out over 2 years Wipes ban use immediately

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Less customer demand

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee

cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 207

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree with the proposal but think other options in combination should be considered, e.g. implementing a tax for plastic and polystyrene during the phase out period may encourage people to phase out products faster.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I believe it can be done faster than 2025.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

Food and beverage packing contributes less than other large packing such as appliance boxes etc so all should be included in stage 2.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Easily accessible alternatives with equally low cost

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

All of these items should be phased out, however there are so many single use plastics of a greater size that are left off that list such as single use takeaway containers.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

These items are all used by consumers but what about plastic used by companies? Such as plastic bags used to wrap clothes for shipping?

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Either cheaper alternative packaging or incentives from the government

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

As soon as possible - 6 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 208

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We could include plastic water bottles, all the packaging on fruit like strawberry containers etc

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Just like the single use plastic bags, when these were phased out people adjusted and quickly, let's really make a difference

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Save our planet!! Environment, animals, pollution

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

This would only be the beginning of saving our earth, such potential benefits from here

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Not having it as an option, simple as that

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Only have wet wipes with no plastic in them available Ban plastic lined coffee cups,

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months let's do it now

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 210

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I would encourage phase-out at a quicker rate than that proposed.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Significant environmental benefits by phasing out.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Environmental benefits are significant. Commercial costs are low - there are viable alternatives.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Mandatory phasing out of these items

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

If these items can be phased out sooner, then adverse environmental consequences might be able to be avoided.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Customers can use own cups. Non-plastic alternatives. Customers are unable to receive take-away coffee.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12-18 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Each company to submit a brief plan outlining their move to compliance, with brief follow-up monitoring visit to ensure compliance.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 211

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There are already viable alternatives and more will be created on the back of this phase out, so going hard is the only option. There will be alternatives, industries won't suffer.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Potential increases in the cost of alternatives must be seen as an investment in the future and our ability to live on this planet.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

By ruling them out as an option. Don't give us a choice, we will find alternatives that are better for the environment but only if we are forced to e.g. plastic supermarket bags.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Appointing a central agency to control.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 212

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Action is needed urgently, the sooner the better.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Manufacturing companies have the ability to implement new environmentally friendly packaging, they don't need time to adjust. It is a matter of accountability.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Education, access to alternatives.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We should include other items such as wipes, balloons, cigarettes.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Manufacturers of such single-use coffee cups should have a solution for recycling these. Either collecting or paying a fee to allow the recycling by third party. As for wet wipes, ban the ones that contain plastic.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 213

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

As well as the secondary objective of 'increasing the uptake of high-value packaging materials including PET, HDPE (2) and PP (5)' it could include and other recyclable material such as paper, cardboard, glass or other innovations

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I'm in favour of the option of a mandatory phase-out but other options could also be considered eg labelling, mandatory recycled content. With just a phase-out there doesn't seem to be an incentive for producers to reduce plastic waste as they could just move to plastics 1,2,5. Those who are using alternatives eg refill, takeaway containers etc would be disadvantaged. Labelling wouldn't be appropriate on single use items but would be helpful as a consumer to know what packaging is inside a boxed item for example

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

all pvc and hard polystyrene could be phased-out earlier

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

polystyrene is especially difficult to get rid of yet alternatives can be used for packaging so could be included in stage 2. Few producers will change unless it becomes mandatory.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

benefits to the environment and reduced volume going to landfill

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

I don't however there are practical alternatives eg cloth produce bags, paper bags or not using one eg for bin liners

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Removing the items from use is the best way for us to not use them. It would help if more places provided refill options. Takeaway and other food vendors being more proactive to encourage using a takeaway container would help. Supermarkets provide a lot of fruit and vegetables already packaged (eg strawberries) which results in plastic waste - providing them non-packaged would be good. They are basically single-use items which most people probably don't recycle.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

disposable coffee cups (with plastic) should be included

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Include them in the items being phased out. Most people realise they should take their own cup when taking away a coffee, it's often laziness that prevents it. In large situations using cups that can be rewashed is possible. Some businesses, events and towns have shown that it's possible to do without disposable coffee cups (containing plastic). For wet wipes - plastic should not be permitted in their manufacture (most people would be surprised to know it is). Education around their use - cloth re-usable alternatives is often possible. As with coffee cups, it's just a throwaway mindset in society that needs to change

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

two years for wet wipes. 2-3 years for coffee cups. Businesses can be transitioning as soon as possible if they know it's going to change.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Businesses (eg events) switching from plastic cups could move to re-washing cups which may be more costly but would have less waste than using a paper cup. Unfortunately the use of water vs the cost of a paper cup may be in favour of the paper cup

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Individuals can monitor for compliance

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 214

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clearly this is a next first step in a much larger and on going process for further elimination, reuse and recycle circular economy process. It is a great next step and the most logical progression.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The weightings are a little hard to understand but the "gut feeling " test which these weightings support suggest that elimination by a ban is the most effective solution

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

No you got it right by having a phase 1 implemented earlier.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

As stated they are not recyclable, brittle, break down into the environment, confusing to the public.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The PR benefit to both brands and NZ of doing the right thing can't be over emphasised. While the costs are there the marketing and brand positioning of choosing to change is a huge opportunity

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Govt funded packaging grants for innovation particularly in reusable, recyclable aluminium and steel tubes, tins, bottles for cosmetics. In short govt collaboration with industry for new packaging initiatives not using plastic.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Non Compostable Produce stickers- the only option to replace given was Compostable stickers!! That is not a solution. As stated these are only industrially compostable, how many of these stickers will actually end up in an industrial compost? As a product all produce stickers are inherently flawed. There is probably not a single consumer in the world that appreciates pulling a sticker off a piece of fruit before they eat it (wondering how toxic the glue was)not to mention how to dispose of the sticker. The logical and sensible solution is to ban those stickers. It has to be an alternative to have No Stickers. If there is fruit available to purchase without stickers vs stickers, I always choose those without. An aside note, it is fundamentally incompatible to see these stickers on Organic produce for obvious reasons.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

3 years

Notes

As a brand owner that packages product with 36 month expiry, I am conscious some affected brands may need significant lead time to shift.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Education and support to start with. Make sure alternatives and information about them are readily accessible. Prosecution only as a last resort.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 215

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This proposal will mean New Zealand can finally join what the rest of the world has already started for many years. This is a good description of the problems. However, the proposed policy should also focus not just on pastic. It should focus on single-use products in general and how NZ's reliance on single-use products in our current linear economy. A reduction of virgin plastic resin usage should also be included in some form of regulatory future strategy. The Government needs to consider the the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of material type, and then propose more concrete policy actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is of utmost importance if we want NZ to transition to a circular economy and finally be more of a world leader in this space. The Government needs to increase access to reusable alternatives and the systems that support them. These reuse alternatives need to be affordable and accessible across NZ and support community-based engagement. Including the opportunity of communities to see the benefit of increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer. We need to avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials that don't appear as harmful as our current model but are equally just as destructive to our environment and economy.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Key actions are covered by these options but should be blended so that the Govt does more than one thing at a time e.g. banning targeted plastics at the same time as implementing levies or a deposit return system etc. This will strengthen a fast transition away from NZ's reliance on all single-use items. Some key policy options/actions could also be included such as deposit return schemes for takeaway packaging, or banning disposables being available for purchase in public places e.g. govt offices or tertiary institutes. Or having plastic free beaches and parks.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More importance needs to be given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse. New Criteria around whether the options limit risk of loopholes and unintended outcomes should also be included.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Support for the mandatory phase-out of all the items listed (except plastic straws until solid public consultation with health and disabled community undertaken). But we need a multiple pronged approach to this policy through positive regulatory options/policies implemented alongside a ban to support alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes to a two-staged approach But the proposed time-frames are too slow. A lot of plastics items will enter our environment well before 2025. Bring stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 and June 2023, respectively

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

A very comprehensive list thank you.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. It's still waste if it's wrapping food or some more plastic cups. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help provide high quality recycling systems. An obvious benefit of phasing out packaging will be for the environment and also for local councils who spend a lot of time and money to deal with excess litter that has been lost from the current waste stream e.g. people just throwing it out their car windows or lost from beachside rubbish bins or the back of industrial buildings.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The Best alternatives for the long term will need to be reusable/refillable and accessible The Govt will need to level the playing field between single-use and reuse e.g. mandate reusables for 'dine in' contexts PET and PP should not be alternatives that are high up the list. They should be a last resort approach if the Govt invests in a better reuse system across the country then better alternatives will come about.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Fully support this approach. The EU are banning them by July 2021. We should follow suit. The quicker the better. Let's be ambitious in this space.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

It's great the Govt has recognized the potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers and the cost savings at a wider community level. The analysis would be more meaningful if the environment wasn't treated as an affected party distinct from human society and our economy. Our society thrives only if the environment is in the same situation.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Added benefit: the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items and change behavior. More reuse schemes and reusable packaging will mean less throwaway packaging overall, not just targeted plastics. Resulting in even more costs savings for local government and ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Reuse systems need to become mainstream, and these systems and products must be accessible and affordable for everyone in our community. NGO's and community groups across the country are already undertaking plenty of public education programs to make people aware of our situation and have more knowledge on sustainable packaging. The Govt needs to support those that are already doing the mahi at a grass roots level through funding and better support through good regulation, policy and investment in this sector. Will need investment in infrastructure e.g. washing/sterilizing facilities and re-fill stations. This investment needs to be local, not just in the big cities. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products. As well as having ALL of our recycling processed on shore in NZ. To ensure the high value plastics actually get recycled and not just sent to landfill when the public think they have done the right thing. Especially when tonnes of recycling have to be sent to the landfill due to contamination from other products that were included in the collection.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Fully support banning all of the listed items, except for a full ban on plastic straws. Although I would like to see plastic straws removed from our hospitality industry and in the public (and our marine ecosystem). There should be consultation with the disabled community and the health sector about a straw ban/exemptions before a decision is made. The social stigma of people that need to use plastic straws seen in public under a ban would expose already vulnerable people to uncomfortable situations. I don't support the exemption of single-use coffee cups & lids and single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5. Especially those takeaway cups from the likes of McDonalds and BubbleTea. There are already businesses and cafes that voluntarily try to reduce their reliance on coffee cups such as providing discounts to customers who BYO mugs. A business should not have to be making less money to support a plastic free NZ especially with the current impacts of COVID-19. We need to be supporting these businesses and ensure that policy doesn't negatively impact businesses already employing reuse tactics. A ban on single-use coffee cups combined with Govt support for reuse schemes is a fully viable option to enable takeaway only venues to continue to thrive. The List should also include other harmful throwaway single-use items: - Plastic Lollipop sticks - Single-serve pottles and containers for condiments and toiletries e.g. sugar saches or mini pottles of jam/peanut butter - Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic - Single-use water bottles - Balloons and balloon sticks - Glitter and plastic confetti and confetti containers e.g. party poppers - Complementary plastic toys e.g. those in Christmas crackers or chocolate eggs. - Confectionary wrappers - Mini soy sauce and tomato sauce condiments, and noddle sauce packets Fully support the position to ban all listed products and their biodegradable etc. counterparts. The Govt should also introduce place-based bans for items that won't be banned completely yet i.e. those that don't make the list. This should include central city single-use-free-zones, or plastic free beaches and parks. Or No bottled water/drinks and throwaways and serviceware on university campuses and in Govt buildings. I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, cigarette butts and reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets. We need to make industry responsible for the re-design of these products, not rely on the public to correctly dispose of "recyclable" products.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Strongly support banning all items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. All of these plastics are never really disposed of correctly, especially when it comes to takeaways. Even if a product is made for recycling majority of the time it goes to landfill anyway. Don't support the definition exempting coffee cups and lids Don't support the definition exempting single use cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 - Single-use plastic tableware should be altered to include paper/cardboard bowls and containers with a plastic/wax lining. - Single-use produce bags definition should be broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags. Handles should also be removed from the exemption as this may just prompt businesses to purchase bags made with handles which would exempt them from having to meet the other requirements.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12-18 months for everything should be considered. Single use cups may need 18-20 months to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure and collaboration with businesses in the community. Alternative options already exist. Some people just need that extra nudge to push them in the right direction.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee Cups The most impactful thing the Govt can do is use regulation, policy and investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability) and availability of reusable alternatives. Put disposable coffee cups on the ban list!!!! This will stimulate industry alternatives and behavioral change must faster. - A levy/producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover costs associated with clean up or disposal (Producers should either re-design their products or face charges - if some products and businesses fail due to this then that doesn't mean it shouldn't go ahead) - Update food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. Including creating official guidelines for reusable serveware so businesses and public feel confident about their food safety or reuse schemes. - Introduce well publicized disposable cup-free zones in all communities. - Phase out disposable cups from public procurement - Support the correct design of cups and reuse schemes that are accepted in the future. Many actions can already happen under s 23 of the Waste Minimization Act without the need for new parliamentary legislation. We need the most efficient pathways to ensure actions are undertaken fast to meet the new targets. The options suggested for coffee cups is appropriate but could be strengthened by: - Targeting investment in scaling up reuse systems at a regional/localized level for washing/sterilization facilities or a deposit return scheme for ALL takeaway coffee cups (both disposable and reusable cups) - Implementing policy that helps remove barriers to reuse schemes growing - Public education campaigns should be lead by NGO's and community groups with a track record of engaging their communities on zero waste. Funding should be provided to these groups to invest efficiently in behavioral change. - Investing in stimulating a reusables network will be a better use of taxpayer funds instead of investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups. Wet Wipes Full support for transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic ASAP. Support the options already considered in the consultation document. Especially the mandating of labels informing users of correct disposal and the presence of plastic. A voluntary agreement with industry would get the ball rolling and make an overall ban much easier to enforce in the coming years - A target date should be set for when plastic in wet wipes will be banned. - Product stewardship approach could be implemented by 2023 to fast track the possibility of banning plastic in wet wipes.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Please consult with businesses in the hospitality industry that are already free of single-use plastic coffee cups.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee Cups With the appropriate policy and financial support for reuse systems this could be achieved by 2022 if not earlier. This needs to happen quickly and be amongst the first products to be phased-out. Wet Wipes Fully support a transition from plastic wet wipes as soon as practical. June 2022 would be ideal.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Comprehensive list and agree with them all Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities and savings for local government and ratepayers.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Full support for a compliance and enforcement strategy. The range of products proposed for a ban is wide and impact multiple sectors, organizations and individuals so will need appropriate funding to have effective enforcement and reduce the high risk of noncompliance slipping through. Community support in reporting breaches to MFE should also be considered and made easily available. This should be done alongside the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 216

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits will include speeding up the development and costliness of alternatives and reducing the impact on the environment

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes there already is. Additional development and cost reduction will happen more quickly with the ban in place.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. Or it could be even sooner.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

In addition to the environmental benefits of phasing out these plastics, there will also be other gains as behaviour changes in other areas / with other plastics - ie there will be a greater flow-on impact with better options across the board.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Taking a national view of availability of recycling schemes etc because smaller provincial centres may not benefit from recycling options available in bigger cities.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Could move the timeframes faster and include more items in the lists (subject to discussion with wider impacted communities of interest eg disability sector, medical needs, social service providers for things like food banks)

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

More clarity around items labeled 'biodegradable' or 'compostable' or standards to go with those (ie so that those items don't

just break down into microplastics and extend the problem)

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

subject to consultation with communities of interest eg disability sector

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 217

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government gave a good description of the problems the targeted plastics can cause. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku. We urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material types used, and to propose more concrete policy & regulatory actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. We urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Please also think of combining options and/or having transitional solutions.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree that the ban option will be the more effective one and we really need urgent action. However, a 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Please shorten times if possible. This is an urgency.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

I do not know much about type of plastics but if there is a broader option, a better option, we should choose it. Ie. I bought a sof  this weekend. We the delivery came I could see that the packaging was plastic. I'd prefer it not to have any plastic. Useless plastic ending in landfill. Sad.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

I don't know.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Earlier if possible.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Information and transparency in the products. Availability or reusable & refillable packaging for affordable products.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

I do not have the answer, but please do not delay the actions. The sooner the better.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

The most impactful thing the Govt can do is use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility & availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Note that accessibility includes affordability.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Disposable coffee cups products should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 218

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The definitions are a little narrow but are a good start

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

There needs to be more focus on reuseable alternatives to make the process simpler for individuals.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

An additional method could be through mass, focused education. A blend of these options to attack these issues would be more powerful than a single option. There is also no mention of any "reuse" targets.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Multiple options should be implemented from the starting point - bans are effective, but utilising multiple options will be more efficient.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Tetrapaks should be included as an example. Plastic windows on other items (ie battery packs, duvet bags etc)

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It will not resolve the contamination of kerbside recycling

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefit to the environment will have a roll on effect, benefitting health and the economy

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Incentives and investment from the government - and a focus on reuse - will make this more bearable.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Financial incentives - it's so expensive to get started using reusable products. Availability is a huge issue, there just aren't enough refilleries.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Disposable coffee cups should be included. Straws should be excluded as some people require straws to drink, and consultation with diasabled peoples organisations should steer that discussion. Other items like plastic lollipop sticks, chewing gum, plastic condiments (butter/jam pottles etc)

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Details of the exemption process for disabled people to access straws needs to be outlined. The exemptions on single use cups seems to not be in line with the stated aims - some single use cups are already recyclable but are still ending up in landfill.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 to 18 months should be doable for most items, some items will require more discussion with affected communities and industries.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Introduce a deposit-return process on single use cups. Reuseable cups are generally offered with a deposit; put single use on the same playing field. This will also encourage people to pick up and return cups they find when they've been littered. A simpler option is to ban them. A deposit-return policy with wet wipes would probably stop shops from selling them, as they'd probably not want to deal with used wipes. If wet wipes aren't going to be banned, then changing the labelling to stop people flushing them and introducing a levy would help. Education is already being done by ngos and charities.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Phase out should start immediately, so a full phase out of at least single use cups could be completed by jan 2023

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The effects of the ban on the disabled community has not been considered.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Enforcement officers could be appointed.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 219

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree in part and appreciate the research and mahi that has gone into describing the problems associated with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items. I agree with the presented problems of plastic packaging. I also think a wider considering of the problems with single-use items regardless of their material, and of all hard-to-recycle items/materials is needed. Use of energy and finite materials (i.e. water) to produce items for single-use/or few uses is inefficient regardless of the materials ability to break down (e.g. a paper fork vs. a plastic fork). I support a bill which encourages a reusable economy, and which acknowledges the problems inherent with 'single-use' as well as plastic. I support a bill which also acknowledges the problems inherent with not planning for a circular use - as is with all hard to recycle items. I.e. mixed material products such as shoes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Again, I like these objectives and appreciate the work that went into creating them. I would suggest that some objectives focus on supporting a circular economy as well as eliminating hard to recycle plastics and single-use plastic items. i.e. supporting the distribution of reusable alternatives, supporting businesses to adopt reusables over non-plastic single-use items. Non-plastic single-use items are a false solution which would again need to be phased out in the near future as we reach our planetary limits. It would be a shame to eliminate plastic, creating a higher demand for bamboo single-use cutlery, only to see increased deforestation, so bamboo plantations can be planted. This problem has been seen with palm oil and soy plantations.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree with all the options listed but I have some other options to consider. Such as a deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, such as is already seen with mojo cafe (<https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/mojo-coffee-joins-reusable-cup-lending-system-in-wellington/D3QHTZ42N6VBP2A6VAGY5EYPVY/>) and other cafes within New Zealand, mandatory reuse targets & "reusables only" for dine-in situations. It would also be great to see some combination options such as banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. I am particularly interested in labelling or some kind of 'ethical' standard being available so consumers can identify, choose between and reward businesses transitioning well to a circular economy.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

Give more importance to the top of the waste hierarchy, refuse and then reduce.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree with the items to be banned, except plastic straws in cases of disability. It would also be good to consider more than just a ban, such as regulatory policies i.e. levies.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, thank you for this mahi. Could we speed up these timelines? By 2023 and 2025 is too late. So much plastic is produced and sent to landfill each and every year. Even a six-month speed up of timelines will help to reduce irrevocable damage to our plant. I suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you! This is great, I agree. This is an expansive & ambitious list of products for a phase-out. Let's do this!

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non-food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, water-ways and marine environment - damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. A small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation. However due to the harmful properties of plastic in the environment, we would support it being replaced as a packaging material. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Sustainable product design is the practical alternative, consider the end-of-life options for a material, preventing any unintended consequences from the targeted phase-out. Also, I support the use of recycled plastic as the next option for producing packaging if there are no suitable alternatives.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The EU are banning them by July 2021 - would be cool if we could meet them at this deadline or close to it.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, thank you this is a comprehensive list!

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Benefits - The opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems not only reduce waste, they also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. More reuse schemes & more reusable packaging will also mean less throwaway packaging overall (not just targeted plastics). This will = even more cost savings for local government & ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If the government supported by using their regulation, policy & investment powers. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community and reflect Universal Design principles.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, I have 3 points that I feel strongly about: 1. I don't support banning plastic straws. 2. I cannot believe the single-use coffee cup (SUC) is not on the ban list. 3. I would like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list. A plastic straw ban would be discriminatory. Some people need a plastic straw to drink. Reusable straw alternatives work well for some people, but not for everyone. Consultation with the disabled community should be sought. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. Reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups... • SUC surcharges • Jar swap systems • Mug libraries • BYO discounts • Retailing reusable cup I know of over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... And they're thriving. This proves that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. A ban on SUC combined with Government support for reuse schemes can provide security for takeaway only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies. These companies are aware of the changing public perception to disposable cups, & are positioned to diversify. The harmful throwaways I'd like to see added to the ban list. • PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS Are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead. • SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS Like soy fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. The Government should introduce place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet. For example: • Reusables only for dine-in contexts • Central city single-use-free zones • No bottled water & throwaway service-ware on university campuses & in Government buildings. • Teabags containing plastic Many teabags contain plastic (either in the bag itself or the adhesives that hold the bag together). This is not common knowledge and many people put used teabags in their compost bins. Consequently, teabags containing plastic present a similar concern for potential plastic contamination of soil as plastic fruit stickers do. Teabags containing plastic should be included on the list for mandatory phase-out too. Not all teabags contain plastic, so alternatives clearly do exist. In addition to potential microplastic contamination of soils, plastic in teabags is also a health concern as the plastic and additives may be released into the tea while it's steeping. • Single-use plastic water bottles: In New Zealand, we have widespread access to potable water from the tap, so bottling water in plastic and transporting it around the country and the world needlessly creates harmful emissions and waste. Single use plastic bottles are an inefficient and environmentally harmful way to provide access to potable water, which could be replaced by public fountains or bulk, reusable containers. Initiatives like Refill NZ are gaining traction, but we need to see Government leadership in banning or at least imposing on single-use plastic water bottles to make a real difference in the volume of plastic water bottles used. This would also benefit the tourism industry, by reinforcing New

Zealand's brand as one of high environmental standards. Exemptions could be designed for civil defence and emergency situations.

- Glitter and plastic confetti: Plastic-based glitter is used in a wide range of cosmetic products and art supplies. Prior to voluntary bans in the UK, early childhood centres admitted to using kilos every year. Similarly, mardi gras and music festival organisers are phasing out the use of glitter for environmental reasons, particularly as there are plenty of environmentally-friendly options on the market. As a microplastic, glitter shares similar environmental impacts to other microplastics (although its sharp edges may cause more physical damage to smaller creatures when ingested) and therefore, it is not always distinguished from other microplastics in peer-reviewed scientific publications.
- Complementary plastic toys on children's magazines and with fast food.
- Chewing gum containing plastic - most large branded chewing gum contains plastic and causes up to 100,000 tonnes of plastic pollution globally every year.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

The submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Government isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, I don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. Other reasons why I do not fully agree with the proposed definitions in table 7 are...

- I do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see our answer to Q16)
- I do not support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. This exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter.
- The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

I believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Put disposable coffee cups on the ban list. This will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage w/ alternatives faster.

- Mandate reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California)
- Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups to inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups.
- A 'latte' levy and/or producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal.
- Update food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. For wet wipes I support a ban as soon as practical. I support a prohibition of the word 'flushable' (these labelling requirements should be mandated under s 23(1)(f) of the WMA). I also support fees being attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs (which can be considerable when they block pipes and form fatbergs). Currently the community is covering these costs through Council. It would be more appropriate to attach this cost to producers and consumers through a fee. This is different to a levy as it's related to the cost of managing the product and could be achieved under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA. A ban on advertising for wet wipes containing plastic would also be appropriate.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

I invite the Government to consult with the 50+ hospitality businesses who are SUC free, and the organisations and small businesses around NZ that support their work such as:

- UYO (Use Your Own)
- SUC-free Wanaka
- Again Again
- Cupcycling
- Good to Go Waiheke
- Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project
- Wanakup

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups - With formal Government support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes - I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable (e.g. by Jan 2022).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

An unconsidered cost of the proposed mandatory phase-out of plastic straws is potential discrimination against individuals who need a plastic straw. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. Reuse schemes reduce waste, costs for local government and ratepayers, and create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. These jobs are also dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Enforcement officers and community monitoring.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 220

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I disagree with banning straws and cotton buds. Paper straws are only useful for a few minutes, glass or metal straws raise serious hygiene concerns. I have recently been using wooden cotton buds and have had several snap during use, this is a significant issue which doesn't exist with the plastic product.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

excluding straws and cotton buds, yes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Not without understanding the implications for the commercial/rural sector where alternative products may be unavailable or inadequate for the purpose.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I'm concerned about the impact inferior alternatives may have on the quality/hygiene of products

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Do not agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items (please comment below)

Notes

Where suitable alternatives don't exist or hygiene is compromised by alternatives I have serious concerns about this proposal. Paper straws are not a suitable alternative for ill/disabled and the experience using them honestly sucks compared to a plastic straw, and multi-use straws raise serious hygiene concerns. Given how minute the footprint of plastic cotton buds is and the fact that the vast majority use these in their home where appropriate rubbish disposal is available, it seems very odd that these have been singled out as a product to eradicate. I question the rating of these as a high risk to marine life as it doesn't seem like a product that would regularly be entering waterways?

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I really don't understand why you'd be focussing on cotton buds? these aren't a product that's regularly used in a public space and it would be very unusual to find these entering waterways, so the noted risk to marine life makes no sense in practical terms? I feel there needs to be more effort made to provide a suitable alternative for plastic straws before these can be phased across the board, phasing them out from use in retail/hospitality would be preferable.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

While I feel straws could be phased out from hospitality/retail use in 18 months I feel they should be available for those who genuinely need them to purchase for home use.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I disagree with removal of single use coffee cups, reusable cups pose a hygiene risk and while some may be lucky enough to have readily available kitchen facilities to wash their cups as they please they are the minority. You're likely to end up with "multi-use" cups becoming disposable in much the same way as "reusable" plastic bags have.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

I do not support this.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 221

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I regularly pick up rubbish from the street and gutters around Lyall Bay and along the coastline of Lyall Bay. This rubbish is predominantly made up of plastic. Along Lyall Bay it is mainly hard plastic that I pick up in small hard plastic broken up into small pieces, polystyrene beads or chunks and cigarette butts. These either coming down the stormwater drains or being washed up after a storm event. It would be good if you had used a percentage of how much New Zealand recycles each year rather than 'recycled worldwide'. We need to know how we compare to the world. I really like the concept of the six R's and the creating a culture of reuse if we have to use plastics. I agree with need to drive a change to the system to use less plastic and any plastic used should be reused as a first priority. The one thing the report does not comment on is the success of the soft plastic ban. I would like to thank everyone involved in banning soft plastic bags as I no longer pick large quantities of soft plastic on the beach. However I now only find the occasional soft plastic bag.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree the first objective should be to reduce the impact of the hard to recycle plastic packaging but we also need to look at items where plastic is included in the product e.g. cigarette butts and tea bags that plastics are included but could be totally removed. I agree the secondary objects of targeting PVC, polystyrene, oxo-degradable plastics and some single use items would be excellent. However you need to monitor these secondary objectives to see if it actually happens. The reduction in public confusion on recycling would be excellent and probably should be at the top of the secondary objectives! For example Wellington City Councils information is rather confusing to say the least.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes to Mandatory Phase out of 1. PVC and polystyrene packaging; 2. Oxo-degradable plastics; 3. Some single use items. But what are your timeframes of the phase out?

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The stages are too long. Another government could be elected and throw this proposal out completely before you even get to 2023! You need to have the stages implemented within less than 3 years. Stage one needs to be by January 2022 and Stage two by January 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The greatest benefit will be not having to pick up polystyrene beads, disposable coffee cup lids and other takeaway containers off Lyall Bay beach and any other coastal environment I visit.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I am ready for the move away from hard to recycle plastic packaging now! I try and not buy items with this packaging. I occasionally get large items delivered to my house with polystyrene packaging. I feel disgusted when all I can do with the polystyrene is send it to the landfill.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Please add the plastic sticks in sweets such as chubba chups and other confectionary. These plastic sticks are particularly prevalent in summer on the coastline and we don't need them! I really agree with all the items for phase out and in particular the non-compostable produce stickers which I try to remove before putting fruit and vegetable waste in my compost bin. If you don't remove the plastic fruit stickers your vegetable garden soil ends up looking like a mini landfill. I can remember when we had no vegetable stickers and we survived.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

I personally believe you need to phase out single use items as soon as possible. Most people who use these items will not have a stock pile of these items. The sooner you define the time the quicker they will be removed from the environment.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We don't need wet wipes with plastic! Seriously we lived without them for a long time. The sewage systems would have less blockages. I wouldn't have to pick these disgusting bits of plastic off the coastline of Lyall Bay. I get about one or two most days I collect rubbish. You can live without single use coffee cups. Take a keep cup, have the coffee at the premises or have recyclable system such as the stainless steel cups. I stopped using single use coffee cups over two years ago.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

The maximum time is 12 months for the timeframe of phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

It would have been useful if you had commented on how you undertook compliance, monitoring and enforcement of the soft plastic regulations. There is too little information in this section for me to comment on. However MfE could have used the soft plastic ban to inform this section. More detail is needed for the general public to make a comment. All I can say is the soft plastic ban seems to have worked and you could use the same enforcement procedures.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 222

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government gave a good description of the problems the targeted plastics can cause. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku. We urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material types used, and to propose more concrete policy & regulatory actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. We urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers key actions we'd expect to see. We have two concerns: There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time, e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. The list is missing some key policy options that could really help grow reuse - deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria & weightings make sense & help us understand the Government's reasoning behind the proposals. We suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy. Some criteria need broader definitions: "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse. "Achievability" should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. We also suggest new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support banning all the items listed (except for plastic straws - more on that later). Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, we urge the Govt not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead multi-task like a boss & take forward more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too! A 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Govt can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. But, the timelines proposed are too slow. Think of all the targeted plastic items that could enter our environment before 2023 and 2025. Right now, the world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. We need to reverse these trends, fast. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. We suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Using our democracy isn't only about speaking up when we disagree. It is also about giving our consent and approval when we feel the Government gets it right. So, we're going to be thanking the Government for creating what we reckon is an expansive & ambitious list of products for a phase-out

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

I agree the proposal should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging). This is because PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025 include the increased potential to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. We also call for Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you, Government, for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics - we wholeheartedly support this. PS the EU (and others) are banning them by July 2021 - just sayin'...

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The Government has made a comprehensive list of costs & benefits. We agree with all of them. We appreciate the recognition of potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers & for the wider community from simplifying our waste & recycling streams. We also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. Overall, we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits - human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There's an extra benefit to banning the targeted plastics that the Government's missed. This benefit is the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems not only reduce waste, they also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. More reuse schemes & more reusable packaging will also mean less throwaway packaging overall (not just targeted plastics). This will = even more cost savings for local government & ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The MAIN thing that would help NZers embrace reusable & refillable packaging is if Government gave reusables some love through the power of regulation, policy & investment. This would help reuse systems compete against single-use, & catapult reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles. The Government has suggested it could do some public education about sustainable packaging... Thanks Government, but heaps of NGOs & community groups do this mahi already! We need you to back us up by focusing on your unique superpowers of regulation, policy & investment.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, we have three points that we feel strongly about. 1. We don't support banning plastic straws. A plastic straw ban would be discriminatory. Some people need a plastic straw to drink. Reusable alternatives work well for some people, but not for everyone. The Government has suggested exemptions for people that need them, but it's hard to design exemptions that aren't stigmatising. At the very least, there must be adequate consultation & agreement with the disabled community before we can support banning plastic straws. 2. We're astounded that the single use coffee cup (SUC) is not on the ban list. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. For takeaways, reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. We know of over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... and they're thriving. Proving that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. A ban on SUC combined with Govt support for reuse schemes can provide security for take-out only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies.. As with all items that involve access to liquids in a hospitality setting, we suggest Govt liaise with the disabled community to seek guidance as to how reusable alternatives can be widely available for all. We urge the Government to take the plunge & ban all disposable coffee cups & lids. We believe they are amongst the most straightforward items to phase out - practically, and due to the increasingly negative public perception towards them. 3. We'd like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS. Like soy fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead. We would support the Government introducing place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet e.g. reusables only for dine-in contexts; central city single-use-free zones; no bottled water & throwaway serveware on university campuses & in Govt buildings.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, we don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. We do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see our answer to Q16). We also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see our answers about this in Q17).

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

The Takeaway Throwaways campaign focuses on serviceware, so we only discuss disposable coffee cups here. For discussion of options for wet wipes, check out the resources from your wider zero waste community. Our suggestions for reducing disposable coffee cups The most impactful thing the Govt can do is use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility & availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Note that accessibility includes affordability. Many of these actions can happen under s 23 of the WMA/without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. Regulatory & legislative actions include disposable coffee cups in the proposed ban list as this will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with the alternatives faster. Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California) Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. A disposable coffee cup levy and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. A Deposit Return Scheme for BOTH disposable coffee cups, & reusables offered through a reuse scheme. A DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all hospitality outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash and reuse returned reusable cups. Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. Collaborative, practical policy actions Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings) Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design principles & are accessible for everyone in the community. Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Our thoughts on the Govt suggestions... The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. We support this alongside regulatory & policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to the growth of reuse schemes. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. Investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups is not a good use of public funds. Better to put this money towards stimulating a reusables network. We urge the Government not to use its finite resources to reinvent the wheel & run a public education campaign about reusables. Loads of NGOs & community groups already do this mahi. We need Government to back our efforts with its unique policy & regulation-making superpowers. We need Government to champion and amplify the positives of truly circular reusable options!

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Takeaway Throwaways does not manufacture, supply or use single-use plastic coffee cups. However, we reckon the best thing the Government can do is chat with the 50+ hospitality businesses who are SUC free, and the organisations & small

businesses around NZ that support their work such as: UYO SUC-free Wanaka Again Again Cupcycling Good to Go Waiheke The Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project Wanakup These businesses & groups report that the availability of reuse systems and cup loan schemes (and customers who BYO!) enables businesses to move entirely to reuse. And, many more businesses would be willing to ditch the disposables if they knew all outlets were going to be in the same boat - something a ban could achieve.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Takeaway Throwaways focuses on serviceware, so we only discuss disposable coffee cups here. For discussion of timeframes for wet wipes, check out the resources from your wider zero waste community. Disposable coffee cups products should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025. Accessible alternatives exist. Were the Govt to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19) we see no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive; we agree with them all. We appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. We like how the Government has recognised that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. However, we are very surprised that this list does not acknowledge how a plastic straw ban could negatively affect individuals who need a plastic straw to drink. And the extra potential benefit offered by the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable alternative products (i.e straws, co-designed with the disabled community) to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes reduce waste & costs for local government & ratepayers. They also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 223

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes, but doesn't go far enough. We need to start creating a culture of reuse because reuse should be the long-term goal and it should start now.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

? We support mandatory phase out, but taking forward only one option is a risk. How does this one option enable New Zealanders to use less plastic overall? Options 2, 4, and 7 provide the option for a multi-pronged approach as a simple ban can lead to swapping out i.e. using the easy to recycle option, but this still contributes to a growing waste problem.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Too slow. The EU plan to ban similar items in 2021-2023. The NZ zero-waste network propose: PVC out by June 2021; All other food and beverage items with PVC and some with Polystyrene by June 2022; and Stage 2 by June 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

You say that PVC and Polystyrene is difficult to recycle, so why continue to allow these materials in packaging. Continuing to allow hard to recycling packaging certainly is inconsistent with the plastic waste hierarchy.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Obvious benefit to the environment.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However, instead of focusing on alternatives the emphasise needs to be on re-use. There is no benefit is a hard to recycle plastic is just a replace to a different plastic that is also used once and chucked away.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Again this is happening in EU by 2021, could the time frame be moved closer?

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Benefit is the development of reuse schemes in communities. This can particularly benefit Otago University Students especially if possible, to create a reuse culture around drinking vessels.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

It's all about normalisation, students and staff do what we know, we need to normalise the world without plastics. However, Otago's move away from single-use cups has seen huge student uptake. Students now carry around keep cups or grab a mug, it's just a part of our student life.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Good start, but so many more single use items couple be included: single-use plastic items like polystyrene bread bag clips; Disposable cups and lids (coffee/tea, including Bubble tea); Lolly wrappers/sticks; Single serve pottles, sachets, containers; Coffee pods; teabags w plastic in them; Plastic film on outside of packaging i.e. tea boxes or chewing gum, letters, magazines; Single use water bottles; Balloons and Balloon sticks; Glitter/plastic confetti; and Complementary plastic toys or incentives.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Ideally one year, but two years is acceptable. The phase out need to signaled and completed in less than one election cycle or it will never happen.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

The University of Otago had a very strong keeper cup culture until Covid19 hit and single use disposable cups reappeared. Keeper cups are the preferred option. Plastic-free, single-use alternatives should not be encouraged but need to be available.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups should be signaled and phased out by 2022/23.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Compliance monitoring must be undertaken and reported. Monitoring needs to be undertaken when landed in NZ, waste audits, and recycling audits. Possibly a breach report system to MFIE similar to bag ban.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 224

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Overall, the consultation document gives a good & thorough description of the problems that the targeted plastics pose to resource recovery systems, and the health & wellbeing of the environment, wildlife & people. We appreciate the work that has gone into justifying the need for these proposals. We would welcome more in-depth consideration of the problems associated with single-use systems (as opposed to single-use plastic items) and then seeing this linked to the proposed policies. From the perspective of zero waste and circular economy theory. The problem isn't just about plastic as a material, but the resource & energy intensive way that all materials are used & discarded in a linear economy. The part of the consultation document to which this question relates contains a small section on "creating a culture of reuse" (p. 20), but doesn't explain how such a culture is created, nor the Government's role in that and how this might go hand-in-hand with the phaseout of single-use items. The consultation document even refers to the Takeaway Throwaways campaign, yet states they are calling on the Government to ban single-use plastic tableware and omits to mention the campaign's equally important headline ask that the Government advance measures to co-design and mandate accessible reusable alternatives. We at Res.Awesome believe the Government's framing of the problem as predominantly about the impact of plastic material, and its downplaying of the 'single-use' part of the equation, has shaped its narrow approach to the policy proposals.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objective of reducing the amount of hard-to-recycle and single use plastics in use through eliminating certain problematic items and materials is not only a correct objective, it's a necessary condition for a circular economy. This objective must be combined with the equally important objective of increasing the uptake and scale of accessible, reusable alternatives and the systems that support them. This additional objective would harness the opportunity presented by banning ubiquitous single-use items to foster movement up the waste hierarchy and prevent uptake of false solutions (i.e. single-use items made of other materials). Facilitating reuse is key to reducing single use plastics and plastic pollution. This is increasingly recognised internationally (including research and commentary on how the EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics can be leveraged to promote reuse, and research and literature by the Ellen MacArthur Foundation).(1) We query why the previous section of the consultation document (on the problem of single-use plastics) promotes the importance of the top layers of the waste hierarchy and of "creating a culture of reuse", yet in the policy objectives these goals are absent. The consultation document also states that the proposal will help NZ achieve its commitments under the New Plastics Economy Global Commitment (to which both MfE and a handful of New Zealand businesses are signatories) (22). The Commitment calls on Government signatories to commit to implementing "ambitious policies" for "encouraging reuse models where relevant, to reduce the need for single-use plastic packaging and/or products"(2) thus we'd expect to see this included in the proposal's main policy objectives.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list is thorough and considers a range of important measures; we take no issue with the measures highlighted and considered. However, the list is missing a blended option(s) - the only options considered are standalone measures. It is unclear why the consultation document has not explored at least one policy option that combines some or all of Options 1-7, in the style of the EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics, or Ireland's recently released National Waste Policy. (3) For more detailed reasoning, please see our response to Q 5. In addition to a blended option, there are further policy intervention options worthy

of consideration that are relevant to creating a culture of reuse. Namely:

- Mandatory reuse targets for certain items (such as serviceware) alongside reduction targets.
- Implementation of deposit return systems and/or a mandatory take-back service for all takeaway serviceware, to level the playing field for reuse systems and reduce the chance of littering for the items and materials not proposed for phaseout.
- Measures to mandate reusables in certain contexts. For example, the Berkeley Ordinance that mandates reusable serviceware for 'dine-in' customers (now being considered by a range of cities across the US).

(4) The Government could also consider the further option of applying fees to cover clean-up costs for items that are not proposed for a ban, but are still problematic, either because they are commonly littered or commonly not disposed of correctly (fees to cover clean-up costs differ from a levy and should be possible under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA).

1. S. Miller, M. Bolger, L. Copello (2019) Reusable solutions: how governments can help stop single-use plastic pollution (3Keel, Oxford, United Kingdom: A study by the Rethink Plastic alliance and the Break Free From Plastic movement); A Lendal and S Wingstrand (2019) Reuse: Rethinking Packaging (Ellen Macarthur Foundation and New Plastics Economy); Ellidh Robb and Grainne Murphy (eds) Moving Away from Single-Use: Guide for National Decision Makers to Implement the Single-Use Plastics Directive (Report by Rethink Plastic alliance and Break Free From Plastic, 10 October 2019).

2. The full text is available here: <https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/13319-Global-CommitmentDefinitions.pdf>.

3. Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (2020) A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy: Ireland's National Waste Policy 2020-2025 (Government of Ireland).

4. City of Berkeley (2019) Single Use Foodware and Litter Reduction (Ordinance No 7639-N.S). materials not proposed for phaseout.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria and weightings are appropriate and useful for understanding how the preferred policy option was chosen. We would like to see greater weight attached to how well each option aligns with strategic direction, particularly achieving outcomes higher up the waste hierarchy. Additional criteria should be added to assess how well each option protects against unintended perverse outcomes (i.e. greater use of single-use items of different materials), and whether the option promotes or undermines accessibility. Some criteria are defined too narrowly. "Effectiveness" should consider whether the option will help to increase the uptake & scale of accessible, reusable alternatives & the systems that support them (see our answer to Q2). "Achievability" should consider more than the need for new or amended legislation. Measures that rely on moral suasion or voluntarism are arguably difficult to achieve (or at least achievement is difficult to measure or assess). For example, avoiding perverse outcomes from mandatory phaseouts rests on education and awareness to ensure businesses make informed decisions to reduce the risk of unintended consequences - how achievable is this? Furthermore, the need for new or amended legislation would be of lesser relevance if a blended option were considered. For example, a mandatory phase-out of certain single-use items could still be advanced under existing legislation while proposals progress through Parliament to introduce a levy on single-use coffee cups, or amendments to the WMA to allow for levies or mandatory recycled content.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We fully support a mandatory phaseout of the items listed (except for plastic straws, see our answer to Q16). We agree that mandatory phase-outs will be effective at achieving the main objective, that maintaining the status quo approach is not satisfactory, and that voluntary approaches like plastic pacts aren't enough to achieve the main objective. However, we disagree with the decision to take forward mandatory phase-outs ONLY. As noted in our answer to Q3, we support a blended approach, in the style of the EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics, (5) or the Irish National Waste Policy (see, in particular, the 'Plastic and Packaging Waste' and 'Single Use Plastic' chapters).(6) It is unclear why the consultation document limits each option to standalone measures and presents the policy choices as either/or options. While the document notes that rejected options may appear in a renewed NZWS or Plastics Action Plan (p.35), we believe a more holistic suite of policy interventions could be considered in this proposal (particularly if the Government wants to create a culture of reuse). We are concerned that measures operating in isolation will struggle to move our economy up the waste hierarchy towards reuse and could create perverse outcomes. In removing a whole suite of single-use items, we urge the Government to consider the possible detrimental replacements in a packaging system dominated by linear approaches, and to design policies/regulations that nudge all actors in our economy towards reusables instead. The potential for 'regrettable substitution' could be avoided by complementary regulations that capture single-use items (of any material) beyond the targeted plastics; for example, levies and deposit return systems, fees to cover clean-up costs, or mandatory reusables in certain circumstances. We believe the Government has a critical role in leveling the playing field between single-use and reuse packaging systems, and in ensuring alternative reusable systems and products are accessible and meet the principles of universal design. We note too that some regulatory measures suit certain items more than others. We recognise that bans may be inappropriate for some items, even though they may be problematic. A more flexible, blended option approach would allow for a greater range of single-use and plastic items to be brought within the proposed regulatory regime. For example, cigarette butts, glitter, balloons etc. Instead, the ban-only approach has knock-on effects for items not considered for a phase-out, such as wet wipes and coffee cups. These are now left entirely unregulated, despite acknowledgement that they are problematic and harmful, and that the Government does wish to phase-them out eventually. With the other policy levers taken off the table, what concrete, regulatory actions can the Government now take to mitigate negative impact and stimulate reduced consumption and increased uptake of reusables in the interim? And what is the pathway for achieving an eventual phase-out?

5. EU Directive 2019/904 on the reduction of the impact of certain plastic products on the environment [2019] L 155/1.

6. Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (2020) A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy: Ireland's National Waste Policy 2020-2025

(Government of Ireland).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The staged approach and the categorisation of the products falling into the two stages make sense. However, both could happen on shorter timeframes. The world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years,(7) and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040.(8) We need to act decisively to reverse these trends. We note that EU Member States will ban many of the items and materials targeted by the present proposal by July 2021 (under the Single-Use Plastics Directive9). So, the growth of alternatives will be in full swing internationally, making it easier for countries like New Zealand to follow suit faster. We suggest that Stage 1 products are phased out by June 2021 and Stage 2 products are phased out by June 2023. 7. Laurent Lebreton and Anthony Andrady (2019) "Future scenarios of global plastic waste generation and disposal" Palgrave Communications. 8. The PEW Charitable Trusts and SYSTEMIQ (2020) Breaking the Plastic Wave: A comprehensive assessment of pathways towards stopping ocean plastic pollution. 9. EU Directive 2019/904 on the reduction of the impact of certain plastic products on the environment [2019] L 155/1.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this expansive and ambitious list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, water-ways and marine environment - damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. A small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation. However due to the harmful properties of plastic in the environment, we would support it being replaced as a packaging material. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We believe practical alternatives exist to replace the hard-to-recycle packaging items proposed for phase-out. However, ensuring uptake of the most desirable alternatives (reusable and refillable packaging or highly recyclable packaging with recycled content) and guaranteeing that these are accessible to everyone, requires more than simply phasing-out some of the undesirable options. The Government says that in the long term it would like to see more reusable or refillable alternatives operating within innovative reuse models (p.39). This is such a pleasing statement to read; we support this vision wholeheartedly. We note that this vision is unlikely to occur spontaneously, and certainly not with the requisite level of urgency, without higher levels of Government support through both targeted policy interventions that level the playing field between single use and reuse, and investment in the necessary infrastructure for accessible reuse models to work at scale. We note the

Government's concern with the environmental impact of alternatives to the items proposed for a ban (p.40). We agree, and reiterate our call for policy & regulatory levers to accompany a ban that direct businesses and consumers towards the best alternatives. We note that it's already possible to BYO reusable containers and tableware for takeaway food and drink. In many cases, washable crockery is a realistic alternative instead of disposables. A handful of reuse schemes exist for reusable takeaway packaging, such as Again Again, CupCycling and Reusabowl. Furthermore, many grocery outlets, from butchers to dedicated zero waste grocers, offer unpackaged, fill your own models or reusable packaging systems. Business to business reuse schemes exist for transport packaging also. The issue is not a lack of ideas or models, but barriers to scale and normalisation within our entrenched linear economy, and lack of adequate incentives to ensure uptake of reusable alternatives when they are available. Furthermore, these barriers promote ad hoc product and system development that isn't always conducive to accessibility. Accordingly, sustained policy interventions and investment are required to level the playing field between single use and reuse. As mentioned above, this requires levies on single-use items and delivery systems (which will encourage uptake of reusable and refillable models), deposit return systems on food and beverage packaging, mandating reusable serveware in certain situations, and reuse quotas/targets. Furthermore, Government oversight is needed to direct the market towards a high-performing, zero waste, circular economy based on reuse that is low emissions and accessible for everyone. While even poorly designed reuse systems likely have far lower impact lifecycle analyses (LCAs) than any single-use system, well-designed reuse systems can have extraordinarily lower LCA impact. Also, some reusable options are less accessible than others - Government oversight can ensure a co-design process for reuse schemes that guarantees reusable alternatives follow principles of universal design. In addition, it may be appropriate to establish a reusables fund under the umbrella of the Disability Allowance to enable those who are eligible for this allowance to purchase accessible reusables if they would like to. The consultation document also states that where plastic packaging is in use, it should be made of higher-value and recyclable materials, with recycled content. Again, regulatory interventions such as levies and legislated mandatory recycled content are required for this outcome. If the powers to achieve this do not exist under the WMA, then part of the present proposal should include a plan to progress the necessary amendments through Parliament.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics - we wholeheartedly support this. We would prefer to see this ban occur more quickly. Many overseas jurisdictions, including the EU, will be phasing-out oxo-degradable plastics by July 2021. We believe New Zealand should follow this timeframe too.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The consultation document sets out a comprehensive list of costs & benefits of the mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. We agree with all listed. We also appreciate acknowledgment of the potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers and the cost savings for the wider community of reducing the complexity of our waste & recycling streams. We also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. Overall, we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits - human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit that is currently missing is the new potential opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. If this opportunity is harnessed, it will not only reduce waste and recycling, it will also have a positive job creation impact. Preliminary studies indicate that reusable packaging systems tend to produce higher numbers of jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. Furthermore, those jobs are more dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals.(10) The growth of reuse schemes will also lead to a reduction in single-use/oneway packaging generally not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and thus ratepayers. 10. See, for example, Miller, M. Bolger, L. Copello (2019) Reusable solutions: how governments can help stop single-use plastic pollution (3Keel, Oxford, United Kingdom: A study by the Rethink Plastic alliance and the Break Free From Plastic movement), p.15; Patrick Albrecht, Jens Brodersen, Dieter W Horst and Miriam Scherf (2011) Reuse and Recycling Systems for Selected Beverage Packaging from a Sustainability Perspective: An analysis of the ecological, economic and social impacts of reuse and recycling systems and approaches to solutions for further development

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

As noted above, concrete Government regulation and investment is needed to move reusable alternatives from the niche to the mainstream. Furthermore, a coordinated universal design approach is needed to ensure these alternatives are accessible for everyone in our community (taking into account potential barriers, such as cost or disability). Government direction and oversight in all this is necessary. A hands-off, pro-voluntary, awareness raising approach from the Government that leaves the development of reuse schemes entirely up to the whims of private interests will not guarantee a baseline reusables system that is widespread, accessible and environmentally, socially and economically efficient. The consultation document notes that removing the targeted plastics could lead to greater use of other hard-to recycle materials, such as composites. The proposal for mitigating this risk is “pairing the phase-out with best practice guidance on sustainable packaging...an opportunity to educate businesses and the public, and raise awareness of the environmental impact of different choices.” (p.46) We do not believe this approach is sufficient to achieve the outcomes the Government seeks. Nor is it the best use of government resource (not least because it risks duplicating the mahi that many community groups and NGOs have been doing for some time now). What’s really needed is for the Government to play its part and back up our collective effort with policy, regulations and investment that make “best practice... sustainable packaging” (i.e. reusable/refillable packaging wherever possible) standard practice.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support banning almost all of the listed single-use plastic items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastic counterparts. However, we do not support a ban of plastic straws. Takeaway Throwaways has always excluded plastic straws from their campaign & petition because some people with accessibility needs require a plastic straw to drink. While some reusable alternatives work well for some people, for others there may be no reusable alternative that is suitable. An exemption to a plastic straw ban can mitigate the potential harm (for example, exemptions to permit plastic straws’ availability “on request” at hospitality outlets and pharmacies), but they are difficult to design without being stigmatising. There is also the risk that disabled people seen using a straw will face backlash from uninformed hospitality staff or the public. We believe that direct consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should have occurred before this consultation document was released. In any case, this consultation must now occur before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We otherwise support the proposed list of items for phase-out, and would like to see the list extended to include other disposable serveware items that also cause harm in our environment, exist in the litter stream and contaminate recycling: 1. Disposable coffee cups & lids - We are extremely disappointed that coffee cups & lids have been expressly excluded from the ban list. The Packaging Forum estimates that New Zealanders use 295 million coffee cups a year. The overwhelming majority get landfilled. Huge confusion surrounds their recyclability and/or compostability. They’re also light and prone to escaping into the environment, and their lids are fully detachable, increasing the potential for litter. We strongly disagree with the Government’s assessment that practical alternatives are lacking. Virtually all outlets accept BYO reusables, most outlets have in-house ceramic options if people forget their cup. There’s also a growing range of reuse schemes/cup loan systems across New Zealand (reflecting international trends in this direction).(11) There are towns, such as Wanaka, that have a vision of being free of disposable coffee cups by 2022.(12) And, nationwide, a growing number of cafes (over 50 to our knowledge (13)) have gone single-use-cup-free already by implementing strategies that combine discounts with surcharges, retail of personal ‘keep cups’ and the adoption of homegrown or national reuse systems, with invitations to BYO, and importantly, encouragement to build community by making time to stay. Even if alternatives are not yet fully established in every corner of the country, the expertise about alternatives and systems for delivering them does exist in New Zealand. Under the present proposal, none of the bans would occur overnight. If coffee cups were included, businesses and consumers would have ample time and notice to prepare and adopt alternatives (particularly if a ban were to phase-in by 2025). A ban with a lead-in time would also grant security for cup reuse schemes to invest to scale. Takeaway Throwaways is involved in the movement to phase-out throwaway takeaway packaging in New Zealand. One of their founders has been working alongside hospitality outlets since 2017 through Use Your Own, to support hundreds of cafes across the country to reduce their use of disposable coffee cups (or cease using them completely). Through this work, research and daily engagement with the public and hospitality outlets across New Zealand, They can attest to how far public and media perception has turned against disposable coffee cups. These items are increasingly recognised as a burden to hospitality outlets financially. Due to their propensity to pollute roadsides and waterways, they are a growing source of embarrassment for brands and of public ire and frustration. We believe that most businesses would willingly cease to use disposable cups if all outlets were in the same boat. The only way to achieve this is through a nationwide ban. 2. Plastic lollipop sticks - These present a similar hazard to plastic cotton buds (which are proposed for a ban) and there are also alternatives, such as cardboard. 3. Single-serve/Portion Control Unit pottles, sachets & containers for condiments - For example, soy fish, pottles with peelable plastic lids for jam, butter and other condiments, sachets of sauces, condiments and sugar. We note that the consultation document highlights the impact of the Fox River Landfill disaster - one of the items commonly picked up by volunteers were these types of single-use/ PCU packets from the accommodation and hospitality providers in this popular tourist destination. We note that these types of products have been earmarked for banning by the Irish Government in their recently released National Waste Policy. (14) 4. Soft plastic wrappers for individually packaging mini confectionary items - For example, mints given out at restaurants as breath fresheners or lollies on flights. The wrappers are very small and thus easily escape rubbish collection, and are an unnecessary level of packaging as confectionary is easily purchased in bulk packaging. 5.

Place-based phase-outs - We would support the Government pursuing a place-based phase-out approach to items that we aren't ready to ban completely, including sustainable public procurement. For example, a mandatory phase-out of disposable serviceware for all dine-in contexts (i.e. like Berkeley, California (15)); single-use free zones in towns and cities (like South Australia's Plastic-Free Precinct trial (16)); on campus or institutional bans of bottled water and disposable coffee cups, including Public Procurement Policy that excludes disposable serviceware etc.(17) 11. See, for example, the inventory of local and global reuse schemes for serviceware on the Takeaway Throwaways website: <https://takeawaythrowaways.nz/reuse-schemes-at-home-and-abroad> 12. Find out more about the SUCFree Wanaka campaign here: <https://www.facebook.com/sucfreewanaka> 13. See the search list on the Use Your Own Aotearoa Café Directory website: <https://www.uyo.co.nz/search?name=&feature%5B%5D=ndc> 14. Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (2020) A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy: Ireland's National Waste Policy 2020-2025 (Government of Ireland), p.33. 15. City of Berkeley (2019) Single Use Foodware and Litter Reduction (Ordinance No 7639-N.S). 16. See, for example, www.plasticfreeplaces.org; <https://www.greenindustries.sa.gov.au/plastic-free-precincts>. 17. For example, • <https://source.wustl.edu/2016/04/waterbottle-ban-success-bottled-beveragesales-plummeted/>; • <https://phys.org/news/2017-05-studentsplastic-bottles-campus.html>; • <http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/sanfrancisco-bans-sale-plastic-water-bottlesclimate-change>; • <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/08/02/business/plastic-water-bottle-ban-sfotrnd/index.html> • <https://australianfoodtimeline.com.au/bottled-water-ban-bundanoon/>

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics within the ambit of the proposed phase-out - we applaud the Government for taking this step. As the consultation document notes, many of these products are not certified, and/or not home compostable nor marine degradable. Those that are certified compostable regularly do not arrive to the types of environments they are designed to degrade in (p.48). If they go to landfill, they produce methane in the anaerobic conditions. Furthermore, whether compostable or not, these products are still designed for single-use applications, with all the wasted embodied energy and resources that that status represents. As the consultation document notes, the items selected for phase-out in this proposal represent an 'unnecessary' use of plastic. Therefore, even if genuinely home compostable plastic alternatives were developed, they would remain an unnecessary application of that technological innovation. We recommend the following alterations or clarifications of the proposed definitions: • Plastic straws: The proposed definition refers to an exemption to allow access to plastic straws for disabled persons and for medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, we note that an exemption is unlikely to fully redress the loss in accessibility brought about by a plastic straw ban. Furthermore, the extent to which the risk of stigmatisation or discrimination is mitigated depends on how the exemption is drafted and the surrounding policy for its application and enforcement. Unfortunately, the potential impact of the exemption is impossible to assess because the proposed exemption has not been drafted for feedback (other than an indication that it may look like the UK or EU approach). There is also no specific field in the submission form to provide specific feedback on the proposal to include plastic straws in the phaseout, the suitability of an exemption, or what an exemption could look like to maximise accessibility. We believe the active participation of the disabled community is not sufficiently upheld by this consultation process. • Single-use plastic tableware: The proposed definition should be amended to clarify that this includes paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings (similar to the plastic cups and lids definition). • Single-use plastic cups and lids: Disposable coffee cups should be included in the proposed phase-out (as discussed in our answer to Q16). We also do not support exempting single-use plastic cups made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 from a ban - even if these are easier to recycle plastic types, the cups are likely to be too food contaminated to recycle. Furthermore, as takeaway, on-the-go products, the cups are likely to be used away from home where the public has reduced access to recycling services. Nevertheless, if the exemption goes ahead, we recommend that it applies to cups only and that any lids are expressly excluded from the exemption as their size effectively makes them 'hard-to-recycle' items in most kerbside systems that rely on automated MRFs for sorting. Furthermore, they are detachable so can easily be lost to the environment.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see our answers about this in Q17).

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Wet Wipes: We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In

the meantime, we would support investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and locking of sewerage systems), and compulsory labeling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging (these labeling requirements should be mandated under s 23(1)(f) of the WMA). Before a ban is phased in, we would also support fees being attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs (which can be considerable when they block pipes and form fatbergs). Currently the community is covering these costs through Council. It would be more appropriate to attach this cost to producers and consumers through a fee. This is different to a levy as it’s related to the cost of managing the product and could be achieved under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA. A ban on advertising for wet wipes containing plastic would also be appropriate.

Coffee Cups: As noted elsewhere in this submission, the Government must consider regulatory & policy interventions and investment to increase the uptake, accessibility and availability of reusable alternatives to disposable coffee cups. We note that many of these regulations & policies can be achieved under s 23 of the WMA and/or without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. These include:

- Adding disposable coffee cups to the proposed phase-out list as this will motivate industry and consumers to find alternatives faster.
- Levies on disposable coffee cups or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal.
- Mandating reusable serviceware only for dine-in customers.
- Phasing-in disposable coffee cup free zones or sustainable public procurement policies that prohibit disposable serviceware (e.g. university campuses and other institutional spaces, buildings associated with local and central govt and Parliament etc.)
- A deposit return scheme for both disposable coffee cups and reusable cups, offered through a reuse scheme, combined with a requirement that hospitality outlets offer a takeback service for the cups they give out (whether for reuse or appropriate disposal).
- Ensuring that reusable alternatives and the systems to deliver them adhere to the principles of universal design so that they are accessible for everyone in the community.
- Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse models to operate effectively, such as reverse logistics and washing/sterilisation infrastructure.
- Creating a more welcoming environment for BYO cups by working with the Ministries of Health and Primary Industries to inform businesses that accepting BYO cups is consistent with food safety regulations (including during covid-19), and amending food safety legislation to require outlets to accept BYO cups (in accordance with appropriate food safety requirements/food control plans) rather than leaving this to the discretion of individual businesses.
- Working with the Ministry for Primary Industries to develop specific food safety guidelines for reusable and refillable packaging systems (not to create onerous regulations, but rather to give businesses a sense of security and confidence in accepting reusables).
- Compulsory labelling requirements for disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about the availability of reusable alternatives and a ban on branding cups.

We note that Ireland’s recently released National Waste Policy provides a useful blueprint for how a Government can accelerate an eventual phase-out of disposable coffee cups and cold drinks cups.(18) We have considered the options put forward in the consultation document (p.49) and offer the following comments:

- We support the suggestion of investing to scale up reuse systems. We note that this will achieve the best outcomes if accompanied by the regulatory & policy interventions listed above as these are necessary preconditions to level the playing field with singleuse. Furthermore, a coordinated approach to scheme design overseen by Government is needed to guarantee basic accessibility and availability of reusable alternatives.
- Non-plastic alternative coffee cups may be appropriate in some contexts (such as medical situations or civil emergencies). However, for more general application this is a false solution as they are still single-use, with all the embodied energy and resource wastage associated with this linear approach. Furthermore, a collection system would be required for composting these cups because they will be too contaminated for recycling and if disposed of to landfill will produce methane in the anaerobic conditions. Thus, they present the same issues as home compostable plastics.
- While public education campaigns to promote reusable alternatives is an option, there are numerous NGOs and community groups in NZ and globally doing this mahi already. We need Government to back our efforts with the powers that only Government has (i.e. regulation, policy and investment) rather than risk duplicating work already being done. However, funding support to some of these NGOs and community groups to conduct their education and campaigning could be appropriate, so long as it operates alongside supportive regulatory measures and infrastructural investment.
- Exploring the feasibility of a scheme to collect and recycle or compost singleuse cups (putting aside the technical challenges to successfully recycling or composting them, which shouldn’t be ignored) doesn’t address the fact that these are still single-use items that waste energy and resources - it’s a way of doing things that the circular economy demands we move away from. Furthermore, the investment in logistics and infrastructure to take back these cups and develop facilities to compost or recycle them would be better diverted towards scaling reuse schemes and developing infrastructure centred around reuse. Reuse schemes would also create a greater number of jobs in the collection, washing and redistribution logistics and these jobs would be more dispersed across the country.

18. Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (2020) A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy: Ireland’s National Waste Policy 2020-2025 (Government of Ireland), pp.33-34.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Res.Awesome does not manufacture, supply or use single-use plastic coffee cups. However, we invite the Government to consult with the 50+ hospitality businesses who are SUC free, and the organisations and small businesses around NZ that support their work such as:

- UYO
- SUC-free Wanaka
- Again Again
- Cupcycling
- Good to Go Waiheke
- The Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project
- Wanakup

These businesses and groups report that the ability to implement alternatives to single use plastic coffee cups enables businesses to move entirely to reuse. Furthermore, many businesses would be willing to cease dispensing disposable coffee cups, but would prefer if all outlets were in the same boat (i.e. through a nationwide ban).

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Wet Wipes: We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not

block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable (e.g. by Jan 2022). Coffee Cups: Disposable coffee cups should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025. Accessible alternatives exist. Were the Govt to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19) we see no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

This document has provided a comprehensive list of the costs and benefits of mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. We agree with all listed, and appreciate the acknowledgement of the potential cost savings for retailers from a move to phase-out unnecessary single-use items, the cost savings for local govt (and therefore ratepayers) from reduced waste & litter, and the fact that banning items across the board has the benefit of levelling the playing field. One significant cost missing is the potential impact that a ban on plastic straws will have for individuals with accessibility needs who require a straw to drink, and the potential that needing to rely on an exemption will be stigmatising. One benefit that is currently missing is the new potential opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. If this opportunity is harnessed, it will not only reduce waste and recycling, it will also have a positive job creation impact. As noted in Q 14, preliminary studies indicate that reusable packaging systems tend to produce higher numbers of jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. Furthermore, those jobs are more dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals. The growth of reuse schemes will also lead to a reduction in single-use/oneway packaging generally (not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and thus ratepayers. As noted in question 13, overall we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits – human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for noncompliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 225

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes, the document has been well thought out. But in some instances, replacing a product made from a hard, poor value to recycle polymer with an more valuable to recycle polymer should not be the only answer. This will not suggest that the plastic product will be recycled. People are generally lazy and also confused by recycling, so will not offer much of their time to figure out if a product can be recycled, or if it needs to be cleaned thoroughly first, or have the label / lid removed etc. It does not gurantee that the product will not be littered or fragment into microplastics which enter the environment. Inclusion of additives into the plastic production process will lower the quality of the polymer and the number of times it will be recycled. Proper recycling of products is asking too much of people and the worlds resources. All plastics and plastic components (ie plastic lining on carboard) should be included as hard-to-recycle plastic items.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The objectives should aim to eliminate the use of all single use plastic and recyclable items, and promote container return schemes, and affordable refillable or reusable containers for purchase.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

If plastic recycling is used - agree to recycle the WHOLE product - ie for a plastic bottle, each layer of plastic (for a squishy bottle), label, lid, and lid liner.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes, except all plastic products should be produced from recycled plastics

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by

2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes but phase-out should be implemented sooner, within a year of submissions closing.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Please include bean bag beans and polystyrene use on building sites

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It would reduce contamination and environmental and toxicological harm

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Huge environmental benefit, however the date must be brought forward.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, but also encourage the consumer to pick up the product and bring their own packaging

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes as oxo-degradable plastics contain significant concentrations of toxic trace elements that would accumulate in the soil and cause harmful effects on microbiota

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

A greater benefit for higher-quality jobs where someone would be cleaning and returning reusable packaging compared to someone sorting through recycling manually at a recycling plant

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Reduced costs - plastic free items currently come at a premium (ie packaged capsicums compared to loose)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Please include products lined with plastic (ie cardboard burger and fries containers, soft drink cups and lids, and coffee cups), sauce sachets and containers, sugar sachets, butter single serves, milk single serves, lollipop sticks, plastic wrapping on sanitary items, courier bags, plastic wrapping on all produce, including fruit stickers and sticker labels (fair trade bananas), scrunchable plastic, balloons, glitter, kitchen sponges, microfibre cloths, coffee pods, teabags, plastic water bottles, chewing gum

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Include fruit packaged in plastic netting bags (ie avocado bags), and elastic bands (ie around celery)

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Please include both of these items to ban. Wet wipes are not necessary at all. Ban all takeaway coffee cups and lids and introduce reusable coffee cups which can be returned to any supermarket, or corner store

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

16 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Audits of recycle bins, audits on all businesses and supermarkets

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 226

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I believe that the problems indicated in the document are definitely accurate and am glad that the government is taking steps to address these issues, however I think the larger issue that must be addressed is the linear nature of all single-use products. By banning a selection of plastic packaging, we are merely making a dent in a problem that really requires a bulldozer. For this regulation to be effective, I think it is necessary take more bold, swift action to ban single use products entirely, and simultaneously encourage refillable/reusable/deposit-based options. The shift in behavior needs to be away from single use items entirely, not just certain materials.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Again, I am very supportive of the government's ambition to eliminate these materials, and am especially excited about the fact that these materials are only "a starting point." However, I think the proposal, as written currently, is unfortunately quite narrow which could hinder the uptake of viable, sustainable alternatives. If the government used its regulatory power to encourage the use of reusable alternatives by supporting these systems on a large scale, we could simultaneously address the waste issue as well as the linear economic model represented by single use items.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I believe that the variety of options listed for shifting away from hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics are correct. In fact, I believe we should be taking this opportunity to an array of these options, rather than just one. Banning hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics while simultaneously taxing other single-use items and enacting product stewardship requirements, etc would allow solutions to be much more cohesive, cooperative, and all-encompassing. Other policy options that could really help grow reuse include: deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria and weightings are appropriate and useful for understanding how the preferred policy option was chosen. I would like to see greater weight attached to how well each option aligns with strategic direction, particularly achieving outcomes higher up the waste hierarchy. Additional criteria should be added to assess how well each option protects against unintended perverse outcomes (i.e. greater use of single-use items of different materials), and whether the option promotes or undermines accessibility. Some criteria are defined too narrowly. "Effectiveness" should consider whether the option will help to increase the uptake & scale of accessible, reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. "Achievability" should consider more than the need for new or amended legislation. Measures that rely on moral suasion or voluntarism are arguably difficult to achieve (or at least achievement is difficult to measure or assess). For example, avoiding perverse outcomes from mandatory phase-outs rests on education and awareness to ensure businesses make informed decisions to reduce the risk of unintended consequences - how achievable is this? Furthermore, the need for new or amended legislation would be of lesser

relevance if a blended option were considered. For example, a mandatory phase-out of certain single-use items could still be advanced under existing legislation while proposals progress through Parliament to introduce a levy on single-use coffee cups, or amendments to the WMA to allow for levies or mandatory recycled content.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

As stated above, I fully support the ban on hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics, however, I do believe that a more holistic approach is necessary to achieve the larger goal of creating a culture of reuse. Without government regulation to prop up sustainable alternatives, I am concerned that other materials will simply replace the ones banned in this proposal. If the government were to use its power to tax all other single use items, put deposit systems into place and support other alternative/reuse systems, people are in a much better position to choose to reuse, rather than continue with the single use status quo. It is within the government's power to even the playing field alternatives, and only when these systems are evenly priced with single use and just as ubiquitous will everyone readily support a circular economy

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I believe two phases is beneficial, as there's no reason to wait longer to phase out some items that can be dealt with more easily. However, I do think that these timeframes can be sped up significantly. There is no reason that any company or supplier would need over 5 years to adjust their model. I believe the two time frames could be amended to June 2021 and June 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, thank you.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

As any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams (not just food & beverage products), it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, many alternatives exist and are already in use today, both in New Zealand and globally. The hurdles these alternatives face are numerous, but solvable by policy and regulation. Currently, deposit and return systems exist, but they are perceived as more "expensive" by consumers. They are also, currently, less widely available than single use options, and of course, they require habit change, which is often met with resistance. If the government wants to encourage a culture of reuse, it needs to work to level the playing field between single use, which currently has the upper hand, and alternative reuse/refill systems. It can do this by investing in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, these were a terrible idea from the start and I am happy to see the government moving quite swiftly from their introduction to recognizing them as harmful. Another couple of years is far too long to wait to remove these from circulation and I believe

they should be phased out in 2021.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

I am a barista and all of our coffee cups and lids are oxo-degradable, as well as some of our takeaway containers. There are many practical alternatives, including BYO cups, cup-lending systems, and of course, in house crockery. All of these are currently available at my cafe, however, very often people still rely on single use cups, even while dining in. I work in a government building and think that we should absolutely lead the charge by banning all single-use items, thus encouraging the use of the abundance of alternatives that are already in existence and readily available at my cafe and at others on precinct. Not to mention, eliminating single use cups would save my cafe money almost immediately.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, and in addition, as mentioned in Q12, eliminating single use products can save retailers money. Further, the community at large would save money by producing less waste.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I believe that the benefits will be greater than those discussed in the proposal. Eliminating the targeted plastics will allow individuals, communities, and business to innovate and create new waste-free solutions, thus providing more jobs, as well as creating less waste, which again, will save our communities money.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

R E G U L A T I O N. These solutions already exist and are in our communities. The biggest barricade to widescale adoption of these alternatives is the behemoth of single-use. If the playing field was leveled by levying single-use WHILE ALSO supporting reuse systems, a circular economy would no longer be massively disadvantaged, as it currently is. I genuinely plead that the government REGULATE with a holistic, broad vision so that this policy can be as effective as possible!

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

As mentioned previously, I work in a cafe and was absolutely gutted to find that single-use coffee cups have somehow evaded the ban list. I know how many single-use coffee cups I send out the door each day and it disgusts me. As much as I push cup lending systems and encourage people to BYOC, while single use coffee cups are an option, they will be used, and used prolifically. I am shocked that single-use coffee cups are not at the very top of the ban list, given how many rubbish bins I see overflowing with them, how many I see daily on the street, and just how simple it would be to ban them! As I've said, the alternatives already exist! They are in our communities, and a large amount of people are already using them. Kiwis love their coffee, and maybe that's why single-use coffee cups escaped the chop, but it goes without saying that if single-use coffee cups mysteriously disappeared tomorrow, Kiwis would find a way to adapt immediately. Again, this is about leveling the playing field so the alternatives that already exist are given a well-deserved (and required!) boost, and also about government using its power to BAN SINGLE-USE ITEMS. PLEASE use this opportunity to ban single use coffee cups so that I, as a barista, don't agonize over every single-use coffee cup I send out the door, so that I don't carry a massive amount of guilt for simply doing my job, and so that my customers are able to enjoy their coffees while also taking care of the planet.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Absolutely agree with banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would

support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, I don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. I do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban; see my response to Q16. I also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

I believe 12-18 months should be enough time for the government to liaise with parties affected, and that New Zealanders deserve a much more rapid rollout than timelines specified in the document. We simply do not have the time to waste.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Our suggestions for reducing disposable coffee cups The most impactful thing the Govt can do is use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility & availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Note that accessibility includes affordability. Many of these actions can happen under s 23 of the WMA/without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. Regulatory & legislative actions Include disposable coffee cups in the proposed ban list as this will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with the alternatives faster. Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California) Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. A disposable coffee cup levy and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. A Deposit Return Scheme for BOTH disposable coffee cups, & reusables offered through a reuse scheme. A DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all hospitality outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash and reuse returned reusable cups. Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. Collaborative, practical policy actions Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings) Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design principles & are accessible for everyone in the community. Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Our thoughts on the Govt suggestions... The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. We support this alongside regulatory & policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to the growth of reuse schemes. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. Investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups is not a good use of public funds. Better to put this money towards stimulating a reusables network. We urge the Government not to use its finite resources to reinvent the wheel & run a public education campaign about reusables. Loads of NGOs & community groups already do this mahi. We need Government to back our efforts with its unique policy & regulation-making superpowers. We need Government to champion and amplify the positives of truly circular reusable options!

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

As discussed previously, alternatives already exist and are in use. There are many businesses in NZ which have gone single-use free. These businesses could provide a model for government regulation which is ultimately the most powerful tool in government's toolbelt to enable businesses to transition away from plastic materials.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Because the alternatives are already in our communities, we just need regulation to push them into the mainstream while simultaneously banning single use coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic. Because this is all that we're waiting for, I don't see any reason these items cannot be banned in the first phase, and I believe that the first phase could be moved up to 2021.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 227

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa in line with overseas best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by a comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "Reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "Making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement that assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with the strategic direction to ensure the highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed timeframes are too slow. I suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 and all other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022. Stage two by June 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed to be phased out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high-quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter that harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so I would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Although a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reus. Nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency and onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups and lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets and containers for food and beauty/toiletry items ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water and other drink bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics such as fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls, plates and containers with plastic or wax lining ● Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Twelve months for everything except single-use cups. Two years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups: I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy and investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: ● investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities ● implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. ● providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change. Wet wipes: I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would support: ● Investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (eg. release of plastics into our waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) ● Compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups: With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes: I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable eg. by January 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs and benefits is comprehensive and I agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support the Ministry for the Environment creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 228

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The phase-out shouldn't be delayed across two stages (2023 and 2025). The environmental threats posed by these types of plastics mean we need to move as quickly as possible to remove them from public use.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I believe a greater effort could be made to increase the scope of the phase-outs to include a wider range of items. I would like to see all applications of PVC and polystyrene included in the ban.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If a plastic product can only be used once, or is hard to recycle, it shouldn't be produced or used at all - the negative impacts on wildlife and the planet are too great.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: ● Environmental benefits of less plastic litter. ● More recycling. ● Improvements to New Zealand's towns and cities due to less plastic litter. Costs: ● Costs to business as they transition to other products.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Not mentioned in the document are the benefits the phase-out will have to New Zealand's marine wildlife. In 2019, marine experts surveyed by Project Jonah named oceanic plastic debris as the second greatest threat to marine mammals in our waters. And, in 2018, Forest & Bird presented evidence that NZ's seas are the worst in the world in terms of risk to sea birds from plastic. The removal of single use, and hard to recycle plastics would help to reduce these risks, and therefore protect marine species, an objective that should be prioritised.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

● Reducing the costs of alternatives. ● Making alternatives easily available. ● Ensuring alternatives are durable. ● Gaining a better understanding of what the different alternatives are.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the phase-out, but the list needs to be expanded to include all single-use plastics, with some limited, controlled exceptions for essential items - e.g. medical supplies.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I believe the scope of banned items should be broadened here. In particular, I don't understand why disposable coffee cups and their lids, and wet wipes that include plastic, aren't included. Viable alternatives to these commonly used and hard to recycle items already exist.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

The timeframe for phasing out should be as soon as possible, with an emphasis on speed over business convenience. A blanket timeframe for everything is counterproductive if it slows up the removal of some items in order to wait for others.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

These should be included in the mandatory phase-out. While all the options noted in the submission document have benefits, as long as the plastic options exist, so do the threats to our planet and its wildlife. There are reusable alternatives to these products already available, but it will require a mandatory phase out for these alternatives to become the norm.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

The Government should engage with, and assist, businesses manufacturing, supplying and/or using products included on the proposed phase-out list (and those involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes). This assistance could include reducing the costs of manufacturing or importing alternative raw materials, and supporting new businesses to produce alternative, biodegradable substitutes.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

These items should be included in the initial ban.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Fines are an effective way to ensure that businesses abide by these new rules.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 229

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The phase-out shouldn't be delayed across two stages (2023 and 2025). The environmental threats posed by these types of plastics mean we need to move as quickly as possible to remove them from public use.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I believe a greater effort could be made to increase the scope of the phase-outs to include a wider range of items. I would like to see all applications of PVC and polystyrene included in the ban.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If a plastic product can only be used once, or is hard to recycle, it shouldn't be produced or used at all - the negative impacts on wildlife and the planet are too great.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: ● Environmental benefits of less plastic litter. ● More recycling. ● Improvements to New Zealand's towns and cities due to less plastic litter. Costs: ● Costs to business as they transition to other products.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Not mentioned in the document are the benefits the phase-out will have to New Zealand's marine wildlife. In 2019, marine experts surveyed by Project Jonah named oceanic plastic debris as the second greatest threat to marine mammals in our waters. And, in 2018, Forest & Bird presented evidence that NZ's seas are the worst in the world in terms of risk to sea birds from plastic. The removal of single use, and hard to recycle plastics would help to reduce these risks, and therefore protect marine species, an objective that should be prioritised.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

● Reducing the costs of alternatives. ● Making alternatives easily available. ● Ensuring alternatives are durable. ● Gaining a better understanding of what the different alternatives are.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the phase-out, but the list needs to be expanded to include all single-use plastics, with some limited, controlled exceptions for essential items - e.g. medical supplies.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I believe the scope of banned items should be broadened here. In particular, I don't understand why disposable coffee cups and their lids, and wet wipes that include plastic, aren't included. Viable alternatives to these commonly used and hard to recycle items already exist.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

The timeframe for phasing out should be as soon as possible, with an emphasis on speed over business convenience. A blanket timeframe for everything is counterproductive if it slows up the removal of some items in order to wait for others.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

These should be included in the mandatory phase-out. While all the options noted in the submission document have benefits, as long as the plastic options exist, so do the threats to our planet and its wildlife. There are reusable alternatives to these products already available, but it will require a mandatory phase out for these alternatives to become the norm.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

The Government should engage with, and assist, businesses manufacturing, supplying and/or using products included on the proposed phase-out list (and those involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes). This assistance could include reducing the costs of manufacturing or importing alternative raw materials, and supporting new businesses to produce alternative, biodegradable substitutes.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

These items should be included in the initial ban.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Fines are an effective way to ensure that businesses abide by these new rules.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 230

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The phase-out shouldn't be delayed across two stages (2023 and 2025). The environmental threats posed by these types of plastics mean we need to move as quickly as possible to remove them from public use.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I believe a greater effort could be made to increase the scope of the phase-outs to include a wider range of items. I would like to see all applications of PVC and polystyrene included in the ban.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If a plastic product can only be used once, or is hard to recycle, it shouldn't be produced or used at all - the negative impacts on wildlife and the planet are too great.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: ● Environmental benefits of less plastic litter. ● More recycling. ● Improvements to New Zealand's towns and cities due to less plastic litter. Costs: ● Costs to business as they transition to other products.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Not mentioned in the document are the benefits the phase-out will have to New Zealand's marine wildlife. In 2019, marine experts surveyed by Project Jonah named oceanic plastic debris as the second greatest threat to marine mammals in our waters. And, in 2018, Forest & Bird presented evidence that NZ's seas are the worst in the world in terms of risk to sea birds from plastic. The removal of single use, and hard to recycle plastics would help to reduce these risks, and therefore protect marine species, an objective that should be prioritised.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

● Reducing the costs of alternatives. ● Making alternatives easily available. ● Ensuring alternatives are durable. ● Gaining a better understanding of what the different alternatives are.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the phase-out, but the list needs to be expanded to include all single-use plastics, with some limited, controlled exceptions for essential items - e.g. medical supplies.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I believe the scope of banned items should be broadened here. In particular, I don't understand why disposable coffee cups and their lids, and wet wipes that include plastic, aren't included. Viable alternatives to these commonly used and hard to recycle items already exist.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

The timeframe for phasing out should be as soon as possible, with an emphasis on speed over business convenience. A blanket timeframe for everything is counterproductive if it slows up the removal of some items in order to wait for others.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

These should be included in the mandatory phase-out. While all the options noted in the submission document have benefits, as long as the plastic options exist, so do the threats to our planet and its wildlife. There are reusable alternatives to these products already available, but it will require a mandatory phase out for these alternatives to become the norm.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

The Government should engage with, and assist, businesses manufacturing, supplying and/or using products included on the proposed phase-out list (and those involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes). This assistance could include reducing the costs of manufacturing or importing alternative raw materials, and supporting new businesses to produce alternative, biodegradable substitutes.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

These items should be included in the initial ban.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Fines are an effective way to ensure that businesses abide by these new rules.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 231

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

As well as phasing out hard to recycle plastics manufacturers who use recycled plastics must offer a cradle to grave guarantee that ensures end of life products are returned to the manufacturer for further recycling and reuse.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All PVC and hard polystyrene should be phased out otherwise you create ways to circumvent the policy.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

There are many alternatives to these plastic groups and replacing them with bioplastic alternatives would not increase costs as we learn to make the change.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

yes replace hard to recycle plastics with easy to recycle plastics but that is not the end. Even easy to recycle plastics should be based upon the circular economy, cradle to grave policy. For example I am in discussion with a manufacturer of street furniture that uses plastic. I am encouraging him to use easy to recycle plastic and provide a cradle to grave guarantee which ensures that once the product becomes redundant and due for replacement it is returned to the manufacturer to be used again in new products

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Unsure. I have not researched sufficiently

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Make the move, phase out the targeted plastics and prices will not escalate due to inherent scaling of the replacement plastics

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Any increase in costs would be negated due to scaling

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I have worked for a global medical equipment supplier that specialised in single use plastics, due to difficulties in steam sterilisation of plastic. More recently I have worked for a medical equipment supplier who specialises in high level disinfection of plastic components using nanonebulised hydrogen peroxide that allows multiple use of plastic components.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

3 years

Notes

Most manufacturers would require 3 years for R&D into new plastic components

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Wet wipes (nappies) do not need to contain plastic, and any existing plastic single use item may be replaced with Bioplastic.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

As above Also if plastic is removed from products such as nappies and incontinence products it is easier to process these through anaerobic digesters and therefore derive a revenue stream.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years is sufficient for the R&D

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Disposal of plastic items that are not included in the circular economy should be monitored by District councils with stricter rules on landfill waste streams and monitoring and compliance should be a regional council activity with some funding from Central Government for the extra staffing.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 232

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I think your definition of "bio-degradable" needs a time constraint. Some so-called bio-degradable or compostable coffee-cups do not compost in my compost bin! A time constraint and conditions for "thin" objects (less than 0.5 or 1mm thick) would stop such false declarations. Compostable should mean that something should break down in a back yard compost heap in about the same time frame as vegetable scraps and fruit peelings. (I do not know any time limit from research, but longer than six weeks would not be acceptable for me as a back-yard composter.)

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

I think you could do it faster - say by Jan 2022 and Jan 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Food packaging is only the start. Having built a small "granny flat" recently, my wife and I have observed the amount of waste involved in packaging of wall-cladding, plastic wrapping on metal guttering, whiteware, furniture, etc. This also needs to be addressed, but I understand that what you have selected is a starting point.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If not sooner!

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think you have identified costs and benefits for businesses mainly. The "public" and "local/national government" are the only other agencies mentioned. Household level, global level and land environments (whenua) and waterways (awa, roto, moana) and non-human creatures have not been mentioned at all. These can all benefit substantially.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Household level, global level and land environments (whenua) and waterways (awa, roto, moana) and non-human creatures have not been mentioned at all. These can all benefit substantially.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Truly compostable options (e.g. coffee cups) that do decompose in my own compost bin would be great. I normally have a keep-cup on me, for those times when I do splurge out on a coffee, but this would be good. I could put items of rubbish into my own household landfill device (compost bin!). As someone who picks up rubbish when I walk around the street, I recycle packaging I pick up (cans, bottles and plastic bottles make up a decent amount of litter) when I can and could and would recycle appropriately labelled coffee cups in my own compost bin. (I don't think you've factored in minor actions like this, but more and more people are taking such actions. My actions on my own do not add up to much, but when multiplied by the number of citizens doing such things, it can amount to quite a bit.)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

This list should be extended over time... take another look in three years time...

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Perhaps mandatory labelling of cups (there is room for it) e.g. "This cup contains __% plastic and is not compostable or easily recyclable" or "This cup is 100% paper and 100% compostable" (if compostable in a typical back yard compost bin). This mandatory labelling (in a minimum size 14pt Arial/Helvetica font) can then start educating consumers. Similarly with wet wipes. The precedent has been set with cigarette packaging - let's extend that so that consumers are better informed about packaging.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18-24 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Again, the main costs are seen as financial. Benefits could also go to households (better informing us of compostable options). Volunteer groups could miss out. I am aware of one volunteer organisation that provides meals for people in need in Hamilton that had to change practices due to Covid. They have ended up using single use trays and delivering meals for much of this year. There are costs to such groups, but such groups are also likely to be broadly supportive of changes.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 234

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The environmental benefits are obvious. The costs will be in the need for businesses to rethink their products and business strategies. But this is what business and entrepreneurship is all about.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, they are already in use

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Plenty of public campaigning, competitions, creating an atmosphere of fun, challenge, we're all in this together

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We need to be aiming for as close as possible to phasing out ALL single use plastics

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

A mandatory ban from cafe outlets. People will easily adjust to BYO reusables

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 236

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Am a contentious recycler, was disappointed and angry when taking coloured #1 plastic bottles and containers to our Te Puke recycle centre, to find they no longer take them. No where else to dispose of, so into the general waste to be carted by truck to the land fill in the Waikato.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Turning the Nations mind set around to a more environmentally healthier and sustainable economy, which has been indoctrinated to a 'cheaper to buy another than repair' attitude, economy since the 1960's. It will take sound policy objectives and planning to be embraced through out Aotearoa.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Agree. It is positive start, to note that there has been buy in to the 'New Zealand Plastic declaration.'

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

2023-2025 is rapidly approaching. Hope the commitment of our newly elected Govt (Nov. 2020-) will continue to lead the war against plastic pollution/dumping and action this mandate soon.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Sooner the better, at present there are little or no options to recycle, minimize, re-use these plastics as stated.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Important to consult with all involved in the plastic making industries, to find alternative solutions. Agree there is a shocking mountain of PVC/Polystyrene which is growing daily. There is still the problem of the stuff in housing foundations, refrigeration insulation, chilly bins, many aspects of our lives now.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There is the recently publicised issue of giant(container size?) plastic bladders which are filled with water, wine, other fluids and ingredients being used once and dumped in the land fill. No one seemed to know anything about them. Why? There needs to be ongoing identifying and including more packaging into the future in my view.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Certainly. If there is no other options to utilize these plastics in Aotearoa, Only adding to the burden of disposal, Ref.Q.6. Also:- Will there be discussion and action of disposable nappies, used by both adults, and babies, in private homes, resthomes, childcare centres, hospitals? What about menstrual pads/tampons? Ostomy/urinary bags? They are causing huge cost to waste treatment plants, land fill, pollution and degradation of the environment, source of health and safety issues?.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

While not associated with any businesses, do believe it depends how we as a Nation view costs and benefits. As stated, the Fox River land fill debacle must have on going costs, with the immediate cost to the clean up plus damage long term to the environment, also other land fill 'time bombs' around the Motu. Not to forget, associated health costs with the leaching of these contaminants into our waterways and potable water-the very essence to life.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

What did we use in the 1950's and 1960's before the wide use of plastics? There are no doubt enterprising kiwis who have found cost effective, alternative packaging, just needs support and exposure.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Absolutely. As keen anti litter supporter and environmentalist, there seems to be no will or incentive to 'do the right thing', at present our local council can only be as good as the litter/waste minimization law, disposal streams costs, prosecution costs.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

As a consumer, there is no option to take back the plastic packaging, remove, recycle, reuse, decline.(i.e circular economy,

waste minimizing)

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Support recommendations.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

support options

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Encouraged to see after the plastic bag ban was enforced, fast food outlets, supermarkets, making changes to items/packaging offered or in some cases withdrawing items altogether. Just need the \$2 shop type businesses to change focus possibly

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

This era of 'take away' has rapidly turned into 'throwaway' society/communities with no consequences. Shameful lack of care in disposal of packaging, straws, containers, etc, littering our once beautiful towns, outside schools, walkways, waterways. Strongly support proposals.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Changes are already being actioned. (ref:Q.16). with all this consultation over the past few years, surely most single use items can be phased out by 2023

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Support recommendations

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

As a concerned citizen, support any environmentally decomposable, reuse, recycle options.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Before 2025 please. We as consumers should be more pro active and choose not support single use items. Since the arrival of the pandemic, COVID 19, has for me raised more concerns. Increased use of wet wipes, single use cups, disposable masks, plastic gloves are now littering the car parks, gutters, blown around the place to be ingested by animals, into waterways, but no safe place to dispose of them. We might be keeping safe but not the flora and fauna who still may cause mutation of the Virus?

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Support all positive costs and benefits

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Possibly through consumer feed back, checking rubbish samples, including local governance/ regional councils as part of the compliance bylaws, education of citizens. Mystery shoppers, register businesses that involved with importing, manufacture, selling these items.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 237

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Roll-on deodorants should be explicitly included in this first round of priority products. It's hard to imagine there are many other more compelling examples corporate greed, collusion, consumer manipulation and disregard for the environment than 50ml throwaway plastic underarm deodorant. Notice how they're all now 50ml regardless of the brand... they've steadily got smaller over the years. Perhaps the likes of Unilever etc have determined they can't sucker consumers into anything smaller than 50ml.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 238

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

we support the complete move away from polystyrene and single use plastics

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

we think you should phase out polystyrene and single use plastic as soon as possible

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

the costs of not doing it are greater

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The benefits will be in improving a sustainable commercial brand as improving condition of plastics in marine environments

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee

cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

as soon as possible

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 239

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If food manufacturers were prevented from using the materials as packaging that would make avoidance simple. If hard to recycled packaging is not banned then improved labelling would make it easier to choose products using easier to recycle materials.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Public education on negative impacts of these products. Levy on manufacture of these products to make alternatives more attractive for businesses.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 240

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Cleaner water ways. Reduced Landfill

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and sewerage systems!

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 241

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Too long and spread out. Needs to be sooner.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There are numerous other PVC and hard polystyrene that are also a problem.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits would be to reduce waste and reduce the effects of pollution. Costs would be the industry but it is time for change.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Yes greater benefits

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

As long as it is not in the lifecycle of the product, we will move away from it!

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Re-usable coffee cups and reusable cloth.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Subsidy.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Allow people to submit reports to be investigated. Manufacturers and suppliers to report once timeframe is up.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 242

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes I agree but believe you underestimate the problems associated with polystyrene.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There needs to be more publicity re the problems associated with Oxo-degradable plastics as there is a lot of greenwash re their use.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

These are the right options. Voluntary initiatives have not proved to be successful in the past. Lowering demand for plastic use is the number one goal. Encouraging sustainable redesign and innovation is also necessary.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

You have presented the options in a transparent way.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Mandatory phase-out will speed progress and allow NZ to benefit from new initiatives developed both here and internationally.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Banning EPS packaging should be in Stage 1. Most is used for packaging and many companies have already found substitutes. Goods with this type of packing should not be imported into NZ. In NZ it is used for fruit and vegetable packaging and

takeaways because it is cheap but other options already exist. Palmy Plastic Challenge has found large quantities (measured by individual units) in urban waterways.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Notes

Where are Oxo-degradable included?

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No hard polystyrene packaging should be in stage 1. This breaks down so easily into small parts and is very difficult to extract from the environment. It is abundant in waterways in Palmerston North. It is impossible to pick up all the fine material so it ends up in the waterways and damages the aquatic environment and the health of people who eat fish who consume plastic particles.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

There will be costs but you should be making producers responsible for their wastes not making this a public cost. You need to include in your cost benefit analysis all the volunteer time that goes into picking up plastic rubbish from the environment. This is an external cost that needs to be assigned to the manufacturer.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Alternatives will only become economic when there is greater demand to reduce the cost of manufacturing. People very quickly found alternatives to plastic bags when these were phased out. Palmy Plastics Challenge is now picking up far fewer new plastic bags. Old plastic bags that are enmeshed in waterway banks are still found. No reuseable bags have been found.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Agree but there needs to be a publicity campaign starting now about why they are a problem and should not be used. Many businesses and individuals currently think they are doing the right thing using oxo-degradeable products

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Don't know as not involved

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Looks comprehensive at a high level. Community initiatives such as Palmy Plastic Challenge put in many hours picking up plastic from waterways. If plastic is not dumped community groups will be able to engage in more rewarding environmental work.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There will be health benefits that have not been accounted for. There will be less micro/nano plastics in the environment for aquatic life and people to consume and this should result in lower costs for the health system.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Using one type of plastic packaging that can be recycled. Having a system to collect this plastic and reuse it. Reusable/refill options are not great for all items due to hygiene requirements. Covid has shown that this is an important consideration moving forward.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

'Outline of proposal' says 'compostable' are being phased out. This is unclear. Phasing out of stickers on fruit/veg needs to be done as these do not decompose in the compost and end up in the garden. Fruit never used to have stickers on it so this is not essential. Items like carrots and parsnips are sold individually without stickers. Fruit/veg imported into NZ also should not be allowed to have stickers. If single use bags are needed they should be recyclable.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

There needs to be a publicity campaign so people understand why disposable cups and lids are not able to be reused.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

None of these items are indispensable and innovation will be encouraged. Low use will push up price and substitutes will become available. Health facilities may need to be excluded.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Make it compulsory for a bright-coloured label to be put on coffee cups and wet-wipes saying they contain plastics. Many people do not know they are wiping baby bottoms and faces with plastic when they use wet-wipes! Labels will also help promote wet wipes with no plastic component. The European Product Stewardship approach should be supported.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

N/A

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Look relevant. Volunteer time and rate payer costs for picking up plastic dumped in the environment should be added to costs. New Zealander's health will also benefit if cheap unhealthy take-away foods become relatively more expensive because the externalities of single-use plastic are accounted for in food production costs.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

An 0800 number to report businesses not following rules. This then needs to be fined if it continues after an official warning is issued. Other comments: 1. If manufacturers use imported resins to produce products in NZ or they are imported their needs to be a product stewardship scheme where they have to take back the discarded product when it reaches end-of-life. 2. Work into ways to manufacture and recycle personal protection equipment in NZ needs to be undertaken. Covid will not be the only pandemic we have to deal with. 3. Safe ways to reduce quarantine wastes also needs to be researched.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 243

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, I've audited my waste and found food packaging to be the biggest contributor and challenge

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The change needs to be with be with industry. Small players are trying to reduce waste already but these options are not the most affordable so are only accessible to few.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There has to be an incentive to change, this is it. The cheaper cost of the status quo has a huge environmental cost that industry is ignoring.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Even sooner if achievable please!

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less landfill waste, environmental contamination. Cleaner oceans, beaches and rivers with less microplastics.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Extremely likely. The plastic bag ban started conversations that encouraged others to think about their waste. This will do the same and create more change.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I'm on a tight budget and struggle to balance cost and my environmental principles. I want to buy zero waste but this costs much more as its not a mainstream option, there is little competition. I want to be able to shop in a supermarket without buying a trolley of plastic. This legislation will ensure all options are more sustainable!

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

There are already alternatives for most of these products but people will continue to opt for the cheaper, less Eco friendly version. Take the wasteful options away and we will all adapt quickly

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Charge a levy for businesses distrusting these? Make them unaffordable. People also need to take some responsibility personally. Coffee isn't life or death. BYO cup or dine in. Make those the only options! Industry will always complain about how this may impact take away customers. If we can bring shopping bags we can bring a cup! 5 minutes of convenience doesn't warrant 100s of years of rubbish! Go hard and people will adapt, we need to change mindset and behaviour

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

1 year.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Financial penalties for non compliance? Loss of licencing?

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 244

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The document outlines well the problems of the targeted plastics. However, the systemic issue that underlies this problem, is the single-use linear economy with big waste streams. With this document, Aotearoa has the opportunity to not only line up with overseas best practice, but to take a lead in transitioning to a circular economy. This document is a great start, but would like to see the Government acknowledge the impact of other materials, their production and waste streams, on the environment. I believe this is needed to stimulate concrete policy & regulatory actions to support a culture of reuse, rather than replacing banned materials with another single-use substitute.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The main objective should include an increased the scale and uptake of reuse systems. The include addressing accessibility of reusable items, as well as supporting community-based advocates who can aid the uptake in the wider community.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

It is concerning to see no ability for a blended option. An approach that uses complementary measures, or guides a gradual decrease, e.g. from levy implementation to a full ban, would contribute to more successful results. Other key policy options used overseas that could really help grow reuse and are not mentioned in these options are: deposit return systems and mandatory reuse targets.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the overall criteria, however, I would like to see an increased emphasis on long-term benefits, rather than short-term costs- which the cost criterium implies. Therefore, I would suggest adding long-term benefits of achieving wage-reduction and well as 'uptake of reuse' in the effectiveness criterium.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

A ban only approach gives a clear indication to the public and is a pathway to rapid change, however, it does not incentivise uplifting the best alternatives, and creates a gap to be easily filled with other single-use items. By layering different regulatory

policies for plastic producers (e.g. levy, product stewardship, deposit return schemes, labelling requirements), while supporting research and community-based initiatives on reusables, the Government can shift away from single-use sustainably without unnecessary pressure on the public. Co-benefits for New Zealand communities include improved health, access to reusables (long-term sustainability), employment opportunities in a new circular economy, focussing on community engagement and new systems uptake.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, a two-staged approach will make for an easier transition into a total ban. However, overseas policy aim to ban single-use plastics by 2021. With the global plastic production expected to triple by 2040, we need act now and start putting systems in place sooner. I would like to see the deadline brought forward to June 2021, and June 2023 respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Moving to alternative materials is one way to address demand, however this might put pressure on other resources in the near future. The best alternative is shifting to reusable/refillable systems that are accessible to the wider public. For products to which this doesn't apply, the Government can look at highly recyclable materials, and packaging with recyclable contents. This requires investing in reuse systems and deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

This shift offers a new opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Having plenty of alternatives would help make this transition easier. If zero-waste options were more affordable, and the local stores that promote them are supported, it would make banning plastic from my shopping basket a lot easier. We need to take zero-waste out of the niche and into the spotlight, this can start by government institutions setting the good example, by banning single-use items in their buildings. We would benefit hugely by supporting businesses, NGO's and organisations that do advocating for zero-waste in our communities and schools.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Single-use coffee cups have plenty of alternatives that already have a wide uptake, they should be included in this list. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. Those that are compostable, are often not actually composted and add more organic waste to our landfills. I would like to see measures to ban soft plastic individually wrapped confectionary and fruit items.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Disposable coffee cups should be included in this table.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

For most items, a timeframe of 12-18 months is suitable but depending on consultations with effective parties, the process can take longer for certain items. For items that already have a high-uptake alternative, like disposable coffee cups, the process could take under 12 months.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I strongly agree with the suggestion of scaling up reuse systems, alongside other policy interventions that can remove barriers for the uptake of these systems. Through policy and investment, Government can increase the uptake and accessibility of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Under section 23 of the Waste Minimisation Act, many of these actions can already happen without a need for new legislation. By supporting community initiatives and local Zero-Waste advocates and businesses, the government can help incentivise communities to engage with alternatives faster. Suggestions for policy and guidelines: - Adding disposable coffee cups on the proposed ban list to encourage industry alternatives - obligatory labelling, including showing the effect of compostable single-use cups when disposed of in landfill - A levy on disposable cups for producers (including compostables) - Deposit return schemes, for both single-use and reusables. This can ensure the single-use items can be disposed of appropriately, and ensure reusables make it back into the reuse scheme. - Working with MOH and PMI around food safety legislation to ensure guidelines are in place to make re-use schemes safe and effective. - Ensuring that reusable cups follow Universal Design principles and are accessible for everyone in the community. - Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes, e.g. sterilisation services.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Disposable coffee cups products should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. Alternatives exist, and uptake is increasing. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes the list of costs and benefits is holistic and comprehensive. However, worth noting is the extra benefit offered by the new opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products. These new schemes can create a employment opportunity and reduce waste and future costs for local government and communities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Because of the wide scope of the proposals, I support implementing a compliance strategy.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 245

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use itemsthrough significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systemsthat support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communitiesto use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunitiesthat reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support the mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, however the proposed time-frames are too slow. I would like to see PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 and all other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Awesome list

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Preferably by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable

packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this the definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups: With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes: I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 247

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Firstly I want to say that it is fantastic that the Government is looking at this massive problem of single use plastics, so HUGE kudos for you for getting to this stage. The Government gave a good description of the problems the targeted plastics can cause. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku. I urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material types used, and to propose more concrete policy & regulatory actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. Please can the Government set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers key actions that I am really happy to see there. Two additional issues are: There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time, e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. The list is missing some key policy options that could really help grow reuse - deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria & weightings make sense & help to understand the Government's reasoning behind the proposals. I suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy. Some criteria need broader definitions: "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse. "Achievability" should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. I also suggest new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support banning all the items listed (except for plastic straws which may be needed for people with disabilities. Consultation is needed to gain further clarification). Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, I urge the Govt not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead go for more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too! A 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Govt can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. But, the timelines proposed are too slow. Think of all the targeted plastic items that could enter our environment before 2023 and 2025. Right now, the world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. We need to reverse these trends, fast. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. We suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. Thanks very much to the Government for creating an expansive & ambitious list of products for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. Government oversight is needed to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you, Government, for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics - I wholeheartedly support this, but with a shorter phase out time frame - by July 2021.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The Government has made a comprehensive list of costs & benefits. I agree with all of them. I appreciate the recognition of potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers & for the wider community from simplifying our waste & recycling streams. I also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. The analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits - human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Very likely. An additional benefit is the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems not only reduce waste, they also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. More reuse schemes & more reusable packaging will also mean less throwaway packaging overall (not just targeted plastics), which means even more cost savings for local government & ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The MAIN thing that would help NZers embrace reusable & refillable packaging is if Government promoted reusables through the power of regulation, policy & investment. This would help reuse systems compete against single-use, & catapult reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles. The Government has suggested it could do some public education about sustainable packaging. However there are already many NGOs & community groups that do this already. These groups need the Government to back them up by focusing on regulation, policy & investment.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, I have three points that we feel strongly about. 1. We don't support banning plastic straws. A plastic straw ban would be discriminatory. Some people need a plastic straw to drink. Reusable alternatives work well for some people, but not for everyone. The Government has suggested exemptions for people that need them, but it's hard to design exemptions that aren't stigmatising. At the very least, there must be adequate consultation & agreement with the disabled community before we can support banning plastic straws. 2 PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE include single use coffee cup (SUC) is not on the ban list. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. For takeaways, reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. There are over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... and they're thriving. Proving that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. A ban on SUC combined with Govt support for reuse schemes can provide security for take-out only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies.. As with all items that involve access to liquids in a hospitality setting, I suggest Govt liaise with the disabled community to seek guidance as to how reusable alternatives can be widely available for all. I urge the Government to take the plunge & ban all disposable coffee cups & lids. We believe they are

amongst the most straightforward items to phase out - practically, and due to the increasingly negative public perception towards them. 3. We'd like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list • SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS. Like soy fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. • PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead. • I would support the Government introducing place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet e.g. reusables only for dine-in contexts; central city single-use-free zones; no bottled water & throwaway serviceware on university campuses & in Govt buildings.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then I would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, I don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. I do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see answer to Q16). I also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

A 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

The most impactful thing the Govt can do is use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility & availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Note that accessibility includes affordability. Many of these actions can happen under s 23 of the WMA/without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. Regulatory & legislative actions • Include disposable coffee cups in the proposed ban list as this will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with the alternatives faster. • Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California) • Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. • A disposable coffee cup levy and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. • A Deposit Return Scheme for BOTH disposable coffee cups, & reusables offered through a reuse scheme. A DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all hospitality outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash and reuse returned reusable cups. • Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. Collaborative, practical policy actions • Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings) • Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design principles & are accessible for everyone in the community. • Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. • Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Thoughts on the Govt suggestions... The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. I support this alongside regulatory & policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to the growth of reuse schemes. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. Investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups is not a good use of public funds. Better to put this money towards stimulating a reusables network. I urge the Government not to use its finite resources to reinvent the wheel & run a public education campaign about reusables. Loads of NGOs & community groups already do this mahi. The Government needs to back the efforts of these groups with its unique policy & regulation-making powers. The Government needs to champion and amplify the positives of truly circular reusable options. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

The best thing the Government can do is chat with the 50+ hospitality businesses who are SUC free, and the organisations & small businesses around NZ that support their work such as: UYO SUC-free Wanaka Again Again Cupcycling Good to Go Waiheke The Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project Wanakup These businesses & groups report that the availability of reuse systems and cup loan schemes (and customers who BYO!) enables businesses to move entirely to reuse. And, many more businesses would be willing to ditch the disposables if they knew all outlets were going to be in the same boat - something a ban could achieve.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive; I agree with them all. I appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. I like how the Government has recognised that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. And the extra potential benefit offered by the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable alternative products (i.e straws, co-designed with the disabled community) to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes reduce waste & costs for local government & ratepayers. They also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. It was clear with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, I support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 248

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Include phase out of single use coffee cups

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All packaging of this type needs to be included because it is socially, environmentally and economically unacceptable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Low costs as alternative packaging can be used.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

No extra cost

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I choose products that use recycling material anyway so no issue here for my family.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Reuse cups already available so its a social change needed. Like plastic bags, we now take bags with us for shopping. We can do the same for coffee.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

ASAP

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 249

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

No to polystyrene used to transport perishable chilled items - there are currently approx 40 recyclers in NZ throughout the North and South Island.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with PVC as this has no end of life option. I agree with the polystyrene plates, cutlery etc as there are other options that can be used and these could be implemented by 2023 (although our business is not in the business of using these so perhaps this is not entirely true?). As for polystyrene for chilled food, 2025 is too soon for many businesses who are dictated by certain markets for what can be sent into them eg Japan. It is unlikely there will be a 'market' solution by 2025 that would enable us to continue to service this market and this would cost us in revenue and business relationships.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I would leave out polystyrene for perishable chilled food products, especially for export.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Puts a lot of pressure on businesses to find alternatives without proper testing or R & D.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

On some routes we have started using cartons - but only using chilled road transport. When you're dealing with airlines and overseas markets, you rely on other people to keep your product in the cold chain. Some people are not very good at this and therefore the best option for insulation and keeping product chilled, is polystyrene.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The knowledge that the solution would work just as well as the current one does!

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

2 years to enable businesses to work through stock on hand and to find alternatives and test these.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Invest in innovation and production of non plastic alternatives. Public education.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Up to 2025

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Business audit - for example supermarkets, cafes, restaurants get audited to show compliance with Food Standards, a packaging standard could also be introduced that checks that none of the single use items are being used. It could become part of the Food standards audit. Importing companies could be audited.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 250

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We should consider local options for dealing with difficult waste streams. Some of these waste streams will continue to exist and will still need to be dealt with even if we do manage to reduce local production. The feasibility of high temperature incineration plants, with appropriate chemical scrubbing, should be reexamined.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes
Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Anything that is part of consumer goods packaging and/or may be expected to be disposed of in considerable amounts either privately or by industry should be included. There are alternatives to these packaging types.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Businesses will need to redesign and revalidate some packaging. Some businesses may need to find alternatives to current packaging models. The consumer may have to bear these development costs, which will become cheaper for the business over time as the manufacturing capability and material supply increases. Removing these products will help remove these items from waste streams.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

I have used some excellent compostable cornstarch plastics.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There may be overseas produced plastics that are part of critical processes and as NZ is a small market the manufacturers may choose to pull out of the NZ market leaving companies operating here without an option. For example I use a variety of single use plastics in scientific applications. While the plastic, once used, is often disposed of a biohazard, and thus does not enter the waste stream, the packaging for these products may be among the restricted types (when trying to recycle the packaging I have seen types 3, 5 and 7 as well as unspecified soft packaging). Because of this the import of these items might be restricted. I am unsure how widespread of an issue this could be.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

I already reuse packaging where possible up to and including soft packaging such as bags. I will preferentially choose items that are reuseable, recyclable or compostable where possible. There are a lack of local options for refillable options, so having that

more widely available would be very helpful. If packaging had reuse and/or recycling information on the package and was not designed to be single use (recloseable lids/bags with package made of recyclable or non-plastic material) that would help my family.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Have reuseable coffee cup deposit scheme that takeaways in a region can participate in. If you return one, you get the deposit back, it can be washed and reused. Customers can pay the deposit to have a to go cup. This seems to be a suggestion.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 251

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

It would be extremely beneficial if public education was to complement the proposal. Reducing public confusion should be further up the hierarchy of the secondary objectives. If people understood the harm and difficulties with the recycling process they would be far less likely to use them in the first place.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If there are alternatives that are less harmful to the environment then we should be using those alternatives regardless of use.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I am not aware of any viable alternatives.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

A total ban will obviously make it easier to avoid. Aside from that, better education around the issue would assist.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Again again cups, reusable cups. Ban wet wipes.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 252

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Bring your own containers and/or smarter transportation mechanisms (e.g. hard plastic containers) which can be returned to the sender.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If our local supermarkets were regulated to not sell us certain materials. Most of the single use goods have no alternative to purchase in no packaging, or re-usable packaging. Genuinely there is nothing we can do if we like certain groceries (meats, pastas)

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 253

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Please please get rid of the meat trays and biscuit trays and milk bottles. So much unnecessary plastic waste creating from these and we buy them everyday without even thinking.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Mandatory phase out is amazing! It's the only way we'll retain our "clean green NZ" image!

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

I think it's important to phase it out sooner. 3 and 5 years of more and more plastic is too much for the world to handle. Please consider phasing it out by at least 2022 maximum.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not,

what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits is we get to pollute the planet less. Cost might be people might be a bit iffy towards change at first but I think people will adjust really quickly. I mean look at the single use plastic bags ban!

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Sooner!

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

I don't know.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Nope, I think you guys have done a great job.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Maybe offering an incentive to customers. And I think a lot of people might be close minded so important to have ads and things going around.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Within the next year would be ideal.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Use compostable ones.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Not a business.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Very sooner than later.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Ecocide has calls to become a crime but I think people would be annoyed if they were fined. So maybe offering small incentives of like 10c?

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 254

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All plastics eventually create permanent harm to the environment, though when and by how much can vary wildly. The question therefore shouldn't be "if", only when, and where are the most effective places to start to maintain momentum. I don't pretend to be a subject matter expert, but I do trust groups like this to be able to make a considered and informed decision

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Alternatives exist but are often not utilized due to very slight differences in cost. For example just yesterday I saw a sign in a takeaway restaurant informing that paper bags for the \$12 meal would cost an additional whopping 20c. Cheap wooden cutlery and wax lined containers already exist, and frankly hard candy doesn't need 3 layers of plastic

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

As you noted, it seems to be a case of replacing one problem with another, meaning no net environmental benefit

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Immediately ban the word "flushable" on all wet wipe packaging. Fatburgs are awful. Generally, tax and twilight disposable plastics and use it to subsidize renewable and/or biodegradable options

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee

cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Much faster than what will happen in practice

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 255

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 256

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Notes

Replacing plastic with other materials that are more environmentally damaging is a risk if the focus is only on plastics.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Options 1 and 8 have been shown not work in other countries. They should not be considered further. Option 3 will not drive change.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Cost should not have a double weighting. Achievability is more important than cost.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Mandatory product stewardship should also be considered. Mandatory phase out risks substitution with more environmentally harmful alternatives.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

It should all be achievable by 2023. If decisions are made quickly then supply chains will have plenty of time to change by 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not,

what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

"Plastic" will need to be defined.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Need to create momentum for behaviour change, a longer timeframe will result in loss of momentum and public willingness to change.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

a product stewardship approach

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that

contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

regulation to prevent others compaqnies from offering cheaper plastic based products.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2024

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Medium benefit for Local Councils as the wet wipes will not cause blockages and coffee cups not fill up litter bins etc.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 257

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Notes

I feel that reducing plastic use overall, especially single use is the most important right now. I also think that it would be an opportunity to encourage unnecessary packaging and single use things in general (i.e. when something is not really necessary, we should ask ourself if we want to replace it's material or rethink it completely / stop producing it)

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Fairly specific but I would just like to add that providing closed bin for recycling might prevent the spreading of all those things we are trying to recycle into the street/nature (happens often in our neighborhood where it is not even that windy or trafficked)

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I think an option or addition to one to encourage manufacturer/exporter to sell more durable objects would be great. However I understand that it is fairly general and possibly hard to enforce.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe a mandatory phase out is necessary to get as much result as early as possible, which I believe is very important.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I would even support earlier phase out if possible. (Even if only possible for parts /specific objects)

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However I think it would be important to leave a door open to add (NOT remove under pressure of companies!!) items a few months after the phase out started to allow for things forgotten but that could be very relevant.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I believe it can make sense to keep those for construction or other long term use. However, I believe those plastic should be recycled whenever possible and the company responsible for those waste (ex deconstruction or construction company) should be accountable for bringing those to an appropriate recycling place and pay for the fee required for the recycling. However, it is also important to make sure that this would not push companies to use possibly worst material for the environment such as concrete pipes instead of pvc pipe (not sure which of pvc or concrete is worst for the environment, this is just to get the point)

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

I don't know.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, but as stated in the document, weighing the other environmental downside of potential replacement will be very important.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Availability.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Ready further in the document, understand why coffee cup are left out. I do believe that this definitely needs to be followed up and solutions made sure to be available to allow phase out of it not too long after the rest. I also wonder if still having some single us bag (ex made of cornstarch instead) would be useful as I am not sure of the environmental impact of cotton bag since cotton fabric is a very impactful industry in the environment. (Not sure what would be better but I hope it has / will be studied) Also, I believe glitter products should be added, or at least much more restricted (ex not for kids play, really for specific use

where the glitter is less likely to end up in streams). For ballons and cigarette butts, I think education campaign could be an interesting additional approach.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

I think it makes sense. I would just leave the definition table able to be amended after roll out.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

I think giving everyone warning as early as possible, and encourage to start looking for alternative product that suit them (ex, café, restaurant..) would help make the transition easier. Some kind of technical counselling support for smaller business that needs bigger changes (ex production line machines...)

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups: I believe a mix of the 3 first ideas offered in the document could be interesting as it would leave some flexibility to places serving coffee to go. Education will probably be necessary anyway to explain why we phase out some plastic, so Education on using reusable alternative seems right. If needing to choose one only, I believe the lending scheme is the best as it could help change the behavior of using disposable things that could then be applied to other products.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Plastic cups: it seems that some ideas could be implemented/available soon, so I think an appropriate time will require to agree on option (s) as soon as possible.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 258

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Does not consider issue of the quality of recycled plastics, which appears to be generally inferior to new product. While it's a good thing to stop using plastic that can't be recycled in NZ, will we be risking a build up of recycled plastic that can't be used? I'd like a clearer statement that our use of plastics in the future has to be very strategic so we can accomplish a true circular economy. Our current recycling ability still falls short.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

As noted above. Good objectives but only short term. Setting out a 10 year plan allows businesses better visibility for capital investment.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Certainty about timing and clear rules make things much simpler for business. People want to be good, but it's much easier to be good when it's the rule for everyone!

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We're not the first mover here. Manufacturers have been on notice with other countries banning it.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Institute proposed ban and increase benefit levels so our poorer population can afford higher priced goods.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Where impact is minimal, why not 12 months?

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Broadcast an intended phase out date and let kiwi ingenuity at creating solutions surprise us! Backing research efforts into alternatives would also be good.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Gone in 5 years.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 259

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The #1 priority should be the environment, and both proposals reflect this.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree that banning makes more sense and will achieve better results for the environment than any of the other options considered.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes - if the food and beverage industry can ban PVC and hard polystyrene effectively, I don't see why we shouldn't go the extra mile to ban it fully (at least in stage 2). There's no point in doing things halfway.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs - it will be very expensive, time-consuming, and cause headaches for heaps of people and organisations, as people will likely be change-averse at first. Benefits - reducing greenhouse gases in the production of PVC and polystyrene, reducing the environmental impact of rubbish not making it into landfill, reducing the amount of PVC and polystyrene that goes into landfill full stop, reducing the risk of people ingesting microplastics.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I imagine it will have greater costs and may take more time than estimated (as is usually the case with these initiatives), however I also imagine there will be more positive environmental consequences that we won't even know until we're at that stage.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

It won't be difficult for me and/or my family - we are all very environmentally conscious people and would be willing to pay slightly more for our takeaways and/or a small tax to help fund this initiative.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe,

versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I think requiring businesses to charge 50c for a single-use coffee cup is one option to encourage people to bring their own reusable cups wherever possible - I think at this stage it will be too difficult to completely phase out coffee cups. Wet wipes are tough as well, and I think the best approach would probably be to nip the source of the issue and strive to make all wet wipes plastic-free, that way there isn't the issue of needing to reduce them further.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

This is tough, I believe 5 years is reasonable, though I'm no expert and am not sure what the correct approach would be.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Surely the same way the supermarkets were monitored for compliance when the single use plastic bag ban happened - and trusting that once people get used to it, if they do see a restaurant not complying or they open a package with polystyrene, they'll speak up about it, and there will be a place for them to report it.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 260

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes, we agree with this description in general. At the same time, we note that polystyrene (EPS) can be 100% recycled, however it requires an investment in a recycling facility and some additional logistics to separate and collect the polystyrene. This simple option has not been investigated fully or offered as an option with the "hard to recycle" tag being evident throughout your document.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The overall objectives are defined correctly. However, we do not agree with your recommended starting point being the timeframe for elimination of EPS packaging. It is not achievable for Daikin to replace EPS with an alternative packaging material in the timeframe nominated.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Some of the options are acceptable. But simple things like education on kerbside collection needs to be improved. The following are our opinions related to the options. Option 1: Yes, we agree with the option Option 2: It is an option to be considered Option 3: We do not agree with this option since labelling itself is an additional resource and cost. And also, it is not good for environment. Alternative methods should be considered. Option 4: For single used plastic items we agree with this. But for polystyrene packaging it is quite difficult to consider a levy or tax due to the mixed structure of the total packaging. Option 5: We agree on this option both for voluntary product stewardship and regulated product stewardship Option 6: No, we do not agree with this option as it is not achievable in the timeline suggested. Option 7: No, we do not agree with this option. Because it is expensive and not achievable in the time frame considering the lack of other countries' development in this area. Option 8: This option should be considered but requires an educational focus.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No, we don't believe the assessment is fair and reasonable for each of the options. The weightings do not adequately reflect the real-world situation. Some of the criteria have not been adequately investigated. Unknown criteria require full investigation.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No, we don't agree with this. From a business aspect we need to focus on an achievable target within a reasonable timeframe. The nominated option selection means that there would not be time to achieve the target. We believe that the best solution would be a stewardship model to take into account all business and environmental requirements and assess these in a balanced and achievable manner.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No, we do not agree. The phase out is not realistic or achievable. The timeframe is too short and there are no other countries aligned to the same timeline for the same EPS phase out requirement. No countries that manufacture Daikin equipment have the same intent or focus therefore there is no possibility for Daikin Air Conditioning New Zealand to supply the most popular air conditioning and heating equipment in the market to consumers throughout New Zealand.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No, stage 2 EPS packaging for products needs to be excluded from the scope because it is not achievable in the suggested timeline.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No, stage 2 EPS packaging for products needs to be excluded from the scope because it is not achievable in the suggested timeline.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The cost is unknown because there are no current solutions that can be applied in the suggested timeframe.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

There are no practical alternatives to EPS packaging since there is no synergy with other countries policies or our manufacturing plants mass producing product in EPS packaging for the rest of the world. There is no option to treat New Zealand differently due to the relatively low volumes of product sold in this region. A far more in-depth study is required than this discussion document with weighted ratings that appear designed to produce the required outcome rather than a balanced and reasonable assessment of the EPS packaging issue.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

No comment

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No. We cannot see any concrete evidence of the costs and benefits scheduled should the government mandate the phase out of EPS packaging within the timeline suggested. They appear to be opinion only with no relevant facts around determination. We will not be able to supply equipment into New Zealand market under this regulation, so it causes a huge negative impact on our business and the market through lack of choice for the consumer and a large increase in cost base for this new technology that no-one has trialled in such a short span of time. How has the writer of this document calculated the costs and benefits? Please provide evidence.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Not likely at all. We do not believe in the cost and benefit effects in table 6 especially for brands who sell other consumer goods like homewares and electronics may be affected by a phase-out of EPS packaging.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

In general, Daikin would prefer a product stewardship model rather than mandatory phase-out of EPS packaging. This is in order to set reasonable and achievable timelines and to consider the balance for both environment and business. We believe a product stewardship program is the correct option against a phase-out plan mandated by the Government.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

No comment

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

No comment

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

No comment

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

No comment.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 261

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Not being able to recycle them or sell them means they are just filling landfills and continuing to cause pollution.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Things have gone too far and it is time to make changes .

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This is a problem that needs to be sorted out asap. Making it mandatory and with a deadline will give this more effective.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

As we have said before we need to get on with this and yet give industry time to adjust

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We would like to include all polystyrene small yoghurt pots, mini soy sauce packets, and the crinkly wrappers on bars and chip packets. Most of these are used by children in their school lunches. Schools can not recycle this stuff so the children do not feel happy about the waste they are making. Do something about it now!

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Within reason as these are not recyclable and there are alternatives that are recyclable. Best to get rid of as much as possible and get the ball rolling.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

R and D for industry to find the right alternative for them and then retooling

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We do believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard to recycle packaging. For instance, glass can be washed and recycled. Fizzy bottles don't need to be made of plastic. Plastics used for packaging should all be recyclable. Surely others must agree that there are practical alternatives to replace hard to recycle plastics or people can choose to reuse or refuse them. Fizzy can go into glass like it used to be in the old days. As PET can be recycled more than once and still be food grade then it should be the chosen plastic.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

It is clear that plastic coffee cups are bad, not only because they are plastic, but also because they are single use. Others must agree that these cups are also bad for the environment all over the world. We suggest that cafes could have a place for regular customers to have their own coffee cup on a hook that is then washed in an industrial dishwasher. Or people should bring their own cups. Wet wipes should be made of either cloth, or paper, without plastic mixed in. We need to stop using plastic cups! They are only making our world worse. Without a doubt we know they are affecting everything about our world so help us stop using them.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We believe that it is a good idea to do the mandatory phase out because we can't just stop instantly or the businesses will die and we want them to have a fair chance. We believe it is a good idea because it will get rid of polystyrene and yoghurts pots are

made of polystyrene which we see a lot of at school. We want to add the crinkly wrappers on bars and chip packets to the list - maybe people will learn they don't need those products or the manufacturers will invent safer types of packaging after the phase out.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

3 years

Notes

As the idea of phasing out non-recyclable plastics is not new then industry should have been preparing for the change, or have made the change, already. Giving a deadline will make looking for alternatives and actioning change actually happen.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We think that you need to change coffee cups and wet wipes to something else. Maybe we can make paper-based lids rather than plastic ones. The options we like are people using keep cups, and carrying a cloth and soap instead of wipes. The reason we don't want any paper cups is because many companies use whitening powder that is harmful to your health. You can use real cups made of china, silicone or glass instead. We also want to be able to use our own cups at fast food and takeaway restaurants.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years at the most

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Council rubbish dumps and recycling depots, environmental groups, farmers who might suffer from fly-tipping, and other concerned groups should be consulted and any and all concerns followed up so that those industries who are supposed to be engaged with the phase out are closely watched and given immediate feedback. Importers of goods that may not comply should be monitored and made to comply the first time they are caught. No leniency.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 262

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I would prefer a broader approach to the increasing waste problem. Yes, single use plastics and hard-to-recycle plastics are a huge problem, but so are single use items made of other materials (especially if compostable items end up in landfill, or if food waste gets tossed in the environment (think apple cores out of car windows)) and extensive use of 'easier-to-recycle' plastics (for decades the onus has been on consumers to recycle, and the manufacturing of all plastics has gone through the roof; even if it is made easier for consumers to recycle, we would still drown in 'recyclable-but-not-recycled' plastics).

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

There still seems to be a heavy reliance (in the objectives) on recycling, rather than refusing, reducing and reusing.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Most options tend to lean towards refuse, reduce and recycle. I would have hoped to also see options that are using the reuse tier in the waste hierarchy (especially because there are good re-use systems already being trialled, or even in use). I also hope that options 1 and 8 - voluntary schemes and doing nothing - will be completely discarded as it is idealistic and naive to assume that voluntary schemes work when manufacturers (as well as most consumers) are mainly looking at economic (ie monetary) impact.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

In principle I agree, but I would have hoped for a higher weighing factor for 'alignment with strategic outcomes'. Also, the word 'cost' appears to be solely used as translation for initial monetary costs (implementation of strategies); long-term the costs to the environment (and with that economic/monetary costs) will outweigh those initial costs though. I would have hoped therefore that 'costs' would not have a double weighing factor.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I do agree that currently the mandatory phase-out seems the easiest option to get 'over the line', due to global sentiments/bans/discussions. However, if some other options (bar 1, 3 and 8) are used in conjunction, then many loopholes

can be closed (think 'handle-less' or heavier plastic bags that have quickly replaced 'single use' shopping bags - therefore reducing the efficacy of the plastic bag ban).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The world has been caught sleeping at the wheel regarding (all) plastics, and the impact they have on all environments. Please make the 'BY 2023 and BY 2025 a lot sooner'. The plastic bag ban was preempted by both supermarkets, and a large number of smaller outlets - and those who were purely reactive to the ban (ie. not proactive) were quick to find work-arounds, whether legal or not. The same should be able to apply to this proposed phase-out.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

See question 8

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

The amount of hard polystyrene packaging on/around non-food items is astounding and completely unnecessary in most cases. Since this, and PVC, is a 'hard-to-recycle' plastic, it should be phased out at the same time as for food & beverage packaging. This will also limit confusion for manufacturers and consumers alike.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefit: No confusion about what plastics can be incorporated into a circular economy. Cost: there may be a, probably temporary, reduction in products imported - if they have PVC or polystyrene packaging.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There already are refill/reuse options for a lot of packaging materials, albeit (in some cases) in fledgling state. There are water refill cafes, a number of (smaller/local) businesses (shops/cafes/restaurants) that are happy to accommodate consumers in 'byo containers', bulk bin shops (some also work on 'zero waste at back-of-the-shop'), educational groups to help people transition back to 'cooking from scratch' (can be money- and time-efficient as well as healthier).

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Absolutely! Oxo-degradable plastics are a prime example of 'green washing'. My only hope is that, given that this is a relatively new plastic 'cousin', that the phase-out can be accelerated and happen well before the next elections in 2023!

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Given the fact that most manufacturers have, in the past, changed their packaging and branding on a regular, and completely voluntary basis, and (call me a cynic) because they have always passed on any extra costs to the consumer, and society as a whole, I do not think that the producers (manufacturers/food outlets/importers etc) will have any problem adjusting to alternatives to 'hard to recycle' plastics. If the COVID recovery scheme looks at 'sponsoring' innovative packaging industries (instead of just looking at roading and 'shovel-ready' projects), then the NZ (circular) economy could benefit tremendously! Apart from economic benefits, there would also be a huge benefit to water-quality, general health (humans and environment alike) and other 'immeasurable' benefits for moving towards a circular economy - the sooner the better!

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

See part of answer to question 13. Sponsoring innovative solution to the phase out of the targeted plastics can lead to a more cohesive society (rather than the egotistical society we seem to have wandered into), a pride in local producers, and a faster approach to a circular economy with reuse in the forefront rather than background.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

- Transparant explanation of not just ingredients used in products, but also the packaging materials. - A move away from 'blended' packaging materials (e.g. paper with a layer of plastic). - A system where I can request dockets to be emailed to me, rather than printed on thermal (plastic containing) receipts. - Single (national) waste stream / recycling stream approach trickling down to ALL local councils, and clear instructions on how not to contaminate recyclables. - A national strategy to encourage re-usables instead of single-use products, and educate people on the benefits (making it more 'mainstream' than 'niche/alternative/hippy/weird' (like it is seen at the moment, still by many))

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I would include a number of extra single-use plastic items, as the environmental impact is high and they have (reusable) alternatives: - hot drink cups (there are many different reusable cups available for 'on the go'), - party-ware (e.g. balloons, glitter, Christmas crackers; they can easily be replace by reusable options), - cheap toys (both give-aways with fast food meals and \$2 shop type; in theory those are not single use, but in practice they are), - sigaret-filters (the sigaret industry have foisted these on people, full well knowing that they do not filter out any nasty components), - chewing gum and tea-bags (2 well known products that often contain plastic that gets ingested by people or get into the environment; either people try and compost them (teabags) or stick them to the underside of their seat in the bus (chewing gum) - either way, they don't end up in landfill where they belong and there are alternatives (loose leaved tea and plastic free gum/lollies)), - wet wipes (most contain plastic, and even if they don't they contribute to fat-bergs that heap cost upon cost on local governments; they can easily be replaced by washable cloths).

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

See additions in answer to question 16. Plus, I would like to suggest that the word plastic is removed from table 7. As you rightly state that 'biodegradable and compostable items rarely enter the type of environment they are designed to fully degrade in', paper plates and bamboo earbuds (as examples) should also be phased out and not be mentioned as alternatives; which then leaves a table where the emphasis is on phasing out single use items rather than single use plastic items.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

The tide, internationally speaking, is against the single use items on table 7. Both major supermarkets here in NZ, for instance, are already making moves towards removing a number of these items off their shelves. As most, if not all, of these items already have viable reusable alternatives, scaling up the manufacturing of those should be achievable in 12 months (and creating jobs in the reusables industry as well as encouraging innovation). My additions may take a year, or 2 longer, as they would require more public awareness and education, plus investment from government (COVID recovery scheme???)

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

(Hot or cold) drink cups: A combination of education regarding reusable alternatives and investment in reusable systems. Wet wipes: A combination of education regarding the 'non-flushability' as well as reusable alternatives (and washing regimes if using reusables), (temporary) product stewardship and investment in reusable systems.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

See my answer to questions 16 and 18. I would like the future phase out of hot drink cups and wet wipes to be included in table 7, with a view of a ban coming into effect in 2023 latest.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Manufacturers, retailers and food outlets are likely to pass on the costs to the general public, but currently that public is already paying for litter clean-up in rates. A benefit for the government, not yet mentioned, is international standing if we are trail blazers as far as single use items bans are concerned.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Education of both the providers and users of single use items, in transitioning to reusable items; coupled with a compliance team that can be alerted to breaches and has a mandate to hand out warnings and fines.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 263

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use itemsthrough significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systemsthat support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communitiesto use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunitiesthat reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 264

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Excluding coffee cups and lids Minimal focus on the reusable alternatives Including straws with little to no consultation with the disability community

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers key actions we'd expect to see. We have two concerns: There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time, e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. The list is missing some key policy options that could really help grow reuse - deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria & weightings make sense & help us understand the Government's reasoning behind the proposals. We suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy. Some criteria need broader definitions: "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse. "Achievability" should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. We also suggest new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support banning all the items listed (except for plastic straws - more on that later). Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, we urge the Govt not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead multi-task like a boss & take forward more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too! A 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Govt can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. But, the timelines proposed are too slow. Think of all the targeted plastic items that could enter our environment before 2023 and 2025. Right now, the world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. We need to reverse these trends, fast. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. We suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Using our democracy isn't only about speaking up when we disagree. It is also about giving our consent and approval when we feel the Government gets it right. So, we're going to be thanking the Government for creating what we reckon is an expansive & ambitious list of products for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Can't be recycled. Damaging to the environment

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Beneficial to new businesses to create eco alternatives.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Of course there is. Convenience isn't number one priority. It's only the start of researched design. As long as it doesn't come back to another product that doesn't decompose. Or resort to reusable which needs a community redesign of product use. Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. We also call for Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you, Government, for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics - we wholeheartedly support this. PS the EU (and others) are banning them by July 2021 - just sayin'...

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Every item!! I don't want any plastic or non biodegradable material being used for one off items.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The Government has made a comprehensive list of costs & benefits. We agree with all of them. We appreciate the recognition of potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers & for the wider community from simplifying our waste & recycling streams. We also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. Overall, we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits – human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

initially as we've learnt to grow on highly damaging convenience, ban things by a date, put a high tax. Businesses will look for alternative in a massive pressure point and high priority.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

availability or a better system to buy in bulk at supermarkets.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, we have three points that we feel strongly about. 1. We don't support banning plastic straws. A plastic straw ban would be discriminatory. Some people need a plastic straw to drink. Reusable alternatives work well for some people, but not for everyone. The Government has suggested exemptions for people that need them, but it's hard to design exemptions that aren't stigmatising. At the very least, there must be adequate consultation & agreement with the disabled community before we can support banning plastic straws. 2. We're astounded that the single use coffee cup (SUC) is not on the ban list. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. For takeaways, reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. We know of over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... and they're thriving. Proving that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. A ban on SUC combined with Govt support for reuse schemes can provide security for take-out only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies.. As with all items that involve access to liquids in a hospitality setting, we suggest Govt liaison with the disabled community to seek guidance as to how reusable alternatives can be widely available for all. We urge the Government to take the plunge & ban all disposable coffee cups & lids. We believe they are amongst the most straightforward items to phase out - practically, and due to the increasingly negative public perception towards them. 3. We'd like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS. Like soy fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead. We would support the Government introducing place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet e.g. reusables only for dine-in contexts; central city single-use-free zones; no bottled water & throwaway serviceware on university campuses & in Govt buildings.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However,

poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, we don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. We do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see our answer to Q16). We also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see our answers about this in Q17).

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

100% quickly compostable. 0% plastics. no leeching

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Takeaway Throwaways does not manufacture, supply or use single-use plastic coffee cups. However, we reckon the best thing the Government can do is chat with the 50+ hospitality businesses who are SUC free, and the organisations & small businesses around NZ that support their work such as: UYO SUC-free Wanaka Again Again Cupcycling Good to Go Waiheke The Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project Wanakup These businesses & groups report that the availability of reuse systems and cup loan schemes (and customers who BYO!) enables businesses to move entirely to reuse. And, many more businesses would be willing to ditch the disposables if they knew all outlets were going to be in the same boat - something a ban could achieve.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

immediate notice for 6 months affect. Clear out old stock.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive; we agree with them all. We appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. We like how the Government has recognised that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. However, we are very surprised that this list does not acknowledge how a plastic straw ban could negatively affect individuals who need a plastic straw to drink. And the extra potential benefit offered by the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable alternative products (i.e straws, co-designed with the disabled community) to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes reduce waste & costs for local government & ratepayers. They also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

high fines to businesses don't comply

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 265

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

They're consistent with regulations overseas and will provide a further incentive for packaging producers to develop non-plastic alternatives.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

A big thumbs-up to making the phase-out mandatory. There's little evidence that FMCG brands change their packaging without being forced to.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes. There are already recyclable and compostable alternatives to both of these categories.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 266

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Reducing the total amount of single-use plastic items will certainly have a net positive effects. The description of hard-to-recycle plastics and single-use plastic items (in food, beverage, packaging industries) are accurate. The overall scope within the objectives mentioned is however too narrow by mainly focusing on waste management procedures. All litter pollution pathways into the environment should be addressed to really tackle this issue (including product designs and more eco-friendly materials).

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The objectives set in the document are partly correct, mainly in terms of their applications with waste management as stated above. The objective to reduce the amount of hard-to-recycle plastics used to package food and beverage packaging (including PVC and plastic items designed to be oxo-degradable) will be beneficial to a) reduce the quantity of plastic litter entering the environment and b) improve and facilitate waste management processes. The second objective has potential to reduce the quantity of plastic items in use and reduce the amount of such items entering the environment. Indeed, single-use plastic items form a large part of items collected during beach clean ups for example (Litter Intelligence data, Sustainable Coastlines; Unpublished data, Te Tai Tokerau Debris Monitoring Project- TTTDMP: <https://tttdmp-northtec.hub.arcgis.com/>). While the second objective is a good start, there are obvious gaps, primarily due to the paucity of data on litter in Aotearoa and our limited understanding regarding the quantity, type, and distribution of litter in our environment. Litter monitoring and data gathering and monitoring are key components to improve our understanding of the issue as highlighted in the Prime Ministers Chief Science Advisor 2019 report (Rethinking Plastics in Aotearoa New Zealand). Decision-making should be data-driven. For example, soft plastic packaging is another type of plastic item that is often found in our environment (Litter Intelligence data, Sustainable Coastlines; Unpublished data, TTTDMP). From my peer-reviewed literature and my personal experience (Unpublished data, Te Tai Tokerau Debris Monitoring Project), cigarette butts are one of the most single-use items found in our environment, yet it is excluded from this proposal. Other items found in our environment (e.g. bottle seals, parking tickets) could also be easily tackled by both industries by designing more eco-friendly products and local governments. Furthermore, plastic items break down into micro-plastics and continue to pollute our environment and remain toxic. Reducing several types of plastic by phasing them out will make a difference although mitigating the impact of plastics in Aotearoa New Zealand should be addressed by taking into account all pathways along which plastic and litter in general reach our environment. Policies can also be based upon best practices and litter mitigation measures that have proven to be effective elsewhere, when data are unavailable in New Zealand. If the objectives and scope fail to address the full extent of this issue, solutions will end up falling short of the intended target. Recommendations from the Prime Ministers Chief Science Advisor 2019 report should be incorporated given that its more holistic view of the lifecycle of plastics (including both where and how plastic litter enters the environment). The National Plastics Action Plan would be best suited for that purpose. Finally, there is a strong need to improve our policies on litter management on both public and private land, especially discharge consents.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

These measures are worthwhile given their potential to improve waste management processes and reduce the quantity of plastic used. Saying that, the proposed solutions focus primarily on two waste management objectives and, unfortunately, do not take into account recommendations made in the Prime Ministers Chief Science Advisor 2019 report. Option 1: With voluntary agreement there is often little commitment from different parties unless an activity is regulated, monitored, and

enforced. Option 2: Should plastic reduction targets be set, then a statutory and enforcement would be required to make it successful. Regulations, including monitoring and compliance could be put in place. Option 3: Labelling to inform the public about the recyclability and environmental harm of a product is important and should lead to positive results. A similar system to the “health rating” on food products or “energy rating” on appliances could be put in place. Information could also include the carbon footprint of a product. Option 4: A levy or tax would be effective, especially if it is based on problematic items (e.g. cigarette butts) and on how polluting a product is (refer to option 3 comments). In consultation with the main industry stakeholders, a tax or levy could target the manufacturers/suppliers of a particular product rather than the consumer. Combined with option 3, consumers would then have the option and be encouraged to purchase products with more eco-friendly packaging and ultimately reduce plastic litter reaching the environment. Option 5: Product Stewardship can be beneficial especially if manufacturers acknowledge the impact of their products on the environment and be encouraged to design more eco-friendly products. One issue is the disposal of an item no longer required and who is ultimately responsible for the appropriate disposal and the costs associated with that disposal. Is it the manufacturer, the user, both? Option 6: A mandatory phase out would have a positive effect on waste management practice, however, sufficient information is required to assess how effective it will be to tackle and reduce litter pollution. Option 7: A mandatory recycled content for hard-to-recycle packaging might have a positive effect. Finding the adequate funding required for both infrastructure and innovation might however take time. Encouraging manufacturers and industries to innovate and develop products that do not incorporate hard-to-recycle plastics in the first place (especially in Aotearoa New Zealand) would likely be more beneficial in the long-term. Option 8: A no-change option, i.e. continuing business as usual with voluntary action is not sustainable and does not meet Aotearoa New Zealand’s commitment to international action against climate change. Litter pollution has negative effects on our environment/ecosystems, economy, and ultimately our health and will continue to do that in the status-quo remain.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This document assessed the options listed based on their costs, effectiveness, and alignment with strategic direction and achievability. While the criteria methodology are adequate, this is not the case with their application due to the narrow scope in assessing the impacts of plastic pollution on our environment. Considering where, how, and what goes into our environment via drains, for example, is also important to tackle the issue of plastic pollution and for proposed solutions to not only be effective but also to meet the overall strategic goal. In terms of costs, a at-source or near-to-source capture of litter is often the cheaper option. It also reduced the amount of plastic degradation and fragmentation in the environment, preventing the formation of micro-plastics from macro-plastics. Hard plastic fragments for example, are one of the main plastic items found in our region of Northland to date (Litter Intelligence data, Sustainable Coastlines; Unpublished data, Te Tai Tokerau Debris Monitoring Project- TTTDMP). Another advantage of focusing effort at the source or near the source is that it would reduce the costs and effort put in place of clean-ups. Prevention will be more cost-effective in the long-term while reducing the impacts on our environment/ecosystems, economy, and ultimately our health.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I concur with the analysis that option 8 or a status quo is unsustainable. A combination of options highlighted in the document (e.g. options 1 to 6) would have a more positive effect in mitigating the litter and plastic pollution issues than selecting only one of these options. Furthermore and as aforementioned, the scope of this document is too narrow and does not align with the recommendations outlined in the Prime Ministers Chief Science Advisor 2019 report. The scope is primarily focused on waste management of plastic litter. Consequently, the objectives outlined in the document will likely fail to address the broader aspect of plastic pollution and mitigate their impacts on our environment.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The approach to phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging for all food and beverage products by 2025 is not only achievable but also necessary. More eco-friendly and sustainable packaging materials are currently available and more will also be available in the future with new innovative technology. Behavioural changes are also necessary to make an even bigger impact. Such change could be encouraged by option 3 highlighted in Question 3. However, the assigned environmental effects listed in this document might not all be achievable for reasons highlighted in Question 2.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The items listed in Table 4 would have a positive effect on waste management processing for hard-to-recycle plastics. The final list should also be data-based, using data available from clean-ups conducted to date (e.g. (Litter Intelligence data, Sustainable Coastlines; Unpublished data, TTTDMP). For example, lollipop sticks, bottle seals, plastic fireworks, and parking tickets can be found all year round in Northland (Unpublished data, TTTDMP); these items could easily be added to the list. At it stands, the document is again too narrow, primarily focusing on recycling and waste management. While it is important to consider banning certain types of plastics, it is also crucial to consider effective measures to prevent littering, especially from discharging into stormwater drains and eventually in our aquatic environment. Failing to do so will result in the continuous impact of non-banned plastics, and litter in general, on our environment/ecosystems, economy, and ultimately our health.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Before banning all PVC, it is crucial to consider the impacts of such decision on all sectors (e.g. construction), which are discussed in the Prime Ministers Chief Science Advisor 2019 report. Decisions should be based on a carbon-footprint analysis of PVC products and their alternatives, e.g. PVC versus concrete pipes. Research and technology innovations should also be funded to find better alternatives to PVC products, which can then be banned once such alternative has been found and the replacement of a particular PVC product is cost-effective.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Cost-effective and sustainable products would need to be created before considering phasing out all PVC in particular (refer to Question 8). Phasing out all PVC by 2025 is likely to have a significant financial but also operational costs, particularly for PVC products with a long-term usage. Products and material to be phased out should again be data-based, i.e. what type and quantity of plastic and other litter are found in our environment from our daily activities. Targetting those items in combination with improved litter capture policies and behavioural changes could dramatically reduce plastic pollution.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Alternatives already exist for food packaging. However, this might not be the case for other industries. This implies that proper investigation should be conducted before making decisions on banning all hard-to-recycle packaging. The quantity of litter generated and other factors influencing litter in our environment, not just the type of litter, should also be taken into account in an investigating.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by 2023 will only be effective if other non-plastic alternatives are available. Otherwise, while the generation of micro-plastics will be reduced, it is unlikely that it will have an important impact in reducing the overall quantity of plastics generated that can enter our environment. A multiple data-based approach is needed to tackle the issues, from better product design and alternatives, to improved capture of litter near its source, to behavioural changes.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There will be some benefits to the environment from a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics, with moderate costs for plastic packaging manufacturers. The costs of more eco-friendly products could be decreased by adding a tax/levy on more polluting plastic items (Refer to Question 3, option 4), which would make them more attractive for suppliers and users in general. In its current state, the environment will unlikely be the main beneficiary of the policy because its scope is too narrow and primarily focuses on waste management. Furthermore, there is little evidence that the list of items proposed is data-based. This document should also address how litter enters our environment, which is discussed in the Prime Ministers Chief Science Advisor 2019 report. It is highly recommended that the scope and objectives of this proposed policies be amended to incorporate recommendations made in the Prime Ministers Chief Science Advisor 2019 report in consultation with industries and other stakeholders with experience in this field.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Unable to answer without further information, including on the import and use resin pellets by New Zealand industries. These pellets can be found in our environment and are small enough to be ingested by wildlife and easily cause harm.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Moving away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging will require an increased awareness regarding the sustainability and/or recyclability of a particular items. This is dependent on the information made available to the public so we can make the appropriate decision in our daily activities. Impact factors and carbon footprint on packaging can be part of the solution (question 3, option 3). Changing from plastic items to non-plastic or more eco-friendly items will reduce the amount of plastic litter generated although not necessarily the total amount of litter generated. Behavioural changes will be required to achieve that goal.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

The proposed phased out of single-use items is a positive and needed outcome. However, important single use items found during clean-ups (Litter Intelligence data, Sustainable Coastlines; Unpublished data, TTTDMP) are not included in the list. This is particular true for cigarette butts, and to a lesser extent for lollipop sticks, bottle seals, parking tickets, etc. The intended outcome, especially to reduce the impacts on our environment, would be lower compared to a policy scope that would also include at-source or near-source litter capture.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

In addition to the listed items, cigarette butts should be included as a single-use item and the onus placed on manufacturers to design a better product. These products should also be designed to be degradable and compostable in an terrestrial environment, which would reduce the likelihood of ultimately entering the marine environment especially in areas away from our coasts. Furthermore, while genuine degradable and compostable alternatives are found, more focus should be placed on finding solutions to capture litter at-source or near-source. Otherwise, plastic items and litter in general will continue to enter our environment due to the lack of adequate regulations and policies. Aotearoa New Zealand advertises its clean and green image to the rest of the world. While this proposed policy is a step forward in addressing the issue of litter, it still places New Zealand behind many countries as it is scope is too narrow.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

with the appropriate support from the government

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet

wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

The options highlighted to reduce the use of wet wipes appear to be appropriate, in particular clear labelling regarding their plastic content, appropriate disposal, as well as public education campaigns. A voluntary agreement with industry to shift away from plastic as an ingredient in wet wipes should be temporary to give industry time to make a permanent shift away from plastic towards other alternatives. Past that period, wet wipes containing plastics should be banned. The options presented to reduce single-use plastic coffee cups appear adequate. As with wet wipes, once alternative are widely available, plastic-lined disposable coffee cups should be banned. The same principle should apply to other type of single-use cups/liquid containers not yet considered in this document.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

A period of 24 months should be appropriate timeframe.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Notes

The information provided is insufficient, including a limited analysis. Banning and changing some plastic items is a step in the right direction. However, while this proposal in its current form will have some benefit for the aquatic environment and outlined objectives are unlikely to be met. Furthermore, the use of alternatives will not necessarily resolve the issue of littering. To truly tackle the issue, all aspects of the lifecycle of plastics should be considered. More information and research is also required to increase our knowledge and understanding of how litter is generated and how it is transported to the environment. Reducing litter at-source or near-source is an important strategy that was not considered in this proposal, yet it warrants further investigation (including the implementation of limits on litter pollution in resource consents).

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The punitive measures proposed should be considered based on how effective other such legislation are. While it will be easier to monitor compliance for businesses, how will it be done at the individual level? Is the government able to show any improved in littering since the implementation of the Litter Act (1979)? Will limitations also apply to this new policy? Should a more proactive approach be put in place instead? Could positive incentive be considered for businesses that, for example, are putting in place measures to reduce their litter and the likelihood of customers littering? Could a system similar to the Food grade in place for restaurant be considered for littering as well? This would allow users and customers to support businesses that reduce their plastic and pollution level in their communities. Leadership and innovation should also be rewarded rather than having only punitive measures in place. Aotearoa New Zealand has the opportunity to close the gap relative to other countries to reduce and mitigate litter and plastic pollution. Doing so will require more research into litter on which sound decision-making can be based. Recommendations highlighted in the Prime Ministers Chief Science Advisor 2019 report should also be considered and incorporated as much as possible in this policy to reduce plastic on our environment/ecosystems and ultimately our health.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 267

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

should be a shorter phase out timeframe

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

non compostable or PLA tea bags should be included

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

the sooner the better it is an unnecessary packaging item and there are suitable alternatives already readily available

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

we should focus on the true costs of plastic in our environment, if a cost analysis was conducted the results would show unsustainable financial costs to the environment outweighing the cost benefits for companies

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

no help needed simple process stop purchasing products in plastic and find alternatives

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Notes

the shorter time frame the better, the plastic bag banning was quick and effective

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

high tax for these items that the consumer has to pay for, this will reduce their use and enable sustainable options to be purchased instead

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

we just don't purchase them and source compostable options

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

as soon as possible

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

regulate the industry to enforce change

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 268

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

There is good progress in these potential regulations but we need to go to the heart of single use which means that there must be a strong stagey developed for circular business practices. Education in how we use existing resources.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The government also desperately needs a circular business, economy, prices strategy combined with environmental procurement. We need a pathway for our resource systems to be circular.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

As above, combining a circular strategy, incentivising circular business practices combines with environmental procurement as a way forward

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

But we need to look at doughnut economics. A government that is brave enough to reimagine out economy without measuring it using GDP. An economy based around the principles of reduce and reuse.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Timeframes need to be faster. 3 years is too long when solutions already exist.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs as in financial will be replaced by new more environmental business practices and innovators who capitalise on a gap in the market. Benefits are to the environmental and eventually the people.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If it was done before, it can be done again. It's attitudes and behaviours you need to change.. Think of drink driving, seat belt wearing and no smoking as examples of how we can change behaviours.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

EU doing by 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Coffee cups need to be on list. Check out again again as a business govt could support as an alternative.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Notes

Ban all single use, no exemptions. There are circular businesses that will take over after these needed changes.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 269

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Other alternatives would be found. The cost of alternatives would likely make companies reconsider the need for packaging and/or would pass on additional costs of single use packaging, encouraging consumers to use reusable alternatives

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Legal restrictions around plastic packaging, making reusable/refillable options in shops the norm

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 270

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I believe that the proposal should also address a disposal plan for 'difficult to dispose' plastics. eg. high temperature furnaces in major centres (at the land fills?) to burn the plastic rather than putting it in the land fills. There may also be potential to generate electricity from the furnaces. These furnaces would likely require an increase in rates to fund it, but the rate payers are generating the plastic waste so I think it would be fair for them to pay for the cost of clean up.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree, but would have preferred a more aggressive approach. ie. a shorter timeline for implementation.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the proposal but would have preferred a shorter timeline.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

I believe that polystyrene in particular should be totally banned from all packaging as it often breaks down and blows away from building sites, residential properties and landfills.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

It would eliminate this waste from filling up our landfills and from some of it escaping into the environment. There may be an increase in some product prices as alternate packing materials may cost a bit more. Shelf lives for some products might reduce.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Make it mandatory to use recyclable plastics instead of hard to recycle plastics. My family would also use reusable glass drink bottles if they were reintroduced to the market (could reintroduce say 15 cents deposits per bottle, refundable at collection depots)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Paper/light cardboard cups. Cloth wet wipes.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Set up a group of inspectors, managed centrally by a government department.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 271

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

For a plastic to be recyclable in NZ and have an end use is fundamental. Single use items are not essential and I fully support them being banned.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Other objectives in the circular economy are to reduce and re-use. Recycling comes third in this hierarchy. I cannot see reference to government disincentives to packaging manufacturers to change the way goods are packaged as a fundamental issue.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Should also include single use coffee cups and lids. If people wish to have a take away coffee, then they must use their own cup. There must also be manufacturing disincentives to continue packaging fizzy drinks and flavoured milk in single use bottles. There once was glass bottles which you received a refund for once returned. This needs to be part of the strategy.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Mandating a phase out is a good first step, needs to be followed by other plastic items not covered here.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

All should be phased out by 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Targeting some industries is not a fair way of achieving our long term goals of reducing plastic litter and microplastics in the marine environment.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

See above

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If there are not alternatives already, the phase out will be a great incentive to develop such products quickly.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Not applicable

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Greater benefit to the environment by reducing litter, allowing greater ecosystem health which ultimately benefits us all. Also brings a greater awareness of the whole huge problem of plastic waste generally, as did the phase out of supermarket and single use plastic bags from retailers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Forcing retailers to accept back the large volumes of excess packaging that goes with the purchase of any household item. They would then have to find an alternative, presently it is forced on a consumer to arrange recycling or disposal.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Add in single use water and beverage bottles. Also single use plastic packaging of butter and spreads so common in hotels and cafes.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

People provide their own coffee cups for filling, with a discount if necessary to encourage. Look at how quickly most people accepted taking their own bags to the supermarket, and how easy that transition was for most people. It is very easy to change behaviour for the better, look to the rules around Covid in NZ and how well these were accepted by the majority. As for wet wipes, these may be convenient for a small portion of the population with small children, but a damp washable cloth makes much more sense.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

If 2023 is unrealistic for whatever reasons you have not targeted these in the initial phase out, the 2025 is surely realistic.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

These proposals target manufacturing at source. I am assuming there are regulatory processes that allow enforcement to be taken and appropriate penalties applied to non compliance by Ministry for the Environment working with other government agencies.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 272

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

A good description of the problems has been provided. But the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. We urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of material type, and then propose more concrete policy actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The objective to reduce hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is vital for a circular economy. But eliminating things is only part of the problem. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics and plastic pollution and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy and avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options listed covers key actions we'd expect to see. However, we have two concerns: Concern 1: There is currently no 'blended' option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time. e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling and product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. Concern 2: The list is missing some key policy options that could help grow reuse. e.g. deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets and reusables only for dine-in situation.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria and weightings make sense and help us understand the reasoning behind the proposals. We suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy. We also suggest new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes and unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support banning all the items listed. Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But we urge the Government not to take a 'ban only' approach and instead to multi-task and take forward more than one option at the same time. A 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift the best alternatives. Plus, it leaves the Government without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Government can level the playing field between single-use and reuse and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies,

deposit return systems, and labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase out than others, but the timelines proposed are too slow. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. We suggest bringing the stage 1 and 2 timeframes forward to June 2021 and June 2023 respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and EPS are used in consumer packaging in non-food and beverage contexts. They can become a contaminant in easy-to-recycle plastic so it's best to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and EPS packaging. Thought should be given however, to exemptions or alternatives for international food chains, medical and chemical supply chain requirements.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will encourage the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials. EPS becomes litter in the environment and creates lasting problems for our soil, water ways and the marine environment. Hard polystyrene cannot be recycled as there is no market for it.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But the best alternatives are reusable, refillable and accessible, followed by high quality recyclable items listed in table 5.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, we wholeheartedly support this. We would prefer to see a quicker ban due to the harm created by these plastics and the green-washing involved. They also contaminate recycling streams.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

We agree with all the costs and benefits provided in table 6. We acknowledge the Government has recognised the benefit of savings for our community from simplified recycling and waste streams. There will also be increased benefits for fresh water quality with less microplastics, reducing plastic pollution in our natural environment and air quality.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There is an extra benefit to banning the targeted plastics that has been missed - the opportunity for business and community to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging solutions to replace the banned items. Not only does this reduce waste, it will also create jobs with research suggesting jobs are likely to be localised and meet development goals in regions across the country.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More onshore processing and recycling collection and sorting facilities would help ensure that higher value plastics get collected in New Zealand. This would increase public confidence and engagement in the recycling system. It would also allow for better packaging choices by designers, who can integrate end of life options in to design choices of materials. Government should also use policy and invest in moving reusable alternatives from the niche to the mainstream. It is already possible for BYO containers and tableware for food and drink to be used in most situations, and in many cases reuse schemes exist, such as Again Again, Cup Cycling, and Reusabowl. The issue is not lack of ideas, but barriers to scale and normalisation of these systems. A coordinated universal design approach is needed to ensure reusable alternatives are accessible for everyone in our community (considering cost or disability).

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support banning all the items listed, including their oxo-degradable and compostable counterparts. However, we have 2 main points: 1. We're astounded the single use coffee cup is not on the ban list 2. We'd like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list, such as; plastic lollipop sticks and wrappers, single-serve pottles and sachets for sauce, soy fish, sugar and toiletries, coffee pods containing plastic, tea bags containing plastic, single-use plastic water bottles, balloons and glitter.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, ox-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics in the proposed phase out. We recommend the following alterations or clarifications of the proposed definitions: • Single use plastic tableware - alter the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings. • Single use plastic produce bags - broaden the definition to include within the scope of the phase out plastic net bags that fruit and vegetables are commonly pre-packed into. • Single use plastic cups and lids - we do not support exempting single-use plastic cups made of plastics 1, 2, and 5 from a ban. Any unwashed cups that contain milk products or smoothies are considered contaminated and will not meet quality standards for recycling. • Single use coffee cups - we would support disposable coffee cups being included in the proposed phase out.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups: We believe the expertise to create reusable infrastructure and accompanying community engagement is well established in New Zealand. Virtually all outlets accept BYO reusables, and most outlets have in-house ceramic options if people forget their cups. There are a growing range of reuse schemes / cup loan systems, and some cafes have eliminated single use cups entirely by implementing strategies to encourage customers to sit, borrow or bring. We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy and investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Local community engagement and collaborative solutions are more impactful in terms of creating lasting behaviour change than high level national education. Funding NGOs and community groups already working to educate and engage on the ground would be the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change. Wet wipes: We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we suggest investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes. Before a ban is phased in, we support fees being attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs from blocked pipes and other issues from wet wipes being flushed into drains.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2023

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The community will assist in monitoring if they are able to report breaches, like the plastic bag ban. We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 273

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

OUSA agrees with the description of the problems of hard to recycle plastics. The issue of plastics in our environment is one that many students are aware of and hold significant concerns about. For example, last year OUSA sent a team of 70 students to Fox Landfill clean up. This was a shocking experience, with students finding chocolate wrappers from 1970, which were still in perfect condition or bread bags that were tangled and spread through logs. It was shocking and no student left saying plastic was a good idea to continue. Thus, plastics and the difficulty of their disposal is an important issue for students. However, OUSA would like to see 'disposal' removed entirely from the hierarchy as even items which are disposed of should be able to break down without causing harm to the environment. There is potentially a better name to reflect an eco-friendly waste cycle. This potentially should be expanded to include all single-use/throw away items as even if it's not plastic based these can be a problem.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

OUSA supports the current objectives, but we believe that they do not go far enough towards creating a circular economy within our community. For example, one of the secondary objectives could be to create a culture of reuse. Therefore, the main objective is to reduce waste, and reuse is second to that, but reusing is an important part of reducing because it reduces the demand for new plastics. For example, In Dunedin it is common for students to throughout usable goods at the end of the year because it is too difficult to resell or pass them on. Therefore, OUSA has started an initiative to collect these goods and resell them back to students at the start of the following year, reducing waste at the end of one year and reducing new purchases at the beginning of the next. As such, OUSA advocates for an emphasis on reuse, as part of reduction.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

OUSA supports the options in part. However, OUSA believes it would be preferable to have a combination of these options. For example, it may be beneficial to have a levy or a tax, alongside a voluntary phase out. Alongside, OUSA believes there should be the potential to expand the reuse options, to include things such as targets for reuse, return schemes or an entire other series of options on how to move to reuse systems. Alternatively, there could be fees imposed on companies for items not covered in this ban (cigarette butts, wet wipes etc.), which have an equally adverse effect on the environment.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

OUSA supports the majority of the criteria. However, OUSA believes achievability for people and businesses, should be added as a criterion. Alongside this, OUSA emphasizes the need to consider the potential loopholes, which each option could create and the best way to mitigate this. OUSA recommends adding a second element to the criteria, which is a weighting around the waste hierarchy i.e., if the option addresses the top layers of the hierarchy it gets more points. We believe that collectively these

changes would make the criteria more effective and efficient in achieving the intended goals e.g. reduction of plastics.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

OUSA supports a mandatory phase out. However, we are concerned about the risk of some plastics being swapped out for other, similarly adverse materials. Therefore, OUSA supports the mandatory phase out alongside other mechanisms to encourage the best outcome over all. For example, alongside the phase out, we could introduce a long-term reduction target (e.g. circular economy by 2035) or providing additional incentives to switch towards preferred plastics. We believe a multi-pronged approach such as this is the most effective means to reduce plastic waste in New Zealand.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

OUSA recognizes that PVC and polystyrene are incredibly detrimental to the environment and there are already many viable alternative available. Therefore, we believe that these phases out stages should be moved forward. In particular, OUSA notes that the EU plans to ban similar items between 2021-2023. Therefore, OUSA recommends the following timeframe be adopted: PVC out by June 2021. All other food and beverage items with PVC and some with Polystyrene by June 2022. Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

OUSA believes it is important for this to have the widest scope possible. OUSA recognizes that some plastic products have a longer lifespan and therefore, may require different timeframes for phase out. However, OUSA does not think it is appropriate to exclude plastics simply because they last longer, ultimately, they are still single use or limited use items and thus, solutions need to be found to their use.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

OUSA notes there will be significant benefits to our natural environment and the mitigation of climate change. Whilst OUSA recognises that there will be costs to shifting away from plastics, we believe these are balanced against the longer-term costs of continuing to consume plastics.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

OUSA recognizes that there are already alternatives to many hard to recycle plastics and thus, we believe it is very possible to transition away from there. However, OUSA believes the over emphasis should be on the need to reduce waste and re-use already existing items, rather than focusing on creating more items, abet from more recyclable materials. OUSA supports developing a more unified recycling system across the country. As a student city, many students find the recycling systems here are different to what they are used to, creating unnecessary confusion and increasingly the likelihood of poor recycling. Therefore, OUSA advocates for a nationally consistent recycling system. The roll out of this system could include incorporating and encouraging the education and academic systems when teaching courses relevant to packaging/design/building/making/food to always have a component on reuse or sustainable design. By incorporating this

thinking into our next generation, they will be going into the work force with that mind set already.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

OUSA notes that the EU is planning on implementing this by 2021. Therefore, OUSA would support a shorter time frame for this, such as early 2022.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

OUSA believes that there will be a broader benefit to students and the wider community from creating a culture of reuse. As noted above, OUSA is working to create a circular economy of student goods which, whilst reducing waste, also provides students with cheaper and more accessible goods.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

OUSA believes the major factors are ease of use, accessibility and cost. For example, for many students traditionally 'eco-friendly' products may be too expensive, due to the increased price which is normally associated with these products. Whilst OUSA recognizes the need to reflect the true value of product, caution is required to ensure that everyday staples do not become inaccessible. OUSA believes this is a question of normalization, whereby plastic free or reduced items become the norm. For example, the University of Otago has recently moved to be a single use plastic campus, which has been met with a huge uptake. Students now carry around keep cups or grab a mug, it's just a part of our student life. Therefore, OUSA believes the major factors that need to consider are ensuring that environmentally friendly items are accessible and become part of our everyday culture of reuse.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We support the mandatory phase out of the single use plastic items. However, we believe this list could be extended to include the following: Extension of list to: Disposable cups and lids including coffee cups and plastic takeaway drink cups; Lolly wrappers/sticks; Single serve pottles, sachets and containers; Coffee pods; Teabags w plastic in them Plastic film on outside of packaging i.e. tea boxes or chewing gum, letters, magazines; Single use water bottles; Balloons and Balloon sticks; Glitter and plastic confetti; Complementary plastic toys or incentives; Political party paraphernalia which is plastic; Unnecessary plastic windows in packaging e.g. pasta packaging or in envelopes.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

However, OUSA would like the definitions to be expanded to include the items listed above.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

In relation to coffee cups, the following could be considered; Nationwide deposit and return schemes; Mug libraries, which are an increasingly common alternative Cheaper reusables cups Disposable cup free zones which can include Universities, government buildings, museums, galleries and important nature sites i.e., national parks and ski fields. There could also be incentive or model for councils to adopt to become disposable cup free towns and create a reuse system within their town. This could work perfectly for rural and small towns. In relation to wet wipes: This is where a tax or a levy could be beneficial to make wet wipes without plastics preferred and more accessible. It would be better to make non-plastic ones cheaper. As wet wipes are often for small children this may also have wider financial benefits to lower socio-economic families with young children, if the non-plastic products ended up cheaper over all.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

OUSA hosts many events, at which we have tried to create as much of a circular economy as possible. For example, at the Dunedin Craft Beer and Food Festival all patrons are issued with a cup on entry and they use this throughout the event. The cups are then returned and the company will reuse them or the patrons are free to take them home. We believe more emphasis on reusable products will make this increasingly possible.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

For coffee cups, we believe the phase out should be by early 2022. For wet wipes, we believe it would be preferable to start with incentives to shift away from plastic based wet wipes and then phase them out over a longer time period.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

In terms of plastic straws, it is important to consider the impact on disabled people who rely on them to drink. Although OUSA understands there are alternatives, it is important to make sure they are suitable and accessible, before removing straws entirely.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

OUSA suggests that we could developed a breach report system to MFIE similar to the bag ban.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 274

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I believe single use coffee cups could be included as well.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

A cleaner environment! Less items sent to landfill

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I've seen some companies replacing polystyrene packaging with cardboard inserts, and others using recycled cardboard moulds

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

We have limited space on this planet and in this country. The less we send to landfill, the more room we have for other things. And the less plastic ends up in the environment and filtered down into our food chain.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Some alternatives are more expensive. Lots of advertising in advance of the changes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

BYO reusable coffee cups. If someone had the ability to invent a mini steriliser that worked within minutes, they could become rich by selling it to all the cafés and eateries. Wet wipes - advertising and making it normal to use reusable wipes, just like reusable nappies used to be the norm.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

I think that depends on the alternatives that we are aiming for. How easy is the proposed alternative to implement? How much will it cost the consumer and/or the businesses?

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 275

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We largely agree with the description of the problems outlined. However we think all single use packaging and items must be strongly discouraged, as they cause similar problems.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We agree with the objectives of banning certain products, as a starting point. But unless we go further up the chain and mandate producers to have verifiable systems for managing the whole lifecycle of all their products, we will be faced with similar issues in the years to come. An objective should also be to incentivise and encourage opportunities for reusing and refilling, not just using easier to recycle plastics or other virgin materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We agree these are the right options to consider, with a combination of these in relevant cases. It should not be an either or, as a combination of actions would yield better results and reflect the urgency for change we are facing. We strongly oppose option 1 - voluntary agreements or pacts with industry, which effectively means option 8 - leaving things as they are now. If the voluntary measures over the last 25 years had been successful, plastic pollution would not have risen to the extend it has. Option 5 should be MANDATORY product stewardship, not voluntary.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We agree with the assessment of the options, particularly with option 6 (product stewardship). We also agree that banning certain products and materials is a very effective and visionary way to tackle the issue of plastic pollution. Banning is not a panacea however and we should not stop there. We strongly urge for a combination of other options (such as mandatory product stewardship, effective labelling etc) for a fully formed strategy.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The timeline should be shortened to reflect the urgency and scale of the problem these products create. The need to change and regulate has been known for a long time and is well overdue.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

They should be phased out as quickly as possible.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Industry is capable of making very quick changes if there is a level playing field with strong leadership from Government. This has been proven overseas consistently, and in NZ with the plastic bag ban.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There are practical alternatives currently in use, however packaging in general should be discouraged. An alternative not mentioned in Table 5 is personal containers, which is how it used to be and everybody managed perfectly.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes but with a shorter timeframe, as explained above.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Strong leadership from Government

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We think this is a great list of items that should be banned. However, we are surprised that coffee cups are not included and believe that plastic take away containers, as well as plastic lined single use containers, cups and packaging, and plastic single serve condiments (such as butter, jam, soy sauce) should be added to this list.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We are concerned with a number of the alternatives proposed, as single use attitudes are still not actively discouraged. Wooden, bamboo, paper, cardboard and other biodegradable materials all have impacts to the environment and all need to be disposed of correctly, which is seldom the case currently.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

We think 12 months is a reasonable timeframe, unless it can be proven that for some cases it is impossible to achieve.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We think this is a great analysis of costs and benefits and agree with them all. We would like to add as a benefit the opportunity for more reuse and a shift from a single use mentality towards a circular economy. Businesses are great at adapting, once they are mandated by government (and consumers) to change.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 276

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Why not faster? Set a tougher target.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Eliminating waste that we can't recycle or repurpose is essential for the health of our whenua

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We have amazing scientists and product development brains in NZ - set them the task to produce an environmentally sound alternative

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If businesses provided environmentally sound packaging in the first place.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 277

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes the outlined problems with hard-to-recycle plastics are true and fair, but it doesn't go far enough to address the problems with plastics as a whole in our packaging and single use items. Just because plastics 1,2 and 5 can technically be recycled, doesn't mean they always are effectively. And the environmental cost of creating plastics from virgin material, and then recycling them maybe once or twice needs to be considered. All single use plastics should be considered hard-to-recycle and should be up for debate on removal from our systems.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Reducing certain types of single use plastics doesn't go far enough. There needs to be support and incentive to move towards a reuse culture. Removing plastics will just move producers and consumers towards single use paper and cardboard packing (this is already happening), which is better, but not by much. Single use anything has a much worse environmental impact than reuse.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

There is still too much emphasis on using recyclable plastics (e.g. saying moving from single use plastic cups numbers 3,4,6 and 7 to cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable). Saying "more likely to be recyclable" really doesn't give much hope. Always go for reuse rather than recycle. It still costs resources to recycle single use items, that shouldn't exist in the first place.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

A 'ban only' approach can sometimes lead to the swapping of one single-use material for another. A 'ban only' approach also doesn't fix the problem of our reliance on virgin plastic resin. Even if we shift to only using 'easier to recycle' plastics, this doesn't ensure that those products are actually recycled or recycled back into the same kind of product.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging, however the proposed time-frames are too slow. I support this proposal: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021: PVC trays are especially problematic for the recycling industry as they are the main contaminants of onshore clear PET recycling, and are easily substituted by clear PET trays. All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. Phasing out will prevent things like this happening.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

And sooner please!!

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit currently missing is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. This would have a positive job creation impact, as well as reducing waste.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Having it easily accessible is key. A mix of moving back to having smaller scale refillery type supermarkets, or having a wider range of bulk buying options in all supermarkets. Having options to buy appliances etc. with returnable packaging. Normalising the reuse culture in takeaway situations for coffee/food etc.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list should be extended to include the following: Disposable coffee cups & lids. Plastic lollipop sticks and wrappers: These present a similar hazard to plastic cotton buds and can easily be replaced by cardboard sticks. Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries: For example, soy fish, pottles with peelable plastic lids for jam, butter and other condiments, sachets of sauces, condiments, sugar and toiletries. One of the items commonly picked up by volunteers cleaning up after the Fox River landfill disaster were single-use sachets from the accommodation and hospitality providers in this popular tourist destination. Some hotels are already voluntarily phasing out these single-serve items. Coffee pods containing plastic: Single-serve coffee pods made of any material are hard-to-recycle because each pod contains coffee grinds that must be removed before recycling is possible. We would support a phase-out of all single-use coffee pods (reusable pods exist), but for the purposes of this consultation we call for those containing plastic to be included in this mandatory phase-out list. Teabags containing plastic: Many teabags contain plastic (either in the bag itself or the adhesives that hold the bag together). This is not common knowledge and many people put used teabags in their compost bins. Consequently, teabags containing plastic present a similar concern for potential plastic contamination of soil as plastic fruit stickers do. The consultation document has earmarked fruit stickers for a ban; for consistency's sake, teabags containing plastic should be included on the list for mandatory phase-out too. Not all teabags contain plastic, so alternatives clearly do exist. In addition to potential microplastic contamination of soils, plastic in teabags is also a health concern as the plastic and additives may be released into the tea while it's steeping. Single-use plastic water bottles: In New Zealand, we have widespread access to potable water from the tap, so bottling water in plastic and transporting it around the country and the world needlessly creates harmful emissions and waste. Single use plastic bottles are an inefficient and environmentally harmful way to provide access to potable water, which could be replaced by public fountains or bulk, reusable containers. Initiatives like Refill NZ are gaining traction, but we need to see Government leadership in banning or at least imposing on single-use plastic water bottles to make a real difference in the volume of plastic water bottles used. This would also benefit the tourism industry, by reinforcing New Zealand's brand as one of high environmental standards. Exemptions could be designed for civil defence and emergency situations. Balloons and balloon sticks. Glitter and plastic confetti: Plastic-based glitter is used in a wide range of cosmetic products and art supplies. Prior to voluntary bans in the UK, early childhood centres admitted to using kilos every year. Similarly, mardi gras and music festival organisers are phasing out the use of glitter for environmental reasons, particularly as there are plenty of environmentally-friendly options on the market. As a microplastic, glitter shares similar environmental impacts to other microplastics (although its sharp edges may cause more physical damage to smaller creatures when ingested) and therefore, it is not always distinguished from other microplastics in peer-reviewed scientific publications. Complementary plastic toys on children's magazines and with fast food. Chewing gum containing plastic - most large branded chewing gum contains plastic and causes up to 100,000 tonnes of plastic pollution globally every year.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I recommend the following alterations or clarifications of the proposed definitions: ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings (similar to the plastic cups and lids definition). ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags that fruit and vegetables are commonly pre-packed into. ● Single-use plastic cups and lids: We do not support exempting single-use plastic cups made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 from a ban. Although these cups are technically recyclable, they are mostly used away from home, and are likely to enter the recycling system unwashed via public recycling bins. Any unwashed cups that contain milk products or smoothies are considered contaminated and will not meet quality standards for recycling. At best, these plastics will be pulled out from the recycling stream and discarded, at worst they can result in the entire contents of the bin going to landfill. Even if the cups are clean enough to meet quality standards (e.g. if they contained water or soft drinks), public recycling bins are often heavily contaminated, resulting in the contents of many going to landfill. For this reason, we recommend defining recyclability not just by the type of plastic, but also by the likelihood of it being recycled given existing collection and processing systems. If the exemption goes ahead, we recommend that lids not be included in the exemption as their size effectively makes them 'hard-to-recycle' items in most kerbside systems that rely on automated MRFs for sorting. Furthermore, they are detachable so can easily be lost to the environment. ● Single-use coffee cups: We would support disposable coffee cups being included in the proposed phase-out.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Effective policy options (many of which are possible under s 23 of the WMA or without the need for new Parliamentary legislation) include: ● Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers ● Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings, museums and galleries, coasts and national parks) ● A deposit return scheme for both disposable coffee cups and reusable alternatives offered through a reuse scheme (e.g. Again Again) plus mandating that all outlets dispensing takeaway cups (whether disposable or reusable) take back empty cups (for appropriate disposal or reuse) - achieved under ss 23(1)(c) and (e) of the WMA. ● Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow universal design principles and are accessible for everyone in the community. ● Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. ● Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. ● Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. ● Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives and where they should be disposed of (i.e. in rubbish bins, unless a commercial collection facility is available for compostable cups) ● A ban on branding of disposable cups (under s 23(1)(d)) ● A levy on disposable coffee cups and/or producer fees under s 23(1)(d) to cover the estimated costs associated with disposal or clean-up. ● Inclusion of disposable coffee cups in the proposed mandatory phase-out list because this will stimulate solutions. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems), and compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging (these labelling requirements should be mandated under s 23(1)(f) of the WMA). Before a ban is phased in, we would also support fees being attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs (which can be considerable when they block pipes and form fatbergs). Currently the community is covering these costs through Council. It would be more appropriate to attach this cost to producers and consumers through a fee. This is different to a levy as it's related to the cost of managing the product and could be achieved under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA. A ban on advertising for wet wipes containing plastic would also be appropriate.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable (e.g. by Jan 2022).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The community will assist in monitoring if they are able to report breaches of the mandatory phase-out to MFE, similar to the plastic bag ban. Monitoring could be undertaken as part of regular council/regulatory checks for health and safety, food code compliance etc.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 278

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Unclear / Not Stated

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Affordable , sustainable , recyclable , available alternatives eg: glass, paper, pottery, cloth etc

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Education & incentives help with compliance . Reuse the cup . Carry a damp cloth in a container and wash it ... simplify

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Ban , fine for non compliance

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 279

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Sooner the better

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

I believe alternatives can and should be found for other industries too. There is no reason to confine restrictions to only a few sectors

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Manufacturers may need support to find alternatives for shipping protection

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Resources about alternatives, particularly for businesses who use or supply the materials to be phased out

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Believe coffee cups should be added. What's so special about those who buy coffee? I am a regular coffee drinker but have not used any disposable cups in at least a year

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months is plenty for anyone

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Make reusable the norm. We don't need to replace one disposable with another. People will get used to it, they are adaptable

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months or preferably sooner

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Stop the materials being imported or manufactured in the first place, target supply

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 282

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The description does not address compostable plastics. The document's focus is on traditional single-use PE & PP plastic produce bags, and the detrimental environmental effects of these. Other than being single-use, none of the arguments for phase-out of single-use plastics applies to environmentally friendly single-use certified home compostable plastic produce bags. These home compostable produce bags should not be included in any phase-out of single-use plastic bags. Compostables are captured under Plastic code '7', a catch-all for other plastics developed since 1988. Inclusion in this group may have influenced the inclusion in the proposed phase-out policy. The description does not address compostable plastics as being an entirely different product to the other plastics within code7. The description does not address the benefits of compostable plastics compared to other plastics. There needs to be a greatly expanded section on compostable plastics and how they are different from other plastics in the #7 category. • Compostable plastics do not build up in the environment – they degrade. This study shows compostable plastics disappeared from a marine test environment within 24 weeks, whereas 98% of the oxo-degradable plastic remained. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0025326X10003553?via=ihub> • There is no mention or differentiation between 'Industrial' and 'Home' compostable plastics. • There is no mention that compostable plastics can, and are, produced from biobased material – the amount of biobased content is increasing over time. • In Table 1 the report itself mentioned the NZ Plastic Packaging Declaration (NZPPD) that states it's a "pledge with businesses that commits signatories to a goal of 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025." Yet the compostable part is ignored in the description.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The objectives are missing any reference to compostable plastics. • Compostable plastics can be a substitute for hard-to-recycle plastic packaging. • Compostable plastics reduce the impact on the environment. • There is no distinction in the document between home and industrial certifications for compostable plastics. • There is no mention of the confusion resulting from not requiring a compostable standard in NZ (similar to Australian ABAP standard).

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The options are missing any reference to compostable plastics - yet the NZPPD is mentioned and the report states "New Zealand has an existing pledge-based agreement known as the New Zealand Plastic Packaging Declaration (NZPPD). Over 20 businesses signed up to a goal of 100 per cent reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025." Substitution of single-use plastic with compostable alternatives is a 9th option in itself. In addition, every one of the international examples of bans and taxes etc listed in Appendix 1, all the examples exempt compostable plastic produce bags and do not support a ban or phase-out of compostable plastic produce bags. The citations mentioned in this report from the international examples deliberately omit references to regular plastic and compostable plastic single-use bags being treated differently in the examples.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

As there was no mention of compostable plastics for either an option, or within options, the criteria completely misses compostable plastics and thus cannot be correctly identified.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We cannot completely agree with the preferred option of 'Mandatory phase-out', as it was selected against criteria with no consideration of compostable plastics and its positive or negative aspects. Aligning with the 'New Plastics Economy Global Commitment' (NPEGC) is given as a confirmation the 'Mandatory phase-out' was the correct selection chosen. The NPEGC states: • "The Commitments 2. A. iii 100% of plastic packaging to be reusable, recyclable, or compostable by 2025." • "Appendix I 3. B. Compostable plastics packaging is not a blanket solution, but rather one for specific, targeted applications." For an example of 'specific, targeted applications consider that plastics cannot be recycled if they are too contaminated. Produce bags for fresh food products (eg raw meat, fish) may become contaminated and become unrecyclable, and this applies to regular plastic and paper bags. If the bag is compostable, this organic contamination is not a problem and it can be composted with no issues. In addition, recent developments from Covid-19 have prevented supermarket customers from bringing their own reusable bags into store during higher alert levels.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics. Replacement with compostable plastics is a viable option for some use cases. However, compostable plastics are not mentioned despite aligning with the NZPPD and NPEGC commitments/declarations used for support in this document. Compostable plastics do not pose a microplastic risk to wildlife like oxo-degradable plastics.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Very few single-use oxo-degradable produce bags are used in the New Zealand market, so there will be no adverse effect in phasing out single-use oxo-degradable bags. The major retailers of produce are educated to the environmental concerns around these bags. The single-use produce bags market is primarily made up of certified home compostable plastic produce bags, single-use paper bags (Foodstuffs) and single-use (non oxo-degradable) plastic and single-use paper (in the case of Progressive supermarkets and independent produce retailers). Practical alternatives for oxo-degradable plastic produce bags are the widely used certified home compostable plastic bag, single-use paper type bags and single-use traditional plastic. These are a practical alternative for a wide range of single-use plastics, whether they are oxo-degradable or not.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The right costs and benefits are not completely identified because there is no mention of compostable plastics - compostable plastics are a practical and environmentally friendly alternative for a wide range of single-use plastics (and are already in widespread use). Compostable plastics benefit the environment, as they: - Make a cleaner marine environment. This study shows compostable plastics disappeared from a marine test environment within 24 weeks, whereas 98% of the oxo-degradable plastic remained. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0025326X10003553?via=ihub> - contain biobased material, and this is increasing over time. - increase public awareness of what happens at the end of life of the product and they are reused as compost.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

We are concerned the phase-out of single-use compostable bags for produce could have greater costs and environmental effects than the document assumes, if compostable plastic produce bags are replaced with paper-based bags or reusable hessian/cotton bags. Already there are paper-based bags in the NZ market with plastic linings or paraffin wax to improve wet

strength. These are classed as 'multiple composites' but are completely unregulated and confusing to the general public as they look like paper bags. For example, paper bags may be: - recyclable but not compostable (100% paper) - compostable but not recyclable (compostable plastic lining so must be composted as the film contaminates traditional paper recycling) - neither recyclable nor compostable (regular plastic lining or a paraffin wax coating so these contaminate both compost and paper recycling streams. Can only go to landfill). Therefore unregulated use of paper bags with linings, classed as multiple composites, will increase the contamination and complexity of the recycling system. Paper bags have a considerably higher CO2 footprint and greater environmental impact regards pollution, water and energy use, yet the document does not address a ban of these bags. <http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/documents/raise/publications/2011/environment/3611.PDF> The ban on single-use plastic (and compostable) retail bags has meant that an increasing number of retailers are now offering single-use paper type retail bags over reusable bags. The same move to paper type single-use produce bags would be expected to happen if single-use compostable plastic produce bags were to be banned.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

We have 3 proposals: 1. Government mandate that all compostable plastics sold in NZ are required to display ABAP certifications for industrial and/or home compostable standards. 2. That government direction is for bio content of compostable materials is progressively increase by set time frames. 3. Government mandate that all paper bags to be both compostable and recyclable, and the contents are sustainably sourced.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Do not agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items (please comment below)

Notes

We completely oppose the definition of, and alternatives to, Single-use plastic produce bags in Table 7, and the further analysis in Appendix 2. Table 7's proposed definition for single-use plastic produce bags is incorrect as there is no distinction between regular and compostable plastics. The alternatives are also incorrect. - 'No bag' is not an option for some produce. For example small or soft fruits (eg grapes), ripe fruit (eg tomatoes), and some vegetables. Retailers must make a bag available for customers, whether it is a free of charge single use bag, or a reusable bags available for purchase. - Reusable produce bags were not allowed during NZ's Covid Alert Level 4. - Placing fruit directly in a trolley, or onto checkout counters, under a no bag scenario would be impractical and unhealthy - especially giving the Covid world we now live in. The table from Appendix 2 contains factual errors and disingenuous examples. Scale of the problem - Environmental impacts of compostable plastic bags ARE NOT similar to those of the banned plastic shopping bags. o Compostable bags help make a cleaner marine environment. This study shows compostable plastics disappeared from a marine test environment within 24 weeks, whereas 98% of the oxo-degradable plastic remained. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0025326X10003553?via=ihub> - The reference to the 2018 Keep NZ Beautiful Litter Audit is a disingenuous addition o the audit was performed before plastic shopping bags were banned. Current anecdotal evidence from organisations involved in marine litter collection shows a big reduction in the number of plastic bags they are collecting as a result of the ban. This audit cannot be used to represent problems from plastic or compostable plastic produce bags. It even states this "It is not clear if these bags were the type already banned." And "Other beach clean-up groups have reported a decrease in bags since the shopping bag ban in July 2021." o The audit found 118 supermarket type bags out of 56 322 items collected - 0.21% of the items. This was 424g, or 0.14% of total weight and 0.79% of plastic weight. These numbers are completely irrelevant to the overall scale of the problem. - Palmy's Plastic Pollution Challenge, reference 65, is from 2019, also before the plastic shopping bag ban. We spoke with both Seacleaners and Sustainable Coastline groups and both confirmed that plastic bags in the environment have reduced considerably since the retail bag ban. Neither separate out and document traditional plastic from compostable plastic items. International examples - There is not a single international example of a country banning plastic produce bags. - In all of the international examples of bans and taxes etc listed in Appendix 1, they all exempt compostable plastic produce bags and do not support a ban or phase-out of compostable plastic produce bags. The examples mentioned in this MFE report deliberately omit references to regular plastic and compostable plastic single-use bags being treated differently in the examples. Potential Exemptions - Compostable produce bags should be exempt and separate to regular plastic produce bags. Alternatives - 'No bag' is not an option for some produce. For example small or soft fruits (eg grapes), ripe fruit (eg tomatoes), and some vegetables. Retailers must make a bag available for customers, whether it is a free of charge single-use bag, or a reusable bags available for purchase. - Reusable produce bags were not allowed during NZ's Covid Alert Level 4. - Placing fruit directly in a trolley, or onto checkout counters, under a no bag scenario would be impractical and unhealthy - especially giving the Covid world we now live in. - Paper shopping bags are regulated even less than compostable plastic bags and have significant downsides. o Already there are paper-based bags in the NZ market with plastic linings to improve wet strength. These are classed as 'multiple composites' but are completely unregulated and confusing to the general public. For example, paper bags may be: recyclable but not compostable compostable but not recyclable (compostable plastic lining so must be composted as the film contaminates traditional paper recycling) neither recyclable nor compostable (regular plastic lining or paraffin wax lining so it contaminates both compost and paper recycling streams - can only go to landfill). o Paper bags are more energy-intensive than compostable plastic bags, thus contributing more to climate change. - "Prices generally reflect how long the bags are likely to last" is incorrect for compostable plastic produce bags - lower prices are negatively correlated with how long they last eg cheaper, unregulated bags may not meet home compostable standards and take longer to compost.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The proposed definitions in Table 7 do not make sense for compostable plastic produce bags. All plastic produce bags, including compostable bags, are being proposed for phase-out. This report makes no distinction between home and commercially compostable plastics. See response to Question 16 for why this is an issue. In addition, the report on p49 states "Until genuine marine degradable and home compostable alternatives are available, we propose that any phase-out includes items made of plastic that is 'degradable', including 'biodegradable', 'compostable' and 'oxo-degradable' unless otherwise stipulated.. 56" This statement is incorrect. Reference 56 states "'Compostable' items generally require an industrial compost where the temperature is tightly controlled to ensure degradation. Home compost does not allow for this level of control." This statement is incorrect. - A genuine home compostable plastic produce bag does exist. - Marine degradable certification 'is not' allowed for items to be used on land, but only for those to be used in a marine environment. This is to discourage behaviour of people littering - to discourage the attitude of "it doesn't matter if I litter as it will degrade in the ocean" o https://www.tuv-at.be/fileadmin/user_upload/docs/download-documents/english/Doc_35e-a_-_OK_biodegradable_M_-_explanation_of_logo.pdf - Reference 56 is stating industrial compost certified items do not compost in home compost environments - this is correct, but irrelevant to all home compostable plastic produce bags. o All known certified compostable plastic produce bags in NZ are home compostable and do not require an industrial compost facility. o Items made from thicker compostable plastic (cutlery, tableware etc) generally require industrial composting.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The correct costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items have not been identified because compostable plastics have been ignored - this applies to produce bags only. - Compostable produce bags are environmentally beneficial compared with regular plastic produce bags. o Compostable produce bags will degrade in the marine environment, resulting in cleaner oceans and waterways compared with regular plastic produce bags. - This report does not provide a level-playing field for businesses supplying compostable plastic produce bags. See answer to Q16 for a breakdown of the errors in Appendix 2 for compostable plastic produce bags. Table 8 is relevant for all single-use plastic items excluding compostable plastic produce bags. Environment - Composting of compostable plastic produce bags is another positive behaviour in waste minimisation and reuse. Importers and suppliers of single-use items - The figure of \$1.9 billion is given as an example of businesses that will be affected, yet it combines regular and compostable plastics. Compostable plastics are a part of the solution and the figure should be broken down to reflect this. Importers and suppliers of alternatives - Compostable plastics should be included here. Public - Compostable produce bags break down over time in the terrestrial and marine environments, thus having a positive impact compared with regular produce bags. Government - A major issue with compostable plastics in NZ is the lack of regulatory oversight on compostable claims, we welcome further development in this area.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 283

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

24 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 284

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes I agree. We need to be moving away from a single use economy and moving towards a circular economy. Recycling should not be the first answer. I also think the government needs to go a lot further in its proposal. It needs to ban plastic products that damage the environment during their use or find a way so they dont damage the environment when used. For example fishing nets. It is devastating seeing sea animals being killed a slow painful death when they get entangled in discarded fishing nets or ropes. The careless actions of fishermen and their products that will take hundreds of years to break down in the oceans. Another example is the plastic mesh used for fencing and to make surfaces non slip on wooden walkways and bridges (used widely by DOC and Local Councils) and the plastic ties use to attach these mesh fences together. Overtime these all break apart and small pieces fall off. For example you see it all the time on walkways where the plastic mesh is breaking down. The gardening industry is another area of huge concern. Plastic "weedmats" laid in the ground. Plastic tree protectors, plastic pots to buy your plants that cant even be recycled or returned to the place of purchase for re-use. The list goes on. If products are to be recycled there has to be a market for that recycled product. Recognise that plastic use is directly related to climate change. However we can not move from single use plastic to single use something else. It must be a circular economy. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku. We urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material types used, and to propose more concrete policy & regulatory actions it will take to create a culture of reuse. I also agree with the Greenpeace and Zero Waste Network submissions.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

A great starting point. The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things and replacing them with some other single use item is only part of the picture. The Government needs to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials. We need a circular economy not a linear one and I dont think this proposal addresses the move to a circular economy. Producers of the plastic MUST be responsible for the end product. Producers must be held accountable for their production. For example how do millions of nurdles get into our harbour? From unregulated industries spilling and not cleaning up and letting the spills run off into the waterways.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers key actions we'd expect to see. Two concerns: There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time, e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. We need more education and easy to use systems. The list is missing some key policy options that could really help grow reuse - deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices. There are no target dates for reuse schemes. Harsher more enforceable laws to prevent plastic pollution.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

Have not fully understood. Is there any policy on regulating the use of plastic in industry? Use of plastic in building and construction? Use of plastic in the transport sector - especially the use of plastic wrap around pallets - surely there must be an alternative to this? Use of plastic in the garden sector. Use of plastic in the agricultural sector. All these sectors need to be responsible for the plastic they use and find non plastic reusable alternatives. Harsher more enforceable laws to prevent plastic pollution.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Support a mandatory phase out of plastics, but this needs to be managed so that the phased out plastics are not simply replaced by other plastics. A circular economy must be encouraged. If the move is to recyclable products how do you ensure the products are actually recycled? The alternatives must be reusable. Support the reduction in the use of plastic packaging. So many products are so overly packaged at the moment. Many items don't even need to be in individual plastic packages. Especially for example in hardware stores or toys etc etc. Support Reuse alternatives and increased recycle content in products

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Agree with phase out of PVC and polystyrene but it must be much faster. Why the delay? There are alternatives there now. PVC trays by June 21 and others as soon after as possible. Plastic production = fossil fuel extraction = increased CO2 emissions and rising global temperatures Plastics must be removed from our economy

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Many items not included. What about plastic bottles and lids? These are one of the biggest litter problems I see around on the streets and at the beach. Why is only food packaging being targeted? There is so much more packaging. What about Tetra Packs? What about lollipop sticks? Why are produce bags with handles excluded from the ban? Why are not all plastic produce bags banned? All EPS should be banned within the next year. I bought a sewing machine for my daughter this week and was disgusted to find it was boxed in EPS when we got it home. What do I do with the EPS now? There is nowhere to take it even.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Much earlier than 2025 is necessary. The longer we wait the more contaminated our oceans become. Costs could possibly be an increase in packaging costs for the producer/supplier but this would be minimal per item so the producer should just absorb the cost as the cost of not doing anything is much higher to the community. Benefits - If plastic is going to have to be used in some situations it must be of high quality and easily recycled or reused. EPS is hideous in our environment the way it so easily breaks down into tiny balls which are impossible to recover and end up being eaten by marine and bird life and contaminating the environment.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Support refilling, reusing, or high recycled content. Support a fully functioning circular economy. Would like to see additional regulations and policy to support the scale and uptake of reusable alternatives, mandatory recycled content and sustainable product design where designing out waste is top priority. Sustainable product design would consider the end-of-life options for a material, preventing any unintended consequences from the targeted phase-out. For example, banning EPS appliance packaging is likely to boost use of moulded cardboard packaging. Research should be done to identify the best practice end-of-life solution for moulded cardboard packaging (i.e. recycling or composting). The research should be widely disseminated to packaging suppliers and product designers so that appropriate choices of glue, coatings and/or colourings are made to align with the end-of-life solution. Clear labelling is also essential so that customers know what they should do with the packaging after use. Durable, reusable appliance packaging should also be explored.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Should be much sooner. These plastics are a menace. I found one in my car glove box the other day. A thousand micro size pieces of plastic scattered everywhere :(Imagine if that was out in the environment. These are labelled so badly as well eg Beco Dog Poo bags. You think you are buying ones that decompose but they are actually still made of petroleum products that just break down into micro plastics. Oxo degradable plastics gone forever ASAP please.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

They need to be accessible locally in all shops. Universal, Affordable, Accessable. eg beverage container return schemes. An entrenched circular economy mindset instead of the current linear one.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I totally agree with the list of items to be phased out BUT there is such a long list of other single use / not fit for purpose plastic items that could also be phased out. BAN SINGLE USE PLASTIC DRINK BOTTLES AND CAPS I do not support exempting coffee cups and lids, or any other single use cup and lid The list should be extended to so many products but some to include are: - Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles including fizzy drink bottles and lids ● Balloons and balloon sticks (no replacement needed - these are not a necessity to life!!) ● Glitter and plastic confetti (no replacement needed - these are not a necessity to life!!) ● Complementary plastic toys Also single serve plastic food packets such as single serve chippie packets, lollies and muesli bars,- these are a constant item in street rubbish clean ups. I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets. Why is this list limited to mainly food packaging? It should include: 1) The many products in the building industry - eg pellet wrap, goods wrapped in plastic and left on building sites, building wrap (why has this suddenly emerged in the last few years?), plastic mesh temporary fencing (which breaks down easily in the sun) 2) Gardening industry - plant pots, weedmats, tree protectors (when planting) plastic temporary fencing, small plastic bags of compost, topsoil, fertiliser etc 3) Transport sector - plastic wrap around pallets 4) Chewing Gum containing plastic - so wrong on so many levels 5) Cigarette Butts 6) Plastic fishing nets and ropes that causes horrific harm on marine life when abandoned in the ocean.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Circular Economy Reuse systems. Sit down at the place of purchase to drink your coffee. What is with this walk away coffee culture anyway? So many new alternatives out there such as Again Again As long as wet wipes causes blockages in the sewage system they should be banned immediately. Why impose this unnecessary extra cost on the rate payer who many dont even use these? (the producer should be bearing this cost)

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

As per the Zero Waste Network recommendations

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Somewhere for the public/community to report breaches (and these be acted upon) Appointment of enforcement officers There must be weight to the enforcement not like the Litter Act at the moment that never seems to get used.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 285

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The description of the problems caused by the targeted plastics was thorough and identified the issues with these materials. We agree with the proposal to ban these problematic materials. However we feel the ban on single use items can be broadened to include all single use items regardless of their material composition. The problem at large isn't only what the material in questions is but rather how it is being applied. The extraction and production processes involved in creating any single use item puts a huge strain on natural resources and disposal systems and hence we need to be looking to a circular economy and reuse approach.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The objective of eliminating problematic materials is a key starting point in moving towards a circular economy. However, in order for this to work in reality the same weight needs to be placed on eliminating single use items. The government will need to work alongside the community and advocacy groups such as takeaway throwaways to co-design reuse systems that are accessible and able to be scaled up.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

we would also like to see a blended approach whereby more than one strategy is at play. We believe this would mitigate any unintended negative consequences of simply placing bans on certain materials or items (such as disposable single use items made from alternative materials)

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the most weighting should be given to the options which are highest up the waste hierarchy such as encouraging reduction and reuse systems.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Mandatory phase outs are a simple efficient way of eliminating harmful plastics and we support the ban of all items listed except for plastic straws. Our view that plastic straws should be exempt is based on thorough consultation by the Takeaway

Throwaways campaign with the disabled community. For some disabled people plastic straws are necessary and a ban could cause unintended negative consequences and discrimination. As mentioned in question 3 we believe a ban only approach could simply result in the swapping of one material for another without addressing the underlying problem which is our reliance on single-use items. Therefore, alongside the ban we would like to see the government co-design and implement reuse systems and regulate packaging so that a higher percentage is made from recycled content and that if it is plastic it is clearly labelled.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Absolutely we agree with the proposed phase out of PVC and Polystyrene packaging for the reasons presented in the consultation document. The two stage process does make sense however we believe the timeframes are too slow. We are in the midst of a climate crisis and we must treat these issues with more urgency. We Propose that PVC trays be phased out by June 2021 as they are especially problematic and contaminate PET recycling. All other PVC items could be phased out by June 2022 and stage 2 by June 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

A great comprehensive list. I would like to see PVC based pallet shrink wrap be added to that list but understand that this would take time, investment and significant collaboration across industries.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, both PVC and PS are used in non-food and beverage consumer packaging and hence they pose just as much risk of contaminating the recycling streams of easy to recycle plastics regardless of their original application. Furthermore, PVC shrink wrap should be phased out. This is incredibly prevalent throughout every step of the materials economy and is widely used across many sectors including distribution of food and non-food consumer goods both on and offshore. We must include this non-recyclable material in the proposed ban. This would be a significant undertaking and the government would need to work alongside industry to scale up reusable pallet wraps systems for on-shore warehouse-warehouse and warehouse- retail distribution. We understand that the Government believes that some applications of PVC and Polystyrene such as in the building sector are outside the scope of this proposal. However, we believe that PVC and Polystyrene should be banned across all industries when its application is simply single use packaging; this would encapsulate the on-shore use of things like pallet shrink wrap.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is not recyclable and hence banning this item would result in less recycling stream contamination. This benefits the environment as PVC is a contaminant and a material which in many of its applications is designed to be thrown away almost instantly. In the case of PVC products such as shrink wrap a ban would benefit both distributors and retailers in the form of cost savings associated with not sending this material to landfill. Due to their lightweight and inherently crumbly nature PS and EPS are particularly prone to becoming litter in the environment whereby it rapidly breaks down into tiny particles and is carried by the wind, making it impossible to recover. Such particles cause damage by infiltrating soil and waterways and in doing so pose a significant risk to wildlife and human health.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, we agree with the practical alternatives set out in table 5. However, particularly where it is easiest to implement such as in the food service industry we believe there needs to be a greater emphasis placed on reuse systems.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. These substances are incredibly harmful to both human health and the environment. What's more the green-washing associated with these products threatens to undermine the public education that is required to make reuse and recycling models more efficient and free of contaminants

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The phase out for targeted plastics will have additional benefits for: Water, air and soil quality, the very ecosystems that are the foundations for good human and wildlife health and wellbeing.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit missing from the discussion is the opportunity for business and new enterprises to establish reuse systems to replace the targeted plastics and other single use items. Reuse systems create localised provincial jobs and especially in areas that have been severely affected by covid-19 , this type of innovative job creation that benefits both people and environment is critical.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

As an individual and as a business owner I would like to see more transparency and public education about what can and can't be recycled. There is very little accessible public information about what types of plastics can be recycled and where they are recycled. I think differentiating between recycling that happens onshore and that which happens offshore is a critical part of the puzzle that will allow consumers to make more informed choices about how much plastic product they consume. We own a zero-waste store that sells food, skincare and cleaning products without packaging. Customers bring their own containers to refill these products. Whilst there is an increasing demand for stores like ours by no means is it mainstream and we occupy a very small market share. One of the things that is potentially damaging to us is a lack of understanding by the general public of what can and can't be recycled. Our societies' reliance on single use items and the recycling system has created a false sense of security that results in many consumers believing that pretty much anything can go in the recycling and that it will actually be made into useful stuff. Therefore, without widespread education about the negative impacts of targeted and single use products there is no incentive for consumers to change their purchasing habits. I also wonder how the government plans to regulate imported products. For instance, our store buys food in bulk packaging, much of this comes from overseas in large plastic bags. None of the plastic that comes to us is labelled and we are left to guess what number plastic it is based on it's physical attributes and this obviously has a high rate of error and subsequent contamination. We believe it is simply unacceptable for manufacturers to send plastic packaging out into the world with no description of what type of plastic it is. Whilst the Government will not be able to regulate the product stewardship of imported items at source I believe we need to develop a way of regulating and labelling these items as they come on shore, just as manufacturers are required to list their food ingredients they must also be required to state their packaging materials so that this information can be disseminated down the supply chain. To some extent stores like ours could then preferentially choose products or suppliers who use easy to recycle plastic packaging and avoid those who don't.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision

is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: • ● Single-use coffee cups & lids • ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We also support extending the list to include these other single-use plastic items: *coffee cups lollypopsticks and wrappers single serve sachets, pottles and containers used for condiments and toiletries coffee pods containing plastic tea bags conatining plastic glitter and plastic confetti, streamers and party poppers complementary plastic toys and giveaways associated with magazines or fast food . magazines made from gloss paper which cannot be recyled individual plastic wraps for greeting cards balloons and balloon sticks chewing gum containing plastics Beyond the single-use items proposed in the document, we would support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes, and other disposable sanitary products, and to reduce the harm from industrial and commercial use of plastics like fishing nets, plastic wrap and strapping used in freight, and plastic building wrap used in construction. We also urge the Government to implement a regulatory plan to address cigarette butts. According to the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, cigarette butts account for 78% of all items littered in New Zealand and are the most commonly found item in beach litter clean ups. Globally, cigarette butts are thought to be the most littered item on Earth.⁸ The consultation document mentions cigarette butts in passing (p.50) but offers no plan because there may not be plastic-free alternatives. However, measures other than a phase-out could be implemented under s 23 of the WMA, such as mandatory on-packet labelling to increase smokers' awareness that butts contain plastic and appropriate means of disposal, or fees on filters put on the market to cover estimated clean-up costs.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Yes with changes We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Other (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: • - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities • - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. • - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 286

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I think hard-to-recycle plastic packaging should also reference plastics that are hard to recycle, or create recycling problems, not just on their chemical composition. I think plastics that perhaps are easy to recycle but are often contained or more likely put in the trash bin for convenience, should also be included as problems that need to be addressed.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I certainly agree with the current objectives. However, there need to be more emphasis and an additional objective to support developing regulations, policy and investment in reusable alternatives and systems. I would seek to amend the main objective as follows: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, and increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, of safe recycled content in packaging and of the systems that support the increased recyclability of each product" An additional secondary objective should also be added: "make affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while assisting communities to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

These are the correct option to consider, but another I would also support is the use of additional regulations such as mandatory minimum levels of recycled content to ensure that we do in fact recycle all the 'easier-to-recycle' plastics still permitted after the proposed bans.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). However, a 'ban only' approach also doesn't fix the problem of our reliance on virgin plastic resin. Even if we shift to only using 'easier to recycle' plastics, this doesn't ensure that those products are actually recycled or recycled back into the same kind of product. I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled

content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The proposed time-frames are too slow. I support PVC trays being phased out by June 2021, all other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022, and Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. Phasing out EPS would help to protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways. Replacing hard polystyrene packaging with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree with the list of examples of practical alternatives set out in Table 5. I would like to see additional regulations and policy to support the scale and uptake of reusable alternatives, mandatory recycled content and sustainable product design where designing out waste is top priority.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I would prefer to see a quicker ban (by June 2021) due to the harm created by these plastics and the green-washing involved.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There are additional benefits for: - Fresh water quality - As microplastic contamination of drinking water is already occurring - Climate - Reducing single-use plastics will reduce our reliance on virgin plastic resin, and therefore on fossil fuels - Future generations -Reducing targeted plastics helps to reduce degradation of ecosystems essential to the wellbeing of future generations and non-human species.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

It is likely that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater benefits than those discussed here. This includes the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. This would have a positive job creation impact, as well as reducing waste.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Standardised collection of materials and investment in recycling education and community engagement would help more people to use the recycling system correctly, reducing contamination.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, (including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastic counterparts), except for plastic straws. Consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. Extend the list to include these other single-use plastic items: - Disposable coffee cups & lids - Plastic lollipop sticks and wrappers - Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries - Coffee pods containing plastic - Teabags containing plastic - Single-use plastic water bottles - Balloons and balloon sticks - Glitter and plastic confetti - Complementary plastic toys (e.g. at fast food restaurants) - Chewing gum containing plastic

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics in the proposed phase-out.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Other (please specify)

Notes

- 12 months for everything except single-use cups - 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups: Coffee cups are non-recyclable due to the waterproof liners and coffee residue, and they are a common contaminant in the cardboard recycling stream. Compostable cups rarely make it to a commercial composting facility where they will safely break down. Coffee cups are also light and prone to escaping into the environment. The fully detachable lids increase the potential for harmful plastic litter. Many businesses already accept BYO reusables, and most have in-house ceramic options if people forget their cup. Policy option we could use include: - Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings, museums and art galleries) - Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups - Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow universal design principles and are accessible for everyone in the community. - Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. - Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. - Inclusion of disposable coffee cups in the proposed mandatory phase-out list because this will stimulate solutions. Investing in expensive systems to downcycle or compost cups is not the best use of public funds. It would be more efficient to invest this money in stimulating the scale and uptake of a reusables network. Wet wipes: I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups: With formal Government support for reuse systems and community engagement, individual towns could meet the target of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Aotearoa as a whole should work towards being SUC free by 2023. Wet wipes: Transition to wet wipes not containing plastic by January 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The community will assist in monitoring if they are able to report breaches of the mandatory phase-out to MfE, similar to the plastic bag ban. I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy, along with the appointment of enforcement officers.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 288

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I would like to see New Zealand keeping up with best practice and even becoming world leading in dealing with hard to recycle plastic packaging and single use plastic items. This policy should be supported with a regulatory roadmap to target the reliance we have on such items.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

These options could help to ensure a long term move away from our reliance on single use plastic

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. I would like to see PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

I think the benefits outweigh the costs. PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker the better. We can see examples of how quickly people have adapted to the ban of single use plastic bags.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable

packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single use plastic items I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 289

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I'm delighted to see a broad range of problematic, difficult-to-recycle plastics included in the proposed ban, and the consultation document is well researched and written. However, I'd love to see a strong move away from recycling and towards re-use as much as possible, as any single-use material takes a toll on the environment.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support the objectives outlined. However, as mentioned above, I think the Government could go further by supporting reusable systems and increasing access to them.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support a 'blended' option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time. For example, banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling and product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. The list is also missing some key policy options that could help grow reuse. For example, deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). However, I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products. This blended approach would result in less waste, a lasting shift in social norms and behaviour change, and stronger markets for recycled resin.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by

2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes: the two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. However the proposed time-frames are too slow. I support the idea of PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 (as they are especially problematic for the recycling industry, being the main contaminants of onshore clear PET recycling); all other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022. I would also support moving to Stage 2 earlier, by June 2023. Despite plastic now being such a terrible problem in our environment, the global plastic industry is set to increase their production. In extracting fossil fuels to produce these products, plastics are contributing to CO2 emissions and thus climate change. We have wasted too much time already - it's time to act decisively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS is incredibly problematic for our environment, as it breaks into tiny balls of plastic. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The best alternatives are reusable, refillable and accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Government wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use and reuse. For example... • Invest in reuse systems • Levy single-use items • Implement Deposit Return Systems on all food & beverage packaging • Mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts • Introduce mandatory reuse quotas/targets • Implement mandatory recycled content regulations

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please

provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items is an extra benefit. Reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems not only reduce waste, they also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. More reuse schemes and more reusable packaging will also mean less throwaway packaging overall (not just targeted plastics). This means even more cost savings for local government and ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Accessibility and making it mainstream. Accessibility means that it needs to be affordable, easy and convenient for people to embrace higher value materials and reusable or refillable alternatives. For example, if I forget my jars or containers at a particular zero waste store, they have plenty of clean, sterilised jars available. The Government needs to focus its powers on regulation, policy and investment in this area.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastic counterparts. However, I strongly support including disposable coffee cups and lids in the ban. New Zealanders use 295 million coffee cups a year, virtually all of which are landfilled. Many alternatives already exist: reuse systems and BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce and remove disposable cups. A ban on single-use cups combined with Government support for reuse schemes can provide security for takeaway only venues. I also do not support banning plastic straws, as I believe this would be discriminatory for disabled people.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Yes, for the most part. However, I am concerned about the lack of consultation with the disabled community. I also believe that coffee cups and lids should not be exempted from the ban.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

I'd like to see these items phased out as soon as possible, with the exception of plastic straws.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

They just need to be banned. There are alternatives already that will be taken up with enthusiasm once a ban is in place. We have become far too accustomed to convenience and these two products are simply not needed. I have personally not used a disposable coffee cup for several years: I have either taken my keep cup, had a coffee on-site, or decided not to have one. There are AgainAgain cups available at some cafes for people who forget, or simply cups collected from Op Shops. Wet wipes are hugely problematic as so many people flush them down the toilet and they are expensive to clean up. When I had babies several years ago, I carried reusable cloths with me and used the water in bathrooms.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

I think these two products should be included in the original list, and should be phased out as soon as possible (by 2022).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, absolutely. However, I am concerned about the fact that some individuals (particularly disabled people) need a straw to drink beverages, and I wouldn't want to see them be stigmatised for this. I also think there are positive opportunities for businesses and organisations to capitalise on reusable products and schemes.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support the idea of appointing enforcement officers to make sure that the regulations are adhered to, as it is a wide-ranging list of products that will be potentially phased out, particularly at first while people get their head around the idea. I don't think voluntary compliance works.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 290

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I am fully supportive of the proposed policy frameworks, standards and regulatory mechanisms, as well as timeframes and strategies for action, with the objective being a full polystyrene phase out.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The period for phasing out plastics will give importers sufficient time to work with their suppliers to source alternative environmentally sustainable packaging alternatives.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Whilst use of EPS in food and beverage is completely unsustainable, packaging generates significant EPS volumes so needs to be phased out too.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

This proposal would significantly reduce the overall volumes of EPS and hard plastics in our environment. Presently with no waste streams and effective ways for managing and containing EPS packaging the lightweight material is easily picked up by winds and is scattered from construction sites and commercial waste skips, into adjacent fields, residential areas, overland waterways and marine environments. It photodegrades into microscopic, carcinogenic particles that are eventually ingested, inhaled or absorbed by both flora and fauna, with a cumulative, bio-persistent effect throughout the food chain.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Viable alternatives for packaging personal electronics and whiteware exist now including dry press biodegradable (molded pulp) paper and sugarcane packaging materials.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Between now and the phase-out end date, requiring manufacturers, importers and retailers to operate a EPS take back scheme.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Require single-use plastic lined coffee cups to include obvious labelling indicating that they are non-recyclable and encourage cafes to discount takeaway coffee for customers who provide/present keep-cups.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

The phase out period would ideally be the same as for EPS packaging, or if this is not possible, within 2 years of the EPS packaging phase out period end date.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 291

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposal should be supported by reducing single-use products in general, and reducing virgin plastic use.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy works towards the transition to a circular economy. I agree with Zero Waste Network's suggestion that the main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." And that an additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I believe this it is important to move away from these specified plastic products, but that it is also important to move away from single use products overall, and replace them with sustainable, reusable products. As a cleaner, I have seen a huge amount of single use waste being thrown away (in many materials). It should be made easier for the consumer/worker, and be regulated at government and manufacturing level. The consumer needs to be provided with products that are more sustainable and reusable. And the process of both manufacturing and recycling needs to be more transparent.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed, with the addition of single use coffee cups, which are a huge issue

(including commercially compostable cups). However, I would like to see the bans supported by reuse alternatives and infrastructure, and increased recycled content in products (as a legal requirement).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages, however the proposed time-frames are too slow. I support the Zero Waste Network's suggestion of: -PVC trays being phased out by June 2021; -All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022; -Stage 2 by June 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils. It will therefore be better to phase it out sooner, as specified above.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so I would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The assessment should not separate the environment out as an "affected party", distinct from human society and our economy. The assessment should instead more holistic, recognising that the environment is intrinsically linked with our society and economy.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting single-use coffee cups & lids, or single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 from the phase-out. I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks; ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries; ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic; ● Single-use plastic water bottles; ● Balloons and balloon sticks; ● Glitter and plastic confetti; ● Complementary plastic toys. As a cleaner, I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. I agree with Zero Waste Networks suggestion to alter the proposed definition single-use plastic tableware to include paper bowls/containers with plastic or wax linings, and that the definition of single-use plastic produce bags be broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups. 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

These are both important issues. COFFEE CUPS: I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities; - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings; - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change. WET WIPES: I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable. Alongside side this, and in the meantime, I support: - investment in community engagement around reusable

alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems); - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

As soon as possible: I consider that with formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, some towns could become single-use cup free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a single-use cup free NZ by 2023. I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree MfE has identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy for the phase-out proposals. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 292

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Yes I do agree, but I do not consent to my submission being published as I am sharing some sensitive information around additives in materials, while these are not strictly confidential - this is still extremely sensitive and care needs to be taken. If it is required to be released under the Official Information Act, please exclude any reference to micro/nanoplastics, or PFAS chemicals or other chemicals in compostable materials.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Driving a culture of reuse should be one of the objectives

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I think you're missing a "risk" criteria. For example the different materials have different risks associated with their recycling. Discharge of chemicals in fibre for example - do you want those chemicals in the soil through composting, in the discharge water through recycling process or some other way - if companies move to this packaging type because their packaging type is banned. I feel this is missing from the criteria, - may require enhanced lifecycle analysis, but would also require you to know what is in these materials other than just the resin code.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I do not believe we know enough about what is in packaging yet to know the risks of banning some materials to move to other "perceived" safer/more environmentally sound alternatives. But we need to ban oxos and some of the items certainly - but I'm not sure if banning whole material types is the best solution for all of the hard to recycle (and compost) items.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by

2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Agree with banning all PVC and PS food and beverage packaging and all OXOs as long as we do not end up with a huge fibre issue. We must ensure we deal with PFAS and other additive issues in fibre at the same time - or we will end up with the cheapest alternative (fibre and PFAS), as organisations try and get fibre to perform like polymer. Worried that banning all EPS packaging without having valid alternatives in place will contribute to the global and growing fibre issues.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Polystyrene nuts for packing, polystyrene beads I believe the construction industry also needs regulation about processing polystyrene outside and discharging directly to the environment (e.g. polyblocks which are shaved in situ!)

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

as per my earlier comment we need to ensure no unintended consequences into the fibre industry before the risks are mitigated or new solutions are innovated. A stocktake should be undertaken as to how prevalent these problematic packaging types are in the different sectors and what alternatives there are that are viable and safe for substitute.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Does that give enough time to innovate the solutions required? A full cost-benefit analysis needs to be undertaken for each packaging type and the application, to look at the viable solutions. Maybe reuse is a better solution, and if govt. were to prioritise reuse we would likely see more movement in that space.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Not all applications have solutions. Moulded fibre has its own issues around barrier additives. We need to invest in high quality reuse systems in the applications where it is economically viable and there are no other solutions in place.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Earlier if possible. If we can do a plastic bag ban in one year why can't we do an oxo ban by 2022.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think you're missing a section with the impact on the processors of the alternatives to the phase-out items. For example you'll

see a surge in cheap fibre, with toxic chemicals if a barrier property is required, and that will impact on the processors (recyclers or composters) and the environment through soil or discharge water.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There are costs I do not believe are fully known yet. No packaging is perfect and there are currently not solutions in place for a reason. It seems that fibre is seen as a solution (assumed compostable) and compostable packaging is also a solution, but we do not really know how this would impact our processors, or what are in these products.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More reuse systems in the FMCG marketplace! Back the reuse organisations that are out there. A guide on what packaging to use for brands is fine, as long as it is independent. We can't get to the end of the phase outs and then start working on reusable - those solutions (which are the only "best" solutions) need to start being worked on now. - Beyond the Bin is working with a number of key stakeholders on how we can assist in the reuse space.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I don't know why single use cups #5 are proposed exempt. Even if the market is almost viable, #1 cups are a better option and are widely available for food and beverage. Additionally, several reuse companies offer schemes for events for cups. Coffee cups (both PE and PLA lined) should be included in the ban. They are as common as shopping bags and the consumer will adjust happily in time. Plus, there are many share schemes coming up to scale. We once survived fine without coffee cups for takeaway. Please ensure the "plastic-free" cups and sugar-cane moulded cups are included as they have either micro/nanoplastic dispersion coating or PFAS chemicals to provide barrier properties. Fibre can NOT perform like plastic without help. In saying that, PLA lined fibre (such as a coffee cup) is most certainly the least of the evils, and can be used in many other applications. A PLA-lined noodle bowl and a PLA-lined coffee cup are essentially the same, so we need to be clear on why we are removing part of the line of packaging. Straws are an issue, those paper and fibre straws are made with additives to provide the barrier properties - (such as PFAS), we need to ensure we are not making more of an issue with our alternatives. We do not want PFAS in composting... - reusable is feasible, just like coffee cups Glitter should be phased out - directly contributing to microplastic pollution through waste water treatment Balloons should be phased out, high litter effect, difficult to collect, high risk to wildlife

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

As above I do not believe you should exclude #5 cups or coffee cups - there are great alternatives with better markets

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

compostable stickers, straws, cotton buds etc. 12 months rest: 18 months

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee-cups: nothing is perfect, but Again Again is a good start. Steel won't shed microplastic through its wash-cycles like the other plastic types might over time. Scale up those solutions, educate the consumers etc. Compostable coffee cups may have multiple end of life opportunities which can be explored however reusable is best. Wet wipes should be banned and the consumer educated about reuse systems, e.g. a flannel. Compostability should not be touted as a solution for wet wipes as it is a different waste type (different consent required) and risk of fecal contamination in home or commercial compost is too great.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2023, reuse systems could scale up in two years with targeted investment

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Through a government department specifically targeted to undertake compliance.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 293

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

A broader framing of the problem would allow for wider issues to be considered and tackled, which will likely require more than a simple ban. The present proposal should be part of comprehensive Government policy targeting reliance on both single-use products in general and on virgin plastic resin. This would include specific regulation and investment to disincentivise single-use and create a reuse culture, and to increase the use of locally-sourced recycled resin through appropriate collection methodologies, mandatory minimum recycled content legislation and a cap and levy on virgin plastic.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objective of reducing the amount of hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics in use through eliminating certain problematic items and materials is not only a correct objective, it's a necessary condition for a circular economy. However facilitating reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics and plastic pollution, and to avoid or mitigate perverse outcomes of the proposed ban. We believe the main objective should be amended as follows: reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, and increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, of safe recycled content in packaging and of the systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. An additional secondary objective should also be added: make affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while assisting communities to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Grey Lynn 2030 Waste Away believes both of these options can be blended together to support a longer lasting and more effective move away from reliance on ALL single-use items.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic directions to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy, e.g. reduction and reuse solutions. We would also support criteria that assesses how well an option protects against unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulation and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The stages are fine, however the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021. All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We appreciate this proposal for a phase-out and would like to thank you for the comprehensive list.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, we believe a more consistent approach will work best. PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We fully support the vision on P40 of "more reusable or refilling alternatives to single-use plastics. There is an opportunity for New Zealand to rethink the use of some plastic packaging altogether, and to design innovative reuse models." We also support the statement that "packaging with recycled content is preferable to new plastic (where feasible)". We agree with the list of examples of practical alternatives set out in Table 5.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There is nothing good about oxo-degradable plastics, and we wholeheartedly support a ban and thank the Government for acting on them. However, the quicker we get rid of these, the better. So we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021, which brings us in line with overseas jurisdictions, such as the EU, that will phase-out oxo-degradable plastics by 2021.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical

alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, though the current cost/ benefit approach perceives the ‘environment’ as an “affected party” separate to, and distinct from, our own human survival. Current and future generations - and indeed the economy - can only thrive within the planet’s limits to stay in balance. Taking action on plastics is an essential step towards preserving the functional ecosystems required to sustain life.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An added benefit is the opportunity for businesses /organisations and community enterprises to develop reuse strategies and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to have knock-on effects towards a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed. Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. A coordinated universal design approach is needed to ensure reusable alternatives are accessible for everyone in our community (taking into account potential barriers, such as cost or disability).

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, with the exception of plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. Some people with accessibility needs require a plastic straw to drink. While some reusable alternatives work well for some people, for others there may be no reusable alternative that is suitable. (We believe that consultation with the disability community regarding a possible straw ban and/or exemption should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws.) We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags. ● Single-use plastic cups and lids: We do not support exempting single-use plastic cups made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 from a ban. Although these cups are technically recyclable, they are mostly used away from home, and are likely to enter the recycling system unwashed via public recycling bins. ● Single-use coffee cups: We would support disposable coffee cups being included in the proposed phase-out (as discussed in our answer to Q19).

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups. 2 years for single-use cups to allow for time to implement reuse infrastructure, as well as collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable coffee cup alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses/communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternatives to replace items being phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 294

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Overall, the consultation document gives a good & thorough description of the problems that the targeted plastics pose to resource recovery systems, and the health & wellbeing of the environment, wildlife & people. We appreciate the work that has gone into justifying the need for these proposals. We would welcome more in-depth consideration of the problems associated with single-use systems (as opposed to single-use plastic items) and then seeing this linked to the proposed policies. From the perspective of zero waste and circular economy theory. The problem isn't just about plastic as a material, but the resource & energy intensive way that all materials are used & discarded in a linear economy. The part of the consultation document to which this question relates contains a small section on "creating a culture of reuse" (p. 20), but doesn't explain how such a culture is created, nor the Government's role in that and how this might go hand-in-hand with the phaseout of single-use items. The consultation document even refers to the Takeaway Throwaways campaign, yet states they are calling on the Government to ban single-use plastic tableware and omits to mention the campaign's equally important headline ask that the Government advance measures to co-design and mandate accessible reusable alternatives. We at Resilient Dunedin believe the Government's framing of the problem as predominantly about the impact of plastic material, and its downplaying of the 'single-use' part of the equation, has shaped its narrow approach to the policy proposals.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objective of reducing the amount of hard-to-recycle and single use plastics in use through eliminating certain problematic items and materials is not only a correct objective, it's a necessary condition for a circular economy. This objective must be combined with the equally important objective of increasing the uptake and scale of accessible, reusable alternatives and the systems that support them. This additional objective would harness the opportunity presented by banning ubiquitous single-use items to foster movement up the waste hierarchy and prevent uptake of false solutions (i.e. single-use items made of other materials). Facilitating reuse is key to reducing single use plastics and plastic pollution. This is increasingly recognised internationally (including research and commentary on how the EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics can be leveraged to promote reuse, and research and literature by the Ellen MacArthur Foundation).(1) We query why the previous section of the consultation document (on the problem of single-use plastics) promotes the importance of the top layers of the waste hierarchy and of "creating a culture of reuse", yet in the policy objectives these goals are absent. The consultation document also states that the proposal will help NZ achieve its commitments under the New Plastics Economy Global Commitment (to which both MfE and a handful of New Zealand businesses are signatories) (22). The Commitment calls on Government signatories to commit to implementing "ambitious policies" for "encouraging reuse models where relevant, to reduce the need for single-use plastic packaging and/or products"(2) thus we'd expect to see this included in the proposal's main policy objectives.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list is thorough and considers a range of important measures; we take no issue with the measures highlighted and considered. However, the list is missing a blended option(s) - the only options considered are standalone measures. It is unclear why the consultation document has not explored at least one policy option that combines some or all of Options 1-7, in the style of the EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics, or Ireland's recently released National Waste Policy. (3) For more detailed reasoning, please see our response to Q 5. In addition to a blended option, there are further policy intervention options worthy

of consideration that are relevant to creating a culture of reuse. Namely:

- Mandatory reuse targets for certain items (such as serviceware) alongside reduction targets.
- Implementation of deposit return systems and/or a mandatory take-back service for all takeaway serviceware, to level the playing field for reuse systems and reduce the chance of littering for the items and materials not proposed for phaseout.
- Measures to mandate reusables in certain contexts. For example, the Berkeley Ordinance that mandates reusable serviceware for 'dine-in' customers (now being considered by a range of cities across the US).

(4) The Government could also consider the further option of applying fees to cover clean-up costs for items that are not proposed for a ban, but are still problematic, either because they are commonly littered or commonly not disposed of correctly (fees to cover clean-up costs differ from a levy and should be possible under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA).

1. S. Miller, M. Bolger, L. Copello (2019) Reusable solutions: how governments can help stop single use plastic pollution (3Keel, Oxford, United Kingdom: A study by the Rethink Plastic alliance and the Break Free From Plastic movement); A Lendal and S Wingstrand (2019) Reuse: Rethinking Packaging (Ellen Macarthur Foundation and New Plastics Economy); Eilidh Robb and Grainne Murphy (eds) Moving Away from Single-Use: Guide for National Decision Makers to Implement the Single-Use Plastics Directive (Report by Rethink Plastic alliance and Break Free From Plastic, 10 October 2019).

2. The full text is available here: <https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/13319-Global-CommitmentDefinitions.pdf>.

3. Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (2020) A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy: Ireland's National Waste Policy 2020-2025 (Government of Ireland).

4. City of Berkeley (2019) Single Use Foodware and Litter Reduction (Ordinance No 7639-N.S). materials not proposed for phaseout.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria and weightings are appropriate and useful for understanding how the preferred policy option was chosen. We would like to see greater weight attached to how well each option aligns with strategic direction, particularly achieving outcomes higher up the waste hierarchy. Additional criteria should be added to assess how well each option protects against unintended perverse outcomes (i.e. greater use of single-use items of different materials), and whether the option promotes or undermines accessibility. Some criteria are defined too narrowly. "Effectiveness" should consider whether the option will help to increase the uptake & scale of accessible, reusable alternatives & the systems that support them (see our answer to Q2). "Achievability" should consider more than the need for new or amended legislation. Measures that rely on moral suasion or voluntarism are arguably difficult to achieve (or at least achievement is difficult to measure or assess). For example, avoiding perverse outcomes from mandatory phaseouts rests on education and awareness to ensure businesses make informed decisions to reduce the risk of unintended consequences - how achievable is this? Furthermore, the need for new or amended legislation would be of lesser relevance if a blended option were considered. For example, a mandatory phase-out of certain single-use items could still be advanced under existing legislation while proposals progress through Parliament to introduce a levy on single-use coffee cups, or amendments to the WMA to allow for levies or mandatory recycled content.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We fully support a mandatory phaseout of the items listed (except for plastic straws, see our answer to Q16). We agree that mandatory phase-outs will be effective at achieving the main objective, that maintaining the status quo approach is not satisfactory, and that voluntary approaches like plastic pacts aren't enough to achieve the main objective. However, we disagree with the decision to take forward mandatory phase-outs ONLY. As noted in our answer to Q3, we support a blended approach, in the style of the EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics, (5) or the Irish National Waste Policy (see, in particular, the 'Plastic and Packaging Waste' and 'Single Use Plastic' chapters).(6) It is unclear why the consultation document limits each option to standalone measures and presents the policy choices as either/or options. While the document notes that rejected options may appear in a renewed NZWS or Plastics Action Plan (p.35), we believe a more holistic suite of policy interventions could be considered in this proposal (particularly if the Government wants to create a culture of reuse). We are concerned that measures operating in isolation will struggle to move our economy up the waste hierarchy towards reuse and could create perverse outcomes. In removing a whole suite of single-use items, we urge the Government to consider the possible detrimental replacements in a packaging system dominated by linear approaches, and to design policies/regulations that nudge all actors in our economy towards reusables instead. The potential for 'regrettable substitution' could be avoided by complementary regulations that capture single-use items (of any material) beyond the targeted plastics; for example, levies and deposit return systems, fees to cover clean-up costs, or mandatory reusables in certain circumstances. We believe the Government has a critical role in leveling the playing field between single-use and reuse packaging systems, and in ensuring alternative reusable systems and products are accessible and meet the principles of universal design. We note too that some regulatory measures suit certain items more than others. We recognise that bans may be inappropriate for some items, even though they may be problematic. A more flexible, blended option approach would allow for a greater range of single-use and plastic items to be brought within the proposed regulatory regime. For example, cigarette butts, glitter, balloons etc. Instead, the ban-only approach has knock-on effects for items not considered for a phase-out, such as wet wipes and coffee cups. These are now left entirely unregulated, despite acknowledgement that they are problematic and harmful, and that the Government does wish to phase-them out eventually. With the other policy levers taken off the table, what concrete, regulatory actions can the Government now take to mitigate negative impact and stimulate reduced consumption and increased uptake of reusables in the interim? And what is the pathway for achieving an eventual phase-out?

5. EU Directive 2019/904 on the reduction of the impact of certain plastic products on the environment [2019] L 155/1.

6. Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (2020) A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy: Ireland's National Waste Policy 2020-2025

(Government of Ireland).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The staged approach and the categorisation of the products falling into the two stages make sense. However, both could happen on shorter timeframes. The world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years,(7) and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040.(8) We need to act decisively to reverse these trends. We note that EU Member States will ban many of the items and materials targeted by the present proposal by July 2021 (under the Single-Use Plastics Directive9). So, the growth of alternatives will be in full swing internationally, making it easier for countries like New Zealand to follow suit faster. We suggest that Stage 1 products are phased out by June 2021 and Stage 2 products are phased out by June 2023. 7. Laurent Lebreton and Anthony Andrady (2019) "Future scenarios of global plastic waste generation and disposal" Palgrave Communications. 8. The PEW Charitable Trusts and SYSTEMIQ (2020) Breaking the Plastic Wave: A comprehensive assessment of pathways towards stopping ocean plastic pollution. 9. EU Directive 2019/904 on the reduction of the impact of certain plastic products on the environment [2019] L 155/1.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this expansive and ambitious list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, water-ways and marine environment - damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. A small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation. However due to the harmful properties of plastic in the environment, we would support it being replaced as a packaging material. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We believe practical alternatives exist to replace the hard-to-recycle packaging items proposed for phase-out. However, ensuring uptake of the most desirable alternatives (reusable and refillable packaging or highly recyclable packaging with recycled content) and guaranteeing that these are accessible to everyone, requires more than simply phasing-out some of the undesirable options. The Government says that in the long term it would like to see more reusable or refillable alternatives operating within innovative reuse models (p.39). This is such a pleasing statement to read; we support this vision wholeheartedly. We note that this vision is unlikely to occur spontaneously, and certainly not with the requisite level of urgency, without higher levels of Government support through both targeted policy interventions that level the playing field between single use and reuse, and investment in the necessary infrastructure for accessible reuse models to work at scale. We note the

Government's concern with the environmental impact of alternatives to the items proposed for a ban (p.40). We agree, and reiterate our call for policy & regulatory levers to accompany a ban that direct businesses and consumers towards the best alternatives. We note that it's already possible to BYO reusable containers and tableware for takeaway food and drink. In many cases, washable crockery is a realistic alternative instead of disposables. A handful of reuse schemes exist for reusable takeaway packaging, such as Again Again, CupCycling and Reusabowl. Furthermore, many grocery outlets, from butchers to dedicated zero waste grocers, offer unpackaged, fill your own models or reusable packaging systems. Business to business reuse schemes exist for transport packaging also. The issue is not a lack of ideas or models, but barriers to scale and normalisation within our entrenched linear economy, and lack of adequate incentives to ensure uptake of reusable alternatives when they are available. Furthermore, these barriers promote ad hoc product and system development that isn't always conducive to accessibility. Accordingly, sustained policy interventions and investment are required to level the playing field between single use and reuse. As mentioned above, this requires levies on single-use items and delivery systems (which will encourage uptake of reusable and refillable models), deposit return systems on food and beverage packaging, mandating reusable serveware in certain situations, and reuse quotas/targets. Furthermore, Government oversight is needed to direct the market towards a high performing, zero waste, circular economy based on reuse that is low emissions and accessible for everyone. While even poorly designed reuse systems likely have far lower impact lifecycle analyses (LCAs) than any single-use system, well-designed reuse systems can have extraordinarily lower LCA impact. Also, some reusable options are less accessible than others - Government oversight can ensure a co-design process for reuse schemes that guarantees reusable alternatives follow principles of universal design. In addition, it may be appropriate to establish a reusables fund under the umbrella of the Disability Allowance to enable those who are eligible for this allowance to purchase accessible reusables if they would like to. The consultation document also states that where plastic packaging is in use, it should be made of higher-value and recyclable materials, with recycled content. Again, regulatory interventions such as levies and legislated mandatory recycled content are required for this outcome. If the powers to achieve this do not exist under the WMA, then part of the present proposal should include a plan to progress the necessary amendments through Parliament.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics - we wholeheartedly support this. We would prefer to see this ban occur more quickly. Many overseas jurisdictions, including the EU, will be phasing-out oxo-degradable plastics by July 2021. We believe New Zealand should follow this timeframe too.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The consultation document sets out a comprehensive list of costs & benefits of the mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. We agree with all listed. We also appreciate acknowledgment of the potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers and the cost savings for the wider community of reducing the complexity of our waste & recycling streams. We also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. Overall, we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits - human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit that is currently missing is the new potential opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. If this opportunity is harnessed, it will not only reduce waste and recycling, it will also have a positive job creation impact. Preliminary studies indicate that reusable packaging systems tend to produce higher numbers of jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. Furthermore, those jobs are more dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals.(10) The growth of reuse schemes will also lead to a reduction in single use/oneway packaging generally not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and thus ratepayers. 10. See, for example, Miller, M. Bolger, L. Copello (2019) Reusable solutions: how governments can help stop single-use plastic pollution (3Keel, Oxford, United Kingdom: A study by the Rethink Plastic alliance and the Break Free From Plastic movement), p.15; Patrick Albrecht, Jens Brodersen, Dieter W Horst and Miriam Scherf (2011) Reuse and Recycling Systems for Selected Beverage Packaging from a Sustainability Perspective: An analysis of the ecological, economic and social impacts of reuse and recycling systems and approaches to solutions for further development

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

As noted above, concrete Government regulation and investment is needed to move reusable alternatives from the niche to the mainstream. Furthermore, a coordinated universal design approach is needed to ensure these alternatives are accessible for everyone in our community (taking into account potential barriers, such as cost or disability). Government direction and oversight in all this is necessary. A hands-off, pro-voluntary, awareness raising approach from the Government that leaves the development of reuse schemes entirely up to the whims of private interests will not guarantee a baseline reusables system that is widespread, accessible and environmentally, socially and economically efficient. The consultation document notes that removing the targeted plastics could lead to greater use of other hard-to recycle materials, such as composites. The proposal for mitigating this risk is “pairing the phase-out with best practice guidance on sustainable packaging...an opportunity to educate businesses and the public, and raise awareness of the environmental impact of different choices.” (p.46) We do not believe this approach is sufficient to achieve the outcomes the Government seeks. Nor is it the best use of government resource (not least because it risks duplicating the mahi that many community groups and NGOs have been doing for some time now). What’s really needed is for the Government to play its part and back up our collective effort with policy, regulations and investment that make “best practice... sustainable packaging” (i.e. reusable/refillable packaging wherever possible) standard practice.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support banning almost all of the listed single-use plastic items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastic counterparts. However, we do not support a ban of plastic straws. Takeaway Throwaways has always excluded plastic straws from their campaign & petition because some people with accessibility needs require a plastic straw to drink. While some reusable alternatives work well for some people, for others there may be no reusable alternative that is suitable. An exemption to a plastic straw ban can mitigate the potential harm (for example, exemptions to permit plastic straws’ availability “on request” at hospitality outlets and pharmacies), but they are difficult to design without being stigmatising. There is also the risk that disabled people seen using a straw will face backlash from uninformed hospitality staff or the public. We believe that direct consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should have occurred before this consultation document was released. In any case, this consultation must now occur before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We otherwise support the proposed list of items for phase-out, and would like to see the list extended to include other disposable serveware items that also cause harm in our environment, exist in the litter stream and contaminate recycling: 1. Disposable coffee cups & lids - We are extremely disappointed that coffee cups & lids have been expressly excluded from the ban list. The Packaging Forum estimates that New Zealanders use 295 million coffee cups a year. The overwhelming majority get landfilled. Huge confusion surrounds their recyclability and/or compostability. They’re also light and prone to escaping into the environment, and their lids are fully detachable, increasing the potential for litter. We strongly disagree with the Government’s assessment that practical alternatives are lacking. Virtually all outlets accept BYO reusables, most outlets have in-house ceramic options if people forget their cup. There’s also a growing range of reuse schemes/cup loan systems across New Zealand (reflecting international trends in this direction).(11) There are towns, such as Wanaka, that have a vision of being free of disposable coffee cups by 2022.(12) And, nationwide, a growing number of cafes (over 50 to our knowledge (13)) have gone single-use-cup-free already by implementing strategies that combine discounts with surcharges, retail of personal ‘keep cups’ and the adoption of homegrown or national reuse systems, with invitations to BYO, and importantly, encouragement to build community by making time to stay. Even if alternatives are not yet fully established in every corner of the country, the expertise about alternatives and systems for delivering them does exist in New Zealand. Under the present proposal, none of the bans would occur overnight. If coffee cups were included, businesses and consumers would have ample time and notice to prepare and adopt alternatives (particularly if a ban were to phase in by 2025). A ban with a lead-in time would also grant security for cup reuse schemes to invest to scale. Takeaway Throwaways is involved in the movement to phase-out throwaway takeaway packaging in New Zealand. One of their founders has been working alongside hospitality outlets since 2017 through Use Your Own, to support hundreds of cafes across the country to reduce their use of disposable coffee cups (or cease using them completely). Through this work, research and daily engagement with the public and hospitality outlets across New Zealand, They can attest to how far public and media perception has turned against disposable coffee cups. These items are increasingly recognised as a burden to hospitality outlets financially. Due to their propensity to pollute roadsides and waterways, they are a growing source of embarrassment for brands and of public ire and frustration. We believe that most businesses would willingly cease to use disposable cups if all outlets were in the same boat. The only way to achieve this is through a nationwide ban. 2. Plastic lollipop sticks - These present a similar hazard to plastic cotton buds (which are proposed for a ban) and there are also alternatives, such as cardboard. 3. Single-serve/Portion Control Unit pottles, sachets & containers for condiments - For example, soy fish, pottles with peelable plastic lids for jam, butter and other condiments, sachets of sauces, condiments and sugar. We note that the consultation document highlights the impact of the Fox River Landfill disaster - one of the items commonly picked up by volunteers were these types of single-use/ PCU packets from the accommodation and hospitality providers in this popular tourist destination. We note that these types of products have been earmarked for banning by the Irish Government in their recently released National Waste Policy. (14) 4. Soft plastic wrappers for individually packaging mini confectionary items - For example, mints given out at restaurants as breath fresheners or lollies on flights. The wrappers are very small and thus easily escape rubbish collection, and are an unnecessary level of packaging as confectionary is easily purchased in bulk packaging. 5.

Place-based phase-outs - We would support the Government pursuing a place-based phase-out approach to items that we aren't ready to ban completely, including sustainable public procurement. For example, a mandatory phase-out of disposable serviceware for all dine-in contexts (i.e. like Berkeley, California (15)); single-use free zones in towns and cities (like South Australia's Plastic-Free Precinct trial (16)); on campus or institutional bans of bottled water and disposable coffee cups, including Public Procurement Policy that excludes disposable serviceware etc.(17) 11. See, for example, the inventory of local and global reuse schemes for serviceware on the Takeaway Throwaways website: <https://takeawaythrowaways.nz/reuse-schemes-at-home-and-abroad> 12. Find out more about the SUCFree Wanaka campaign here: <https://www.facebook.com/sucfreewanaka> 13. See the search list on the Use Your Own Aotearoa Café Directory website: <https://www.uyo.co.nz/search?name=&feature%5B%5D=ndc> 14. Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (2020) A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy: Ireland's National Waste Policy 2020-2025 (Government of Ireland), p.33. 15. City of Berkeley (2019) Single Use Foodware and Litter Reduction (Ordinance No 7639-N.S). 16. See, for example, www.plasticfreeplaces.org; <https://www.greenindustries.sa.gov.au/plastic-free-precincts>. 17. For example, • <https://source.wustl.edu/2016/04/waterbottle-ban-success-bottled-beveragesales-plummeted/>; • <https://phys.org/news/2017-05-studentsplastic-bottles-campus.html>; • <http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/sanfrancisco-bans-sale-plastic-water-bottlesclimate-change>; • <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/08/02/business/plastic-water-bottle-ban-sfotmd/index.html> • <https://australianfoodtimeline.com.au/bottled-water-ban-bundanoon/>

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics within the ambit of the proposed phase-out - we applaud the Government for taking this step. As the consultation document notes, many of these products are not certified, and/or not home compostable nor marine degradable. Those that are certified compostable regularly do not arrive to the types of environments they are designed to degrade in (p.48). If they go to landfill, they produce methane in the anaerobic conditions. Furthermore, whether compostable or not, these products are still designed for single-use applications, with all the wasted embodied energy and resources that that status represents. As the consultation document notes, the items selected for phase-out in this proposal represent an 'unnecessary' use of plastic. Therefore, even if genuinely home compostable plastic alternatives were developed, they would remain an unnecessary application of that technological innovation. We recommend the following alterations or clarifications of the proposed definitions: • Plastic straws: The proposed definition refers to an exemption to allow access to plastic straws for disabled persons and for medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, we note that an exemption is unlikely to fully redress the loss in accessibility brought about by a plastic straw ban. Furthermore, the extent to which the risk of stigmatisation or discrimination is mitigated depends on how the exemption is drafted and the surrounding policy for its application and enforcement. Unfortunately, the potential impact of the exemption is impossible to assess because the proposed exemption has not been drafted for feedback (other than an indication that it may look like the UK or EU approach). There is also no specific field in the submission form to provide specific feedback on the proposal to include plastic straws in the phaseout, the suitability of an exemption, or what an exemption could look like to maximise accessibility. We believe the active participation of the disabled community is not sufficiently upheld by this consultation process. • Single-use plastic tableware: The proposed definition should be amended to clarify that this includes paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings (similar to the plastic cups and lids definition). • Single-use plastic cups and lids: Disposable coffee cups should be included in the proposed phase-out (as discussed in our answer to Q16). We also do not support exempting single-use plastic cups made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 from a ban - even if these are easier to recycle plastic types, the cups are likely to be too food contaminated to recycle. Furthermore, as takeaway, on-the-go products, the cups are likely to be used away from home where the public has reduced access to recycling services. Nevertheless, if the exemption goes ahead, we recommend that it applies to cups only and that any lids are expressly excluded from the exemption as their size effectively makes them 'hard-to-recycle' items in most kerbside systems that rely on automated MRFs for sorting. Furthermore, they are detachable so can easily be lost to the environment.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see our answers about this in Q17).

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Wet Wipes: We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In

the meantime, we would support investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and locking of sewerage systems), and compulsory labeling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging (these labeling requirements should be mandated under s 23(1)(f) of the WMA). Before a ban is phased in, we would also support fees being attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs (which can be considerable when they block pipes and form fatbergs). Currently the community is covering these costs through Council. It would be more appropriate to attach this cost to producers and consumers through a fee. This is different to a levy as it’s related to the cost of managing the product and could be achieved under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA. A ban on advertising for wet wipes containing plastic would also be appropriate.

Coffee Cups: As noted elsewhere in this submission, the Government must consider regulatory & policy interventions and investment to increase the uptake, accessibility and availability of reusable alternatives to disposable coffee cups. We note that many of these regulations & policies can be achieved under s 23 of the WMA and/or without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. These include:

- Adding disposable coffee cups to the proposed phase-out list as this will motivate industry and consumers to find alternatives faster.
- Levies on disposable coffee cups or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal.
- Mandating reusable serviceware only for dine-in customers.
- Phasing-in disposable coffee cup free zones or sustainable public procurement policies that prohibit disposable serviceware (e.g. university campuses and other institutional spaces, buildings associated with local and central govt and Parliament etc.)
- A deposit return scheme for both disposable coffee cups and reusable cups, offered through a reuse scheme, combined with a requirement that hospitality outlets offer a takeback service for the cups they give out (whether for reuse or appropriate disposal).
- Ensuring that reusable alternatives and the systems to deliver them adhere to the principles of universal design so that they are accessible for everyone in the community.
- Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse models to operate effectively, such as reverse logistics and washing/sterilisation infrastructure.
- Creating a more welcoming environment for BYO cups by working with the Ministries of Health and Primary Industries to inform businesses that accepting BYO cups is consistent with food safety regulations (including during covid-19), and amending food safety legislation to require outlets to accept BYO cups (in accordance with appropriate food safety requirements/food control plans) rather than leaving this to the discretion of individual businesses.
- Working with the Ministry for Primary Industries to develop specific food safety guidelines for reusable and refillable packaging systems (not to create onerous regulations, but rather to give businesses a sense of security and confidence in accepting reusables).
- Compulsory labelling requirements for disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about the availability of reusable alternatives and a ban on branding cups.

We note that Ireland’s recently released National Waste Policy provides a useful blueprint for how a Government can accelerate an eventual phase-out of disposable coffee cups and cold drinks cups.(18) We have considered the options put forward in the consultation document (p.49) and offer the following comments:

- We support the suggestion of investing to scale up reuse systems. We note that this will achieve the best outcomes if accompanied by the regulatory & policy interventions listed above as these are necessary preconditions to level the playing field with singleuse. Furthermore, a coordinated approach to scheme design overseen by Government is needed to guarantee basic accessibility and availability of reusable alternatives.
- Non-plastic alternative coffee cups may be appropriate in some contexts (such as medical situations or civil emergencies). However, for more general application this is a false solution as they are still single-use, with all the embodied energy and resource wastage associated with this linear approach. Furthermore, a collection system would be required for composting these cups because they will be too contaminated for recycling and if disposed of to landfill will produce methane in the anaerobic conditions. Thus, they present the same issues as home compostable plastics.
- While public education campaigns to promote reusable alternatives is an option, there are numerous NGOs and community groups in NZ and globally doing this mahi already. We need Government to back our efforts with the powers that only Government has (i.e. regulation, policy and investment) rather than risk duplicating work already being done. However, funding support to some of these NGOs and community groups to conduct their education and campaigning could be appropriate, so long as it operates alongside supportive regulatory measures and infrastructural investment.
- Exploring the feasibility of a scheme to collect and recycle or compost singleuse cups (putting aside the technical challenges to successfully recycling or composting them, which shouldn’t be ignored) doesn’t address the fact that these are still single-use items that waste energy and resources - it’s a way of doing things that the circular economy demands we move away from. Furthermore, the investment in logistics and infrastructure to take back these cups and develop facilities to compost or recycle them would be better diverted towards scaling reuse schemes and developing infrastructure centred around reuse. Reuse schemes would also create a greater number of jobs in the collection, washing and redistribution logistics and these jobs would be more dispersed across the country.

18. Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (2020) A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy: Ireland’s National Waste Policy 2020-2025 (Government of Ireland), pp.33-34.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Resilient Dunedin does not manufacture, supply or use single-use plastic coffee cups. However, we invite the Government to consult with the 50+ hospitality businesses who are SUC free, and the organisations and small businesses around NZ that support their work such as:

- UYO
- SUC-free Wanaka
- Again Again
- Cupcycling
- Good to Go Waiheke
- The Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project
- Wanakup

These businesses and groups report that the ability to implement alternatives to single use plastic coffee cups enables businesses to move entirely to reuse. Furthermore, many businesses would be willing to cease dispensing disposable coffee cups, but would prefer if all outlets were in the same boat (i.e. through a nationwide ban).

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Wet Wipes: We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not

block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable (e.g. by Jan 2022). Coffee Cups: Disposable coffee cups should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025. Accessible alternatives exist. Were the Govt to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19) we see no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

This document has provided a comprehensive list of the costs and benefits of mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. We agree with all listed, and appreciate the acknowledgement of the potential cost savings for retailers from a move to phase-out unnecessary single-use items, the cost savings for local govt (and therefore ratepayers) from reduced waste & litter, and the fact that banning items across the board has the benefit of levelling the playing field. One significant cost missing is the potential impact that a ban on plastic straws will have for individuals with accessibility needs who require a straw to drink, and the potential that needing to rely on an exemption will be stigmatising. One benefit that is currently missing is the new potential opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. If this opportunity is harnessed, it will not only reduce waste and recycling, it will also have a positive job creation impact. As noted in Q 14, preliminary studies indicate that reusable packaging systems tend to produce higher numbers of jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. Furthermore, those jobs are more dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals. The growth of reuse schemes will also lead to a reduction in single-use/oneway packaging generally (not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and thus ratepayers. As noted in question 13, overall we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits – human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for noncompliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 295

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The consultation document describes comprehensively the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items. We appreciate the research that has gone into preparing the document. We support the overall proposal, which will better align us with current international best practice to reduce hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items. We appreciate that this consultation is focused solely on plastic products. In addition to the impact of the targeted plastic materials, we note that many underlying problems stem from the wider economic and regulatory eco-system through which these and other materials flow. Considering these wider problems is useful when determining regulatory responses, such as the present proposal. For example, all single-use products (not just plastic) involve waste in terms of energy, resources and landfill space, which is harmful to Papatūānuku, and keeps us stuck in a linear economy. We would support the Government proposing additional regulatory measures for 'creating a culture of reuse' that cuts across material types, alongside the proposed phase-out of single-use plastic items. Reuse systems will significantly reduce the climate change impacts of Aotearoa's packaging system. The document also defines materials as hard to recycle for technical reasons, like PVC or PS. However, many other plastic types (even ones that are technically easier to recycle, like PET) may still be hard-to-recycle in practice because of: • suboptimal collection systems (e.g. commingling or contaminated public place recycling) • over-reliance on off-shore markets (including markets where we cannot be certain materials will be safely received and processed) • inherent product design flaws (e.g. pigmented/coloured plastics or use of nonrecyclable labels, tear off tamper wraps, multi-pack packaging, composite products and soft plastic pouches). • the use to which a product is put, e.g. take-away containers and cups, even if made of easier to recycle materials like PET, are generally too food contaminated to recycle and used away from home where recycling bins are less accessible. Furthermore, the low price of virgin plastic resin vis-a-vis recycled resin creates economic barriers for keeping even 'easier to recycle' in a closed loop packaging system, which brings into focus the environmental harm caused by our continued reliance on virgin plastic (such as continued resource extraction and climate impacts). So, a broader framing of the problem would allow for these wider issues to be considered and tackled, which will likely require more than a simple ban. The present proposal should be part of comprehensive Government policy targeting reliance on both single-use products in general and on virgin plastic resin. This would include specific regulation and investment to disincentivise single-use and create a reuse culture, and to increase the use of locally-sourced recycled resin through appropriate collection methodologies, mandatory minimum recycled content legislation and a cap and levy on virgin plastic.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. We believe the main objective should be amended as follows: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, and increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, of safe recycled content in packaging and of the systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "make affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while assisting communities to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer." Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, & will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list is thorough and considers a range of important measures. We would like to note some concerns. There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time. E.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. We also support the use of additional regulations such as mandatory minimum levels of recycled content to ensure that we do in fact recycle all the 'easier-to-recycle' plastics still permitted after the proposed bans. The EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics, and the plastics and packaging and single-use plastics chapters of the recently released Irish National Waste Policy, provide useful examples of blended approaches. The list is missing some key policy options that could help grow reuse. E.g. deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets & "reusables only" for dine-in situations. The Government could also consider the further Option of applying fees to cover estimated costs for clean-up and disposal of items not proposed for a ban, but are still problematic, such as cigarette butts, takeaway packaging and wet wipes. These types of fees to cover clean-up and disposal costs differ from a levy and should be possible under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA).

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction. This would ensure that the highest ranking outcomes are higher up the waste hierarchy e.g. reduction and reuse solutions. We would also support criteria that assesses how well an option protects against unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Mandatory phase-outs are a clear, simple way of eliminating harmful plastics. We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). However a 'ban only' approach can sometimes lead to the swapping of one single-use material for another. A 'ban only' approach also doesn't fix the problem of our reliance on virgin plastic resin. Even if we shift to only using 'easier to recycle' plastics, this doesn't ensure that those products are actually recycled or recycled back into the same kind of product. We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products. This blended approach would result in less waste, a lasting shift in social norms and behaviour change, and stronger markets for recycled resin.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging, for the reasons given in the consultation document. The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: - PVC trays being phased out by June 2021: PVC trays are especially problematic for the recycling industry as they are the main contaminants of onshore clear PET recycling, and are easily substituted by clear PET trays. - All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 - Stage 2 by June 2023 The world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. Furthermore, plastic production is a direct product of fossil fuel extraction - the leading contributor to CO2 emissions and rising temperatures. We have wasted time in not recognising these problems for many years, so we must now act decisively to reduce what plastics we can from our economy.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging, for the reasons given in the consultation document. The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: - PVC trays being phased out by June 2021: PVC trays are especially problematic for the recycling industry as they are the main contaminants of onshore clear PET recycling, and are easily substituted by clear PET trays. - All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 - Stage 2 by June 2023 The world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. Furthermore, plastic production is a direct product of fossil fuel extraction - the leading contributor to CO2 emissions and rising temperatures. We have wasted time in not recognising these problems for many years, so we must now act decisively to reduce what plastics we can from our economy.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Diversion from landfill, increase in recycling rates and decreased impact on the environment. A change to different packaging solutions has the potential to have a positive impact in terms of embodied carbon associated with packaging models. Simplifying the packaging on the market will make it easier to communicate to householders and businesses about best practice recycling. Currently the variety of materials on the market causes huge amounts of confusion even amongst committed recyclers. PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, waterways and marine environment – damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. Part of our work as a social enterprise is installing heat pumps, and we have to dispose of EPS to landfill because there is no option for recycling for us in Wellington. We see a similar story working with businesses across the region to improve their waste systems. We have limited sway with manufacturers who use this packaging due to our small market share. Only a small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation and products such as picture frames. These are not circular systems of recycling, there are no systems in place to ensure this material is captured for recycling at end of life. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We fully support the vision on P40 of “more reusable or refilling alternatives to single-use plastics. There is an opportunity for New Zealand to rethink the use of some plastic packaging altogether, and to design innovative reuse models.” We also support the statement that “packaging with recycled content is preferable to new plastic (where feasible)”. We agree with the list of examples of practical alternatives set out in Table 5. As stated in Q2, we would like to see additional regulations and policy to support the scale and uptake of reusable alternatives, mandatory recycled content and sustainable product design where designing out waste is top priority. Sustainable product design would consider the end-of-life options for a material, preventing any unintended consequences from the targeted phase-out. For example, banning EPS appliance packaging is likely to boost use of moulded cardboard packaging. Research should be done to identify the best practice end-of-life solution for moulded cardboard packaging (i.e. recycling or composting). The research should be widely disseminated to packaging suppliers and product designers so that appropriate choices of glue, coatings and/or colourings are made to align with the end-of-life solution. Clear labelling is also essential so that customers know what they should do with the packaging after use. Durable, reusable appliance packaging should also be explored.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There is nothing good about oxo-degradable plastics, and we wholeheartedly support a ban and thank the Government for acting on them. We would prefer to see a quicker ban due to the harm created by these plastics and the greenwashing involved. By far the majority of companies we have come across who have been supplying these to the public were under the misapprehension that they are better for the environment. Oxo-degradable plastics also contaminate recycling plastic streams. The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to be a priority and for it to happen by June 2021, which brings us in line with overseas jurisdictions, such as the EU, that will phase-out oxo-degradable plastics by 2021.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Not applicable.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The consultation document sets out a comprehensive list of the costs and benefits to various sector groups of the mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. The phase-out of targeted plastics will have additional benefits for: indigenous communities; freshwater quality; ecosystem health; air quality; human health and future generations. The link between waste and climate is often underestimated. Reducing single-use plastics will reduce our reliance on virgin plastic resin, and therefore on fossil fuels. In 2019 the lifecycle of global plastic production – from extraction to disposal – was equivalent to the impact on the climate of 189500MW coal-fired power stations. Emissions from plastic emerge not only from the production and manufacture of plastic itself, but from every stage in the plastic lifecycle – from the extraction and transport of the fossil fuels that are the primary feedstocks for plastic, to refining and manufacturing, to waste management. Acting to reduce single-use plastics and increase recycled content will also help New Zealand meet its international and domestic climate change obligations. In terms of public perception moving away from single-use items will help shift a transition to more conscious consumerism. 77% of household consumption emissions are associated with consumption of goods and services. Our society needs to make the connection between consumerism and climate impact. The current cost/benefit approach perceives the ‘environment’ as an “affected party” separate to, and distinct from, our own human survival. Current and future generations – and indeed the economy – can only thrive within the planet’s limits to stay in balance. Taking action on plastics is an essential step towards preserving the functional ecosystems required to sustain life.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit currently missing is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. This would have a positive job creation impact, as well as reducing waste. Preliminary studies indicate that reuse systems produce far more jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. This is also expected to be the case for reusable packaging Page | 12 systems, with commentators noting that these increased jobs are also more likely to be localised and geographically dispersed,⁵ which meets provincial development goals. The growth of reuse schemes and shifting social norms will also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging (not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More transparency including clear packaging labelling, more onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed. This would increase public confidence and engagement in the recycling system, creating a positive flow-on of reduced contamination. It would also allow for better packaging choices by designers, who can integrate end-of-life options (e.g. closed loop recycling) into design choices of materials. Mandatory recycled content is a key regulatory lever to assist with pull-through of recycled plastics in the economy and better design. Standardised collection of materials and investment in recycling education and community engagement would help more people to use the recycling system correctly whether at home or at work, reducing contamination, which can result in recyclable materials going to landfill. Government regulatory policy and investment is needed to move reusable alternatives from the niche to the mainstream. We note that it’s already possible to BYO reusable containers and tableware for takeaway food and drink. In many cases, washable crockery is a realistic alternative instead of disposables. A handful of reuse schemes exist for reusable takeaway packaging, such as Again Again, CupCycling and Reusabowl. The issue is not a lack of ideas or models, but barriers to scale and normalisation of these systems within an entrenched linear economy, and lack of adequate incentives to ensure uptake of reusable alternatives when they are available. Accordingly, sustained policy interventions and investment are required to level the playing field between single-use and reuse. A blended policy mix could include levies on single-use items and delivery systems (which will encourage uptake of reusable and refillable models), deposit return systems on food and beverage packaging, mandating reusable serviceware in certain situations, and reuse quotas/targets. Money must be made available for the infrastructure needed to make reuse work (e.g. reverse logistics and sterilisation), with a preference for locally based infrastructure to reduce emissions and increase community engagement. A coordinated universal design approach is needed to ensure reusable alternatives are accessible for everyone in our community (taking into account potential barriers, such as cost or disability).

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, (including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastic counterparts), except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. Some people with accessibility needs require a plastic straw to drink. While some reusable alternatives work well for some people, for others there may be no reusable alternative that is suitable. We think consideration should be given to extending the list to include these other single-use plastic items: - Disposable coffee cups & lids: - Plastic lollipop sticks and wrappers - Single serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries: - Coffee pods containing plastic: - Teabags containing plastic: - Single-use plastic water bottles - Balloons and balloon sticks. - Glitter and plastic confetti: - Complementary plastic toys on children's magazines and with fast food. - Chewing gum containing plastic Beyond the single-use items proposed in the document, we would support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes, and other disposable sanitary products, and to reduce the harm from industrial and commercial use of plastics like fishing nets, plastic wrap and strapping used in freight, plastic building wrap used in construction and other single-use items used by the construction industry e.g. cable ties and nail gun waste. We also urge the Government to implement a regulatory plan to address cigarette butts. According to the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, cigarette butts account for 78% of all items littered in New Zealand and are the most commonly found item in beach litter clean ups. Globally, cigarette butts are thought to be the most littered item on Earth. The consultation document mentions cigarette butts in passing (p.50) but offers no plan because there may not be plastic-free alternatives. However, measures other than a phase-out could be implemented under s 23 of the WMA, such as mandatory on-package labelling to increase smokers' awareness that butts contain plastic and appropriate means of disposal, or fees on filters put on the market to cover estimated clean-up costs.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics in the proposed phase-out, and applaud the Government for taking this step. As the consultation document notes, many of these products are not certified, and/or not home compostable nor marine degradable. Those that are certified compostable often don't end up in the right place to be composted, potentially contaminating recycle streams or emitting methane when disposed of in landfill. Furthermore, as with any single-use product they embody wasted energy and resources. For all these reasons, we support their inclusion in the phase-out proposal. We recommend the following alterations or clarifications of the proposed definitions - Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include containers with plastic or wax linings (similar to the plastic cups and lids definition). - Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags that fruit and vegetables are commonly pre-packed into. - Single-use plastic lids. - Single-use coffee cups: We would support disposable coffee cups being included in the proposed phase-out (as discussed in our answer to Q19). - Plastic straws: Table 7 notes that an exemption will be considered to allow access to plastic straws for disabled persons and for medical purposes. If plastic straws are banned, an exemption is essential to ensure those who need a plastic straw to drink can still access them, but we note that exemptions can be stigmatising, especially if poorly designed or resourced. We are concerned that the potential exemption has not been drafted in time for this consultation. We seek assurance that the Ministry will ensure active and wide participation of the disabled community in the drafting/design of such an exemption before determining whether or not to ban plastic straws.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups The Packaging Forum estimates that New Zealanders use 295 million single-use coffee cups a year. The overwhelming majority of single-use coffee cups are landfilled or escape into the national environment. Coffee cups are non-recyclable due to the waterproof liners and coffee residue, and they are a common contaminant in the cardboard recycling stream. Compostable cups rarely make it to a commercial composting facility where they will safely break down. Coffee cups are also light and prone to escaping into the environment. The fully detachable lids increase the potential for harmful plastic litter. We believe that the expertise to create reusable infrastructure and accompanying community engagement is already well established in New Zealand. Virtually all outlets already accept BYO reusables, and most outlets have in-house ceramic options if people forget their cup. There are a growing range of reuse schemes/cup loan systems. Some towns, such as Wanaka, have a vision of being free of single-use coffee cups by 2022. Nationwide, a growing number of cafes (over 50 that we know of) have eliminated single use cups entirely by implementing strategies to encourage customers to "sit, borrow or bring". They have implemented a combination of incentives such as discounts/surcharges, retail of 'keep cups', adoption of homegrown/national reuse systems (e.g. Again Again and informal cup loans), invitations to BYO, education around the issue and importantly, encouragement to build community by making time to stay. We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Effective policy options (many of which are possible under s 23 of the WMA or without the need for new Parliamentary legislation) include: ● Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers ● Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings, museums and galleries, coasts and national parks) ● A deposit return scheme for both disposable coffee cups and reusable alternatives offered through a reuse scheme (e.g. Again Again) plus mandating that all outlets dispensing takeaway cups (whether disposable or reusable) take back empty cups (for appropriate disposal or reuse) - achieved under ss 23(1)(c) and (e) of the WMA. ● Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow universal design principles and are accessible for everyone in the community. ● Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. ● Working with MoH and MPI to create

official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. ● Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives and where they should be disposed of (i.e. in rubbish bins, unless a commercial collection facility is available for compostable cups) ● A ban on branding of disposable cups (under s 23(1)(d)) ● A levy on disposable coffee cups and/or producer fees under s 23(1)(d) to cover the estimated costs associated with disposal or clean-up. ● Inclusion of disposable coffee cups in the proposed mandatory phase-out list because this will stimulate solutions. The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. We support this happening alongside regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. We do not believe that investing in expensive systems to downcycle or compost cups is the best use of public funds. It would be more efficient to invest this money in stimulating the scale and uptake of a reusables network. Local community engagement and collaborative solutions are more impactful in terms of creating lasting behaviour change than high level national education. Funding support to NGOs and community groups already working to educate and engage on the ground would be the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems), and compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging (these labelling requirements should be mandated under s 23(1)(f) of the WMA). Before a ban is phased in, we would also support fees being attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs (which can be considerable when they block pipes and form fatbergs). Currently the community is covering these costs through Council. It would be more appropriate to attach this cost to producers and consumers through a fee. This is different to a levy as it’s related to the cost of managing the product and could be achieved under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA. A ban on advertising for wet wipes containing plastic would also be appropriate. An alternative pathway that could be helpful would be to declare disposable sanitary products (which would include wet wipes) as a ‘Priority Product’ - this would enable a considered, wraparound approach to a multitude of similar products at once.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Not applicable.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

No comment.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. We appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used, and the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste and litter. An unconsidered cost of the proposed mandatory phase-out of plastic straws is potential discrimination against individuals who need a plastic straw. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. Reuse schemes reduce waste, costs for local government and ratepayers, and create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. These jobs are also dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The community will assist in monitoring if they are able to report breaches of the mandatory phase-out to MFE, similar to the plastic bag ban. In light of the far wider scope of this particular phase-out proposal and the breadth of actors in our economy and within our communities who are likely to be affected, we support MFE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. We also believe that appointment of enforcement officers under s 76 would be appropriate in this case.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 297

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 298

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Why are options not being proposed for all non-recyclable plastics? Those is the difficult to recycle categories particularly. Yoghurt pots? There must be an alternative, else don't allow them to be imported and sold?

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

As previous comment, surely more plastic types or at least items (yoghurt pots) could be phased out. All seems way too little, too slow

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Any items where you've provided an easy alternative (all of them, I thought) surely could be phased from sale within this period

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Re-usable cups are fine for takeaways. Like with bringing your own bags it's a learning process, but it needs to happen else things will never change. Vendors will then adapt, as supermarkets did, to provide options for those without cups (eg buy or 'hire' reusables). Not hard

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years, as requires public learning/adaptation to become normal behavior, as per single use bags

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 299

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 300

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

All plastics have a negative impact on the environment and the sooner we phase them out the better.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Massive environmental benefits - reduced waste plastics both in landfill and in the general environment and ocean

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 301

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

It has a good description of the problems the targeted plastics can cause. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku. I urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material types used, and to propose more concrete policy & regulatory actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. I urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers key actions I'd expect to see. I have two concerns: 1. There is currently no 'blended' option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time, e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. 2. The list is missing some key policy options that could really help grow reuse - deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria & weightings make sense & help me understand the Government's reasoning behind the proposals. I suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy. Some criteria need broader definitions: "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse. "Achievability" should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. I also suggest new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support banning all the items listed (although not sure about plastic straws - more on that later). Bans are a clear, simple way

of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, we urge the Govt not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead multi-task like a boss & take forward more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too! A 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Govt can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. But, the timelines proposed are too slow. Think of all the targeted plastic items that could enter our environment before 2023 and 2025. Right now, the world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. We need to reverse these trends, fast. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. We suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Using our democracy isn't only about speaking up when we disagree. It is also about giving our consent and approval when we feel the Government gets it right. So, I'll be thanking the Government for creating what I think is an expansive & ambitious list of products for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. I also call for Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics - I wholeheartedly support this. I would prefer to see this ban

occur more quickly. Many overseas jurisdictions, including the EU, will be phasing-out oxo-degradable plastics by July 2021. I believe New Zealand can and should follow this timeframe too.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Not applicable to me.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The Government has made a comprehensive list of costs & benefits. I agree with all of them. I appreciate the recognition of potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers & for the wider community from simplifying our waste & recycling streams. I also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. Overall, I think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits – human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There's an extra benefit to banning the targeted plastics that the Government's missed. This benefit is the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems not only reduce waste, they also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. More reuse schemes & more reusable packaging will also mean less throwaway packaging overall (not just targeted plastics). This will result in even more cost savings for local government & ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The MAIN thing that would help NZers embrace reusable & refillable packaging is if Government gave reusables some love through the power of regulation, policy & investment. This would help reuse systems compete against single-use, & catapult reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles. The Government has suggested it could do some public education about sustainable packaging... Thanks for thinking of it, but heaps of NGOs & community groups do this already! They need you to back them up by focusing on your unique superpowers of regulation, policy & investment.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support banning all the listed items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, there are three points that I feel strongly about. 1. I don't support blanket-banning plastic straws. A plastic straw ban would be discriminatory. Some people need a plastic straw to drink. Reusable alternatives work well for some people, but not for everyone. The Government has suggested exemptions for people that need them, but it's hard to design exemptions that aren't stigmatising. At the very least, there must be adequate consultation & agreement with the disabled community before I can support banning plastic straws. 2. I genuinely cannot believe that so much goes so far, but that the single use coffee cup (SUC) is not on the ban list. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. For takeaways, reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. I know of over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... and they're thriving. Proving that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. A ban on SUC combined with Govt support for reuse schemes can provide security for take-out only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies. As with all items that involve access to liquids in a hospitality setting, I suggest Govt liaise with the disabled community to seek guidance as to how reusable alternatives can be widely available for all. I urge the Government to take the plunge & ban all disposable coffee cups & lids. We believe they are amongst the most straightforward items to phase out - practically, and due to the increasingly

negative public perception towards them. 3. I'd like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS. Like soy sauce fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead. Single-use plastic water bottles Balloons and balloon sticks Glitter and plastic confetti Complementary plastic toys I would support the Government introducing place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet e.g. reusables only for dine-in contexts; central city single-use-free zones; no bottled water & throwaway serviceware on university campuses & in Govt buildings.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, I don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. I do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see answer to Q16). I also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

I believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see answer in Q17).

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support: - Including disposable coffee cups in the proposed ban list as this will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with the alternatives faster. - Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California) - Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. - A disposable coffee cup levy and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. - A Deposit Return Scheme for BOTH disposable coffee cups, & reusables offered through a reuse scheme. A DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all hospitality outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash and reuse returned reusable cups. - Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. - Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings) - Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design principles & are accessible for everyone in the community. - Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. - Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Not applicable

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Disposable coffee cups products should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025. Accessible alternatives exist. Were the Govt to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19) I see no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022. I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable, and I do not see a barrier excluding them from being among the first items to be phased-out i.e. by 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive; I agree with them all. I appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. I like how the Government has recognised that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. However, I am very surprised that this list does not acknowledge how a plastic straw ban could negatively affect individuals who need a plastic straw to drink. And the extra potential benefit offered by the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable alternative products (i.e straws, co-designed with the disabled community) to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes reduce waste & costs for local government & ratepayers. They also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, I support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 302

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Unclear / Not Stated

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The first chapter argued that the plastic range of 1,2 and 5 can be recycled onshore. Level 3,4,6 and 7 are hard to recycle onshore and well the value is shallow. Therefore, I believed if we don't have facilities to recycle other types of plastic onshore and if they are of low value, it is better to ban hard-to-recycled material. Rethinking the plastic waste hierarchy is a good start to change the thinking of the consumers as well as vendors. This is a hard step to start and might be results will be low at the beginning, however, continuing will give more benefits in the future.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing plastic leads to sustainable development goals, a Circular economy, and climate change through zero waste.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree with these two stages. The government or authorized agencies should inform manufacturers, suppliers, retailers as well as customers regarding these changes first. Then they will work on it from now. Someone can say, should be given more time. But I believe, given more time is we put the environment in more danger.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I don't think the two-phase need to change. I believe it is good to take any action to reduce the PVC and Hard Polystyrene packaging by 2023 as the first step and then responsible parties can evaluate the success rate of the first mission and drawbacks, which area need to put more attention, may change the plan and strategies.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

There are a lot of benefits of phasing PVC, at the same time cost will be increased. If manufacturers are trying to find an alternative way, most prefer and directed plants. This might be a negative impact on the environment again. As well, manufactures could be charging their cost from the customer, which increases the value of the product. But my biggest concern is the homeware, electronics items, and other consumer goods. There are quite a lot of products which were covered with plastic. So, how manufactures are concerning to reduce waste. Waste use as a resource to create new products.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, 2023 is a good time and gives manufacturers enough time to think and use environmentally friendly and low-cost alternatives. Some people could be saying, 2023 is a long time and need to take an action immediately. But this year the whole world faced a deadly tragedy and still, all the countries are suffering from COVID- 19. So, the government needs to give some time to manufactures as well as consumers.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

targeted plastics used commonly. The majority are consumable products. Benefit is trying to find a new option to create a new job market. Such as, if the country used reusable or recyclable plastic then we need to create a more recyclable factory.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

trying to use reusable or recyclable products, always check the recyclable labels when buying products. Even we buy higher value materials or reusable refillable alternatives, this cost will be one time. Support for local boards and government to keep clean New Zealand.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I agree with all the items mentioned on the list. But I would like to add more items to this list. 1. Cigarette butts. People throw-away cigarette butts everywhere and this will end in the environment. 2. Plastic take out containers. - the black plastic containers are not made in recyclable materials. Because these plastic containers don't reflect light and the optical scanners. Alternatives - use your own recyclable or steel or glass food containers with a bamboo lid rather than using a plastic lid. 3. Plastic wrap - plastic wrap or plastic storage bags. This use to store leftovers or storage vegetables or cooked foods. Alternative - Reusable containers. plastic-free reusable wrap. Reusable cotton cloth. 4. Plastic party cups - party cups widely distribute at festivals, events, and parties. Australia has been banned use single-use party cups and they produce their own cups of reusable plastics. Alternative -bring your own cups or use reusable cups. 5. Six-pack rings - Six-packs rings or multi-packs rings to secure beverages such as cans and beer which deadly impact on marine life. Alternative- Totally banned and try to be sold separately or an edible one. 6. Balloon sticks - this is one of the highest risks to the seabirds. Alternative - planet-friendly party and skip the balloons. Go for more eco-friendly decorations like paper lanterns, flowers.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

. In my opinion is a different time frame for different items. For example, single-use plastic tableware and cutlery can phase out within 12 months. Because, most of the takeaways provide bamboo, timber, or paper cutlery and takeaway containers. Therefore, authorised parties can totally ban single-use plastic tablewares within 12 months. Plastic cups, plastic straws can give 18 months, because customers need to adjust to bring their own cups or straws. Or manufacturers and inventors need time to innovate new products from bamboos or papers. Single-use plastic bags - I guest this also enough for 12 months period. At first, supermarkets can introduce, paper or cotton, hessian bags for small amount. Then supermarkets need to promote or motivate consumers to bring those bags every time when they visit supermarkets. There are some companies, non-profit organization, introduce these kinds of bags or sell those. I believe the government needs to take a step for banned single-use plastic shopping bags like before how they reduce plastic bags around the country. Then customers automatically change for these transforming and they will bring their own bags with them. Furthermore, supermarkets can keep a small scale near the vegetable and fruits section, and customers can measure their own and add to the trolley. Then they need to keep measuring the weight of the products separately. Like a sticker or prefer to calculate all amount and quantities at the same time. Non -compostable produce stickers- I guess this also can give a 12-month period. My idea is, we can see these stickers in the fruit item, so supermarkets and manufactures can, mentioned the product code and other stuff on the shelf rather than put the sticker. Plastic cotton buds, plastic drink stirrers will take more than 1 to 2 years.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

my answer to this is twofold. The first option is Single-use coffee cups Can easily reduce in the coffee shops which are established inside of a building. For example, universities cafes or cafes in malls or cafes in popular buildings (PwC building in Auckland, etc.). So, these kinds of coffee shops can go with the option of don't sell takeaway cups or reusable or recyclable cups and consumers can request if they really need one, but at a higher price. This will be annoying for consumers at the beginning, but later they will be adopted to transforming or new change and will bring their own cups as a habit. However, this method was hard for travellers and mobile coffee shoppers. They also can use the same method as mentioned before or introduce bamboo or paper coffee cups that are recyclable. However, my second opinion is to introduce and motivate and keep

an awareness program to customers BYO coffee cups. Now there is quite a lot of organizations, which are introduced recyclable or reusable coffee cups. So, customer can buy those from the supermarkets or warehouses and use everywhere they are going. Travelers can use cups in their bags or others can keep cups in their vehicles if they are going to forget. If this will continue consumers are automatically adjusted for these. Otherwise, this is a hard matter to overcome from the world. (Stojo from Canada, and some Australian companies, have reusable, dishwasher friendly and portable options). I think all the options mentioned in the consultation documents are good. There are some organizations that create bio-degradable bamboo baby wipes. But eventually, this is hard to give for demand and destroy the environment. Makeup removers' wet wipes can introduce soft cloth which can be reused after a good washing.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

I guess, 2023 is enough for plastic coffee cups and 2025 for wet wipes.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I hope you have identified the single-use plastic bag's cost and benefits. But I would like to add a little bit more of my thoughts. Environment - Cost- I believe, if organizations or manufacturers lead towards plants alternative, this could be more negative than using plastic. Trees/ plants are a scarce resource, and they are not growing faster than people consumer wants growing. So I believe this would cost in the future. Retailers - benefits - Retailers can introduce or conduct awareness programs or notice to BYO containers to meat items. As well they can introduce cotton or hessian products in the vegetable and fruits section. Moreover, Big supermarkets like foodstuff and countdown have their own bakery facilities. Therefore, they can introduce cotton bread bags instead of soft plastic. This will help to reduce their cost and lead long term benefits. Public - Cost_ I highly believed that manufacturers, suppliers, and retailers are passed the transforming cost to customers because those are profit-oriented organizations. The public must pay more money to buy reusable packages or reusable coffee cups. The initial investment could be more expenses. Benefits - healthy, nourishing food. Because if you are not sending plastic and other unnecessary, unhealthy, poisoning items to landfills or our land, then land gives us organic and nourishes foods which good for long life.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I agree with the regulations.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 303

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Phasing out all packaging will drive innovation

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Costs - may be initial increase in packaging costs, or breakages, or availability of alternatives Benefits - reduction in pollution

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I think you've got it about right

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Suppliers to use them

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Not sure

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

4 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Good question

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 304

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 305

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 306

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

need to ascertain ability for manufacturers/suppliers to comply

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

difficult to mandate all variations

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

ensure public support, wider public awareness, and public action

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

incentivise industry and people to utilise renewable alternatives

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

significantly increase charges for single-use

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

industry bodies could assist education for six months, enforcement thereafter

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 307

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We must move away from plastic and find economic and sustainable alternatives.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits of stopping the pollution, stop using plastic/oil and also developing new ways of packing and producing with less environmental impact

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

People only change when they are made to change. Let's start sooner than later

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

I don't manufacture.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The cost of taking out the pollution from rivers and sea is enormous. Besides that it's time to move forwards

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Definitely. We must adapt. We've learned how to separate things to recycle, how to compost, how to be conscious kiwis. Now we can learn more.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

The covid made us change from one day to another. Let's do it sooner! Stop postponing this welcoming change!

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Eatable cups, compostable cups, multi use cups (bring your own).

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

I'm not in this business, but alternatives and support from government and the society make the change happens

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months. Seriously. We all can adapt. Bring your own cup or drink you cuppa in the coffee shop.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I don't know. But should be checked by tue government and the community.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 309

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Polystyrene use in New Zealand appears to be increasing rather than decreasing, not only as a packaging material, but now as a filler and as insulation material in roading, construction and landscaping projects

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes because it all has an impact.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less waste entering out environment, especially our waterways.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Perhaps monitored by compliance officers who would be visiting the business for other purposes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 310

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

including all will force business to find environmentally friendly alternatives and not just shift to another plastic

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The lightweight material is easily picked up by winds and is scattered from construction sites and commercial waste skips, into adjacent fields, residential areas, overland waterways and marine environments. It photodegrades into microscopic, carcinogenic particles that are eventually ingested, inhaled or absorbed by both flora and fauna, with a cumulative, bio-persistent effect throughout the food chain.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

availability prior to phase out to enable choice which will be better received than forced alternative use

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 311

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

I support phasing the use of this material out completely

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 312

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 313

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Do not agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items (please comment below)

Notes

At this stage, we oppose any phase out of plastic single-use straws. We oppose this for three reasons: 1. There is no real detail around the proposed exemptions; 2. The proposed exemptions are not guaranteed. In the consultation document, the Ministry only commits to consider exemptions and describes the exemptions as potential (Ministry for the Environment, 2020, pp. 48, 65). The Ministry also appears to state that any exemptions will be dependent on submissions (Ministry for the Environment, 2020, p. 65); and 3. There is no proposed mechanism to address, or any acknowledgement of, the extra costs disabled people will face from banning plastic single-use straws. The details of any exemption matter The consultation document says any exemption could be similar to those in England and European Union. Apart from that there is no detail about how the exemptions would work. Given the possible effects of a ban on plastic single-use straws on some disabled people's lives, this lack of detail is very problematic. An effective and non-stigmatising exemption will be extremely difficult to achieve. In general, there are reports of the exemptions in other jurisdictions being ineffective, imposing costs on disabled people, and/or being stigmatising (Jenks & Obringer, 2020; Danovich & Godoy, 2018; Schultz, 2019). Exemptions need to be effective and, crucially, non-stigmatising. This means there needs to be widespread knowledge about, and a commitment to, any exemption in the hospitality industry as well as knowledge and acceptance of the exemption from the general public. For any exemption to be effective, single-use plastic straws have to be widely and reliably available, which will be difficult given the supply of straws will shrink dramatically with the ban. The costs of exemptions for disabled people An exemption could also increase the already high costs disabled people face, both financial-costs and time-costs. Disabled people and their whānau are already far more likely to report income inadequacy than non-disabled people (Murray, 2019, pp. 10-11, 24-27). Disabled people also report that one of the biggest barriers they face is a lack of time (Wilkinson-Meyersa, et al., 2014, p. 1547). With an exemption both financial and time costs could increase. For example, if disabled people have to buy straws from pharmacies that imposes a cost where currently disabled people can get straws for free in many hospitality establishments. Those pharmacies may also charge higher rates than supermarkets for straws. If only some hospitality establishments stock plastic straws, or are aware of the exemption, this will increase the time-cost for disabled people and their whānau of accessing meals and drinks. They may have to try multiple venues. An exemption process may also be stigmatising and will require people to disclose that they have a disability (Jenks & Obringer, 2020; Schultz, 2019; Danovich & Godoy, 2018). Research into alternatives There is not a single alternative to plastic single-use straws that works for every disabled person. There is tremendous diversity within the disability community. United States research has found that paper straws do not work for an overwhelming number of disabled people. Between 70% to 78% of the disabled people in this research would not recommend them (The Disability Organizing Network, 2018, p. 4). The most recommended alternative to current single-use plastic straws is compostable single-use bent plastic straw (77% of disabled people in this research would recommend them). This alternative would also be banned under the current proposals. The highest scoring remaining alternative was a BPA-free reusable bent straw (67% of disabled people in this research would recommend). The steel and silicon options had between 38% and 52% of disabled people recommending them (The Disability Organizing Network, 2018, p. 4). In addition, as the consultation document acknowledges, alternatives often cost more (Ministry for the Environment, 2020, p. 43). The way forward The Ministry for the Environment needs to proactively involve disabled people in any decision-making around banning plastic straws and the design of any exemptions. This current consultation process is not adequate. The online process the Ministry prefers for submissions provides no easy way to provide feedback on the straw proposal specifically or to comment on possible exemptions. Instead it has high-level overarching questions. The details of any exemptions need to be worked out with disabled people before any ban of single-use plastic straws takes place. This is crucial. If a ban is passed, with poorly designed exemptions or the exemptions are not in place, there will be a significant and unacceptable impact on some disabled people. Designing for everyone There is currently not a strong enough focus on making sure reusable products are universally designed and work for all disabled people. We are not at all confident a solely market solution will ensure disabled people's needs are met by new reusable technology and products. Instead the government needs an adequately resourced strategy for ensuring the needs of disabled people are met by designers and companies working on reusable products. This will likely require a mix of incentives and awards. It will also require linking disabled people to designers and encouraging more diversity amongst designers so that disabled people are represented amongst the workforce designing the technology of the future. Addressing costs Even if more inclusive reusable products are available, cost will be a significant barrier. A straightforward solution is to expand the existing Disability Allowance to cover the purchase of reusable alternatives to single-use products that are linked to a disability-related need. The Disability Allowance is currently underutilised with most people receiving far below the possible maximum (Murray S., 2020). About us CCS Disability Action is a community organisation that has been advocating for disabled people to be included in the community since 1935. We provide direct support to approximately 5,000 children, young people and adults through our 18 branches, which operate from Northland to Invercargill. Our support focuses on breaking down barriers to participation. We receive a mixture of government and private funding. CCS Disability Action has a national network of access coordinators, who work with local government and transport operators to create a more inclusive society. We also run New Zealand's nation-wide Mobility Parking Permit scheme. This scheme currently supports more than 150,000 people to more easily access their communities and

facilities. Our fully owned subsidiary, Lifetime Design Ltd, advocates for and provides universal design guidelines to improve the accessibility of New Zealand housing. Bibliography Danovich, T., & Godoy, M. (2018, July 11). Why People With Disabilities Want Bans On Plastic Straws To Be More Flexible. Retrieved from NPR: <https://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2018/07/11/627773979/why-people-with-disabilities-want-bans-on-plastic-straws-to-be-more-flexible> Jenks, A. B., & Obringer, K. M. (2020). The poverty of plastics bans: Environmentalism's win is a loss for disabled people. *Critical Social Policy*, 151-161. Ministry for the Environment. (2020). Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment – moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment. Murray, S. (2019). The state of wellbeing and equality for disabled people, their families, and whānau. CCS Disability Action. Murray, S. (2020, August). Ethnic inequality in the payment of the New Zealand Disability Allowance (with tables). Retrieved from Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343431748_Ethnic_inequality_in_the_payment_of_the_New_Zealand_Disability_Allowance_with_tables Schultz, K. (2019, October 28). Plastic Straw Bans Are Not Fair to People with Disabilities, and Here's What We Can Do About It. Retrieved from Creaky Joints: <https://creakyjoints.org/advocacy/plastic-straw-bans-bad-for-people-with-disabilities/> The Disability Organizing Network . (2018, December). Discovering Alternative Straw Use for People with Disabilities: Survey Findings & Analysis. Retrieved from <http://disabilityorganizing.net/uploads/donet-straw-report-012319-ACCESSIBLE.pdf> Wilkinson-Meyers, L., Brown, P., Reeve, J., McNeill, R., Patston, P., Dylan, S., . . . McEldowney, J. (2014). Reducing disablement with adequate and appropriate resources: a New Zealand perspective. *Disability and Society*, 1540-1553.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 314

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

• Polystyrene use in New Zealand appears to be increasing rather than decreasing, not only as a packaging material, but now as a filler and as insulation material in roading, construction and landscaping projects. • Given the deleterious impact of polystyrene in terms of soil toxicity, water contamination and its negative impact on fauna and flora, I am keen to see this issue addressed without delay. • I fully support central government's initiative to phase out polystyrene and of the proposed policy frameworks, standards and regulatory mechanisms, as well as timeframes and strategies for action, set to achieve this. • The cradle-to-grave lifecycle of polystyrene yields toxicity at each stage. • Polystyrene manufacturing processes release harmful benzene emissions; carcinogenic chemicals are leached during the use-phase; at disposal phase, polystyrene often contaminates recycling waste streams, and accounts for 30% of global landfill. • The lightweight material is easily picked up by winds and is scattered from construction sites and commercial waste skips, into adjacent fields, residential areas, overland waterways and marine environments. It photodegrades into microscopic, carcinogenic particles that are eventually ingested, inhaled or absorbed by both flora and fauna, with a cumulative, bio-persistent effect throughout the food chain. • Polystyrene presents an unmanageable, toxic waste stream. • Because of the manner in which it breaks down, polystyrene is impossible to fully recover from the receiving environment. I therefore strongly support a phase-out of polystyrene manufacturing and use and support a mandate on suppliers/importers that requires suppliers/importers to take back polystyrene, at their own cost. • In the interim period, while consultation on a polystyrene phase-out is underway, it is our advice that: o environmental externalities linked to polystyrene are clearly communicated by government to consumers and businesses o businesses be educated and encouraged to engage with suppliers to advise them to use, (in the case of packaging), reusable or biodegradable alternatives; or to enforce a packaging take-back policy. o in the case of roading, construction and landscaping projects, construction companies, developers and civil engineering companies should be engaged and made aware of the environmental impacts of polystyrene use, and be advised of and encouraged to use alternatives (such as waste concrete, rock filler, soil). • Large volumes of photo-degraded polystyrene accumulate daily in Auckland's urban streams, in estuaries and along coastline. • There is a growing body of international research pointing to the endocrine disrupting impacts of polystyrene on aquatic fauna. • Once combined with organic residues (such as shown below) polystyrene and other microplastics become very difficult to separate and recover from these environments .

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Improved and healthier environment for people, flora and fauna, out oceans and soils

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Again again cups,

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

the quicker the better

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

reward those companies people who are early adopters with tax cuts or incentives

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 315

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

A blanket approach is the only way to truly address the plastic problem. If all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging is phased out there will be a reduction in resources needed to process the refuse. If only certain packaging is banned the resources needed to process the waste still exists.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Reduced resources spent on processing and storing plastic waste, environmental benefits through reduction in microplastics and general pollution.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes
Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

3 years

Notes

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 316

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Straws would be a challenge. There are types of beverages that work best with large diameter straws: "bubble tea" favoured by Asians and some crushed ice drinks. In addition, there are people who need straws in able to imbibe without choking.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Step one needs to be clear mandatory labelling and education, businesses do need a strong up front signal to drive their change. We can't rely only on early adopters. We need better education.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Effective support and education is needed. So many people have a "single use" habit. They throw away reusable items, so education, plus an improved waste system to prevent contamination is essential.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Oxodegradeable is "green wash", clear labelling can help with PVC and polystyrene (expanded) and we need to work with the packaging industry to ensure substitutes are fit for purpose - maybe develop for reuse and circular options.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Early strong/firm signals of change needed for businesses, maybe 2003 is a challenge given some products are still being

shipped, with the COVID 19 slow downs.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There are more Low Density Polyethylene being offered as alternatives: labelling essential, somewhere to recycle the product essential, perhaps need to build more reuse into the system.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

styrene are too cheap to manufacture new. People need to understand the economics of the recycling market because we need to bring the public with us on this. So allow time and \$ for the research to plug into the education programmes and ID appropriate for specific target audiences..

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

NA - packaging industry needs to respond. But from a user perspective it would be very helpful.in addition to being better for our planet's ecosystem and therefore also human health.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We see so much of the above on our beaches. We need to enable funding for more R&D if needed to find solutions. Also need to ensure there is no greenwashing.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Because this results in more-microplastics getting into the environment and is in effect green-washing from a consumer perspective.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

NA

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

From a TA perspective, this may help with our procurement processes. Mandatory labelling might also help.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Yes, along with mandatory labelling.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Really need to quantification of size of issue, mandatory labelling and associated education to bring people with us.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

there needs to be perhaps an infographic explanation of properties of types of plastics

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

should be 1 year, but given COVID 19 and shipping challenges, make it 18 months. Maybe there can be a 6 month period of grace. We still need mandatory labelling, because there are times when single use compostable is better.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I think one of the main issues is people and routines - that set them up ready for work. There is also the fact people feel like they are achieving something having a nice cup of coffee on the run. Popularity of drive through and takeaways makes these behaviour changes harder.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months, with a 6 month period of grace, given COVID 19 hold ups. Need to distinguish between plastic lined and PLA lined, as I understand PLA is derived from an organic product that biodegrades into organic, not pleastic? We may need more education or research on this.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Notes

NA

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Customs/border for imports of food product. I think we have electronic equipment as a priority product so need spot checking

as those items are also used for illegal imports. Would need standard messaging going to all suppliers of imported goods to explain what we are trying to achieve as a country.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 317

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

It may also be good to include that the use of the plastic may affect whether they are easy or hard to recycle. For example, where the use means that they are hard to clean, therefore making them unsuitable for recycling due to contamination.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The primary objective is key to reducing the risk of plastics to the environment, however an additional objective which should be pursued in a bid to remove hard to recycle plastics, reduce the amount of plastics requiring recycling and therefore the use of other resources, is an increase in the use of reusable plastics (packaging/items). This needs to be done at all levels: through the support of companies to use reusable items/packaging, support the infrastructure that is needed to facilitate it and through community engagement. This would help to solutions to move higher up in the waste hierarchy, and helps avoid the move from one single-use material to another.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Other options such as making reusable items mandatory for dine-in settings should also be considered. Another point to consider with Option 6, is that although the mandatory phase-out of PVC and PS packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items is very feasible with many suitable alternatives already being available, it may be good to do this in conjunction with infrastructure support for the handling of alternative materials such as non-plastic compostable packaging and/or single-use items (stirrers, spoons etc). This will help support the move to a greener circular system. I do not believe Option 8 should even be considered.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

. However I believe the timeframes are too long, and should be brought forward. Suitable alternative materials are available, and the relative short shelf-life of food means that turnover would be high, therefore transmission should be more quickly achieved as stock turnover is continuous. Would it be possible to have a mandatory date, but have incentives in place to encourage transitions to occur earlier?

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Phasing out all PVC and PS would have multiple benefits, including; the efficiency of the recycling of other plastics, would reduce the change of these two plastics that contain known toxicants from entering the environment, and also reduce the level of confusion around what is/isn't recyclable by the general public which would help optimize what is going to recycling.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. I agree with the examples provided in Table 5, and it must be acknowledged that new materials are currently under development which could provide even more alternatives in the future.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Other beneficiaries include Ecosystem health – both from the end-of-life impacts of plastics but also in reducing the amount of plastics being produced which uses large amounts of resources, and also introduces new carbon into the biosphere (from fossil fuels). Therefore the impact on climate is also lessened. Human health – reduced potential level of plastics within food and air if less plastic is being produced. Also air quality which are impacted by production and management/disposal of plastics. General disruption of the natural environment through littering also is known to have an impact on mental health and wellbeing, therefore reduction in plastic production and potential seepage into the environment would benefit these. Indigenous communities – through the impact on the natural environments that are integral to customary practices.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Reduction in the price of the better alternatives, which currently are often considered as “boutique” and cost more. A move towards these options will help to reduce their costs and then make it more available to the wider population. Clearer and stricter labelling rules. Better information provided to retailers around food safety and BYO containers.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with all those items listed in Table 7. Other items I feel should also be included, are: • Lollipop sticks and wrappers. They are a common items in litter, and previously used to be made from paper, therefore an alternative material is already available. • Single-serve condiments/toiletry packets. Condiment packets are a common items in litter. The Fox Glacier landfill disaster also highlighted the high numbers of these going to landfill as they were a very common item collected by volunteers helping to clear up the waste that had been washed out. These items do not have the potential for recycling due to their small size, contamination by residual food/soup, and being made of multiple materials (plastics, foils). Their composition may also make it difficult to find replacement materials, although not necessarily impossible but development may not be financially viable. • Plasticised thermal paper receipts. • Complementary plastic toys on children’s magazines • Plastic polymer-based chewing gums. • Glitter and plastic confetti. These primary microplastics/mesoplastics directly enter the environment during use, and indirectly through wastewater effluent, as they are not always removal during wastewater treatment. And those removed during treatment end up in the biosolids which are often applied to land. Consideration also needs to be made to the use of “biodegradable” alternatives. Research to date suggests that they do not degrade under the environmental conditions they often end up, and that they still pose a risk to their receiving environments. • Balloons (rubber and foil) and associated sticks/ribbon. • Single-use plastic coffee pods- including the “compostable” plastics. • Tea bags – sealed with plastic, and the individual plastic wrapping of bags. • Single-use water bottles – in Aotearoa-New Zealand there seems no need to have to buy bottled water. It may also be good to consider a ban on the production of bottled water for export. • Synthetic fibre wet wipes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Single-use plastic produce bags – this should be extended to include a ban on the pre-sealed plastic bags that fresh produce is often sold in. in addition this should also include the plastic net bags that pre-bagged times come in (e.g. onion bags). Single-use plastic cups and lids –All plastic cups and lids should be considered here, not only those in 1, 2 and 5. Although the polymers are not recyclable the probability of them being recyclable is very small due to the contamination through use.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for single-use items where alternatives are already available. 2 years for where new alternatives need to be identified and/or infrastructure needed to support a change is required.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups: • Mandatory reusable for dine-in customers • Creation of official guidelines and food safety regulations around the use of reusable coffee cups. Wet wipes: • Declare as a priority product and ban the importation/sale of them.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2022 for both plastic-lined coffee cups and wet wipes

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The wider community could help support this by reporting breaches – e.g. reporting the use of single items in dine-in situations. Could it be incorporated into a climate certification for a business? As a “Plastic Footprint” similar to carbon footprint accreditation schemes?

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 318

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Where we have a problem, we need to resolve the existing issue as well as preventing further issues

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

Unless we have suitable alternatives, the general populace will struggle to support a phase out if they don't have reasonable

alternatives.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

An incredible benefit to our environment and overall waste management processes.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes but these alternatives may also require a shift in behavior and that will take time. We need to support innovation and research to support this shift and provide alternatives.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Potential short term costs for long term benefits.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Education/alternatives

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

We can do it. We have demonstrated through the removal of plastic bags in supermarkets the adaptability of us as a consumer.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Stop the import and production of these types of products to support the start of this initiative. Don't allow the importation or production of products that do not meet standards outlined in this proposal.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Through clear education, communication and understanding of timeframes. Once time frames have been passed, put support in place with producers and companies to support this transition.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 319

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

No clothing has been taken into account yet makes up over 70% of the micro-fibres found in our drinking water as well as a large proportion of refuse CO2 emissions

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Definitely need some reform in the plastics area, but needs to be ALL plastic and include textiles

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Recycling these should still meet our plastic needs so utilize the current stores o plastic to create a more circular process

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Recycling these should still meet our plastic needs so utilize the current stores of plastic to create a more circular process for the items still required

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Stop imports and create solutions for recycling, research into this needed and uptake by social enterprises

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Textiles

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Start with all and encourage uptake of recycling enterprises

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Need to have support for entities that look at options for recycling or reuse of these plastics

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Computerized ability to segregate rubbish, then utilize current developing resources - research in to seaweed, bio plastics, community based projects already undertaking this, etc

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Textiles need to be included in a phase out, definitely more research into compostable residue of plastics in environment

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Higher benefit if managed holistically and all sectors looked

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Benefits to reduction in landfills as the plastics become a valuable commodity rather than throw away, social and community enterprises may develop around this creating job opportunities as well as research

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Clarity around what can be reused, recycled, ease around recycling, i.e. separate collections for each, colour coded symbols as

all look same on plastic items, including clothing, encouragement of filters to reduce microplastics from waste water

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Include textiles

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Achieved in lessor time with plastic bags but need to allow industry lead in and time to source alternatives

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

only allow those with bioplastic and provide compost for each area, research longer term effects of the plastics breaking down.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA but I feel there needs to be a fee for removal of non recyclable items for those imported or used so that it is in the companies best interest to support recycling or reuse of these items.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

6 months coffee cups, 1 year baby wipes

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

review of each industry , landfill items audit, community surveys, research

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 320

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There are many other, more sustainable options that should be used instead

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Environmental

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Using other materials (biodegradable) to create cups.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Support from the government to transition to more sustainable products.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2025

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Incentivised approach, not just taking a stick and harsh regulations. A transition.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 321

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

include unnecessary packaging such as boxes for tubed products (i.e. toothpaste, cosmetic products) unnecessary plastic

packaging of fruits (i.e. Sliced fruits)

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

just benefits for the planet. companies (their packaging department) have to take this drastic change. Profit should be secondary goal.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

if companies stop using plastics, us consumers will just adopt. We might not even realise something changed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

single-use cups - encourage dine in or ask customers to bring their bottle Wet wipes - reusable cloth wipes and provide free public "washing machine" use to wash these reusable sanitary wipes/clothes

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

a push from consumers and regulation from government...tax incentive/rebate, R&D rebate and R&D from government can also help

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

6 months for New Zealand

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 322

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Polystyrene manufacturing processes release harmful benzene emissions; carcinogenic chemicals are leached during the use-phase; at disposal phase, polystyrene often contaminates recycling waste streams, and accounts for 30% of global landfill.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

it is impossible to remove from land and waterways once it has broken down into small parts. This is a huge benefit to our natural spaces and organisms if we can remove the problem at the source

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 323

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

reduction i landfill, ecological benefits of removing particulatres from ecosyste

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 324

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Reduces chance of loopholes being exploited, ie, mis-classifying product type to be able to continue producing it with PVC

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Reduced emissions/improved air quality by removing a common substance burnt on rural properties to avoid paying transfer station fees.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

More cardboard can be used in packaging - look at companies like Apple that have dramatically reduced/removed PVC and polystyrene from their products and packaging.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 325

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Due to the fact that our recycled waste was being dumped at sea in the past and that it is not being disposed of in the correct manner.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

New Zealand has failed to adopt a sound method of waste disposal and still relies on landfill (rubbish dumps). We need Waste To Energy plants in N.Z. Then plastic can be disposed of correctly and produce energy.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

These products are very useful and can be disposed of if we have WTE plants.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Waste To Energy disposal of rubbish/plastics.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Do not agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items (please comment below)

Notes

They are useful in maintaining food quality and long life of food to prevent food waste.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest

other options.

Notes

Phase out wet wipes, as they create major problems with sewer systems.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The major plastic problem comes from clothing being washed and entering the food chain as micro plastics. This is the greatest adverse effect of plastic which NEEDS to be addressed. A move to natural fiber garments should be promoted.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 327

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Unclear / Not Stated

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It's good to address one area before moving to another area. Food and beverage is also one of the highest contributor so it makes sense

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The biggest benefit is a sustainable and environmental friendly approach

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Na

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

We may not be the first country to do this but being among the early adopters proves to the other nation that it's doable and encourages more countries to follow. More adopters also provides the manufacturer of alternative environmental friendly packaging to leverage the cost and provide a better priced product appealing to more customers

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

A life calculator that counts the benefits this move make in several aspect such as energy saved, dump site size saved, etc

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Reusable containers

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Na

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

18 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Online transparent reporting site that shows list of business entity with proven wrongdoing and number of reports lodged against them.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 328

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assist communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, however the proposed time-frames are too slow. I support: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so I would like to see the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected

party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems (such as the great example of Again Again cups) The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed. Support for growth/expansion of great innovations & start ups like the Again Again cup deposit scheme, which I am aware wants to expand to other containers.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups: I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups,

supporting deposit return schemes for takeaway cups , and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change

Wet wipes: I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would also support:

- investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems)
- compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups: With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and I agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 329

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

totally against the use of single-use plastics, so wasteful since all that energy and resource went in to creating something that will only be used once and landfilled - and if not properly disposed, it's so detrimental to the environment

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

i think all polystyrene - including those in construction should also be banned. There are wool insulates which surely can be manufactured as an alternative. The construction/development industry is one of the highest contributors of waste to landfill - allowing the use of polystyrene in this industry will only allow more polystyrene added to our landfills

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not,

what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

if the cost of plastic alternatives is not too high

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 330

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Sooner is better

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

alternative innovations accelerated

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

unsure

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

cost effective eco alternatives

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

discounted coffee for reusable cups. rewards schemes for keep cups. non plastic wipes. washable wipes

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 mo

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Fines/name&shame/potential for imprisonment for serious/repeat offenders.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 331

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Move to ban before 2025; industry must adapt faster. A wider range of plastic products would be good to block. Ban plastic bread bags; demand plant based alternatives, eg those investigated by SCION CRI in the 2000s, surely we can boost R+D and jobs in the lignin/cellulose space in NZ via forestry waste or seaweed?

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Think also charges should be levied on producers. Recycling was a ruse started by industry to deflect regulation and charges upstream in production

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Mandatory phase-out is vital; only caveat in to move faster.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Be great at phase out items before 2025; polystyrene-- HP printers packed in formed cardboard [from paper and card waste] since 00s. These products pollute the globe and we should stop them sooner; be bold and courageous!

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes b/c as doc notes at p45, 'Many New Zealand manufacturers, brands and businesses have already moved away from using PVC and polystyrene, in line with best practice and international trends. '

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Less waste, less pollution, less noxious fumes, less marine biodiversity damage -- but try for 2023 or 24. !

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Pollution, waste, and 'take-make-waste' linear processing is harmful and only has eye to profit not circular economy principles which are vital and must be implemented

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Govt is aiming for circular economy model ; this is part of that process and important. There are larger scale things to address too, but this is a functional and people- visible policy.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Bringing in phase-outs sooner. invest in more R+D for plant-based NZ made/designed alternatives; incentivise reuse and less plastics at the design, transport , wholesale/ retail and packaging levels. Be more like Germany?! Aim for 2021/22 - courage! A more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Add bread bags to the mix Add plastic sticks of Chupa Chup lollipops!

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

the 2 year window is a compromise--2025 too slow! Look at Sth Korea re bags: Announced 2018 Passed 2019 Fully implemented by Sept 2020. Or Swiss: 1990! Come on NZ!

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Raglan shows: just bring your own or use Again Again; we are adaptable. Keep Cups or heavier duty cardboard as we used to use. Otherwise task SCION with a full-on R+D and the plan and implementation roll out of lignin-based products derived from pine forests.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years, with a lot of alternatives on show; one generation ago we did not have these 2 items. We can adapt. -introduce compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes; it's a great range of options and is thorough. It's great to see MFE being FOR the enviro.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Ensure compliance is fully resourced, and funds for compliance ring-fenced. Be active in calling-in in public eyes for monitoring too/compliance. Fund WasteMINZ and Love Food Hate Waste etc.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 332

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

I think the purpose of the packaging is irrelevant to the environmental impact, therefore shouldn't just be constrained to food, beverage and EPS

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Substantial, long-term environmental benefits

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Availability. Also mandatory ban because often our use of non-recyclable plastics is not by choice but because we buy something that we simply can't find without plastic packaging

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 333

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Overall, the consultation document gives a good & thorough description of the problems that the targeted plastics pose to resource recovery systems, and the health & wellbeing of the environment, wildlife & people. We appreciate the work that has gone into justifying the need for these proposals. I would welcome more in-depth consideration of the problems associated with single-use systems (as opposed to single-use plastic items) and then seeing this linked to the proposed policies. From the perspective of zero waste and circular economy theory, the problem isn't just about plastic as a material, but the resource & energy intensive way that all materials are used & discarded in a linear economy. The part of the consultation document to which this question relates contains a small section on 'creating a culture of reuse' (p. 20), but doesn't explain how such a culture is created, nor the Government's role in that and how this might go hand-in-hand with the phase-out of single-use items. The consultation document even refers to the Takeaway Throwaways campaign, yet states we're calling on the Government to ban single-use plastic tableware and omits to mention the campaign's equally important headline ask that the Government advance measures to co-design and mandate accessible reusable alternatives. I believe the Government's framing of the problem as predominantly about the impact of plastic material, and its downplaying of the 'single-use' part of the equation, has shaped its narrow approach to the policy proposals.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. I urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers key actions I'd expect to see. I have two concerns: 1. There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time, e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. 2. The list is missing some key policy options that could really help grow reuse - deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria & weightings make sense & help to understand the Government's reasoning behind the proposals. I suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy. Some criteria need broader definitions: "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse. "Achievability" should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. I also suggest new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether

they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support banning all the items listed (except for plastic straws - see my answer to Q16). Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, I urge the Govt not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead take forward more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too! A 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Govt can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The staged approach and the categorisation of the products falling into the two stages make sense. However, both could happen on shorter timeframes. The world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years (1), and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040 (2). We need to act decisively to reverse these trends. EU Member States will ban many of the items and materials targeted by the present proposal by July 2021 (under the Single-Use Plastics Directive). So, the growth of alternatives will be in full swing internationally, making it easier for countries like New Zealand to follow suit faster. I suggest that Stage 1 products are phased out by June 2021 and Stage 2 products are phased out by June 2023. 1: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-018-0212-7> 2: https://www.pewtrusts.org/-/media/assets/2020/07/breakingtheplasticwave_report.pdf

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this expansive and ambitious list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, water-ways and marine environment - damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. A small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation. However due to the harmful properties of plastic in the environment, I would support it being replaced as a packaging material. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Many alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. I also call for Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics - I wholeheartedly support this. I would prefer to see this ban occur more quickly. Many overseas jurisdictions, including the EU, will be phasing-out oxo-degradable plastics by July 2021. I believe New Zealand should follow this timeframe too.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The consultation document sets out a comprehensive list of costs & benefits of the mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. I agree with all listed. I also appreciate acknowledgment of the potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers and the cost savings for the wider community of reducing the complexity of our waste & recycling streams. I also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. Overall, I believe the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits - human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit that is currently missing is the new potential opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. If this opportunity is harnessed, it will not only reduce waste and recycling, it will also have a positive job creation impact. Preliminary studies indicate that reusable packaging systems tend to produce higher numbers of jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. Furthermore, those jobs are more dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals. (1) The growth of reuse schemes will also lead to a reduction in single-use/one-way packaging generally (not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and thus ratepayers. 1: See, for example, Miller, M. Bolger, L. Copello (2019) Reusable solutions: how governments can help stop single-use plastic pollution (3Keel, Oxford, United Kingdom: A study by the Rethink Plastic alliance and the Break Free From Plastic movement), p.15; Patrick Albrecht, Jens Brodersen, Dieter W Horst and Miriam Scherf (2011) Reuse and Recycling Systems for Selected Beverage Packaging from a Sustainability Perspective: An analysis of the ecological, economic and social impacts of reuse and recycling systems and approaches to solutions for further development (PriceWaterhouseCoopers), pp.ix, xvii, 53.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

As noted previously, concrete Government regulation and investment is needed to move reusable alternatives from the niche to the mainstream. Furthermore, a coordinated universal design approach is needed to ensure these alternatives are accessible for everyone in our community (taking into account potential barriers, such as cost or disability). Government direction and oversight in all this is necessary. A hands-off, pro-voluntary, awareness raising approach from the Government that leaves the development of reuse schemes entirely up to the whims of private interests will not guarantee a baseline reusables system that is widespread, accessible and environmentally, socially and economically efficient. The consultation document

notes that removing the targeted plastics could lead to greater use of other hard-to-recycle materials, such as composites. The proposal for mitigating this risk is “pairing the phase-out with best practice guidance on sustainable packaging... an opportunity to educate businesses and the public, and raise awareness of the environmental impact of different choices.” (p46) I do not believe this approach is sufficient to achieve the outcomes the Government seeks. Nor is it the best use of government resource (not least because it risks duplicating the mahi that many community groups and NGOs have been doing for some time now). What’s really needed is for the Government to play its part and back up our collective effort with policy, regulations and investment that make “best practice... sustainable packaging” (i.e. reusable/refillable packaging wherever possible) standard practice.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, (including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastic counterparts), except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. Some people with accessibility needs require a plastic straw to drink. While some reusable alternatives work well for some people, for others there may be no reusable alternative that is suitable. I also support extending the list to include these other single-use plastic items: Disposable coffee cups & lids: A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this “branded litter” already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. For takeaways, reuse systems & BYO ‘keep cups’ are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. There are over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... and they’re thriving. Proving that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. A ban on SUC combined with Govt support for reuse schemes can provide security for take-out only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies.. As with all items that involve access to liquids in a hospitality setting, I suggest Govt liaise with the disabled community to seek guidance as to how reusable alternatives can be widely available for all. I urge the Government to take the plunge & ban all disposable coffee cups & lids. I believe they are amongst the most straightforward items to phase out - practically, and due to the increasingly negative public perception towards them. Plastic lollipop sticks and wrappers: These present a similar hazard to plastic cotton buds and can easily be replaced by cardboard sticks. Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries: For example, soy fish, pottles with peelable plastic lids for jam, butter and other condiments, sachets of sauces, condiments, sugar and toiletries. One of the items commonly picked up by volunteers cleaning up after the Fox River landfill disaster were single-use sachets from the accommodation and hospitality providers in this popular tourist destination. Some hotels are already voluntarily phasing out these single-serve items. These types of products have been earmarked for banning by the Irish Government in their recently released National Waste Policy (p.33). Coffee pods containing plastic: Single-serve coffee pods made of any material are hard-to-recycle because each pod contains coffee grinds that must be removed before recycling is possible. I would support a phase-out of all single-use coffee pods (reusable pods exist), but for the purposes of this consultation I call for those containing plastic to be included in this mandatory phase-out list. Teabags containing plastic: Many teabags contain plastic (either in the bag itself or the adhesives that hold the bag together). This is not common knowledge and many people put used teabags in their compost bins. Consequently, teabags containing plastic present a similar concern for potential plastic contamination of soil as plastic fruit stickers do. The consultation document has earmarked fruit stickers for a ban; for consistency’s sake, teabags containing plastic should be included on the list for mandatory phase-out too. Not all teabags contain plastic, so alternatives clearly do exist. In addition to potential microplastic contamination of soils, plastic in teabags is also a health concern as the plastic and additives may be released into the tea while it’s steeping. Single-use plastic water bottles: In New Zealand, we have widespread access to potable water from the tap, so bottling water in plastic and transporting it around the country and the world needlessly creates harmful emissions and waste. Single use plastic bottles are an inefficient and environmentally harmful way to provide access to potable water, which could be replaced by public fountains or bulk, reusable containers. Initiatives like Refill NZ are gaining traction, but we need to see Government leadership in banning or at least imposing on single-use plastic water bottles to make a real difference in the volume of plastic water bottles used. This would also benefit the tourism industry, by reinforcing New Zealand’s brand as one of high environmental standards. Balloons and balloon sticks. (1) Glitter and plastic confetti: Plastic-based glitter is used in a wide range of cosmetic products and art supplies. Prior to voluntary bans in the UK, early childhood centres admitted to using kilos every year. Similarly, mardi gras and music festival organisers are phasing out the use of glitter for environmental reasons, particularly as there are plenty of environmentally-friendly options on the market. As a microplastic, glitter shares similar environmental impacts to other microplastics (although its sharp edges may cause more physical damage to smaller creatures when ingested) and therefore, it is not always distinguished from other microplastics in peer-reviewed scientific publications. Complementary plastic toys on children’s magazines and with fast food. Chewing gum containing plastic - most large branded chewing gum contains plastic and causes up to 100,000 tonnes of plastic pollution globally every year. (2) Beyond the single-use items proposed in the document, I would support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes, and other disposable sanitary products, and to reduce the harm from industrial and commercial use of plastics like fishing nets, plastic wrap and strapping used in freight, and plastic building wrap used in construction. I also urge the Government to implement a regulatory plan to address cigarette butts. According to the Prime Minister’s Chief Science Advisor, cigarette butts account for 78% of all items littered in New Zealand and are the most commonly found item in beach litter clean ups. Globally, cigarette butts are thought to be the most littered item on Earth. (3) The consultation document mentions cigarette butts in passing (p.50) but offers no plan because there may not be plastic-free alternatives. However, measures other than a phase-out could be implemented under s 23 of the WMA, such as mandatory on-package labelling to increase smokers’ awareness that butts contain plastic and appropriate means

of disposal, or fees on filters put on the market to cover estimated clean-up costs. 1: Wilcox, C., Mallos, N. J., Leonard, G. H., Rodriguez, A., & Hardesty, B. D. (2016). Using expert elicitation to estimate the impacts of plastic pollution on marine wildlife. *Marine Policy*, 65, 107-114; Gilmour, M. E., & Lavers, J. L. (2020). Latex balloons do not degrade uniformly in freshwater, marine and composting environments. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 123629; Mellish, S., Pearson, E. L., McLeod, E. M., Tuckey, M. R., & Ryan, J. C. (2019). What goes up must come down: an evaluation of a zoo conservation-education program for balloon litter on visitor understanding, attitudes, and behaviour. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(9), 1393-1415. 2: <https://www.sciencefocus.com/science/what-is-in-chewing-gum/>; <http://justoneocean.org/chewing-gum> 3: Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisory (2019) Rethinking Plastics in Aotearoa New Zealand, p.95.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I support banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then I would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, I don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. I do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see my answer to Q16). I also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

A 12 - 18 month time period should be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see my discussion about this in Q17).

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Disposable coffee cups The most impactful thing the Govt can do is use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility & availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Note that accessibility includes affordability. Many of these actions can happen under s 23 of the WMA/without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. Regulatory & legislative actions include disposable coffee cups in the proposed ban list as this will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with the alternatives faster. Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California) Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. A disposable coffee cup levy and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. A Deposit Return Scheme for BOTH disposable coffee cups, & reusables offered through a reuse scheme. A DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all hospitality outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash and reuse returned reusable cups. Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. Collaborative, practical policy actions Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings) Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design principles & are accessible for everyone in the community. Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Thoughts on the Govt suggestions... The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. I support this alongside regulatory & policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to the growth of reuse schemes. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. Investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups is not a good use of public funds. Better to put this money towards stimulating a reusables network. I urge the Government not to use its finite resources to reinvent the wheel & run a public education campaign about reusables. Loads of NGOs & community groups already do this mahi. We need Government to back our efforts with its unique policy & regulation-making superpowers. We need Government to champion and amplify the positives of truly circular reusable options! Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into

waterways and blocking of sewerage systems), and compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging (these labelling requirements should be mandated under s 23(1)(f) of the WMA). Before a ban is phased in, I would also support fees being attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs (which can be considerable when they block pipes and form fatbergs). Currently the community is covering these costs through Council. It would be more appropriate to attach this cost to producers and consumers through a fee. This is different to a levy as it’s related to the cost of managing the product and could be achieved under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA. A ban on advertising for wet wipes containing plastic would also be appropriate.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

A combination of regulation to disincentivise single-use and build a reuse culture, community engagement, and reuse infrastructure would enable the transition away from single-use coffee cups. I invite the Government to consult with the hospitality businesses, collaborations, and social enterprises working in this space in Aotearoa to hear what has made their projects successful, as well as ongoing barriers and opportunities, such as: ● UYO ● SUC-free Wanaka ● Again Again ● Cupcycling ● Good to Go Waiheke ● The Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project ● Takeaway Throwaways ● Wanakup In relation to wet wipes, a collaborative effort with an educator such as Kate Meads who has long advocated and supported public transition to reusable alternatives, could be appropriate.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable (e.g. by Jan 2022).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

A comprehensive list of the costs and benefits of mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. I agree with all listed, and appreciate the acknowledgement of the potential cost savings for retailers from a move to phase-out unnecessary single-use items, the cost savings for local govt (and therefore ratepayers) from reduced waste & litter, and the fact that banning items across the board has the benefit of levelling the playing field. One significant cost missing is the potential impact that a ban on plastic straws will have for individuals with accessibility needs who require a straw to drink, and the potential that needing to rely on an exemption will be stigmatising. One benefit that is currently missing is the new potential opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. If this opportunity is harnessed, it will not only reduce waste and recycling, it will also have a positive job creation impact. As noted in Q 14, preliminary studies indicate that reusable packaging systems tend to produce higher numbers of jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. Furthermore, those jobs are more dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals. The growth of reuse schemes will also lead to a reduction in single-use/one-way packaging generally (not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and thus ratepayers. As noted in Q13, overall I think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits – human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. (1) Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches. 1: <https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/121906873/400-plastic-bag-breaches-reported--but-businesses-are-getting-around-the-ban>

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 334

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

• I fully support central government's initiative to phase out polystyrene and of the proposed policy frameworks, standards and regulatory mechanisms, as well as timeframes and strategies for action, set to achieve this. • The cradle-to-grave lifecycle of polystyrene yields toxicity at each stage. • Polystyrene manufacturing processes release harmful benzene emissions; carcinogenic chemicals are leached during the use-phase; at disposal phase, polystyrene often contaminates recycling waste streams, and accounts for 30% of global landfill. • The lightweight material is easily picked up by winds and is scattered from construction sites and commercial waste skips, into adjacent fields, residential areas, overland waterways and marine environments. It photodegrades into microscopic, carcinogenic particles that are eventually ingested, inhaled or absorbed by both flora and fauna, with a cumulative, bio-persistent effect throughout the food chain. • Polystyrene presents an unmanageable, toxic waste stream. • Because of the manner in which it breaks down, polystyrene is impossible to fully recover from the receiving environment. I therefore strongly support a phase-out of polystyrene manufacturing and use and support a mandate on suppliers/importers that requires suppliers/importers to take back polystyrene, at their own cost.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

There are already many alternatives to single use coffee cups. Single use coffee cups should be included in the list of single use plastic-containing items to be immediately phased out.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

There are already many alternatives to single use coffee cups. Single use coffee cups should be included in the list of single use plastic-containing items to be immediately phased out. I.e. they should be phased out by the end of 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 335

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. "An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021. All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022. Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It's more consistent

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Ideally this would be done earlier, by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Taxes on hard to recycle plastic and subsidies on reusable containers Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with it except for the ban on plastic straws. It is important that consultation with the disabled community is done and it must be ensured that exemptions are sorted before any action happens. I also support the list being extended to include: - plastic lollipop sticks - single serve pottles, sachets, and containers for condiments and toiletries - teabags and coffee pods containing plastic - single use plastic water bottles - balloons and balloon sticks - glitter and plastic confetti - complementary plastic toys I also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as industrial plastics, particularly fishing nets

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

single use plastic produce bags should include plastic net bags tableware: should include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single use cups 2 years for single use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

the most impactful role for the government is to use regulation, policy and investment to increase the uptake, accessibility, reach, and availability of reusable alternatives I support the government investing in scaling up reuse systems, implementing interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing including a levy or fee on disposable cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating reusables only for dine in contexts and public buildings - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change With wet wipes I support transitioning away from plastic containing ones asap, but in the meantime, investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and issues associated with wet wipes, as well as compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose correctly and prohibiting the use of the word 'flushable' on packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

coffee cups - by 2023, wet wipes as soon as practicable - Jan 2022

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 336

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The environmental problems with plastic are well-documented. We need to work towards phasing out all single use plastic (except for essential purposes such as medical equipment) as even when plastic is recyclable it is often not captured for recycling or can only be recycled a limited number of times.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I believe the focus on packaging is just a beginning, but does not go far enough. Polystyrene, for example, is also used extensively in the construction industry, and when it is sawn up on building sites it is often not contained and small and large pieces blow into the environment, contaminating the soil, beaches, and waterways. There is a viable alternative now for underfloor insulation, but it is slightly more expensive so rarely used. A blanket ban on polystyrene would increase the market for this new product and drive down prices.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Again, I think NZ could be more ambitious. By 2025 we will have added many more tonnes of these products to landfills, and microplastics to the environment.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Again, why only focus on packaging?

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Awareness and education must accompany these changes. New Zealanders took easily to the plastic bag ban, and got used to putting their shopping bags in their car to go to the supermarket or mall. With encouragement, we can do the same with bringing our own lunch containers, plates, cutlery etc.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Easy to find alternatives, reminders to bring re-usables along, discounts for using re-usables at food outlets, information about why this is making a difference to the environment.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Disposable coffee cups should be included. New Zealanders can get used to the idea of bringing a keep cup, and many cafes are part of cup lending schemes. So called 'eco-cups' are not easily composted, not recyclable, and not a good alternative. We need to get away from the sanctioning of all single use items.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

If we built the true cost to our future generations, who will have to cope with unstable and risky landfills and contaminated soils and waterways into our concept of 'cost' into these calculations the shortest possible time-frame would also look like the cheapest.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban them both. Wet wipes can easily be replaced with re-usable cotton cloths. Coffee cups can be replaced with keep cups.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

As soon as possible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

As above - we should be thinking about the cost to our future generations not just immediate costs.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Fines issued for non-compliance, and a system for the public to report on non-compliance. If repeated fines incurred, a stricter penalty, e.g. enforced closure of the business.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 337

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This will reduce the quantity of plastic but we also need to promote and support re-use systems

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This sends strong positive messages that we are moving away from single use plastics

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We also need regulatory requirements to support reuse alternatives

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The time frames are to slow PVC trays need to phased out by June 2021 and Stage 2 by 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not,

what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Phasing it out will protect our water ways and soils and reduce contamination in the recycling stream.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

These need to be banned by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes but we also need to consider the environment as an extension of ourselves and our community rather than a commodity or resource to be used

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Business opportunity to create reuse systems and packaging. Creates strong message that single use is not suitable for NZ businesses and society

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wetwipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 338

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by a comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils. Phasing out PVC will also assist NZ re-processors to effectively recycle PET 1 trays.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed. Provide information and resources to businesses to help them to make good packaging choices.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: - Single-use coffee cups & lids (including compostable cups) - Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: - Plastic lollipop sticks - Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries - Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic - Single-use plastic water bottles - Balloons and balloon sticks - Glitter and plastic confetti - Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets. We at Single Use Cup Free (SUCfree) Wanaka recommend that single use coffee cups are added to the list of items. A ban on single use coffee cups is an easy and effective solution for these reasons: 1. BYO cups are available at low or no-cost. 2. Cup-lending schemes are already established and cup libraries are cheap to run. 3. In Wanaka, behaviour change around single-use cups has happened rapidly and it is already a social norm in the town for people to BYO cup. 4. Our slogan Sit, BYO or Borrow has helped cafes communicate new behaviours and quickly educates visitors to our town.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement and support cafes, restaurants and bars.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change SUCfree Wanaka (under the banner of the legal entity Plastic Free Wanaka) is a collaborative, hospitality-led initiative with the goal of making Wanaka single-use cup-free (SUCfree) by 2022. We believe we

have a working model for a SUCfree NZ which can be shared with other communities to support them to adopt new behaviours and support government legislation. With the support of the Queenstown Lakes Waste Minimisation Community Fund, SUCfree Wanaka 2022 was launched in 2019 along with the implementation of Again Again's cup lending scheme. The SUCfree campaign encourages cafe customers to avoid single-use cups, and instead choose to "Sit, BYO or Borrow". In the short space of time since our launch these behaviours are becoming the norm in our town. Overheard at a recent community event - "oh mate you don't want to be seen with that in here!" Since we launched in 2019 we have had wide support across the Wanaka hospitality sector and the wider community - 28 cafes have joined the SUCfree Wanaka movement and are taking action to reduce their use of takeaway cups. In the first 12 months we estimate to have saved around 180,000 single-use cups from landfill. - 9 Wanaka cafes are already 100% SUCfree and 3 more are about to make the move - each saving between 1,000 - 2,000 cups from landfill each month - 26 cafes have cup lending schemes in place (Again Again, glass jars, cup libraries, local cup lending scheme) Critical to our success so far has been: - A collaborative model - sustainability groups working together with the hospitality sector and cafes working together towards a shared goal - Financial support from local council has enabled us to pay for a part time coordinator to run the community engagement campaign and support cafe staff - Engagement with all sectors of our community through digital media, cafe ambassadors, workshops, get togethers, local media - Having access to working solutions that overcome the main barriers for customers (forgetting to take a cup and not planning to have a coffee). For example cup lending schemes such as Again Again and Wanakup. Whilst there has been an enormous amount of volunteer time contributed to the project the financial support has helped to amplify and support this energy. Around New Zealand there are many volunteer groups and not for profit organisations are working on the ground to reduce waste. They have the knowledge, skills and connections to make real change for their communities. With funding from local and national government these groups can employ coordinators and deliver promotions, marketing and community engagement to support legislative changes and behaviour change in our communities. We recommend local and national government: - Support specific regions/towns/suburbs to be case studies to exemplar. Help them to transfer the knowledge to other groups and organisations. Support a network of groups and regions. - Ban free single use cups - enforce a high charge on single use cups. Suggest a levy of \$1 to disincentivize use and fund community groups to engage with their communities for behaviour change - Supporting cup lending systems already in place. - Provide more education on the problem - single use coffee cups can't be recycled. They are very unlikely to end up in a compost facility. The logistics of gathering up compostable cups and ensuring they're getting to the industrial composting facility is complex and extremely unlikely to occur. What we have discovered is that all of the coffee cups used in our district go to landfill. - Provide a sustainability tax rebate for businesses creating a financial incentive for businesses who are taking an active role to reduce single use plastics. - Lead by example - eg no takeaway cups in government buildings. No cafes in government buildings with single use cups. - Fund research into life cycle analysis of single use cups and different reusable cups to help people make good choices. - Develop case-studies, webinars, work with national level industry organisations and trainers. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Whilst there has been an enormous amount of volunteer time contributed to the project the financial support has helped to amplify and support this energy. Around New Zealand there are many volunteer groups and not for profit organisations are working on the ground to reduce waste. They have the knowledge, skills and connections to make real change for their communities. With funding from local and national government these groups can employ coordinators and deliver promotions, marketing and community engagement to support legislative changes and behaviour change in our communities. We recommend local and national government: - Support specific regions/towns/suburbs to be case studies to exemplar. Help them to transfer the knowledge to other groups and organisations. Support a network of groups and regions. - Ban free single use cups - enforce a high charge on single use cups. Suggest a fee of \$1 to disincentivize use. - Supporting cup lending systems already in place. - Provide more education on the problem - single use coffee cups can't be recycled. They are very unlikely to end up in a compost facility. The logistics of gathering up compostable cups and ensuring they're getting to the industrial composting facility is complex and extremely unlikely to occur. What we have discovered is that all of the coffee cups used in our district go to landfill. - Provide a sustainability tax rebate for businesses creating a financial incentive for businesses who are taking an active role to reduce single use plastics. - Lead by example - eg no takeaway cups in government buildings. No cafes in government buildings with single use cups. - Fund research into life cycle analysis of single use cups and different reusable cups to help people make good choices. - Develop case-studies, webinars, work with national level industry organisations and trainers. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups We at SUCfree Wanaka have set an ambitious goal of making Wanaka single-use cup free by 2022. We believe that other towns, with support, can adopt our model and meet their goal of being a single-use cup (SUC) free. With Government regulatory, policy and financial support for replicating the successes of those towns, we could have a SUCfree Aotearoa by

2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 339

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I think the packaging bans should be extended to many of the off-the-shelf hardware items in hardware stores like Mitre 10,

Bunnings and Placemakers. There are 100's of examples of over-packaged items that create non-recyclable waste when consumers get their purchases home. Many of these (e.g. nails, screws) never used to be packaged, and these stores are already providing unpackaged alternatives.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

So that the onus is put back on the manufacturers to find alternatives that are recyclable

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Environment benefits from obviating the need to expand landfill options to take all the waste. Manufacturers of plastic packaging get a free ride as society and taxpayers and ratepayers in particular, have to shoulder the costs of disposal of products and downstream environmental impacts.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

As an ex-CRI scientist, I have observed that the current NZ government has been let down by the short-sightedness of funding decisions made by the MBIE contestable research funding process. For example, the Biopolymer Network, a research partnership comprising Plant & Food Research, AgResearch and Scion, is now defunct - despite some 15 years of building an international reputation for research into alternatives to oil-based products like plastics, fibres and chemicals. Just when its expertise is needed most.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The introduction of microplastics into the environment, through the oxo-degradation process, is despicable. As is earlier versions of plastics being 'degradable' simply because the starch they contain breaks down to release microplastics. Out of sight and out of mind is not a solution.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

It would be made easier if they weren't available in the first place. When I was growing up we got by without the extensive packaging we have today. The government can also help by mandating that its regulatory authorities take into consideration some of the consequences of food safety requirements that result in the cop-out option of packaging that includes plastic.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Fully support it

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

3 years

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I cannot see why coffee cups should be exempted. They, and especially their lids, are among the worst offenders. There are alternative technologies that companies like Earth Pac could bring to market if they had the appropriate support. Or people should be forced to BYO ceramic cups. Wet wipes are also totally unnecessary. 100's of thousands of NZ'ers have been raised successfully without wet wipes. It is sheer laziness that they are used.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Through people being able to report easily, violations to one of the government's regulators or compliance bodies like the Commerce Commission. For example, I was able to report the NZ sale of a 'biodegradable' plastic bags that had been banned in Australia, to the Australian Commerce Commission.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 340

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal begins a strong step for Aotearoa in achieving the same practices implemented overseas.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." This could also go alongside a secondary objective: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which encourages communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Fully back the phase-out of each of the listed items - except for plastic straws, at least until the disabled community has had their say on this particular matter.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The proposed stages (2023 and 2025) are simply way too slow. Stronger action is needed and June 2021 should be a definite target with regards to phasing out PVC trays, and begin stage 2 in June 2022.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This is a very strong proposal and the move is an extremely positive one.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Plenty.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

June 2021 would be even better.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level

the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Creating a suitable monitoring and enforcement strategy - with the community also having access to the ability to report breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 342

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I think the proposed policy of reducing single-use and hard-to-recycle plastics is a good start, however reuse of items also needs to be considered and supported by regulatory measures, policy and investment. Consumers need to be supported to reject single-use items in favour of those which can be reused and that will only happen if the infrastructure is in place to make reuse a much easier option than it currently is.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support the mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed. Additionally, I would like to see regulation implemented to support reusable alternatives. I'm concerned a ban alone would end up resembling a game of Whack-a-Mole, with one banned item quickly being replaced by another single-use product. If the aim is to reduce single-use plastics, consumers must be given viable alternatives, including the option to more-easily reuse items.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It's my understanding that these types of plastic often contaminate the recycling streams of plastics that are easier to recycle, therefore the fewer of them in circulation, the better.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Any plastic which cannot be recycled or (in the case of EPS) disposed of correctly poses an ongoing pollution risk. The fewer of these products in our environment, the better.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Regulatory support for local operators who are attempting to offer consumers reuse and refilling services, so that choosing the more environmentally conscious option becomes easier. I'd also support a levy on single-use plastic items to hopefully encourage consumers to think about the longer-term impact of their purchasing choice.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I'd also love to see single use coffee cups and lids, single use plastic water bottles, plastic-based glitter and confetti and plastic toys given away with fast food to be phased out. I understand there is concern that some of those in the disabled community may be unfairly targeted by the proposed phasing-out of plastic straws. I do not understand this issue in enough depth, however I would like the disabled community to be adequately consulted with regarding this before any decision is made.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I support an out-right ban on both single-use coffee cups and lids and wet wipes that contain plastic as the best way to reduce their presence. Failing that, I would support a levy on their use.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12-18 months.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 343

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and hard polystyrene packaging that is single use or is used only a few times should be phased out

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Unsure

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think in terms of prioritising things- we need to be focusing on plastic that is single-use or used only a short while. So I think we need to invest our energy into what would deliver the most benefit for the environment.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

PLEASE

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Returnable reusable bags/containers instore.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Unsure

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 344

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This needs to be extended to EPS used in construction.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We need to tackle all of it and look how to expand into other areas of plastic use.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The benefits for the environment will be ample to overcome perceived costs.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

We banned plastic shopping bags and we seem to have adapted quickly to this.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 345

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

In order to meet our obligations around climate change, we need to transition to packaging that doesn't require the extraction of fossil fuels.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Ultimately, the phase-out will be impacted by the availability of alternatives and inventory on hand. There is no reason why 12 months would be unreasonable, given the agility we have seen as part of the covid-lockdown, the short timeframe lead-in when plastic bags were phased out and the fact it would actually be longer than 12 months given there would be awareness building before the regulation came into effect.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

For wet wipes, fund organisations like Plunket to educate families around alternatives. For coffee cups, there are already schemes in place that support re-usable cups. These should be able to be ramped up by the market.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 346

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Alternatives need to be made easily available and at appropriate price points

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Not a manufacturer

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Given the deleterious impact of polystyrene in terms of soil toxicity, water contamination and its negative impact on fauna and flora, I am keen to see this issue addressed without delay.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

environmental externalities linked to polystyrene are clearly communicated by government to consumers and businesses businesses be educated and encouraged to engage with suppliers to advise them to use, (in the case of packaging), reusable or biodegradable alternatives; or to enforce a packaging take-back policy.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Seaweed-based hydrophobic coatings.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Because of the manner in which it breaks down, polystyrene is impossible to fully recover from the receiving environment. I therefore strongly support a phase-out of polystyrene manufacturing and use and support a mandate on suppliers/importers that requires suppliers/importers to take back polystyrene, at their own cost.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 347

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Recyclability has two components; the material's actual recyclability and then secondly, its propensity or not to be actually recycled by humans. No matter how recyclable it is, if human beings are not motivated in their day-to-day actions to actually recycle then, simply put, the type of plastic that is not recycled is immaterial. A non-recycled PET bottle out bobbing in the ocean constitutes as much an environmental threat as its PVC brother floating beside it. Over my at times despondent years of picking up rubbish around various parts of NZ I gave up being astonished at the number of PET bottles thrown away, even when there were suitable rubbish facilities close by. I have a mental image of the skate park I walked through just this morning.... bottles everywhere, even with clearly labelled bins no more than 30 away. What is the incentive in that person's back pocket? A well-designed mandatory container deposit scheme is crucially also needed to increase the actual percentage of recycling achieved. Without it volumes of recycling will not rise. We have an obvious example; I pick up as many aluminium cans as I do bottles and the like, yet we all know the high recyclability attributes of aluminium. A well thought through container deposit scheme is a must. There is a corollary to this. Just earlier this week I personally observed Council staff right here in Palmerston North emptying the contents from all the local park's "Recyclables" bins in with the general rubbish from the adjoining bins. I spoke to the man involved, and he confirmed that is the general practice in the city. I know it happens elsewhere to. At the risk of labouring the point, it is not enough to make recycling worthwhile for the producer or the recycler alone, it has to be made worthwhile for the individual as he or she goes about their day, every day, every week. Recycling has to be inculcated in our behaviour... Behavioural Economics 101.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

These should be included as good packaging design, is or should be a key and natural part of the whole design process. Pollution prevention at source is far more efficient and easier than any planet-wide pollution pick-up process. Good packaging design is simply a necessary but natural step in the overall product design process. Incentives are needed to nudge such behaviour. No access to market if in polluting packaging is one such very good incentive

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits would be immeasurable and profound environmentally. Whilst they would show much less financial benefit, this would probably be only initially. Over time financial costs would go down and financial benefits go up. But really what do you mean by costs. With just a focus on financial costs, there will always be at best, ignorant oversight or at worst, deliberate thus malign, non-accounting of all the environmental dis-benefits. We collectively suffer from 'Excelsis' a disease in where if something can't be put in a column on a spreadsheet it gets ignored

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes and if not, they will be found, once the economic imperative of non access to markets asserts its role as a true market incentive.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

I am an interested individual motivated enough by my pollution pick-up experiences over the years to write this individual submission. I have not had the time to closely read the plethora of good submissions written by good people, often very hard-working volunteers, working under the auspices of good organizations. (As a Palmerston Northonian, may I give a shout out here to the good efforts of all the Environment Network Manawatu people.).Accordingly I am not here to rehash the excellent analysis and work done by other various people and entities. However I would like to re-emphasize my earlier point about costs versus benefits. In what language are these defined?..... the language of conventional GDP analysis, and the Grossly Distorted Picture it often gives, and in essence, its ultimate in-applicability here. How do you measure the dis-benefits in the vernacular of human behavioural economics..... the language of intangibles. How does the albatross found dying on Napier's beach value the benefits of the internalized 'Gross Distorting Protrusion' found in its stomach an entire 500 ml soft drink but hard bottle?

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

answer is along the same veins as above

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Choice choice choice! - which would be far easier if all the costs of polluting packaging were fully internalised. They wouldn't be economic to produce so wouldn't be on the supermarket shelf to begin with.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Simply ban them - with appropriate phase out allowance.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

I am not a manufacturer but I know someone who's battled to get environmentally sound products into the market. They cannot compete with products that are being subsidized by the environment. Undercutting by linear players will always flip the table at which true circular manufacturers endeavour to dine.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

3 years max

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

This question is too open-ended. Ultimately, compulsory withdrawal from market shelves would have to be the final step similar to the product safety recall processes applying to food and public health incidents.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 348

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, however the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: - PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 - All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 - Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected

party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Agree. We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water, soda and milk bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups. 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - Investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - Implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - Providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zerowaste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not

containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - Investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e.release of plastic in to waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - Compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fatbergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 349

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

All single-use products (not just plastic) involve waste in terms of energy, resources and landfill space, which is harmful to Papatūānuku, and keeps us stuck in a linear economy. I would support the Government proposing additional regulatory measures for 'creating a culture of reuse. Additionally, the low price of virgin plastic resin vis-a-vis recycled resin creates economic barriers for keeping even 'easier to recycle' in a closed loop packaging system, which brings into focus the environmental harm caused by our continued reliance on virgin plastic (such as continued resource extraction and climate impacts).

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Affordable re-use items need to be implemented in NZ, making this consumer and producer change easy in an economic sense. If NZ is to commit to the New Plastics Economy Global Commitment, then systems for better than excellent recycling of plastics coupled with more re-use items available (Less recyclable materials in use) must come into this.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

In addition to the options listed, I would support including additional measures to support the uptake and scale of reuse, e.g. - mandatory targets for reuse/refill on specified items - deposit return systems for takeaway serveware to ensure that they are in a recyclable condition (i.e., clean) and put in the correct recycling bins - mandating reusables in dine-in settings (as done by the Berkeley Ordinance) - levies on targeted single-use items - guidelines for the durability, reparability or modularity of products. (As stated in joint submission from Zero Waste Network et al.)

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

A ban only approach doesn't fix our reliance on virgin resin, but can result in swapping out one harmful item for another.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a costly contaminant and non-recyclable. Phasing this out removes it from the system, ensuring high quality recycling can occur.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

NZ is an innovative nation, so phasing these items out would, I hope result in some great, useful and un-harmful alternatives. I agree with the list of examples of practical alternatives set out in Table 5

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for acting on this harmful product.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n.a.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Current and future generations - and indeed the economy - can only thrive within the planet's limits to stay in balance. Taking action on plastics is an essential step towards preserving the functional ecosystems required to sustain life. (As stated in joint submission from Zero Waste Network et al.)

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

A benefit is to our localised, provincial economies. More employment through devising re-use schemes would enhance livelihoods locally, creating opportunities for resilient systems.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Transparency on the recycling industry as a whole. Better designed and easier to use recycling systems for everyone. More uptake from industry/businesses to offer the higher value alternatives so the prevalence 'on the shelf' is easier to find, purchase and use. Localised industry to drive the re-use and recycling for our nation.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I support the list to include single use coffee cups and lids, lollypop sticks and wrappers, coffee pods containing plastic, tea bags containing plastic, all single serve plastic pouches, balloons, confetti, 'freebie' toys on magazines and with food packages, plastic contained in chewing gum. Plastic straws phasing out firstly need to be consulted with the disabled community.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Clarification of items to be more carefully considered.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Re-use for all coffee cups if they are to be takeaway. Wet wipes must remove plastic, bottom line.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n.a.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12months for cups. To remove all disposable cups and lids - it is already being done in many NZ communities, so the blue print is there for success of this. Wet-wipes requires more community engagement and education as well as the phasing out and re-design of this product, so a longer timeframe of 24months i see as appropriate and achievable.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The community will assist in monitoring if they are able to report breaches of the mandatory phase-out to MfE, similar to the plastic bag ban. In light of the far wider scope of this particular phase-out proposal and the breadth of actors in our economy and within our communities who are likely to be affected, we support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. We also believe that appointment of enforcement officers under s 76 would be appropriate in this case. (As noted by the joint submission from Zero Waste Network et al.)

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 351

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We need to go further. I live at Mt Maunganui It's not just straws I'm constantly picking up but plastic straw wrappers, wrappers for mints from restaurants and glad wrap. If you're a fast food outlet, a restaurant, cafe or a bakery on a peninsula (harbour on one side, sea on the other) there should be stringent rules around packaging- or at the very least, guidelines issued.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Plastic wrappers

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If it can't be easily recycled then it's waste and we need to stop waste from being created

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefit- our planet's well-being

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Go further. Even recyclable plastics end up in land-fill.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Body overseeing implementation and compliance

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 352

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Strongly agree. Also strongly support the Re-thinking Plastics Royal Society document that preceded it

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We have to start somewhere and although I would like to see us go faster and further the objectives identified are probably the most important and practical at this time.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I strongly support banning for all the reasons mentioned in the document. I am less sure about the exemptions especially when they are clearly such major contributors. It is not credible to me to say there are no alternatives for wet wipes and disposable coffee cups with lids when these products used not to exist. Cigarette butt filters have always been with us but we are phasing out smoking and vaping is an alternative we didn't previously have. It is also possible that there are re-usable filters already in existence or able to be developed.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Although refer to 3 above

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

But the scale of the problem would steer me towards a faster phase out if it was possible

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Because the environment doesn't differentiate the source or category of the packaging. The environment is sensitive to volume. Overall we need to reduce our use of ALL plastics and extend the life of existing-in-use plastic. A huge amount of packaging of other products is actually unnecessary, or serving a very narrow purpose at the expense of a much larger more important purpose.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

There are undeniably significant costs, These are largely economic borne by businesses and consumers Some may be able to be mitigated using a "just transition model". product wastage, and some convenience that will be sacrificed but this can be minimised by changing distribution systems and customer attitudes. Some may be partially offset by new business opportunities and customer options not all of which though most of which will add to product cost. There may be some increased product wastage, and some convenience that will be sacrificed but this can be minimised by changing distribution systems and customer attitudes. Some may be partially offset by new business opportunities and customer options, not all of which, though most of which, will add to product cost. Theses costs are likely short-lived. It is important to remember there are long term environmental costs every time we reduce or delay our efforts. The benefits are environmental and multi-generational in nature.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Even if we have to create them because they are not fully-developed or possible yet. It might not be easy but we undertake other complex challenges like visiting the moon and Mars, which appears to have much less benefit to our own planet. We should be developing alternatives to MOST plastics and reducing the down-cycling reality of recycled plastics. To misquote Einstein "We need an entirely new manner of living if mankind is to survive'. Our present trajectory is not sustainable. Small modifications to our current way of life will not make enough difference.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If it is not possible to do this earlier. I am thrilled that the document follows the science rather than popular opinion/greenwash.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

No I don't manufacture or sell such products. I have sympathy for those who do and will be adversely affected, particularly those who thought they were promoting and using a more sustainable alternative.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I don't have any evidence to support my answer but I find your assessments of the costs and benefits credible and in line with my own impressions and reading on the subject.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Quite likely because you it is impossible to accurately predict and quantify all outcomes of any far-reaching action. That however is not a reason for not doing something. It is a reason for trying to anticipate and observe such outcomes and adjust actions accordingly.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Simply making such products unavailable. Our business is a general practice. We are appalled at the level of single use and hard-to-recycle products in health care especially since Covid. We have extremely limited alternatives and those that exist have safety and cost concerns. In my home my I have more alternatives and I try and maximise their use. I am fortunate that I have the resources to do this because the alternatives can be costly in terms of time, labour, cost and occasionally other resources like vege gardens. My adult children also use alternatives but are constrained

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

See notes Q3

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Notes

I feel unqualified to say anything other than the earliest practicable timeframe. I am sure due consideration was probably given to all timeframes and the timeframe was optimal although I would like it shorter e.g 18 months

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Including them in the ban.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

not applicable

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

As stated previously the same timeframe as the other single use products.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I am not qualified to give evidence but the costs and benefits are certainly in line with my understanding and reading around this subject.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Unsure. We have the precedent of single use plastic bags. If that was as successful as it seems to be we could use the same methods.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 353

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 354

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Would be better to see broader consideration of impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material type used, and to see more concrete policy and regulatory actions proposed to create a culture of reuse. The problem is framed predominantly about the impact of plastic materials, and the 'single-use' part of the problem has been downplayed, but needs to be addressed.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The proposal to reduce hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is essential for moving towards a more circular economy. Eliminating these items is only part of the solution and more can be done towards increasing access to reusable alternatives and systems that support them. This should be added as an objective.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Support for the measures identified. Further policy intervention options could be considered that are important for fostering a culture of reuse. These could include implementation of deposit return schemes or compulsory take-back schemes; measures to mandate reuseables in certain contexts; and options for applying fees to cover clean-up costs for items that are not proposed for a ban but that are problematic (either because that are commonly littered or commonly not disposed of correctly).

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

Some criteria need broader definitions - "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse "Achievability" should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. Could also include criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes and unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support the banning of all the items listed. Other approaches should be brought forward at the same time. A ban-only approach probably won't be enough to really lift alternatives. The playing field between single-use and reuse, and a reduction of the negative impact of a wider range of items could be achieved by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems and labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The staged approach makes sense, but the timelines proposed are too slow and should be brought forward.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this expansive and ambitious list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, water-ways and marine environment - damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. A small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation. However due to the harmful properties of plastic in the environment, we would support it being replaced as a packaging material. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes there are many practical alternatives to the hard-to-recycle packaging. The best alternatives are reusable/refillables and accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If these best alternatives are to be everyone's go to practical option, then the government must act to level the playing field between single-use and reuse. That is there needs to be investment in reuse systems, levy single-use, deposit return schemes, mandate reusables in certain contexts, and implement mandatory recycled content regulations. Ensuring the uptake of the most desirable alternatives requires more than just banning the undesirable options.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Definitely support this and would prefer to see the ban occur more quickly.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The analysis would be improved if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits - human society, including the economy, can only thrive if the planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit missing is that the proposal will create new opportunities for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusables packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. This will not only reduce waste and recycling, but will also have a positive job creation impact. The growth of reuse schemes will also lead to a reduction in single-use/one-way packaging more generally (not just the targeted plastics), which will have even greater benefits.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The main thing that will help me and my family consume less of these will be that we don't have to purchase things that include these products anymore. Often now it is difficult to avoid them. This is on the assumption that better alternatives are used by producers to replace them and not worse things (which requires that the government invest in making the better alternatives standard practice).

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support the banning of the listed items. I note there is concern about plastic straws and that some people need plastic straws to drink. I think it would be suitable to create exemptions in these circumstances, but in general plastic straws should be banned. There are easy alternatives. Single-use coffee cups should be added to the product phase-out. There are many practical and readily available alternatives to single-use coffee cups. I urge the government to ban all single-use coffee cups (and lids). They are one of the most straightforward items to phase out. I would like to see other items added to the ban list including: -single-serve/PCU condiments (like soy-sauce fish, pottles for jam and butter, sugar and sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers, plastic coffee pods. - plastic lollipop sticks. -wet wipes containing plastic. - place-based bans for items the government won't ban completely yet (e.g. reusables only for dine-in contexts).

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I do not support exempting disposable coffee cups and lids from a ban. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls and containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

I think a 12-18 month timeframe is ample for most items as suitable alternatives already exist.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

The government needs to consider including single-use coffee cups in this product ban. There are many readily available alternatives and reusable schemes already operating. If they are not included in the ban then there should be a levy added to disposable coffee cups and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to self-cover the costs of estimated clean-up/disposal. With this cost likely to be passed on to consumers, it will hopefully help to level the playing field with reuse alternatives which ultimately is a decision the consumer has to make as long as single-use options continue to exist. Food safety legislation should be updated to require that outlets must accept clean BYO cups. Wet wipes that contain plastic should be included in this product ban. There are plenty of alternative options readily available. In the meantime there should be

compulsory labelling on wet-wipes containing plastic to inform users how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit the use of the word 'flushable' on the product packaging. Before a ban is phased in fees should be attached to wet wipes to cover the clean-up costs. Currently the community is unfairly covering the costs of this through Councils, but it would be more appropriate to attach this cost to producers and consumers.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

They should both be banned immediately, as there are readily available, easy alternatives to both (compared to some of the other products that are proposed to be banned). But definitely within 12 months.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Given the scope of the present proposal I support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 355

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I think we need to be mindful of what options are out there in terms of replacement and in terms of means to recycle. I also think we can consider what other sort of processing / development other industries are doing / need to ensure efficiencies.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. I highly approve of a mandatory phase out. I get that is likely to be push back but once people understand there are clear boundaries then innovation will happen. You do however need to support the innovation and ensure that it does not just create more problems (e.g. oxo-degradable plastics) and consider what other industries can do in terms of providing solutions.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not,

what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes. It will mean that there is more market for the viable alternatives which will improve the business case for the R&D that is likely to be required.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

I appreciate there will be costs, however my gut feel is that benefits will far outweigh not doing this. Not only the obvious environmental benefits but the systems and processes that will need to be developed will also be of benefit to other industries facing similar systems change issues.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

More R&D is needed in this area. And this may be an opportunity for the mountains of textile waste - particularly replacing polystyrene packaging (noting that it will be heavier).

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Definitely. This is one of the worst "innovations" that has occurred in recent years.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a. Note that cellulose from "waste" textiles is proving to be an alternative for use in some biodegradable bag options (not sure if /how it would create bottles, but it can be used for bags)

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

no comment

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Product suppliers simply need to not use so much packaging. It simply should not be an issue at a customer / individual level.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months should be feasible for all the little items. For the coffee cups and the take-away containers, a couple of years may be needed as the infrastructure to support the alternatives needs to be in place - see below.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

I also see you have not mentioned alternatives such as stainless steel as a packaging item (e.g. Again Again coffee cups). This is also a valid material in many cases. For the food industry business, there needs to be thought given to centralised dishwashing services and the logistics around it - with the growing prevalence of pop up caravan coffee-carts / take-away services, they do not have the washing facilities so in order for it to be viable, there needs to be the infrastructure to support this. Think Laundry-mat for dishes :-)

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Immediate! There is more than enough waste textile to be making alternatives to wipes. There's no reason there cannot be a public supply of material wipes contained with containers similar to sanitary containers for dirty clothes and an appropriate laundry service. Job creation right here.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

There needs to be resource and budget allocated for the resources to do spot audits and effective education of alternatives with fines for repeat offenders - and these need to be sufficient to be an actual deterrent and acted upon.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 356

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

JRAIA(The Japan Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Industry Association) support the New Zealand Government's active efforts to protect the global environment. However, it is generally recognised that EPS is not the "HARD-TO-RECYCLE" plastic(<https://epsrecycling.org/>). A global network of EPS recycling has also been established, and it is recognised that NZ is also participating in this framework (<https://epsrecycling.org/global-recycling-access/new-zealand> and <https://www.plastics.org.nz/environment/recycling-disposal>). When used in food packaging, it may be HARD-TO-RECYCLE due to dirt, etc., and causing environmental problems, but EPS, which is used as a cushioning material when packing products, can be collected and be considered as recyclable. Rather than taking measures(phase-out) put all EPS together, we propose that recyclable items should be taken care separately.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

1. There is no reasonable reason for weighting (effectiveness: triple weighting, cost: double weighting). 2. Evaluation criteria in terms of international harmonization should be added: If the countermeasure option deviates from the global standard, the product specifications must become unique and special only for New Zealand, which causes various cost increases. We are concerned that it will eventually impose the burden on the general public in New Zealand.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

1. As the answer to Question 4, the rationale for weighting is ambiguous, so it is not possible to agree with the results obtained. 2. The cost evaluation of option 6 may not be performed correctly. In Table 3, the cost evaluation for Option 6 is "Somewhat (= 1)", which is doubled to +2 points. This means Option 6 has some cost benefit. On the other hand, Table 6 of the consultation document reassessed the costs and benefits of Option 6, but analyzed that the cost burden is expected. Therefore, in Table 3, the cost evaluation of Option 6 should be No (= -1), which is double weighted to -2 points. If so, the total score will be 6 instead of 10, thus, Option 6 may not be the best.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We, JRAIA agree to Stage 1 and the first half of Stage 2 (prohibition of all PS food and beverage packaging not captured by Stage 1). However, JRAIA disagree with the second half of Stage 2 (prohibition of all other EPS packaging(eg, homewares, electronics)). For example, EPS for cushioning purpose used when packing electrical and electronic equipment is not HARD-TO-RECYCLE, it should not be included in the scope. Regarding these recyclable materials, we believe that it is in line with the "Circular economy" policy in the future by improving the infrastructure, collect valuable material correctly, and increasing the

recycling ratio, as it is in the other countries. In addition, there is no other country that prohibits EPS for cushioning purpose in packaging, and JRAIA disagree to introduce the regulation only in New Zealand from the viewpoint of international harmonization.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Although EPS as cushioning material for the packaging of electrical and electronic products is mentioned in the consultation document as a "potential exemptions", please clarify that the EPS for cushioning purpose is exempt. These are recyclable, If EPS for cushioning is also subject to the regulation and is phased-out, moulded cardboard is proposed as an alternative material. But, in order to obtain the same cushioning performance as EPS with moulded cardboard, it must become much bigger in size and weight. Our understanding is that there is no practical and rational alternative material for EPS avoiding increase of the environmental load. Furthermore, there is no other country that prohibits EPS for cushioning purpose in packaging, and it is not preferable to introduce the regulation only in New Zealand from the viewpoint of international harmonization, so JRAIA would like you to clarify the exclusion.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

In the packaging of electrical and electronic products, especially in case of relatively larger or heavier products, if EPS is prohibited, and then replaced most probably by paper material, in order to ensure the same cushioning performance as EPS, the packaging must become much bigger in size and weight. In addition to the increase of the direct cost of paper material, the transportation cost also increase due to deterioration of transportation efficiency. Furthermore, there is no country that prohibits EPS for cushioning purpose in packaging, and if only New Zealand introduces its own regulations, products for New Zealand will be designed exclusively, caused additional cost such as manufacturers' internal management costs, certification costs, etc. It is also important to keep in mind that there are additional cost factors that go beyond the direct cost of alternative material. On the other hand, the expected benefits are likely to be small.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

JRAIA has an objection to the EPS packaging material. Firstly, EPS is not "HARD-TO-RECYCLE" material (please refer the comment to Question 1). Secondly, moulded cardboard which is listed as an alternative for EPS packaging, some cases are already marketed for lightweight products, but in case for the product beyond a certain weight (e.g. air conditioners, those are handled by member companies of JRAIA), the packaging using moulded cardboard become much bigger in size and weight in order to obtain the equivalent cushioning performance as EPS. It may result the increase of the environmental load due to increase of paper material consumption and less transportation efficiency. Therefore, it is considered there is no practical alternative.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

JRAIA would like to express an objection on the evaluation results of the "Brand owners" aspect. From the perspective of a brand owner who exports large products such as air conditioners to New Zealand, the cost evaluation result seems too small. If all EPS for cushioning purpose in product packaging is replaced with moulded cardboard, the paper material cost must significantly exceed the suggested level (between a few cents to a dollar). In addition, the transportation cost also become greater due to the increase in packing size and weight, but it is not considered in the report. Furthermore, there is no other country that bans EPS for cushioning purpose in packaging, so if the proposed regulations are implemented in New Zealand, products for New Zealand will be specially designed. In such case, the other factor to increase cost like internal management costs of brand owners, certification cost, etc., need to be taken into account. A broader quantitative analysis of costs should be carried out.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

If all EPS for cushioning purpose in product packaging is replaced with moulded cardboard, the paper material cost must significantly exceed the suggested level (between a few cents to a dollar). In addition, the transportation cost also become

greater due to the increase in packing size and weight, but it is not considered in the report. Furthermore, there is no other country that bans EPS for cushioning purpose in packaging, so if the proposed regulations are implemented in New Zealand, products for New Zealand will be specially designed. In such case, the other factor to increase cost like internal management costs of brand owners, certification cost, etc., need to be taken into account. When considering the phase-out of EPS for packaging purpose, a little more detailed Impact Assessment in wider aspect should be carried out. On the other hand, there are few extra benefits to be added.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 357

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

not only coffee cup but also for clear cup for smoothie, tapioka pearl drink with fat straw and cap, little sauce/dressing container

in takeaway clear container(like the one for sushi)

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

What about the thick plastic bag when you buy bedding products (they mostly imports) and single thick bag of soil and compost things,

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

sooner the better in urgent matter not sending them to landfill and to reduce/stop making them at first

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

let us(every single person living in NZ young or old) know how serious making/using/dumping those at the end on the earth and change humans minds totally, shopping habit, using/saving wisely from now on but asap as everyday things (regret the past what we did wrong on the earth)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

we don't have enough time to ease/kind to every person happy, need to act as fast as possible now for the earth !!

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

no more takeaway/takeout business/lifestyle which is convenient for humans in this busy world but make it unhealthy life from easy purchase, spending a lot of money without thinking much not saving, not cooking real meal at home with fresh produce, takeaway coffee using one time plastic cup is too many at every corners in the world, Coffee beans are very precious to be grown but not known by drinker who just buy everywhere at takeaway style , people who really love coffee appreciate and make at home. people who really want to get food/drink from restaurant/cafe must bring your own container/cup to buy. For international/local traveler also the same, must bring/purchase own cup/container to get during the trip if really needed but tour driver/guide should suggest/lead the way how NZ operate in this way, or sit and eat at the restaurant/cafe.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

easy not to use/buy/make them, think about alternative, paper/bamboo compostable material container is the best. it it leaks no choices to sell. No need to exist wet wipes. anybody have cloth/towel make it wet with water to use. do not skip the effort to be lazy and make more rubbish. Educate humans!!

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Not enough time to allow people on the earth (one home) act as now as selfish anymore, and also make business stop thinking only for their profit not the environment, we consumer never want to support those business anyway.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

every council in NZ should work and control independently and monitoring places to report to the government regularly.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 358

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree that hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items need to be reduced in order to keep our environment clean and safe for us and our wildlife and to help manage our recycling system. However, I think this goes for all single-use items in our economy as well as the general system where items do not have a long life and are then thrown away as part of the linear economy. So I would say that the problems are not just to do with plastic but any item that will end up in landfill or littered in our environment after only a short use. It would be great to see more emphasis on using less virgin plastics and aiming to have a percentage of recycled plastic in all plastic items. Overall, the description does cover a good range but I think it is not complete; including having more focus on how all this connects with climate change as we move further into the 2000's.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This is again a good starting point. Banning these items would greatly reduce the amount in use. But that is not the only way in which the government could help our economy move to a more circular system. The government could also encourage reuse systems and organisations that are already working on these in our communities to avoid other single-use items replacing the banned ones (eg. paper bags).

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The list of options is comprehensive yet is missing some important options that have not been mentioned. These include deposit return schemes, reuse only when dining in at cafes/restaurants and incorporating other reuse systems in general. Perhaps also getting outlets to take back their own single-use items which they sell such as coffee cups. It would be great to see mentioned aims to support or incorporate reuse systems as part of the whole proposal with the government leading by example. Such as, what if all government buildings and businesses were to implement reuse systems themselves?

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Banning is a good place to start and I agree with banning the items listed. Yet, I'm confused as to why that was the only option chosen. It would work well if the government also chose to implement a few of the other options, either while they progress to banning items, or on other problem items. It seems that options have been limited, meaning there is less leeway for the government in the future when wanting to implement other bans. It would make more sense to implement a few options to broaden the scope. Having labelling requirements, such as for single-use coffee cups, could help until these get banned, or adding levies to other items that are not yet being considered for bans but are still problematic. Single-use coffee cups could have a levy implemented which could reduce the deposit for a reusable cup, making it more affordable for customers to choose the environmentally friendly option.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree that there should be two stages for phasing out as some are easier than others to phase out. But 2023 and 2025 is too late. The sooner these phase-outs happen, the better it is for us and our environment. Similar items are being banned by the EU by July 2021. It would be great to have these timelines brought forward between 2021 and latest 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and polystyrene are also used for other packaging of goods and could easily end up in the recycling system, still contaminating it. So it would make sense to phase-out all PVC and polystyrene packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

In general, wouldn't the benefits be incredible for our health and survival as well as that of our environment and planet? They would not be contaminating our recycling systems, being ingested by wildlife or us, and littering and polluting the environment and also helping NZ in the fight against our climate emergency. Encouraging and supporting reuse systems would help with some costs, such as for customers and businesses, throughout the phase-out. Even if there are costs for companies or manufacturers, there would undoubtedly be costs and changes for them in the near future with climate change progressing as it is.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There are many alternatives, lots of which already exist. The best alternatives would be the least harmful to our environment. These include reusables and refillables and making these more accessible. And then packaging with high recycled content. But these alternatives need to be made accessible and more cost effective so that people move away from single-use and towards reuse. Examples include: invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There might be even more benefits from phasing out the targeted plastics through the opportunities created when reuse systems are utilised by the community and businesses. More jobs will be created in this area alongside the reduction in waste which won't be going to landfill.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Overall, by having better and more affordable access to refilling and reusing alternatives. If these are supported by the government through regulations, policies and investment, then they would be made more affordable for everyone. Encouraging small businesses and organisations in what they already do and helping them with strategies to improve their outreach and collaborating with them to introduce new systems such as having reusable pick up schemes and standardising products for easier reuse, collection or recycling.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support banning all these single-use items and their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts. However, I am very confused as to why coffee cups (and their lids) are not being banned as well. There are already so many alternatives and many great systems in place for people to bring a reusable coffee cup, pay a deposit on a return scheme cup (like Again Again in Wellington) or systems such as mug libraries. And there is always the option of sitting in to drink a cup of coffee instead. So many disposable coffee cups are used every year and then thrown out, either littered or straight to landfill. I would have thought that disposable coffee cups are one of the easiest items to ban due to the availability of alternatives already out there, as well as a general shift towards keep cups. The list is also not as comprehensive as it could be. Items such as lollipop sticks, glitter, balloons, coffee pods, teabags (yes they contain plastic), soy sauce fish, mini butter pottles and many other condiment packaging could also all be included or at least on the trajectory for the future. Cigarettes are also made with plastic and are one of the most littered items around. Wet wipes have also not been included but cause all sorts of environmental pollution and problems. If not part of the ban, why not start with better labelling and manufacturer fees for cleanup at end of life?

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

It's great that all the other alternatives (oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable) are being banned as well. I don't support an exemption on disposable coffee cups and lids as explained above in Question 16. And also not the exemption of single-use cups made from recycled plastic as this does not align with moving away from single-use items in general and towards reusables and refillables (as stated on pg 39 of the proposal).

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Some items would be easier to begin phasing out than others, but in general, they should all be able to be phased out within the next year and a half years, so up until mid 2022. The government should try to stagger the phase-outs if consultation with certain communities or groups is needed.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

For coffee cups, first of all, I think they should be banned as well. However, in the meantime, the government should consider banning the sale of disposable coffee cups if the customer sits in. Perhaps there could be a levy on them so that reusable options can be subsidised for the public and generally investing in reusable systems, a lot of which are already in place, for easier accessibility for customers. Deposit return schemes are also a great way to reduce litter and waste. For wet wipes, better labelling, getting manufacturers to help pay for environmental cleanup and their end of life.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Straightaway alongside all the other single-use items on the list. If not, as soon as possible!

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think the list of costs and benefits covers a great amount which is good. It could also include the benefits that will be gained from reuse schemes by communities, organisations and businesses.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 359

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Response regarding the proposed projects (no space provided): Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling: • The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. • To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support. Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics: • Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end use, volumes and types of plastic exported. • This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. • The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Thier Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: • Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user businesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; • Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a 'world leading' exemplar model of reduction. A "circular approach to resource management" and "reduced public confusion" are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: • Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. • This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: • Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. • To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. the above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: • Education • Support (financial and logistical) • Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) • Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) • Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

• The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted. • For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): • innovators, • producers, • suppliers/logistics bodies, • commercial end-users, • consumer end-users, • recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a 'cost-benefit' analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." • Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that

contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 360

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by a comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer"

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. I suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so I would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

A more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct

from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change. Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and I agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 361

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We need to focus on and re-prioritize reusing over recycling across all material types. We need to encourage and facilitate limited use of plastics that can be reused multiple times PRIOR to the recycling process. By prioritizing and considering reuse over recycling for plastics and product design involving plastics, we are making economical use of our resources and further limiting the impact on our environment. I would reword "better reflecting the waste hierarchy and a circular approach to resource management, by ensuring that the materials we use can be reused or recycled" to "by ensuring the materials we use can first be reused and then recycled at end of life" This should also be the underpinning priority or secondary objective, with the others listed to follow.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Mandatory Phase Out eliminates the current problem but it needs to be paired with an awareness campaign and incentives for best practice alternatives. There is no point banning one problematic product and then have the second-worst alternative take it's place. We should actively be removing these problematic single use plastics and simultaneously advocating for the best available replacement options to bring behavioural change and promote a true circular economy.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, however the proposed time-frames are too slow. PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Absolutely!

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so I would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There is huge opportunity for innovation and development once single use plastics are phased out and there will be the opportunity for growth in industry, job creation resulting in production for alternative options and systems created to cater for a more reuse orientated circular economy.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More support and funding for reusable alternatives and infrastructure such as wash stations, refill stations and recycling centres. More transparency, clear labelling, and consistent approach to recycling nationwide. Awareness and education around the use of nature's resources and which consumer choices are both economical for us and the environment (ie produce a small carbon footprint). Shifting the focus from a consumer culture by supporting and promoting long-life products.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding Plastic Straws, I believe the mandatory phase-out should apply to the general public. For the disabled community trial kits featuring fully funded sustainable (ie. compostable or reusable) alternatives to use should be provided, and then funded on prescription. For those few for whom a compostable or reusable alternative does not meet their needs, plastic straws should be available on prescription with special authority as currently applies to other medical supplies and medications. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets. I also feel strongly that single use disposable menstrual and sanitary products, wet-wipes and especially disposable nappies should be included in this strategic plan for mandatory phase out. Currently reusable alternatives exist for all of these products and the knowledge to use them hygienically. Vanuatu in particular is leading the way in banning disposable nappies. This waste is avoidable and unnecessary, and could be easily eliminated. A phase out over 2 years would allow sufficient time to create enough domestic inventory and educate the public accordingly. These products currently also cause great harm not only to the environment, but to our infrastructure through blocked pipes and wastewater networks. Phasing them out would be a huge economic benefit to individuals, local and national government.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Other (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

For wet wipes I would outright ban the use of the word flushable and all wet wipes have large clear labelling that states these are to be sent to landfill. There should be a public campaign of how to launder reusable options correctly and sanitize things in a home laundry, empowering the general public to return to reusable wipes. I would consider consulting with the coffee industry around potentially regulating the sizing of cups to fit coffee machines as this is the biggest obstacle for baristas when opting to accept a reusable cup. It would be great to see infrastructure exist to rinse/dry reusable cups and serveware in public places.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

A maximum of two years, in effect by 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

There needs to be strong regulation and enforcement strategies in place to support this

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 362

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This proposal gave a good description about the problems plastic can cause, and will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. However, plastic is not the sole core problem. The core problem to be tackled is the use of materials in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy, resources, and harms the earth (even if the item was say, made from cardboard). I urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of material type, and then propose more concrete policy actions it will take to create a culture of reuse. Therefore, the proposal should include and/or be supported by reducing single-use products in general. It should also be supported by reducing virgin plastic use (eg. heightening demand on recycled plastic content).

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Reducing hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics is vital in working towards a circular economy. However, eliminating the 'bad' is only half of the picture. It needs to be replaced by the 'good'. I urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of: Increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, & will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials. Suggested wording from Zero Waste Network that I agree with: Amended Main Objective: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." Additional Secondary Objective: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers a range of very useful actions. However: 1. There is currently no option which combines these actions. A 'blended' approach would be far more powerful/effective. I have had chats about this proposal with those both inside and outside of the zero waste community, and have heard a lot of feedback that bans aren't necessarily a perfect solution, at least on their own. The Government could, for example: not only ban the targeted plastics, but also implement levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling and product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. 2. The list is missing some key policy options that could be very effective in helping grow reuse: ● Deposit return systems for takeaway packaging (already used across NZ with by some small businesses, like Again Again and Reusabowl); ● Mandatory reuse targets; ● "Reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and Government offices. Blending these tools, and adding the extra suggestions, would support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items, and avoid unintended outcomes from a ban (such as a reliance on other single use replacements, as has happened with the plastic bags ban in some cases).

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy (ie. refuse/reduce/reuse, before recycle/compost). Some criteria need broader definitions: ● “Effectiveness” should consider whether the options boost reuse; ● “Achievability” should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. There should also be new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility (for example, in the case of straws), and whether they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support banning all the items listed (except for plastic straws). Bans are a clear and simple way of eliminating harmful items from our community/country/land. However, I urge the Government to multi-task and use a range of effective combined tools in its power. (The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - so can we!) A ‘ban only’ approach has a high chance of leading to problematic alternatives (such as other non-plastic single use items), and it leaves the Government without tools to tackle problem items it isn’t ready to ban yet. The Government can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems, labelling requirements, and increased recycled content in products (as a minimum % legal requirement). In order to transition effectively and efficiently into a circular economy, there needs to be reuse infrastructure starting to be developed and phased in immediately.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages, however the proposed timeframes are too slow. We need to reverse the devastating trends of plastic item waste fast. The EU will ban many of these items by July 2021. I suggest bringing the two timelines forward: ● Stage 1 phase out complete by June 2021; ● Stage 2 phase out complete by June 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils. It will therefore be better to phase it out sooner, as specified above.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban (I've even come across organic hard sponge like pieces that dissolve in water and fertilise the garden, or heard of research into lab-grown fungi made into moulded package padding). However, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Government wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. I also call for Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I strongly support this ban. The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so I would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021. The EU (and others) are banning them by July 2021.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

I appreciate the Government's comprehensive costs/benefits list. The assessment should not separate the environment out as an "affected party", distinct from human society and our economy. The assessment should instead be more holistic, recognising that the environment and its 'health' is intrinsically linked with the health and function of our society and economy.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. These schemes/systems would create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging (not just those targeted), due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes. This will mean even more cost savings for local Government & ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Rather than "educating" and "raising awareness" on "best practice" and "environmental impact" (pg.46), we need the Government to put their resources/funds into reuse infrastructure. A lot of NGOs, community groups and individuals already work to raise awareness and educate about best practice. I see a lot of work happening in schools as well. And so many individuals like myself work hard to avoid single use items, and opt for reusables. However, the systems we currently live in make this very hard. We don't have government funded education programs to create widespread, mainstream behavioural change. In order to normalise reusables, we need the Government to back our grassroots with PRACTICAL solutions, through its power of regulation, policy, and investment. People learn and change behaviour best through doing. The former could waste a lot of important funds unnecessarily, and possibly even come across as patronising. We can and do educate ourselves, but we can't create legislation etc. ESPECIALLY in the time of COVID, we need Government regulation/policy/investment that supports reuse infrastructure to the extent that it functions consistently across the country, and is established enough to be trusted in terms of safe hygiene, and can be embraced by all. We would help reuse systems compete against single-use & launch reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community (including those with physical disabilities), and reflect Universal Design principles. Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Also, mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support the banning of all of the listed single-use plastic items (including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic counterparts). However, please note three adaptations: 1. The exception is plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions (to find alternatives that suit all, and reduce stigma) should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. (See CCS Disability Action's submission on this question). 2. I am alarmed that single use coffee cups (SUC) aren't included in the ban list. I strongly disagree with excluding single-use coffee cups & lids (or single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5) from the phase-out. I fully support Takeaway Throwaway's reasoning on this. There is already a cultural move towards reusable coffee cups and away from "branded litter", the massive environmental harm SUC (and their lids) produce. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. Over 50 cafes have are known to Takeaway Throwaways as having eliminated SUC entirely (and they're thriving). Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies. I believe that reusable coffee cups are the most normalised kind of reusable takeaway serviceware/tableware. There is strong evidence for functional alternatives to SUC, and for SUC being amongst the most straightforward items to phase out, both practically, and due to the increasingly negative public perception towards them. 3. I would like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list: ● Plastic lollipop sticks (hazardous); ● SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS and TOILETRIES: Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers, soy fish, mini confectionary wrappers; ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic; ● Single-use plastic water bottles; ● Balloons and balloon sticks; ● Glitter and plastic confetti; ● Complementary plastic toys (like freebies from McDonalds Happy Meals). I would support the Government introducing place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet e.g. reusables only for dine-in contexts; central city single-use-free zones; no bottled water & throwaway serviceware on university campuses & in Govt buildings. I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics due to the confusion they cause (and the fact they are hardly ever disposed of correctly), their environmental harm, their contamination if recycling and organics collections, and they're waste of energy/resources (like any single use item). As explained in question 16, I strongly disagree with exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban, as well as single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. This ban must clearly include cup lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. I agree with Zero Waste Networks suggestion to alter the proposed definition single-use plastic tableware to include paper bowls/containers with plastic or wax linings, and that the definition of single-use plastic produce bags be broadened to include plastic net bags in the ban. Regarding straws: The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then I would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. It wouldn't be appropriate to move forward with a straw ban (and definitions etc) until there has been active consultation with the disabled community.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12-18 month time period should be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see Q17).

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

COFFEE CUPS: I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. Many of these actions can happen under s 23 of the Waste Minimisation Act without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. Regulatory & legislative actions: ● Including disposable coffee cups in the proposed ban list as this will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with the alternatives faster; investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities; ● Implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings; ● Providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change; ● Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups; ● Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups;

● A Deposit Return Scheme for BOTH disposable coffee cups, & reusables offered through a reuse scheme. A DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all hospitality outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash and reuse returned reusable cups. Collaborative, practical policy actions: ● Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings); ● Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design principles & are accessible for everyone in the community; ● Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services; ● Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Regarding Government suggestions: ● Investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups is not a good use of public funds. Better to put this money towards stimulating a reusables network. ● I urge the Government not to use its finite resources to reinvent the wheel & run a public education campaign about reusables. Loads of NGOs & community groups already do this mahi. We need Government to back these efforts with its unique policy & regulation-making superpowers. We need Government to champion and amplify the positives of truly circular reusable options. WET WIPES: I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable. Alongside side this, and in the meantime, I support: ● Investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems); ● Compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

I agree with Takeaway Throwaways, that the best thing the Government can do is chat with the 50+ hospitality businesses who are SUC free, and the organisations & small businesses around NZ that support their work such as: ● UYO, ● SUC-free Wanaka, ● Again Again, ● Cupcycling, ● Good to Go Waiheke, ● The Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project, ● Wanakup. According to Takeaway Throwaways, these businesses & groups report that the availability of reuse systems and cup loan schemes (and customers who BYO) enables businesses to move entirely to reuse. And, many more businesses would be willing to ditch the disposables if they knew all outlets were going to be in the same boat - something a ban could achieve.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Disposable coffee cups products should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out (well before 2020). Accessible alternatives already exist successfully. Were the Govt to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19), there is no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022. The ban could start in certain areas most equipped, before being rolled out to the whole of Aotearoa. I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022. The 'flushable' label should be banned from all brands by mid 2021, if practicable to enforce separately. Ultimately though, it is important to find a reusable system for these as well. I already know of a business that picks up, launders, and re-delivers reusable nappies.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs and benefits is comprehensive. I agree with them all, including the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. I also appreciate the recognition that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. However, the list should acknowledge how a plastic straw ban could negatively affect individuals who need a plastic straw to drink - this is a significant potential cost for the disabled community. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out (eg. straws, co-designed with the disabled community). This includes a wealth of employment opportunities. Reuse schemes also reduce both waste & costs for local government & ratepayers.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported (according to Stuff). Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 363

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We agree with the description of hard-to-recycle plastics and single-use plastic items used in the food, beverage, and packaging industries, and believe that reducing the total amount of single-use items will have a net positive impact. However, we believe the total scope considered within these objectives is too narrow and is especially focused on waste management procedures, while not addressing litter pollution pathways into the environment. We elaborated on our concerns regarding the limited scope in question 2.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We agree in part with the objectives, in terms of their applications with waste management. The first objective to reduce the amount of hard-to-recycle plastics used for food and beverage packaging, in particular PVC products and plastic items designed to be oxo-degradable. We agree that this objective is worthwhile and will have a positive impact on making waste management processes easier to manage. We believe this objective has the potential to reduce the quantity of plastic litter entering the environment. The listed proposal includes replacing some PVC and oxo-degradable plastic products with other types of plastic and non-plastic materials. Therefore it is expected that the scope of this objective is primarily for improved waste management processes and secondarily to attempt to reduce the number of plastic items created. The scope for the second objective is to reduce the amount of single-use plastic items. We agree that this has the potential to reduce the total quantity of plastic items in use and therefore a lower risk for these items leaking the environment. Our submission contains both agreement and critiques of the objectives and scope of the policy. We also provide a rationale separately to state our position and reasons for some of our disagreements. The overall scope is based on the assumption that changing the material composition of a limited number of plastic items is unlikely to have a significant impact in the likelihood of these items, or their replacement, becoming litter and leaked to the environment. The consultation document relies on unqualified assumptions. The statement that these measures will "lower the risk of environmental damage including through litter and poor resource management" assumes improved waste management techniques for recycling will reduce the total quantity of plastic litter leaked to the environment, and that these litter plastics items are composed primarily of the types of plastics described. The unqualified assumption is that these actions will have a substantial improvement in water quality. Our analysis is based on two points. Firstly, there is very little understanding of how much, and what types of plastics are leaked to the environment from various land uses across New Zealand. Secondly, a key recommendation from the Prime Ministers Chief Science Advisor (PMCSA) 2019 report titled "Rethinking Plastics in Aotearoa New Zealand" is for improved litter monitoring and data collection. We agree with the PMCSA's recommendation which will provide the data-driven decision-making required to urgently address plastic pollutants. Additionally, these efforts could be supported by section 86(b) of the Waste Minimisation Act of 2008 which would enable the monitoring and reporting of waste capture information that could provide this data and measures to improve litter capture infrastructure [see s86(b)(iv)]. We believe that the objectives listed do not aspire to address the pathways along which plastic and other litter items flow to our streams, rivers, and oceans. The assumption that reducing the number of certain types of plastics will improve overall environmental outcomes lacks substantiating evidence and is contrary to what we have identified working in the stormwater management industry. Stormwater drains are the primary conduit for litter waste leaking to the environment and, to date, very little data exists to quantify how much, and what types of plastic are leaked to the environment. Reducing one or more types of plastic will make a difference, but not all plastics are inherently bad, rather it is the way we store, move, and manage our waste. It is based on this point that we advocate for improved infrastructure to create resilience rather than cherry-picking on a limited type of plastic and extrapolating a high benefit environmental outcome. In recent years, our scientific understanding of what physical and chemical impact plastics have on the environment has triggered the need to take action. Policymakers have a significant opportunity to build on the progress made elsewhere where policies have already investigated various avenues for litter mitigation measures and taking these best practices to adopt and embed locally. There is growing societal pressure to stop plastic waste from entering our streams, rivers, and oceans that we believe will continue until more permanent solutions are implemented. At Stormwater360 we design and manufacture stormwater treatment devices to address specific pollutants. Over two and a half decades we have advocated for improved water quality policy and conducted numerous studies across different land uses to highlight the amount of litter and other contaminants present in stormwater runoff. We have developed products based on this scientific understanding together with regulatory requirements, which can complement or constrain the design options available to professionals. Our technology development process aims to achieve innovative design through effective pollutant capture and be cost-effective across different land use applications. Taking from our experience and from peer-reviewed published work, there is a consensus that the most polluted single-use item is cigarette butts. This proposal specifically excludes the banning of cigarette filters, which is the most abundant single-use littered item globally. The primary mechanism for litter entering our waterways is through the highly efficient stormwater network. From here it breaks down into microplastics

and uptakes higher concentrations of adsorbed chemicals that sediment in the waterways typically would. The result is persistent pollutants that have increased toxicity. Based on this information, we suggest expanding the scope of the litter policy, either by expanding the policy or including enhanced litter capture in the National Plastics Action Plan. The National Plastics Action Plan would be best suited to incorporate the recommendations from the PMCSA's report, which takes a more holistic view of the lifecycle of plastics, particularly in understanding both where and how plastic litter is leaked to the environment. Because of the waste management focus, the consultation document does not allow for any recommendations where improved litter capture through stormwater and wastewater drains could be achieved. Our recommendation would be to expand the scope to include litter capture techniques and technology for application in stormwater reticulation networks, together with these two waste management objectives. Litter capture technology has advanced significantly over the past three decades in response to our understanding of the impact it has on our environment. Equally as important, we also have enough information and examples available as to the role that regulations have on both litter capture initiatives but also on the technology development process. This role should certainly not be understated, where the optimal scenario is for effective regulations to guide technology development towards the intended outcomes. This scenario has proven effective in other markets, but unfortunately, this cannot be said about New Zealand. It is through measures such as this consultation process that we have the opportunity to shape how and where we target litter capture. If the objectives and scope do not address the full extent of the problem then the solution will always fall short of the target. We believe there are simple and effective regulatory options available, with the first being a basic requirement for all resource consent holders to capture litter leaving their property through stormwater drains. The lack of existing policy on litter management on both public and private land across New Zealand is a cause for concern. Discharge consents should have a high tolerance for plastics, especially inland uses with high concentrations of plastic waste, such as recycling facilities, waste storage and loading zones across commercial land use, industrial sites, and so on. Currently, no limits are placed on discharge quantities for litter pollution. More than thirteen years ago the city of Los Angeles placed a total maximum daily limit of zero for plastic pollutants larger than 5mm from entering their stormwater drains. In this regard, New Zealand's policy lags significantly behind other nations. Recently, Auckland Council adopted a similar requirement in their Network Discharge Consent. Schedule four, published this year, requires a gross pollutant trap to be installed under certain conditions. This is a positive development that we would encourage both national and regional regulators to include in their plastic litter capture strategies. We believe that that there is scope within the Waste Minimisation Act of 2008 for the Minister to make recommendations or regulations for litter capture infrastructure, specifically within sections 23, 51, and 86. This infrastructure is the primary conveyance of plastic waste and other pollutants into the environment. We also believe that it is necessary for New Zealand to close the regulatory gap that exists compared to other countries, in particular those countries with which New Zealand is actively collaborating on other parallel matters of climate and environmental policy such as the USA, Canada, and Australia. We have submitted a document together with this submission to Plastics.Consultation@mfe.govt.nz stating some of our recommendations and comments. Please read this submission together with that document.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part. To avoid unnecessary repetition we have made extensive comments regarding the scope, please refer to the response to Question 2: Policy Objectives and the accompanying discussion note. We agree in part that these measures are worthwhile objectives because they have the potential to improve waste management processes. They also go some way in reducing the total volume of plastics used. The design and management of pollutants in stormwater are achieved through a combination of structural measures (those infrastructure and physical processes design to perform a function) and non-structural measures (those behavioural measures designed to perform a function). Incorporating both aspects is encouraged for optimal performance. This consultation document focuses on two waste management objectives and does not take recommendations from the PMCSA report. The MfE's response document prioritises certain objectives as 'high' which is then not then reflect in this policy. It may be that other recommendations are incorporated into the National Plastics Action Plan (yet to be released at the time of this writing). Option 1: Voluntary agreement with industry and business - our experience with this type of agreement is that there is little commitment unless the activity is regulated, monitored and enforced. Stormwater360 has been supporters of the work by the Sustainable Business Network and PlasticsNZ, where there has been some successful improvement of litter capture across their member sites. To reiterate, these activities are mostly unregulated to the level that is required across New Zealand. Option 2: Plastic reduction target - as stated in the documentation, "on its own, it has no statutory force or enforcement mechanism" would not result in the level of action required. This type of activity should have required regulations, with monitoring and compliance, which is currently being done to 100% capture, for example, the entire State of California aims to have "full trash capture" or zero waste to their environment by the year 2030. For reference, the California Waterboards documentation is available here: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/trash_implementation.html which is enabled through the Clean Water Act and the Environmental Protection Agency with more information available from here: <https://www.epa.gov/trash-free-waters/clean-water-act-and-trash-free-waters>. If plastic reduction targets are set, then they would require the statutory and enforcement required to make it successful. The full California Statewide Trash Policy for reference is available from here: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/trash_control/docs/01_final_sed.pdf Option 3: Labelling requirements - we agree that improved labelling would have positive results. In particular, single-use items such as cigarette butts could be labelled or made a different colour so that they are more visible. Option 4: Levy or tax - for this to be effective, the quantification of the types of plastic litter items should be done to holistically apply charges to 'problematic items'. Since cigarette butts are the most litter single-use item across the globe, a significant portion of those taxes should go to water quality improvement projects. All smoking areas should require a gross pollutant trap in the nearest drain. With regards stormwater and drainage quality improvements, development contributions already exist across the country, however, the lack of litter-focused technology, performance or consent limits means much of this funding does not result in enhanced litter capture. The challenge with this option is defining who the users are if a 'user pay' principle is selected. Is it the user of the plastic bag, or the user of the environment? Option 5: Product stewardship - this option presents certain issues. There is the risk of implying that all plastics are bad, which can not be a valid argument. It could be argued that plastics have improved our way of living and benefited humanity more than any other material in the course of history. The product is not necessarily the problem, rather the way we all manage our waste. With that said, it would be beneficial for product stewardship by the likes of cigarette firms to acknowledge the impact of their product on the environment. A more effective option would be for user stewardship, if a user chooses to purchase a product that contains plastics then the responsibility should be for them to dispose of it correctly. Oftentimes that disposal is down a stormwater drain, which may or may not be intentional. Litter capture solves this problem and this is the approach taken by the likes of the State of California in the USA. Option 6: Mandatory phase-out - we partially agree with this option. It will have a positive impact on the waste management practice but we do not feel there is sufficient information on how effective it will be on litter pollution. Option 7: Mandatory recycled content for hard-to-recycle packaging - we are not experts in this regard, but partially agree with the sentiment. However, the funding required for infrastructure and innovation may not have a rapid impact. We also propose that increased litter capture from

stormwater can enable increased circular economic activity if captured plastics are recycled. Option 8: No change - this option, in our opinion, is not sustainable and does not meet New Zealand's commitment to international action against climate change, such as our signature to the Paris Agreement. The environmental impact of litter to the environment will continue to have significant environmental impacts, with further negative impacts on human health and economic activity.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The consultation document assesses the options listed based on their effectiveness, cost, alignment with strategic direction, and achievability. We agree with the criteria methodology but disagree with their application to this narrow scope in assessing the impact of plastics on the environment. Please refer to the response to Question 2: Policy Objectives and the accompanying discussion note. We believe that certain key assumptions have not been tested, but their evaluation has been made. The risk associated with applying these criteria is that they impact on waste management alone, without considering where, how, or what goes into our drains. This means the overall effectiveness of litter pollution is low, even if the proposed solutions described high effectiveness and high achievability, they may not enable the overall strategic direction. Within cost, a key criterion is that objectives can be implemented without placing undue costs on the community, business, or public funds. Our position is that private property owners should be responsible for the litter generated and transported off of their property, by their activity. Numerous studies have shown that taking this approach is the most cost-effective means of capturing trash. At-source or near-to-source capture of litter is generally the cheaper option, but also reduces the amount of plastics degradation and fragmentation, which results in the formation of microplastics from microplastics. This option also has other benefits, such as incentivising better housekeeping and cleaning sites to reduce maintenance requirements. This is the optimal balance between structural and non-structural controls working together. An example of the economic analysis conducted is from the City of Los Angeles, which in 2007 identified the optimal methods of capturing trash from drains across 150,000 catch pits in the city. For reference, please see section 8 of the Los Angeles County trash management plan available here:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/board_decisions/basin_plan_amendments/technical_documents/2007-012/09_0723/L.%20A.%20River%20Trash%20TMDL_Final%20%20Staff%20Report_August%209,%202007.pdf The City of Los Angeles investigates the cost-benefit analysis of catch basin inserts, vortex separation systems, floating debris traps, end-of-pipe nets, and trash racks. Several of these options were identified in the PMCSA's report, specifically in recommendation number six. Another important cost consideration would be to quantify what the cost of doing nothing is, or the option 8 cost on human health, economic activity, and environmental outcomes. This figure is then used to determine what the cost of improvements would be, plus the current cost of trash clean-ups. From our experience, the practicality of this analysis is often based on the infrastructure network design, which is usually left out of any desktop review and scoping exercise. Based on these learnings and using internationally applied best practice, we have developed innovative technologies to cover both options, because the cost-benefit analysis requires a full lifecycle cost analysis to be accurate.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes, in part. A reduction in total plastic loading will directly reduce the number of plastics entering the environment through leakage. The phasing out of oxo-degradable plastics will also directly improve the environmental benefits. However, half of the options considered (four of the eight) have one or more unknown assessment evaluation inputs, making their evaluation against options 4, 5, 6, and 7 a comparison of oranges and apples. Our position here is that the original scope is too focused on the waste management side of plastic litter and therefore these objectives and their evaluation is not going to impact the broader aspects of plastics and their impact on the environment. We agree with the analysis of option 8, the current status quo is unsustainable, however, these objectives do not place the environmental outcomes at a significantly higher level than the status quo either. The scope is too narrow and does not align with the broader aspects outlined in the PMCSA's report and thorough recommendations.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Notes

Yes, we agree that this phase-out approach for all food and beverage products that contain PVC and EPS, with all EPS prohibited by 2025 as achievable and necessary. More sustainable packaging materials are available, all that is needed is for our behaviours in these uses to change. However, we disagree with the assigned environmental impacts listed in the document, please refer to the response to Question 2: Policy Objectives and the accompanying discussion note.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, we agree that the items listed would positively benefit the waste management processed for hard-to-recycle plastics. This question and description in the consultation documentation illustrates the very narrow scope of this plan. However, we maintain that the focus of these objectives is disproportionately focused on waste management and could have unintended consequences if applied across other industries, such as construction. The title of the document is the impact of plastic on the environment, but the consultation questions are limited to recycling and therefore will not be able to achieve the higher-level outcomes that are required here in New Zealand and that are being applied by other countries. The PMCSA's report provides more detail on fundamental questions such as "show we ban all plastics"

which need to form the base philosophy behind this proposal. Not all plastics are harmful if managed correctly, there are effective measures to stop litter from discharge into our stormwater drains. If these options are not considered alongside questions about banning certain types of plastics, then the reality is that the non-banned plastics and other litter will continue to impact the environment.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Most certainly not. The impacts of this are detailed in the PMCSA's report. The incorporation of PVC materials for piping in the construction industry was initiated to replace concrete pipes. Concrete has a much larger carbon footprint than PVC so the use of plastics has significant environmental benefits. Therefore including all PVC products in stage 2 for complete phase-out would cause significant impacts to other industries, such as manufacturing and construction, with the potential of increasing carbon emissions if reverting back to concrete products is the alternative.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Alternative materials would need to be found. PVC materials are ubiquitous in industries such as manufacturing and construction where they are used in long-life applications, not single-use applications. PVC has replaced concrete and steel parts in many applications with significant benefits associated, particularly in its reduced carbon footprint and product weight. Phasing these materials out would have significant financial and operational impacts associated with unintended consequences and disruptions to products that are not designed for short-term lifecycle use. Although PVC is more difficult to recycle, this should not be the sole justification for banning this material, because the impact of doing this would not necessarily make a significant impact on reducing the amount of total plastic pollution leaked to the environment. Plastic and other litter are leaked to the environment, either intentionally or unintentionally, from our day-to-day activities. There are nearly zero requirements for litter capture across New Zealand which is the unfortunate reality that we operate within. The root cause of littering has less to do with the plastic itself and more to do with conscious and subconscious human behaviours, on which much social science research has been published. The lack of litter capture redundancy and design within our engineered infrastructure to capture our discarded waste is what we as a company have focused on for 25 years.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes in part, for food packaging there are alternatives. In other industries, there may not be the same alternatives that are appropriate. These need to be investigated, but the focus should not only be on the materials, there are other factors that influence the amount of litter that is generated and leaked to the environment, not just the particular type of plastic. Please refer to the response to Question 2: Policy Objectives and the accompanying discussion note.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Although we agree there are environmental risks associated with the degradation of plastics in the environment, through chemical, physical, or light-induced plastic degradation, we believe that banning one type will not have a significant impact on the overall amount of plastics which leak into the environment. It is our opinion that if the full capture of litter at-source capture is the minimum requirement for discharge consents across the country, this would have a much greater impact on the total quantity of litter prevented from entering the environment. Focusing solely on oxo-degradable plastics would likely result in their replacement with other types of plastics with a slightly reduced risk of microplastic generation. These replacements can still form microplastics so the effectiveness of this recommendation is likely to be moderate within the food and beverage industry and low to very low outside of these industries. Having a robust infrastructure network to capture litter near to its source will reduce the amount of litter leaked to the environment in its entirety, not only focused on a small fraction of total plastic materials. Please refer to the response to Question 2: Policy Objectives and the accompanying discussion note.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

We do not manufacture oxo-degradable plastics, we do make use of their alternatives as listed in the consultation documentation.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We agree, in part, that there will be some benefits to the environment and moderate cost increases for plastic packaging manufacturers.

However, we do disagree with the ranking for the environmental benefits which is discussed below. We also disagree with the statement about the value of PR for retailers. We have conducted numerous pilots for retailers across New Zealand who have taken this work for various news and PR purposes to their customer base without following through on their intended commitments. Our analysis of these unfortunate events is that sustainability efforts can easily be manipulated for marketing purposes without real commitments to corporations' environmental and sustainability policies. Our opinion is that the root cause of this is founded on the fact that there is very little regulation to abate the leaking of litter to stormwater drains across the country. We would discourage including the benefit of positive PR because at this stage very little is being done to capture significant amounts of litter and therefore positive PR opportunities serve purely as lip service. The Litter Act of 1979 allows for litter control officers to issue infringement notices and fines to persons caught littering. Stormwater360 have captured, classified, and reported on tens of thousands of litter and plastic items in these pilot studies, to both public and private land uses, with no significant increase in discharge consent requirements for litter capture. From our work, we have measured the variability of litter across different land uses, and from this data, it is likely that litter is reaching every catch pit across the country. The requirement to capture this litter has only just become required in certain applications with Auckland Council's Network Discharge Consent, available from here: <http://content.aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz/regulations/technical-guidance/ndc/Documents/Healthy%20Waters%20NDC%20Schedule%204-full%20version.pdf> We argue that the environment will not be the main beneficiary of the policy because the scope is too narrow and is based on the assumption that the majority of plastic litter leaked to the environment is composed of PVC, EPS, and oxo-degradable plastics from the food and beverage industry. This assumption is untested and missing the impact of all other ubiquitous plastic items that are leaked to the environment. For this reason, we believe the potential positive impact of this policy has been overstated because the intended outcomes are based solely on the waste management field, and does not include the stormwater management field. The basis of the policy document does not address how litter leaks to the environment, which is discussed at a high level in the PMCSA's report. Our recommendation would be to reform the scope and objectives of this policy taking in more of the recommendations from the PMCSA's report together with industry representatives with extensive and international experience in this field. Please refer to the response to Question 2: Policy Objectives and the accompanying discussion note.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

We agree that there are benefits to moving away from certain types of plastics, however, we disagree with the practicality and stated costs and benefits of this policy. This includes 16% of resin imported consisting of PVC and polystyrene. The assumption here is that all imported PVC and polystyrene resin go to the food and beverage industry and it also excluded all pre-manufactured PVC and polystyrene products across all industries. This analysis supports our interpretation that this policy does not have the correct scope or objectives for significant environmental benefit as stated.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Changing to different plastic types may require educating ourselves about what types of plastics are better suited to recyclability. This comes with the required change in behaviour when using plastics in our daily operations. Changing from one type of plastic to another is unlikely to change the number of plastics items polluted, either intentionally or by accident by our families, friends, colleagues, and tourists. Changing from plastic items to non-plastic items will reduce the amount of litter generated, but these options are not likely to represent a significant reduction in total litter generated or captured.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Agreed that this is a positive idea. However, the single most abundant litter item has been missed from this list, which is internationally recognised as cigarette butts, which is also a single-use plastic. This waste recognised in other items and a recent KNZB (2018) was referenced. For additional references on this topic, there are public consumption articles (such as <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/08/cigarettes-story-of-plastic/#:~:text=Did%20You%20Know%3F-,About%204.5%20trillion%20cigarettes%20are%20discarded%20each%20year%20worldwide%2C%20making,as%20long%20as%2010%20years.>) and also peer-reviewed publications (such as <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0013935119300787>). Concentrating on this list of single-use items will make a positive impact, but there are numerous other single-use and multi-use items which will not be affected by this policy scope. Therefore the over environmental impact by phasing out these materials is expected to be lower than a broader litter capture scope will provide. Please refer to the response to Question 2: Policy Objectives and the accompanying discussion note.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Yes, but the suggested change is to include cigarette butts as a single-use item that contains plastics. Additionally, the statement "until genuine marine degradable and home compostable alternative are available" implies that litter capture options are not being considered and that a future change in plastic material properties will be relied on to solve this issue. This statement is unqualified in that there is no reasonable confidence that can be placed on if these materials can be made and also when this may become a viable option. In the interim period, plastic litter will continue to be discharged with very little regulations to stop it in New Zealand. This places New Zealand behind many other countries in addressing the impacts of plastics on the environment. Please refer to the response to Question 2: Policy Objectives and the accompanying discussion note.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

The items listed can be phased out within 12 months.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We actively encourage our families and staff to use their own mugs for coffee and material cloths instead of single-use wet wipes. There are health benefits associated with wet wipes, and so a total phase-out of these items would not be encouraged, rather better waste management techniques together with litter capture infrastructure across land use's that are known to be litter hotspots for improved redundancy.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Does not apply to our business.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

We do not entirely agree with completely phasing out wet wipes that contain plastics. These are unlikely to be recycled if used for sanitary purposes, and for this use, they have benefits but should be disposed of responsibly. Litter capture technologies, if implemented, could provide redundancy in the infrastructure network to capture unintentionally littering, hence our advocacy for this option.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The section 'potential risks and unintended consequences' identifies some of the aspects we have discussed in this submission, however, we feel this section is too short with a limited analysis conducted. Our view here is the overall benefit to changing some plastic items will not provide the wide-scale litter capture that is required. This level of litter management has been investigated and implemented internationally. Our view is that the environmental benefits that have been associated with the scope of this policy have been poorly defined and are overstated. The impact rating is stated as 'high benefit' to the environment, but the policy recommends changing some plastics to other types of plastic. These alternatives have the potential to also be littered. Therefore changing the material composition does not solve the issue, but rather transfers it to another negative outcome. We agree that there will be some benefits associated with this policy in its current form, however, the research required to understand how litter is generated and transported to the environment, and what cost-effective measures exist to safeguard and protect the stormwater drains has unfortunately been completely overlooked in this scoping and consultation document. There are little to no consent limits on plastic pollution in resource consents, despite the availability of low-cost, locally developed products to fill this need.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The PMCSA's report recommends more research into litter research as part of recommendation set number two. A lack of data will result in poor decision-making. Monitoring activities conducted by Stormwater360 into the amount of litter entering drains across various land uses around the country, with some studies up to a full-year in duration, has found on average 600-800 pieces of litter enter each drain per year. For context, there are more than 100,000 catch pits in the city of Auckland alone. This figure is only an average, with the actual results showing extreme variability between different drains, some receiving several thousand individual litter and plastic waste per year. Plastic litter entering stormwater drains concentrates around these litter 'hotspots' where litter loading is either very high or very variable depends on the land use activities, which are in essence human behaviours. Compliance is often left to industry associations and not by the consent issuers. Some of the worst litter leakages we have seen are at recycling facilities themselves, with drains overloaded by plastics and microplastics. To date, we have enjoyed a positive relationship with plastics associations across New Zealand and other countries, and in our experience, there is a lot of room for improvement in monitoring and compliance around litter and especially plastic litter. However, most consents do not make provision for plastic litter discharge. The punitive measures proposed should be considered based on the effectiveness of other such legislation. How much positive impact does the Litter Act of 1979 have on the quantity of litter? Is it possible to know who littered, and when? We believe the same limitations will apply to this policy and a more proactive approach is required. There are opportunities for New Zealand to close this gap relative to other countries, but this will require correctly scoped initiatives and policies. It is also critical to leverage skills and expertise that already exist within New Zealand, or else there is a risk that scientific and technological advances made locally benefit those cities and regions internationally who choose to regulate litter capture for their benefit.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 364

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use itemsthrough significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systemsthat support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communitiesto use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunitiesthat reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected

party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not

containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 365

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 366

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

These options could be blended to support an effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also fully support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 367

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling: • The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. • To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support. Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics: • Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end use, volumes and types of plastic exported. • This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. • The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Thier Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: • Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user buisnesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; • Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a ‘world leading’ exemplar model of reduction. A “circular approach to resource management” and “reduced public confusion” are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: • Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. • This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: • Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. • To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: • Education • Support (financial and logistical) • Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) • Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) • Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

• The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted. • For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): • innovators, • producers, • suppliers/logistics bodies, • commercial end-users, • consumer end-users, • recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a 'cost-benefit' analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." • Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 368

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Should also provide industry support for reusable alternatives

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I don't think voluntary actions should be considered. It shows a disregard for the seriousness of the topic.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Consistency will make messaging easier to understand and will remove the chance of PVC mixed with easy to recycle plastics by mistake.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Protect waterways from EPS, as well as the things I mentioned above.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Though I would prefer a closer target, like 2022.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

As always, the opportunity for greener business models creates a space in the market for new opportunities. Also I feel that the proposal's consideration of 'the environment' may be a bit superficial and not fully identify how crucial a healthy environment is for our survival as a species, so in that regard the benefits are greater.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Better recycling infrastructure and better support for local green initiatives.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Mid 2022

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Monitored by MfE

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 369

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

All plastics which are hard to recycle should be phased out. For eg. Nylon, Polycarbonate etc are not listed. It is better to list plastics that are easy to recycle. All others should be phased out or restricted.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Only around 55% of the recyclable plastics are recycled now in NZ. One option should be around setting up small recycling stations / collection centers in the community. This is being successfully tried in many countries.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Not enough. All plastics except easily recyclable ones should be phased out. Eg. Polycarbonate etc are not included in the list. It is easier to list the recyclable plastics.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Why there should be two stages? Why not phase out in a single stage? There are alternative packaging solutions available already. Making the phase out in two stages will only extend the use of non recyclable plastics.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

All plastics which are hard to recycle should be phased out. For eg. Nylon, Polycarbonate etc are not listed. It is better to list plastics that are easy to recycle. All others should be phased out or restricted.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes. It is not just recyclability is the problem for these plastics. PVC for eg, has lot of other ingredients like fillers plasticiser oils etc which will leach out and contaminate waterways.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Don't think there will be much of cost impact. Around half of the people will go to reusable alternatives and the other half will go to costlier alternate materials. So I think the net cost impact will be zero.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, proper grades of Polyethylene and Polypropylene can replace most of PVC and Polystyrene packaging solutions. Mass production will reduce the cost of natural alternatives.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Oxo-degradable plastics are conventional polymers (e.g. LDPE) to which chemicals are added to. accelerate the oxidation and fragmentation of the material under the action of UV light and/or. They degrade these plastics to smaller fragments which are more dangerous from an environment perspective. You can use straight plastics (LDPE) instead and open more avenues to recycle them.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

It is just a habbit change. We have seen banning single use shopping bags didnt affect our lives at all. We easily turned to reusable bags.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Instead of two phases it should be a single phase by 2023

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

It is better to classify "easily recyclable" and "others". All "Others" should be phased out.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Food grade HDPE and polypropylene cups (Without paper mixed) which can be easily reused or recycled

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups can be replaced with new material in 2 years.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 370

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 371

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). Would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. Suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable

packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee

cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 372

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling: ● The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. ● To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support. Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics: ● Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end use, volumes and types of plastic exported. ● This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. ● The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Thier Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: ● Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user businesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; ● Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

A “circular approach to resource management” and “reduced public confusion” are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: ● Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. ● This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: ● Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. ● To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: ● Education ● Support (financial and logistical) ● Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) ● Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) ● Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted. ● For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): ● innovators, ● producers, ● suppliers/logistics bodies, ● commercial end-users, ● consumer end-users, ● recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We/I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a 'cost-benefit' analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." ●
Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 373

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring NZ in line with overseas current best practice.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The proposed policy is a great start towards a circular economy. The main objective should be however to “reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. “ An additional secondary objective should be added regarding making reuse alternatives more affordable and accessible.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed with the exception of plastic straws. Plastic straws are a necessity for many people in the disabled community and by introducing a ban (even with an exemption) this would further stigmatise disabilities and introduce challenges for disabled people. I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The proposed time-frames are too slow. I suggest PVC trays being phased out by June 2021. All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022. Stage 2 by June 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non-food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams so it's better to be consistent and phase out all hard PVC and PS packaging

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these the better, so I would like the phase-out to happen by June 2021.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

A more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as the 'affected party' distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased use and uptake of reusables. This would require regulation and infrastructure to make it equally as convenient for businesses to provide reuse options and consumers to use them. Better (and accessible) infrastructure such as the Reusabowl scheme or washing facilities, and funding for locally-based community engagement would help. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in NZ actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups: I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes: I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems)

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups: With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes: I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and I agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 374

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 375

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). I would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. I suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and I agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 376

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The linear economy causes major waste issues across all waste types, not just plastics. Add emphasis on using less virgin plastic and ensuring recycled plastic is mandated more

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The government needs to ensure a circular economy is enabled across all waste streams, not just plastic. The objectives are a good start but only a start. Plastic is one of many issues with waste we have.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Deposit return schemes are not considered but should be, as well as re-use schemes and systems. Government should lead and set an example across these issues. There should be a right to return items to the manufacturer/producer, and prevent waste producers externalising their costs to the environment in the form of waste. This way, new items will have a true cost that reflects their cost to the environment eg poisons, air pollution, landfill etc. Items that produce less waste will therefore become cheaper than items that produce more.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Agreed with the list of banned items. But the government proposal has only followed limited options with a narrow scope. Single use items and disposable coffee cups need to be banned, or legislated such that they are not cost-effective to use.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Dates are too passive and should be brought forward - there is no excuse to keep delaying and risk changes with new governments etc

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Phase all out as it can still end up affecting recycling material quality

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Obviously it limits the mess that future generations have to deal with, and immediately will improve our wellbeing and directly our health and the health of the environment around us. No brainer. Businesses need to get real and work to reduce their impact. As stated before, many manufacturers externalise the cost to the environment, for future generations to pay. This mentality needs to stop, it's the only way for the planet to survive the existential threats we face today.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Many alternatives exist. Make reusables and refillables the norm and cost -effective and readily available. Prevent alternatives that are wasteful or produce pollution or waste. Simple. People adapt easily. Levy single use, encourage and invest in reuse systems. Mandatory reusables for dine in cafes and restaurants.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Many opportunities and businesses can evolve through re-use systems

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Access to normalised and cost effective reuse systems; incentives for reuse; work with businesses large and small to encourage reuse and prevent waste (rather than the current focus on recycling)

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Fully support banning. Coffee cups and lids must be banned to, it's a complete fallacy and untruth that alternative systems to these cups doesn't exist - of course it does. Many people use reusable cups. Disposable coffee cups need to be made illegal. Also make illegal balloons, plastic teabags, lollipop sticks, drinks with plastic straws etc... so many opportunities to reduce waste, much of which can currently be found washed up on our beaches.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Ban disposable coffee cups and lids, it's a no brainer.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Phase out all in a staggered approach

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Disposable coffee cups and lids and wet wipes need to be banned - simple. These didn't exist a few years ago, ridiculous that they are not being banned and completely nonsensical and obviously as a result of industry influence,

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Straightaway

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 377

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Overall, the consultation document gives a good & thorough description of the problems that the targeted plastics pose to resource recovery systems, and the health & wellbeing of the environment, wildlife & people. We appreciate the work that has gone into justifying the need for these proposals. We would welcome more in-depth consideration of the problems associated with single-use systems (as opposed to single-use plastic items) and then seeing this linked to the proposed policies. From the perspective of zero waste and circular economy theory, the problem isn't just about plastic as a material, but the resource & energy intensive way that all materials are used & discarded in a linear economy. The part of the consultation document to which this question relates contains a small section on 'creating a culture of reuse' (p. 20), but doesn't explain how such a culture is created, nor the Government's role in that and how this might go hand-in-hand with the phase-out of single-use items. The consultation document even refers to the Takeaway Throwaways campaign, yet states we're calling on the Government to ban single-use plastic tableware and omits to mention the campaign's equally important headline ask that the Government advance measures to co-design and mandate accessible reusable alternatives. We believe the Government's framing of the problem as predominantly about the impact of plastic material, and its downplaying of the 'single-use' part of the equation, has shaped its narrow approach to the policy proposals.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objective of reducing the amount of hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics in use through eliminating certain problematic items and materials is not only a correct objective, it's a necessary condition for a circular economy. This objective must be combined with the equally important objective of increasing the uptake and scale of accessible, reusable alternatives and the systems that support them. This additional objective would harness the opportunity presented by banning ubiquitous single-use items to foster movement up the waste hierarchy and prevent uptake of false solutions (i.e. single-use items made of other materials). Facilitating reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics and plastic pollution. This is increasingly recognised internationally (including research and commentary on how the EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics can be leveraged to promote reuse, and research and literature by the Ellen MacArthur Foundation). We query why the previous section of the consultation document (on the problem of single-use plastics) promotes the importance of the top layers of the waste hierarchy and of "creating a culture of reuse", yet in the policy objectives these goals are absent. The consultation document also states that the proposal will help NZ achieve its commitments under the New Plastics Economy Global Commitment (to which both MfE and a handful of New Zealand businesses are signatories) (p.22). The Commitment calls on Government signatories to commit to implementing "ambitious policies" for "encouraging reuse models where relevant, to reduce the need for single-use plastic packaging and/or products", thus we'd expect to see this included in the proposal's main policy objectives.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list is thorough and considers a range of important measures; we take no issue with the measures highlighted and considered. However, the list is missing a blended option(s) - the only options considered are standalone measures. It is unclear why the consultation document has not explored at least one policy option that combines some or all of Options 1-7, in the style of the EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics, or Ireland's recently released National Waste Policy A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy. For more detailed reasoning, please see our response to Q 5. In addition to a blended option, there are

further policy intervention options worthy of consideration that are relevant to creating a culture of reuse. Namely: Mandatory reuse targets for certain items (such as serviceware) alongside reduction targets. Implementation of deposit return systems and/or a mandatory take-back service for all takeaway serviceware, to level the playing field for reuse systems and reduce the chance of littering for the items and materials not proposed for phase-out. Measures to mandate reusables in certain contexts. For example, the Berkeley Ordinance that mandates reusable serviceware for 'dine-in' customers (now being considered by a range of cities across the US). The Government could also consider the further Option of applying fees to cover clean-up costs for items that are not proposed for a ban, but are still problematic, either because they are commonly littered or commonly not disposed of correctly (fees to cover clean-up costs differ from a levy and should be possible under s 23(1)(d) of the WMA).

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria and weightings are appropriate and useful for understanding how the preferred policy option was chosen. We would like to see greater weight attached to how well each option aligns with strategic direction, particularly achieving outcomes higher up the waste hierarchy. Additional criteria should be added to assess how well each option protects against unintended perverse outcomes (i.e. greater use of single-use items of different materials), and whether the option promotes or undermines accessibility. Some criteria are defined too narrowly. "Effectiveness" should consider whether the option will help to increase the uptake & scale of accessible, reusable alternatives & the systems that support them (see our answer to Q2). "Achievability" should consider more than the need for new or amended legislation. Measures that rely on moral suasion or voluntarism are arguably difficult to achieve (or at least achievement is difficult to measure or assess). For example, avoiding perverse outcomes from mandatory phase-outs rests on education and awareness to ensure businesses make informed decisions to reduce the risk of unintended consequences - how achievable is this? Furthermore, the need for new or amended legislation would be of lesser relevance if a blended option were considered. For example, a mandatory phase-out of certain single-use items could still be advanced under existing legislation while proposals progress through Parliament to introduce a levy on single-use coffee cups, or amendments to the WMA to allow for levies or mandatory recycled content.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We fully support a mandatory phase-out of the items listed (except for plastic straws, see our answer to Q16). We agree that mandatory phase-outs will be effective at achieving the main objective, that maintaining the status quo approach is not satisfactory, and that voluntary approaches like plastic pacts aren't enough to achieve the main objective. However, we disagree with the decision to take forward mandatory phase-outs ONLY. As noted in our answer to Q3, we support a blended approach, in the style of the EU Directive on Single-Use Plastics, or the Irish National Waste Policy A Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy (see, in particular, the 'Plastic and Packaging Waste' and 'Single Use Plastic' chapters). It is unclear why the consultation document limits each option to standalone measures and presents the policy choices as either/or options. While the document notes that rejected options may appear in a renewed NZWS or Plastics Action Plan (35), we believe a more holistic suite of policy interventions could be considered in this proposal (particularly if the Government wants to create a culture of reuse). We are concerned that measures operating in isolation will struggle to move our economy up the waste hierarchy towards reuse and could create perverse outcomes. In removing a whole suite of single-use items, we urge the Government to consider the possible detrimental replacements in a packaging system dominated by linear approaches, and to design policies/regulations that nudge all actors in our economy towards reusables instead. The potential for 'regrettable substitution' could be avoided by complementary regulations that capture single-use items (of any material) beyond the targeted plastics; for example, levies and deposit return systems, fees to cover clean-up costs, or mandatory reusables in certain circumstances. We believe the Government has a critical role in levelling the playing field between single-use and reuse packaging systems, and in ensuring alternative reusable systems and products are accessible and meet the principles of universal design. We note too that some regulatory measures suit certain items more than others. We recognise that bans may be inappropriate right now for some items, even though they may be problematic. A more flexible, blended option approach would allow for a greater range of single-use and plastic items to be brought within the proposed regulatory regime. For example, cigarette butts, glitter, balloons etc. Instead, the ban-only approach has knock-on effects for items not considered for a phase-out, such as wet wipes and coffee cups. These are now left entirely unregulated, despite acknowledgement that they are problematic and harmful, and that the Government does wish to phase-them out eventually. With the other policy levers taken off the table, what concrete, regulatory actions can the Government now take to mitigate negative impact and stimulate reduced consumption and increased uptake of reusables in the interim? And what is the pathway for achieving an eventual phase-out?

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The staged approach and the categorisation of the products falling into the two stages make sense. However, both could happen on shorter timeframes. The world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the

flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. We need to act decisively to reverse these trends. We note that EU Member States will ban many of the items and materials targeted by the present proposal by July 2021 (under the Single-Use Plastics Directive). So, the growth of alternatives will be in full swing internationally, making it easier for countries like New Zealand to follow suit faster. We suggest that Stage 1 products are phased out by June 2021 and Stage 2 products are phased out by June 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this expansive and ambitious list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC and PS are used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is not recyclable and is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will assist in the ongoing drive to provide high quality recycling materials to reprocessors. EPS, which becomes litter in the environment, crumbles into thousands of tiny balls of plastic which are impossible to recover and can be mistaken for food by birds and fish. This creates lasting damage to our soil, water-ways and marine environment - damage which is compounded by the free-ranging and harmful chemicals that adhere to these microplastics, many of which are bioaccumulating. Cheap EPS from overseas is especially likely to fall apart, resulting in pervasive pollution. Phasing out EPS would therefore protect our soil, marine ecosystem and waterways, which are so fundamental to our future survival. A small quantity of higher quality EPS is being collected for recycling - and is reprocessed either overseas or onshore into insulation. However due to the harmful properties of plastic in the environment, we would support it being replaced as a packaging material. Hard polystyrene (6) packaging cannot be recycled as there is no market for it. Replacing it with a recyclable material, or ideally a reusable packaging option, would shift us closer to a circular economy.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We believe practical alternatives exist to replace the hard-to-recycle packaging items proposed for phase-out. However, ensuring uptake of the most desirable alternatives (reusable and refillable packaging or highly recyclable packaging with recycled content) and guaranteeing that these are accessible to everyone, requires more than simply phasing-out some of the undesirable options. The Government says that in the long-term it would like to see more reusable or refillable alternatives operating within innovative reuse models (39). This is such a pleasing statement to read; we support this vision wholeheartedly. We note that this vision is unlikely to occur spontaneously, and certainly not with the requisite level of urgency, without higher levels of Government support through both targeted policy interventions that level the playing field between single-use and reuse, and investment in the necessary infrastructure for accessible reuse models to work at scale. We note the Government's concern with the environmental impact of alternatives to the items proposed for a ban (40). We agree, and reiterate our call for policy & regulatory levers to accompany a ban that direct businesses and consumers towards the best alternatives. We note that it's already possible to BYO reusable containers and tableware for takeaway food and drink. In many cases, washable crockery is a realistic alternative instead of disposables. A handful of reuse schemes exist for reusable takeaway packaging, such as Again Again, CupCycling and Reusabowl. Furthermore, many grocery outlets, from butchers to dedicated zero waste grocers, offer unpackaged, fill your own models or reusable packaging systems. Business to business reuse schemes exist for transport packaging also. The issue is not a lack of ideas or models, but barriers to scale and normalisation within our entrenched linear economy, and lack of adequate incentives to ensure uptake of reusable alternatives when they are available. Furthermore, these barriers promote ad hoc product and system development that isn't always conducive to accessibility. Accordingly, sustained policy interventions and investment are required to level the playing field between single-use and reuse. As mentioned above, this requires levies on single-use items and delivery systems (which will encourage uptake of reusable and refillable models), deposit return systems on food and beverage packaging, mandating reusable serviceware in certain situations, and reuse quotas/targets. Furthermore, Government oversight is needed to direct the market towards a high-performing, zero waste, circular economy based on reuse that is low emissions and accessible for everyone. While even poorly

designed reuse systems likely have far lower impact lifecycle analyses (LCAs) than any single-use system, well-designed reuse systems can have extraordinarily lower LCA impact. Also, some reusable options are less accessible than others - Government oversight can ensure a co-design process for reuse schemes that guarantees reusable alternatives follow principles of universal design. In addition, it may be appropriate to establish a reusables fund under the umbrella of the Disability Allowance to enable those who are eligible for this allowance to purchase accessible reusables if they would like to. The consultation document also states that where plastic packaging is in use, it should be made of higher-value and recyclable materials, with recycled content. Again, regulatory interventions such as levies and legislated mandatory recycled content are required for this outcome. If the powers to achieve this do not exist under the WMA, then part of the present proposal should include a plan to progress the necessary amendments through Parliament.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for proposing a blanket ban on oxo-degradable plastics – we wholeheartedly support this. We would prefer to see this ban occur more quickly. Many overseas jurisdictions, including the EU, will be phasing-out oxo-degradable plastics by July 2021. We believe New Zealand should follow this timeframe too.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The consultation document sets out a comprehensive list of costs & benefits of the mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. We agree with all listed. We also appreciate acknowledgment of the potential cost savings for retailers if customers BYO containers and the cost savings for the wider community of reducing the complexity of our waste & recycling streams. We also like how the Government has recognised that bans help to put all retailers in the same boat. Overall, we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits – human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit that is currently missing is the new potential opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. If this opportunity is harnessed, it will not only reduce waste and recycling, it will also have a positive job creation impact. Preliminary studies indicate that reusable packaging systems tend to produce higher numbers of jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. Furthermore, those jobs are more dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals.¹ The growth of reuse schemes will also lead to a reduction in single-use/one-way packaging generally (not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and thus ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

As noted above, concrete Government regulation and investment is needed to move reusable alternatives from the niche to the mainstream. Furthermore, a coordinated universal design approach is needed to ensure these alternatives are accessible for everyone in our community (taking into account potential barriers, such as cost or disability). Government direction and oversight in all this is necessary. A hands-off, pro-voluntary, awareness raising approach from the Government that leaves the development of reuse schemes entirely up to the whims of private interests will not guarantee a baseline reusables system that is widespread, accessible and environmentally, socially and economically efficient. The consultation document notes that removing the targeted plastics could lead to greater use of other hard-to-recycle materials, such as composites. The proposal for mitigating this risk is “pairing the phase-out with best practice guidance on sustainable packaging... an opportunity to educate businesses and the public, and raise awareness of the environmental impact of different choices.” (46) We do not believe this approach is sufficient to achieve the outcomes the Government seeks. Nor is it the best use of government resource (not least because it risks duplicating the mahi that many community groups and NGOs have been doing for some time now). What’s really needed is for the Government to play its part and back up our collective effort with policy, regulations and investment that make “best practice... sustainable packaging” (i.e. reusable/refillable packaging wherever possible) standard practice.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support banning almost all of the listed single-use plastic items, including their oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastic counterparts. However, we do not support a ban of plastic straws. Takeaway Throwaways has always excluded plastic straws from our campaign & petition because some people with accessibility needs require a plastic straw to drink. While some reusable alternatives work well for some people, for others there may be no reusable alternative that is suitable. An exemption to a plastic straw ban can mitigate the potential harm (for example, exemptions to permit plastic straws' availability "on request" at hospitality outlets and pharmacies), but they are difficult to design without being stigmatising. There is also the risk that disabled people seen using a straw will face backlash from uninformed hospitality staff or the public. We believe that direct consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should have occurred before this consultation document was released. In any case, this consultation must now occur before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We otherwise support the proposed list of items for phase-out, and would like to see the list extended to include other disposable serviceware items that also cause harm in our environment, exist in the litter stream and contaminate recycling: 1. Disposable coffee cups & lids We are extremely disappointed that coffee cups & lids have been expressly excluded from the ban list. The Packaging Forum estimates that New Zealanders use 295 million coffee cups a year. The overwhelming majority get landfilled. Huge confusion surrounds their recyclability and/or compostability. They're also light and prone to escaping into the environment, and their lids are fully detachable, increasing the potential for litter. We strongly disagree with the Government's assessment that practical alternatives are lacking. Virtually all outlets accept BYO reusables, most outlets have in-house ceramic options if people forget their cup. There's also a growing range of reuse schemes/cup loan systems across New Zealand (reflecting international trends in this direction). There are towns, such as Wanaka, that have a vision of being free of disposable coffee cups by 2022. And, nationwide, a growing number of cafes (over 50 to our knowledge) have gone single-use-cup-free already by implementing strategies that combine discounts with surcharges, retail of personal 'keep cups' and the adoption of homegrown or national reuse systems, with invitations to BYO, and importantly, encouragement to build community by making time to stay. Even if alternatives are not yet fully established in every corner of the country, the expertise about alternatives and systems for delivering them does exist in New Zealand. Under the present proposal, none of the bans would occur overnight. If coffee cups were included, businesses and consumers would have ample time and notice to prepare and adopt alternatives (particularly if a ban were to phase-in by 2025). A ban with a lead-in time would also grant security for cup reuse schemes to invest to scale. Takeaway Throwaways is involved in the movement to phase-out throwaway takeaway packaging in New Zealand. One of our founders has been working alongside hospitality outlets since 2017 through Use Your Own, to support hundreds of cafes across the country to reduce their use of disposable coffee cups (or cease using them completely). Through our work, research and daily engagement with the public and hospitality outlets across New Zealand, we can attest to how far public and media perception has turned against disposable coffee cups. These items are increasingly recognised as a burden to hospitality outlets financially. Due to their propensity to pollute roadsides and waterways, they are a growing source of embarrassment for brands and of public ire and frustration. We believe that most businesses would willingly cease to use disposable cups if all outlets were in the same boat. The only way to achieve this is through a nationwide ban. 2. Plastic lollipop sticks: These present a similar hazard to plastic cotton buds (which are proposed for a ban) and there are also alternatives, such as cardboard. 3. Single-serve/Portion Control Unit pottles, sachets & containers for condiments. For example, soy fish, pottles with peelable plastic lids for jam, butter and other condiments, sachets of sauces, condiments and sugar. We note that the consultation document highlights the impact of the Fox River Landfill disaster - one of the items commonly picked up by volunteers were these types of single-use/PCU packets from the accommodation and hospitality providers in this popular tourist destination. We note that these types of products have been earmarked for banning by the Irish Government in their recently released National Waste Policy (p.33). 4. Soft plastic wrappers for individually packaging mini confectionary items For example, mints given out at restaurants as breath fresheners or lollies on flights. The wrappers are very small and thus easily escape rubbish collection, and are an unnecessary level of packaging as confectionary is easily purchased in bulk packaging. 5. Place-based phase-outs We would support the Government pursuing a place-based phase-out approach to items that we aren't ready to ban completely, including sustainable public procurement. For example, a mandatory phase-out of disposable serviceware for all dine-in contexts (i.e. like Berkeley, California); single-use free zones in towns and cities (like Plastic-Free Precinct trials in Australia 1); on campus or institutional bans of bottled water and disposable coffee cups, including Public Procurement Policy that excludes disposable serviceware etc. 2 See, for example, www.plasticfreeplaces.org; <https://www.greenindustries.sa.gov.au/plastic-free-precincts> For example, <https://source.wustl.edu/2016/04/water-bottle-ban-success-bottled-beverage-sales-plummeted/> <https://phys.org/news/2017-05-students-plastic-bottles-campus.html>; <http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/san-francisco-bans-sale-plastic-water-bottles-climate-change>; <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/08/02/business/plastic-water-bottle-ban-sfo-trnd/index.html>; <https://australianfoodtimeline.com.au/bottled-water-ban-bundanoon/>

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics within the ambit of the proposed phase-out - we applaud the Government for taking this step. As the consultation document notes, many of these products are not certified, and/or not home compostable nor marine degradable. Those that are certified compostable regularly do not arrive to the types of environments they are designed to degrade in (48). If they go to landfill, they produce methane in the anaerobic conditions. Furthermore, whether compostable or not, these products are still designed for single-use applications, with all the wasted embodied energy and resources that that status represents. As the consultation document notes, the items selected for phase-out in this proposal represent an 'unnecessary' use of plastic. Therefore, even if genuinely home compostable plastic alternatives were developed, they would remain an unnecessary application of that technological innovation. We recommend the following alterations or clarifications of the proposed

definitions: Plastic straws: The proposed definition refers to an exemption to allow access to plastic straws for disabled persons and for medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, we note that an exemption is unlikely to fully redress the loss in accessibility brought about by a plastic straw ban. Furthermore, the extent to which the risk of stigmatisation or discrimination is mitigated depends on how the exemption is drafted and the surrounding policy for its application and enforcement. Unfortunately, the potential impact of the exemption is impossible to assess because the proposed exemption has not been drafted for feedback (other than an indication that it may look like the UK or EU approach). There is also no specific field in the submission form to provide specific feedback on the proposal to include plastic straws in the phase-out, the suitability of an exemption, or what an exemption could look like to maximise accessibility. We believe the active participation of the disabled community is not sufficiently upheld by this consultation process. Single-use plastic tableware: The proposed definition should be amended to clarify that this includes paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings (similar to the plastic cups and lids definition). Single-use plastic cups and lids: Disposable coffee cups should be included in the proposed phase-out (as discussed in our answer to Q16). We also do not support exempting single-use plastic cups made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 from a ban – even if these are easier to recycle plastic types, the cups are likely to be too food contaminated to recycle. Furthermore, as takeaway, on-the-go products, the cups are likely to be used away from home where the public has reduced access to recycling services. Nevertheless, if the exemption goes ahead, we recommend that it applies to cups only and that any lids are expressly excluded from the exemption as their size effectively makes them ‘hard-to-recycle’ items in most kerbside systems that rely on automated MRFs for sorting. Furthermore, they are detachable so can easily be lost to the environment.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see our answers about this in Q17).

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Takeaway Throwaways is a campaign focused on serviceware, so we focus only on disposable coffee cups in this response. Please refer to the joint submission by the zero waste community for comments in relation to wet wipes. As noted elsewhere in this submission, the Government must consider regulatory & policy interventions and investment to increase the uptake, accessibility and availability of reusable alternatives to disposable coffee cups. We note that many of these regulations & policies can be achieved under s 23 of the WMA and/or without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. These include: Adding disposable coffee cups to the proposed phase-out list as this will motivate industry and consumers to find alternatives faster. Levies on disposable coffee cups and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. Mandating reusable serviceware only for dine-in customers. Phasing-in disposable coffee cup free zones or sustainable public procurement policies that prohibit disposable serviceware (e.g. university campuses and other institutional spaces, buildings associated with local and central govt and Parliament etc.) A deposit return scheme for both disposable coffee cups and reusable cups, offered through a reuse scheme, combined with a requirement that hospitality outlets offer a takeback service for the cups they give out (whether for reuse or appropriate disposal). Ensuring that reusable alternatives and the systems to deliver them adhere to the principles of universal design so that they are accessible for everyone in the community. Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse models to operate effectively, such as reverse logistics and washing/sterilisation infrastructure. Creating a more welcoming environment for BYO cups by working with the Ministries of Health and Primary Industries to inform businesses that accepting BYO cups is consistent with food safety regulations (including during covid-19), and amending food safety legislation to require outlets to accept BYO cups (in accordance with appropriate food safety requirements/food control plans) rather than leaving this to the discretion of individual businesses. Working with the Ministry for Primary Industries to develop specific food safety guidelines for reusable and refillable packaging systems (not to create onerous regulations, but rather to give businesses a sense of security and confidence in accepting reusables). Compulsory labelling requirements for disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about the availability of reusable alternatives and a ban on branding cups. We note that Ireland’s recently released National Waste Policy provides a useful blueprint for how a Government can accelerate an eventual phase-out of disposable coffee cups and cold drinks cups (pp.33-34). We have considered the options put forward in the consultation document (p.49) and offer the following comments: We support the suggestion of investing to scale up reuse systems. We note that this will achieve the best outcomes if accompanied by the regulatory & policy interventions listed above as these are necessary preconditions to level the playing field with single-use. Furthermore, a coordinated approach to scheme design overseen by Government is needed to guarantee basic accessibility and availability of reusable alternatives. Non-plastic alternative coffee cups may be appropriate in some contexts (such as medical situations or civil emergencies). However, for more general application this is a false solution as they are still single-use, with all the embodied energy and resource wastage associated with this linear approach. Furthermore, a collection system would be required for composting these cups because they will be too contaminated for recycling and if disposed of to landfill will produce methane in the anaerobic conditions. Thus, they present the same issues as home compostable plastics. While public education campaigns to promote reusable alternatives is an option, there are numerous NGOs and community groups in NZ and globally doing this mahi already. We need Government to back our efforts

with the powers that only Government has (i.e. regulation, policy and investment) rather than risk duplicating work already being done. However, funding support to some of these NGOs and community groups to conduct their education and campaigning could be appropriate, so long as it operates alongside supportive regulatory measures and infrastructural investment. Exploring the feasibility of a scheme to collect and recycle or compost single-use cups (putting aside the technical challenges to successfully recycling or composting them, which shouldn't be ignored) doesn't address the fact that these are still single-use items that waste energy and resources - it's a way of doing things that the circular economy demands we move away from. Furthermore, the investment in logistics and infrastructure to take back these cups and develop facilities to compost or recycle them would be better diverted towards scaling reuse schemes and developing infrastructure centred around reuse. Reuse schemes would also create a greater number of jobs in the collection, washing and redistribution logistics and these jobs would be more dispersed across the country.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Takeaway Throwaways does not manufacture, supply or use single-use plastic coffee cups. However, we invite the Government to consult with the 50+ hospitality businesses who are SUC free, and the organisations and small businesses around NZ that support their work such as: UYO SUC-free Wanaka Again Again Cupcycling Good to Go Waiheke The Grey Lynn Koha Jar Project Wanakup These businesses and groups report that the ability to implement alternatives to single use plastic coffee cups enables businesses to move entirely to reuse. Furthermore, many businesses would be willing to cease dispensing disposable coffee cups, but would prefer if all outlets were in the same boat (i.e. through a nationwide ban).

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Takeaway Throwaways focuses on serviceware, so we only discuss disposable coffee cups here. For discussion of timeframes for wet wipes, please refer to the joint submission from the wider zero waste community. Disposable coffee cups products should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025. Accessible alternatives exist. Were the Government to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19) we see no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

A comprehensive list of the costs and benefits of mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics. We agree with all listed, and appreciate the acknowledgement of the potential cost savings for retailers from a move to phase-out unnecessary single-use items, the cost savings for local govt (and therefore ratepayers) from reduced waste & litter, and the fact that banning items across the board has the benefit of levelling the playing field. One significant cost missing is the potential impact that a ban on plastic straws will have for individuals with accessibility needs who require a straw to drink, and the potential that needing to rely on an exemption will be stigmatising. One benefit that is currently missing is the new potential opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems to replace the targeted plastics. If this opportunity is harnessed, it will not only reduce waste and recycling, it will also have a positive job creation impact. As noted in Q 14, preliminary studies indicate that reusable packaging systems tend to produce higher numbers of jobs than systems based on disposal or recycling. Furthermore, those jobs are more dispersed across the country, which meets provincial development goals. The growth of reuse schemes will also lead to a reduction in single-use/one-way packaging generally (not just targeted plastic), which will further reduce costs for local authorities and thus ratepayers. As noted in Q13, overall we think the analysis would be more meaningful if the environment was not treated as an affected party separate to our human or economic benefits - human society (including the economy) can only thrive if our planet is well.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 378

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

The more, the better!

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Easier access to compost bins etc for those who don't have them/aren't educated in that area

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 380

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by a comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected

party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Agree We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: Single-use coffee cups & lids Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: Plastic lollipop sticks Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic Single-use plastic water bottles Balloons and balloon sticks Glitter and plastic confetti Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets. We at Plastic Free Wanaka recommend that single use coffee cups are added to the list of items. A ban on single use coffee cups is an easy and effective solution for these reasons: 1. BYO cups are available at low or no-cost. 2. Cup-lending schemes are already established and cup libraries are cheap to run. 3. In Wanaka, behaviour change around single-use cups has happened rapidly and it is already a social norm in the town for people to BYO cup.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Yes with changes We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement and support cafes, restaurants and bars.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities implementing regulatory and

policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change

SUCfree Wanaka (under the banner of the Plastic Free Wanaka) is a collaborative, hospitality-led initiative with the goal of making Wanaka single-use cup-free (SUCfree) by 2022. We believe we have a working model for a SUCfree NZ which can be shared with other communities to support them to adopt new behaviours and support government legislation. With the support of the Queenstown Lakes Waste Minimisation Community Fund, SUCfree Wanaka 2022 was launched in 2019 along with the implementation of Again Again's cup lending scheme. The SUCfree campaign encourages cafe customers to avoid single-use cups, and instead choose to "Sit, BYO or Borrow". In the short space of time since our launch these behaviours are becoming the norm in our town. Overheard at a recent community event - "oh mate you don't want to be seen with that in here!" Since we launched in 2019 we have had wide support across the Wanaka hospitality sector and the wider community. 25 cafes have joined the SUCfree Wanaka movement and are taking action to reduce their use of takeaway cups. In the first 12 months we estimate to have saved around 180,000 single-use cups from landfill. 9 Wanaka cafes are already 100% SUCfree and 3 more are about to make the move - each saving between 1,000 - 2,000 cups from landfill each month. 26 cafes have cup lending schemes in place (Again Again, glass jars, cup libraries, local cup lending scheme). Critical to our success so far has been: A collaborative model - sustainability groups working together with the hospitality sector and cafes working together towards a shared goal. Financial support from local council has enabled us to pay for a part time coordinator to run the community engagement campaign and support cafe staff. Engagement with all sectors of our community through digital media, cafe ambassadors, workshops, get togethers, local media. Having access to working solutions that overcome the main barriers for customers (forgetting to take a cup and not planning to have a coffee). For example cup lending schemes such as Again Again and Wanakup. Whilst there has been an enormous amount of volunteer time contributed to the project the financial support has helped to amplify and support this energy. Around New Zealand there are many volunteer groups and not for profit organisations are working on the ground to reduce waste. They have the knowledge, skills and connections to make real change for their communities. With funding from local and national government these groups can employ coordinators and deliver promotions, marketing and community engagement to support legislative changes and behaviour change in our communities. We recommend local and national government: Support specific regions/towns/suburbs to be case studies to exemplar. Help them to transfer the knowledge to other groups and organisations. Support a network of groups and regions. Ban free single use cups - enforce a high charge on single use cups. Suggest a fee of \$1 to disincentivize use. Supporting cup lending systems already in place. Provide more education on the problem - single use coffee cups can't be recycled. They are very unlikely to end up in a compost facility. The logistics of gathering up compostable cups and ensuring they're getting to the industrial composting facility is complex and extremely unlikely to occur. What we have discovered is that all of the coffee cups used in our district go to landfill. Provide a sustainability tax rebate for businesses creating a financial incentive for businesses who are taking an active role to reduce single use plastics. Lead by example - eg no takeaway cups in government buildings. No cafes in government buildings with single use cups. . Fund research into life cycle analysis of single use cups and different reusable cups to help people make good choices. Develop case-studies, webinars, work with national level industry organisations and trainers. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

In Wanaka we have 9 cafes who have already transitioned away from use of single-use coffee cups and 3 more about to make the switch. The most effective way to support businesses to transition away from hard to recycle single use items is to use legislation to enforce a ban on single-use cups. In support of legislation the following initiatives would help businesses to transition: Make it easier by taking the choice of a single-use cup away, so customers only had the choice of a sit, BYO or borrow. Establish think tanks, advisory groups, networks to share information and resources. Provide information to the hospitality sector to help them understand the problem with single-use cups and the impact on the environment and climate. Provide resources and information to help frontline hospitality staff educate their customers and be SUCfree ambassadors. Consider starting with a levy on single-use cups and then transition to a total ban. Support individual towns that are already working with each other by funding the cost of collaboration and coordination. Provide funding to support community groups working on the ground to help their communities change behaviours and create social norms. Invest in education and awareness campaigns to prepare people for the change. When the plastic bag ban came into effect in July 2019 the Wanaka community adopted the change with very little resistance. This was due to the work that had been done on the ground for many years by local groups and organisations like Wastebusters, Sustainable Wanaka and Plastic Free Wanaka. These groups helped to establish social norms and create peer pressure which created the tipping point for an easy transition to plastic bag free. The same can be done for single use coffee cups.. Restaurants have benefited from small amount of funding for paid coordination, community engagement, social media, administration and support.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups We at Plastic Free Wanaka and SUCfree Wanaka have set an ambitious goal of making Wanaka Single-use Cup free by 2022. We believe that other towns, with support, can adopt our model and meet their goal of being a single-use cup (SUC) free. With Government regulatory, policy and financial support for replicating the successes of those towns, we could have a SUCfree Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing

plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 382

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a 'world leading' exemplar model of reduction. A "circular approach to resource management" and "reduced public confusion" are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: ● Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. ● This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: ● Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. ● To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: ● Education ● Support (financial and logistical) ● Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) ● Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) ● Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

● The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted. ● For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): ● innovators, ● producers, ● suppliers/logistics bodies, ● commercial end-users, ● consumer end-users, ● recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We/I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a 'cost-benefit' analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." ●
Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 383

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for tangible solutions to achieve this, and approaches to achieve a 'world leading' exemplar model of reduction.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: Education, Support (financial and logistical), Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) and Feasibility.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Support the prohibition based phase-out.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We/I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The lens needs to be broadened beyond a cost-benefit; analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

As per above notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Remove cups made of PET, HDPE or polypropylene this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

yes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires

consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 384

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The descriptions do not quantify in full the size of each issue and allow perspective to be given to each type of plastic and form that it comes in. All products are lumped in the same description and small plastic items are not correctly compared or weighted against large plastic use items. The description has also not included any balance to the reason for use of the plastics i.e. food waste prevention versus luxury item packaging and the benefits each of these have to other important sustainability issues.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Objectives are correct for plastics only and do not include flow on effect objectives such as food spoilage and logistics handling cost increases that potential changes could occur.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Options are correct but they need to be consider at a plastic type level and use level so the final outcome maybe a combination of several options. It is presented as one option fits all

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Have only considered the cost of the alternative and not of the flow on effect of not have the current. i.e. increased cost of logistics and handling without labels, increase in spoilage of food due to less packaging or as effective packaging.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

As there is no consideration for a mixture of all options that best suit the relevant industry or reason for use.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Appears to cover the common understood products

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No as this should be seen as a starting point to drive best industry practice and a catalyst for the other PVC products to be voluntarily removed.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

it appears this would just add additional cost to the industries when alternative solutions may not be readily available yet

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes there are practical alternatives but some of these are not yet ready or cost effective (cost sustainable for business) so the timeframe on roll out needs to consider this.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

in the example of the produce label moving to an eco compostable label the cost increase would be +70% of current cost as quoted by suppliers

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

very likely as cost of alternatives have been underestimated and flow on effect cost have not been considered

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

an industry led approach based on what is achievable now and what R&D is being done on better ways. This is a better approach than making it mandatory but a set date and having to use high cost or non developed alternatives.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Do not agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items (please comment below)

Notes

We submit that produce labels be excluded from the list due to them playing a vital part in food identity, food traceability, brand identity (as all other packaging is being removed) and preventing product fraud. In context of the current alternatives and the

size of use versus other identified items until such time a cost effective sustainable alternative is found we think it should be removed from the item list.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

in regards to the produce label compositable is very broad and non specific based on what is achievable now and to what level both in industrial and home

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

should be dependant on a cost effect alternative being available

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

specifically in regards to the produce label the cost benefits do not consider correctly the areas of food safety, food traceability, food fraud, product waste

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

industry best practice so to ensure there is not a high compliance cost on an already costly process

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 386

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There are plenty of alternatives

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

All benefits. PVC should only be used for construction and manufactured goods where there is not a degradable alternative. ie. pipes

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

We do not.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

No comment

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

It is not a question of whats easier. Thats is exactly why we are in this mess. It whats should be done and is sustainable.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We have mugs, use them.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Not making them out of plastic. Maybe government should offer interest free / low interest loans for manufacturers to adapt their manufacturing process.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Additional tax on goods that do not comply at border and fines for nz manufactured goods. Policing like any other law.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 387

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to). We wish to add that we applaud the government's efforts to take steps to deal with these targeted plastic items. We also believe there is scope to go further and faster. In the current environment of closed borders and no international visitors, the Government has the opportunity to act boldly and swiftly, with aggressive deadlines. Lockdown earlier in 2020 showed that the team of 5 million is very capable of making drastic changes when needed and that businesses are capable of pivoting their models. The scale of the ecological crisis that plastic presents requires major efforts from all sectors of society, and transformation on short timeframes. It is the Government's responsibility to lead this process with clarity and focus. We also wish to warn against a false sense of security that "easy-to-recycle" plastics are somehow acceptable or condoned just because they are "easy" to recycle in theory. In practice, many of the problems with plastic discussed in the consultation document and in the joint submission apply to all plastics, whether theoretically "easy" to recycle or not.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to). In addition, we note the broader scope of plastics that require urgent attention that we outlined in our answer to Q1. Accordingly, APPA would like to change the main objective as follows: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from all plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, and increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, of safe recycled content in packaging, and of measures to mandate the increased recyclability of each product."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to). We note that in the list of options we would also like to see the government propose the use of s 23(1)(d) of the WMA to place fees on any problematic plastic items that are commonly found in plastic pollution surveys in Aotearoa and which the government is not proposing to ban yet (e.g. cigarette butts, coffee cups, other food and beverage packaging, bottle caps etc.). Many of our members are active in the area of citizen science and civil society clean-ups, along coastlines, waterways, parks and public places, either through our work researching and quantifying plastic pollution and/or through community organised efforts to remove this pollution from the natural environment and protect our wildlife and ecosystems. We see firsthand not only the extent of this pollution, but also the sheer amount of time, energy and resources that goes into clean-up efforts from voluntary groups, researchers, scientists and local government. In our view the costs of these efforts are quantifiable and fees should be placed on some of the biggest plastic pollution offenders (based on the research that many of our members undertake) to cover these clean-up costs and rather than continuing to have them be externalised onto the voluntary sector, local government, communities, the whenua, awa and moana.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to). While we support mandatory phase-outs first and foremost, for those items that the Government will not move to ban that are still recognised plastic polluters, we note our point in Q3 that the government should use the tools available to it to ensure that producers cover the costs of clean-up efforts, rather than the current situation where these efforts are taken for granted and thus either happen for free, or simply do not happen at all.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

APPA is in favour of a proactive and clear single phase-out date as early as possible, but no later than by 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to). In addition, we note that a further obvious benefit would be the reduction and elimination of these harmful products escaping into our environment. The cost of (not taking action) would be leaving more material for our children to deal with in the future as landfills will leak their contents.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to). In addition, APPA wishes to reinforce that we support adding cigarette filters to the list of mandatory phase-out products. Cigarette butts are the most commonly littered items on the streets in New Zealand (Keep New Zealand Beautiful, 2019) as well as on the beach (Sustainable Coastlines, 2020). Cigarette butts contain plastics and are harmful to the environment. They are often mistaken for food by birds and mammals causing damage and potentially leading to mortality (Slaughter et al., 2011). In addition, littered cigarette butts contaminate groundwater. At the very least, if cigarette butts are not to be included in the mandatory phase-outs, action needs to be taken to ensure tobacco companies cover the costs of cleaning up this pervasive item of plastic pollution, and that on-pack labelling is mandated to ensure smokers are informed that filters contain plastic and must not be littered.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

APPA would like to see a phase-out of all the listed single-use items within 12 months (or sooner). We note that we would also

like to see single-use coffee cups included in the list of items to be banned, and that the phase-out should follow the same timeline as all the other single-use items (12 months or sooner). Given the sheer amount of avoidable resources wasted, we urge a more active timeline than the joint submission of the zero waste community for single-use coffee cups.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which APPA contributed and has signed on to).

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 388

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling: ● The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. ● To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open the partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support.

Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics: ● Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end-use, volumes and types of plastic exported. ● This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. ● The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Their Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: ● Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user businesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; ● Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a ‘world leading’ exemplar model of reduction. A “circular approach to resource management” and “reduced public confusion” are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: ● Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. ● This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: ● Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. ● To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Notes

Question 3. Yes in part. Per. above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: ● Education ● Support (financial and logistical) ● Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) ● Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) ● Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

- The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted.
- For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product

stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): ● innovators, ● producers, ● suppliers/logistics bodies, ● commercial end-users, ● consumer end-users, ● recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We/I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a cost-benefit analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." ● Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 389

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

Yes However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around

reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MFE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MFE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 390

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support the banning of hard-to-recycle and single-use plastics for the reasons that have been outlined in the proposal. I would also like to urge the government to consider the waste involved in easy-to-recycle plastics (due to plastic's limited recycling life) and also the waste of single-use items in general, which have a significant environmental impact. I support moving Aotearoa towards a circular economy that is supported by systems of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Notes

I would like to see NZers have more access to reusable alternatives so we can shift away from a linear economy.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support a mandatory phase-out alongside support and incentive for people to shift away from single-use items to reusable alternatives.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The phase-out is too slow. Globally, our plastic production is predicted to double by 2040. We need to treat this problem with a lot more urgency than the proposed timeline. The European Union will ban some of these same items by July 2021. I support the ban starting from the end of 2021.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Regardless of whether or not they are used for food and beverage packaging, all PVC and hard polystyrene have an unacceptable negative impact on our environment. None of them should be exempt. Consistency is important.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is not recyclable. Polystyrene is a major environmental hazard due to the fact that it breaks up into tiny pieces which are ingested by wildlife. These plastics are now in the food chain which is hugely concerning for human health.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

People mistakenly believe that they are making a better environmental choice by using oxo-degradable plastics when, in reality, they cause more harm due to the way that they break up into very small pieces. Oxo-degradable plastic is also a contaminant in our recycling systems. It should be phased out as soon as possible, preferably by the end of 2021 (the European Union is banning them by July 2021).

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

One benefit that has been missed is the opportunity for organisations to develop reuse systems, which would generate employment.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

We need the government to legislate hard-to-recycle (and single-use products in general) out of the system and to invest in and incentivise reusable alternatives and make them more accessible to the public.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I would like the government to ensure that the disabled community are not unfairly disadvantaged by the phasing-out of plastic straws. Plastic straws should still be readily available to those who genuinely need them. I would like to see more single-use plastics added to the list of banned items, including disposable coffee cups. NZ currently sends 295 million disposable coffee cups to landfill each year. Reusable alternatives are readily available. As well as disposable coffee cups, I support the following items also being phased out: balloons, glitter, single-serve containers for condiments (e.g. pottles of butter, soy sauce "fish" containers) and toiletries, chewing gum containing plastic, plastic lollipop sticks, plastic coffee pods, plastic tea bags, free plastic toys (given out at places like McDonald's) and bottled water (we are fortunate to have widespread access to clean drinking water in this country).

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Single-use plastic cups made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 should not be exempt from the ban. Although these cups are recyclable, the reality is that because they are generally used when people are outside of their homes, they are not often actually recycled. Paper containers that include a lining of plastic should also be included in the ban.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

I believe that 12 months is achievable.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Encourage the use of reusable coffee cups through legislation and investment. Transition from wet wipes containing plastic to those that don't contain plastic. Promote the use of reusable wipes.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

12 months.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

I think it's important to acknowledge the benefits of job creation resulting from moving to systems of reuse.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

The public will help with monitoring. An enforcement strategy is required to ensure compliance.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 391

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support these items, but the problem is not just plastic. It is about all throw away items. When anything is waste, the environment suffers. It is about ridding ourselves of single use anything, this throw away culture and looking at systems such as reusables.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I absolutely am in support of banning these items but I feel it is important we eliminate all waste. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This list covers key actions I would love to see however: 1. I am concerned there is no blended option (a mixture of these actions together simultaneously). 2. The options are lacking a few important actions such as deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Notes

The criteria & weightings make sense & help us understand the Government's reasoning behind the proposals. We suggest more importance is given to how well each option targets the top layers of the waste hierarchy. Some criteria need broader definitions: "Effectiveness" should consider whether the options boost reuse. "Achievability" should consider more than whether new legislation is needed. We also suggest new criteria around how well the options promote accessibility, and whether they limit risk of loopholes & unintended outcomes.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support banning all the items listed. Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, we urge the Govt not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead take forward more than one option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive. A 'ban only' approach won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Govt can level the playing field between single-use &

reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. But, the timelines proposed are too slow. Think of all the targeted plastic items that could enter our environment before 2023 and 2025. We need to reverse these trends, fast. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. We suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

There are options available for packaging that are free of these items so they are available. These items are very detrimental for the environment, showing up in many beach cleans, and so I support them being banned and swapped for a sustainable option and not having to see them on my beach cleans anymore!

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The benefits would be not finding the tiny polystyrene balls on the beach and in waterways (plastic pollution), so benefits for the earth and the future of our children.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There's an extra benefit to banning the targeted plastics that the Government's missed. This benefit is the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes & reusable packaging systems not only reduce waste, they also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging. More reuse schemes & more reusable packaging will also mean less throwaway packaging overall (not just targeted plastics). This will = even more cost savings for local government & ratepayers.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The MAIN thing that would help NZers embrace reusable & refillable packaging is if Government gave reusables some love through the power of regulation, policy & investment. This would help reuse systems compete against single-use, & catapult reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I'm astounded that the single use coffee cup (SUC) is not on the ban list. A rapidly growing movement encouraging the end of this "branded litter" already exists within NZ cafe culture & communities. NZers use 295 million coffee cups a year. Virtually all get landfilled, pollute the environment or contaminate recycling. The lids are fully detachable, which also increases the potential for litter. There are many current practical alternatives. For the vast majority of vendors, the option to use a dine in cup has & always will be a feasible & accessible alternative. For takeaways, reuse systems & BYO 'keep cups' are commonplace. Hundreds of cafes are voluntarily employing tactics to reduce & remove disposable cups, such as mug libraries, jar swap systems, BYO discounts & SUC surcharges, plus retailing reusable cups. We know of over 50 cafes nationwide that have entirely eliminated SUC from their establishments... and they're thriving. Proving that there are alternatives & that banning SUC is viable. A ban on SUC combined with Govt support for reuse schemes can provide security for take-out only venues. Disposable coffee cups are a significant financial burden upon hospitality businesses. Their existence only financially benefits packaging companies.. As with all items that involve access to liquids in a hospitality setting, we suggest Govt liaise with the disabled community to seek guidance as to how reusable alternatives can be widely available for all. We urge the Government to take the plunge & ban all disposable coffee cups & lids. We believe they are amongst the most straightforward items to phase out - practically, and due to the increasingly negative public perception towards them. Also, I'd like to see more harmful throwaways added to the ban list SINGLE-SERVE/PCU CONDIMENTS. Like soy fish, pottles for jam, butter & other condiments, sugar & sauce sachets, mini confectionary wrappers. Also, plastic coffee pods. PLASTIC LOLLIPOP STICKS are just as hazardous as plastic cotton buds. Cardboard can be used instead. We would support the Government introducing place-based bans for items it won't ban completely yet e.g. reusables only for dine-in contexts; central city single-use-free zones; no bottled water & throwaway serviceware on university campuses & in Govt buildings.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, we don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. We do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see our answer to Q16). We also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

We believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Our suggestions for reducing disposable coffee cups The most impactful thing the Govt can do is use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility & availability of reusable alternatives to throwaway coffee cups. Note that accessibility includes affordability. Many of these actions can happen under s 23 of the WMA/without the need for new Parliamentary legislation. Regulatory & legislative actions Include disposable coffee cups in the proposed ban list as this will stimulate industry alternatives & motivate consumers to engage with the alternatives faster. Mandatory reusables for dine-in customers (as in Berkeley, California) Compulsory labelling on disposable coffee cups that inform consumers about reusable alternatives & a ban on branding cups. A disposable coffee cup levy and/or a producer fee on all disposable cups put on the market to cover estimated costs associated with clean-up or disposal. A Deposit Return Scheme for BOTH disposable coffee cups, & reusables offered through a reuse scheme. A DRS will work best if combined with a mandatory cup take-back policy for all hospitality outlets that give out takeaway cups. The outlet can dispose of returned disposable cups appropriately, or wash and reuse returned reusable cups. Updating food safety legislation to require outlets to accept clean BYO cups. Collaborative, practical policy actions Well-publicised disposable cup-free zones (e.g. university campuses & Govt buildings) Ensuring that reusable cups & reuse schemes follow Universal Design principles & are accessible for everyone in the community Investing in the infrastructure needed for reuse schemes to work well, e.g. reverse logistics & sterilisation services. Working with MoH and MPI to create official reusables guidelines so that businesses & the public can feel confident in the safety of reuse. Our thoughts on the Govt suggestions... The Government suggests it could invest in scaling up reuse systems. We support this alongside regulatory & policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to the growth of reuse schemes. Doing both will be most effective & efficient. Investing in alternative disposable products or systems to downcycle or compost cups is not a good use of public funds. Better to put this money towards stimulating a reusables network. We urge the Government not to use its finite resources to reinvent the wheel & run a public education campaign about reusables. Loads of NGOs & community groups already do this mahi. We need Government to back our efforts with its unique policy & regulation-making superpowers. We need Government to champion and amplify the positives of truly circular reusable options!

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Disposable coffee cups products should be included in the list of items proposed for phase-out. We should be seeking to remove them from the economy well before 2025. Accessible alternatives exist. Were the Govt to commit to supporting reuse schemes & to developing and amplifying guidance (see Q19) we see no reason why disposable coffee cups cannot be amongst the first to be phased-out, i.e. by 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 392

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Manufacturers of most consumables continue to over-package everything we purchase - it is very very difficult to make purchases of any kind without plastic and massive amounts of packaging generally - including the continued overuse of polystyrene.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Having everything in the supermarket in biodegradable or practicable recycle packaging.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 393

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Why not??? So terrible for the environment Particularly our oceans.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Environment benefits (less pollution And sick wildlife) cost of products however likely go up as alternatives manufactured or sourced.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Not sure.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Cost effective alternative, easy to source.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Funding/subsidies for Reusable cups and cloth nappies

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 394

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 395

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). The joint submission makes clear that the government's problem definition does not match the scope of the items targeted by the proposal, in that there are a far wider range of plastic packaging and single-use plastic items that are hard to recycle, end up as plastic pollution, or contaminate recycling streams. To the list already raised in the joint submission, we note that the Government may also consider expanding the scope of targeted plastics to capture halogenated polymers and an exhaustive list of fluorinated polymers and open list of cured resins and condensation products which are now subject to Prior Informed Consent under the Basel Convention's Plastics Amendments, which comes into force 1 January 2021. Halogenated polymers. The Basel Plastic Amendments only excludes from PIC procedures batches of single "non halogenated polymers" (where NZ can guarantee these resins are destined for recycling in an environmentally sound manner in the receiving country and are almost free from contamination and other types of waste). There are exceptions to this listed under indent 2 and 3 of the second bullet point of entry Y48: an exhaustive list of fluorinated polymers and an open list of cured resins and condensation products). Including these to the list of phased out resins will support New Zealand in meeting its obligations to the Basel Convention. This will also ensure New Zealand is not left with stockpiles of products made from such resins when PIC cannot be obtained from receiving countries and ensure hazardous plastics are not filling our landfills nor leaking into our environment. The NZPSC would also like to add that in the consultation document's description of the problems presented by the targeted plastics, greater discussion is warranted regarding the risk plastic packaging presents for human health when used as a food contact material (FCM). There is an expanding body of research in this area, including a scientific consensus statement from the beginning of 2020 (<https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-020-0572-5>). While the potential health risks from additives are not limited to plastic packaging and can also be present in other material packaging types (such as paper and card), the range of potential (and non-disclosed) additives to polymers used for FCMs makes plastic a specific material of concern. The risks are also relevant in relation to the 'easy-to-recycle' plastics effectively condoned by this proposal because there is the potential that if plastic recycle is not well collected and sorted, contamination can enter the recycling feedstock. This can introduce further problematic toxic substances into the food chain if that feedstock is then used for recycled content in plastic FCM. Regardless, the recycling process also produces non-intentionally added substances (NIAS) that are also hazardous for human health. These issues should be explored in any proposal outlining the problems and potentials of plastic as a material, particularly when the ease of certain polymers' recyclability is raised as a reason for leaving them outside this proposal's regulatory ambit.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We believe the objectives could be framed in a more visionary and ambitious manner that better outlines the positive outcomes and future packaging system that we wish to achieve in Aotearoa through proposals like the present. For example, we support policies, plans and strategies for safe product and packaging design and plastic-free delivery system design wherever possible. Where plastic free delivery systems are not possible, we support the elimination of single-use disposable packaging where this is avoidable and unnecessary. We also support a shift away from the use of recycled plastics in food and beverage contact materials. The NZPSC understands the growing evidence of increased risk to human health when plastic food contact material is recycled. The NZPSC also supports a shift away from plastic food contact materials wherever possible. The risk of toxicants leaching into New Zealanders' food and beverages also increases markedly when plastic food and beverage containers are exposed to ambient and higher heat, to fat, and acidity.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). Overall, we believe that the options list is too short. Both Option 1 and Option 8 reflect the status quo approach so aren't really policy options to be consulted on. As this is a proposal under s 23 of the WMA, it would make sense to explore some further options based on the powers available under that section. This could include instituting fees to better manage products that are not within the ambit of the phase-out list, and exploration of take-back and deposit return systems for some items, such as takeaway packaging (as is increasingly being encouraged overseas, such as in Europe through the DRS Manifesto spearheaded by Zero Waste Europe and endorsed by a wide number of organisations: <https://zerowasteurope.eu/2019/07/deposit-return-systems-an-effective-instrument-towards-a-zero-waste-future/>).

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We reinforce the view expressed in the joint submission that mandatory phase-outs are an important part of addressing the plastic pollution crisis, but that on their own will not be as effective, nor protect against unintended outcomes, in the same way as a blended approach would, in which a ban on some items is accompanied by levies, fees, deposit return systems, takeback for reuse, reduction targets, mandatory recycled content, and labelling requirements on other items. We also support efforts to update the WMA so as to enable the kinds of regulations that are needed but not yet possible under the Act. We hope that the plastics team will communicate with the WMA review team about the kinds of policies that are needed to address our plastic pollution crisis that are not currently possible under the Act.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We note that we expect that many of these products could be phased out a lot more quickly than the time frames given here - particularly where products are unnecessary, avoidable and where alternatives are immediately available. Naming specific products within a category of EPS, PS or PVC which could be quickly phased out or immediately banned would avoid significant additional environmental harm. For example, EPS tableware and commercial fish bins (where WoolCoolTM and recyclable cardboard options are available). We note that in just one site of one NZ commercial fishing company, 91,000 EPS fish bins are used once and landfilled every year. We support not only the ban of EPS but also all PVC and PS packaging in the two-stage approach.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). In addition we note here: We support not only the ban of EPS but also all PS and PVC packaging in the two-stage approach.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). This expanded phase out of all PVC and polystyrene packaging would further protect New Zealanders from the toxic impacts of these resins. PVC, PS are all listed as two of the four most hazardous/priority plastics by experts (<https://www.nzpsc.nz/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Priority-Plastics-Rochman.pdf>). These are particularly difficult to recycle and are made of toxic materials. PVC contains endocrine disrupting chemicals which are toxic to humans at extraordinarily low doses (https://www.aesan.gob.es/AECOSAN/docs/documentos/noticias/2019/Disruptores_endocrinos.pdf). Styrene monomer (the polystyrene precursor) was listed a possible carcinogen in 2014 (<https://www.intechopen.com/books/household-hazardous-waste-management/polystyrene-as-hazardous-household-waste>). Styrene is also an endocrine disruptor (http://istas.net/descargas/disruptores_endocrinos-eng.pdf) and can lower dopamine levels in the body (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3365860/>).

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We support the position that packaging with recycled content is preferable to virgin plastics (where feasible) on environmental grounds. However, where no alternative currently exists, and where recycled content is used for food contact materials, we recommend precaution on human health grounds due to the known health risks associated with recycled food contact material.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We also note that these plastics contain additives that accelerate degradation into small fragments when exposed to air. This process quickly creates microplastics that are problematic in the environment. Oxo-degradable plastics are not a viable solution as they merely fragment into small pieces more rapidly than other plastics, rather than biodegrade (<https://www.royalsociety.org.nz/assets/Uploads/Plastics-in-the-Environment-evidence-summary.pdf>). Those who currently use oxo-degradables should immediately transition to safer alternatives (preferably to packaging free delivery systems or safe, durable and reusable materials).

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We note also that the removal of halogenated resins would also lower the risk of environmental damage from these plastics identified as hazardous, and reduce recycling stream contamination and thus increasing recyclability both onshore and offshore. We also believe more emphasis could be placed on the job creation potential of the proposals, particularly if effort is made to shift towards reuse and refill alternatives. Research shows that employment opportunities increase as an economy moves to address plastic pollution through actions further up the waste hierarchy, such as reuse and repair.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). In addition we note a further considerable benefit that phasing-out the targeted plastics will help ensure Aotearoa is not the source of plastic pollution in other parts of the world, either through primary and secondary industries trade, waste trade, tourism, or if leaked into the environment and carried by tidal flows to the shores of other countries.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We believe cigarette filters should also be added to the proposed list of single-use plastics for phase out, or at the very least that producers should be required to fund the cost of clean-up through fees imposed on their product (under s 23(1)(d)). We also support the phase out of wet wipes and studies that explore the potential phase out of disposable sanitary products, alongside environmental justice efforts that make a wider range of reusables available, accessible and affordable for everyone who needs them.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We expect that some of these products could be phased out more quickly than others, particularly where products are unnecessary, avoidable and where alternatives are immediately available. We do believe that 12-18 months is a realistic timeframe for the items currently listed.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We believe both these items should be included the list of items proposed for a phase-out and believe that will be the most effective way to reduce their use - a time-frame of two to three years would give businesses and consumers the time to adapt.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee

cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). We note that there is no reason wet wipes cannot be phased out from June 2021 as reusable sanitary wipes and cleaning cloths are already available on the NZ market. However, the phase out could be carried out over the year with ecotaxes applied to the purchase of wet wipes during the phase out to incentivise consumption choices toward reusable alternatives. Ecolevies could be used to alleviate local councils of the financial burden of the environmental impacts of wet wipes and other disposable plastic items.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to).

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support the position outlined in the joint submission of the zero waste community (to which NZPSC contributed and has signed on to). In addition we note that NZ's waste and environmental policies and compliance are only as strong as the supporting data. NZ has historically lacked waste data. The NZ Government needs to invest in regular independent ongoing monitoring, evaluation, and reporting of waste, including volumes imported, consumed, leaked into the environment and their pathways (e.g. through beach audits), recycled, landfilled, exported for waste management etc. Materials monitoring and reporting should be conducted independent of those responsible for producing those materials. Monitoring must capture more than the physical properties of plastics to also capture their toxic chemical constituents. This will require testing protocols appropriate to endocrine disrupting chemicals including non-monotonic low dose response. Toxicology and ecotoxicology should include leakage into food and beverages, agricultural soils, marine and freshwater ecologies and marketable fish and produce.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 396

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice and so I agree with the descriptions. I know this consultation is about plastics but the government also needs to address single use items as a whole, not just those made from plastic, and so changes that relate to multiple products should be considered alongside implementing changes to restrict the use of plastics. The proposed policy should be supported by a comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products of any material and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. "An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I do but I believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with the strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). I would like to see positive

regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes however the proposed time-frames are too slow. It makes sense to have a two phased approach. I suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021. All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022. Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for the mahi that has gone into this list and all work on the consultation.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

But reusable alternatives should be supported/funded over the current focus on those products that can be recycled. Tetrapaks is an example where the industry is indicating that they are to receive funding to create a plant to 'upcycle' tetrapaks. We know this is pure greenwash and should not be supported with government funding.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

in part. I fully support a ban but 2023 is too late. They should be phased out much sooner, by June 2021.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for industry sectors (such as the craft brewers), businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ●Single-use coffee cups & lids ●Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ●Plastic lollipop sticks ●Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ●Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ●Single-use plastic water bottles ●Balloons and balloon sticks ●Glitter and plastic confetti ●Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ●Single-use plastic tableware: I suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ●Single-use plastic produce bags: I suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: -investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities -implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage)

systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fatbergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and I agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The packaging industry or any other industry group should not be involved in such compliance monitoring.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 397

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The phase-out shouldn't be delayed across two stages (2023 and 2025). The environmental threats posed by these types of plastics mean we need to move as quickly as possible to remove them from public use.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

I believe a greater effort could be made to increase the scope of the phase-outs to include a wider range of items. I would like to see all applications of PVC and polystyrene included in the ban. Coffee cups, baby wipes, glad wrap in places like bakery food, other wrapped produce in produce department, sushi trays, sandwich boxes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If a plastic product can only be used once, or is hard to recycle, it shouldn't be produced or used at all - the negative impacts on wildlife and the planet are too great.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: Environmental benefits of less plastic litter. More recycling. Improvements to New Zealand's towns and cities due to less plastic litter. Costs: Costs to business as they transition to other products.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Not mentioned in the document are the benefits the phase-out will have to New Zealand's marine wildlife. In 2019, marine experts surveyed by Project Jonah named oceanic plastic debris as the second greatest threat to marine mammals in our waters. And, in 2018, Forest & Bird presented evidence that NZ's seas are the worst in the world in terms of risk to sea birds from plastic. The removal of single use, and hard to recycle plastics would help to reduce these risks, and therefore protect marine species, an objective that should be prioritised.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Reducing the costs of alternatives. Making alternatives easily available. Education to the population. Businesses being happy to accept reusables, such as cups and bags at the bulk bins at the supermarket

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the phase-out, but the list needs to be expanded to include all single-use plastics, with some limited, controlled

exceptions for essential items - e.g. medical supplies.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I believe the scope of banned items should be broadened here. In particular, I don't understand why disposable coffee cups and their lids, and wet wipes that include plastic, aren't included. Viable alternatives to these commonly used and hard to recycle items already exist.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

The timeframe for phasing out should be as soon as possible, with an emphasis on speed over business convenience. A blanket timeframe for everything is counterproductive if it slows up the removal of some items in order to wait for others.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

These should be included in the mandatory phase-out. While all the options noted in the submission document have benefits, as long as the plastic options exist, so do the threats to our planet and its wildlife. There are reusable alternatives to these products already available, but it will require a mandatory phase out for these alternatives to become the norm.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

These items should be included in the initial ban. 1-2 years, these products exist purely for convenience and are not needed

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Fines are an effective way to ensure that businesses abide by these new rules.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 398

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice The proposed policy should be supported by a comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: - PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 - All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 - Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

- Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. - Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed. - Provide information and resources to businesses to help them to make good packaging choices.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: - Single-use coffee cups & lids - Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: - Plastic lollipop sticks - Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries - Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic - Single-use plastic water bottles - Balloons and balloon sticks - Glitter and plastic confetti - Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets. We at Plastic Free Wanaka recommend that single use coffee cups are added to the list of items. A ban on single use coffee cups is an easy and effective solution for these reasons: 1. BYO cups are available at low or no-cost. 2. Cup-lending schemes are already established and cup libraries are cheap to run. 3. In Wanaka, behaviour change around single-use cups has happened rapidly and it is already a social norm in the town for people to BYO cup. 4. The slogan of our single use cup free (SUCfree) Wanaka campaign is Sit, BYO or Borrow - this simple message has helped cafes communicate new behaviours and quickly educate visitors to our town.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement and support cafes, restaurants and bars.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities implementing regulatory and

policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change - SUCfree Wanaka (under the banner of the Plastic Free Wanaka) is a collaborative, hospitality-led initiative with the goal of making Wanaka single-use cup-free (SUCfree) by 2022. We believe we have a working model for a SUCfree NZ which can be shared with other communities to support them to adopt new behaviours and support government legislation. With the support of the Queenstown Lakes Waste Minimisation Community Fund, SUCfree Wanaka 2022 was launched in 2019 along with the implementation of Again Again's cup lending scheme. The SUCfree campaign encourages cafe customers to avoid single-use cups, and instead choose to "Sit, BYO or Borrow". In the short space of time since our launch these behaviours are becoming the norm in our town. Overheard at a recent community event - "oh mate you don't want to be seen with that in here!" Since we launched in 2019 we have had wide support across the Wanaka hospitality sector and the wider community. - 30 cafes have joined the SUCfree Wanaka movement and are taking action to reduce their use of takeaway cups. In the first 12 months we estimate to have saved around 180,000 single-use cups from landfill. - 9 Wanaka cafes are already 100% SUCfree and 3 more are about to make the move - each saving between 1,000 - 2,000 cups from landfill each month - 26 cafes have cup lending schemes in place (Again Again, glass jars, cup libraries, local cup lending scheme) Critical to our success so far has been: - A collaborative model - sustainability groups working together with the hospitality sector and cafes working together towards a shared goal - Financial support from local council has enabled us to pay for a part time coordinator to run the community engagement campaign and support cafe staff - Engagement with all sectors of our community through digital media, cafe ambassadors, workshops, get togethers, local media - Having access to working solutions that overcome the main barriers for customers (forgetting to take a cup and not planning to have a coffee). For example cup lending schemes such as Again Again and Wanakup. Whilst there has been an enormous amount of volunteer time contributed to the project the financial support has helped to amplify and support this energy. Around New Zealand there are many volunteer groups and not for profit organisations are working on the ground to reduce waste. They have the knowledge, skills and connections to make real change for their communities. With funding from local and national government these groups can employ coordinators and deliver promotions, marketing and community engagement to support legislative changes and behaviour change in our communities. We recommend local and national government: - Support specific regions/towns/suburbs to be case studies to exemplar. Help them to transfer the knowledge to other groups and organisations. Support a network of groups and regions. - Ban free single use cups - enforce a high charge on single use cups. Suggest a fee of \$1 to disincentivize use. Supporting cup lending systems already in place. - Provide more education on the problem - single use coffee cups can't be recycled. They are very unlikely to end up in a compost facility. The logistics of gathering up compostable cups and ensuring they're getting to the industrial composting facility is complex and extremely unlikely to occur. What we have discovered is that all of the coffee cups used in our district go to landfill. - Provide a sustainability tax rebate for businesses creating a financial incentive for businesses who are taking an active role to reduce single use plastics. - Lead by example - eg no takeaway cups in government buildings. No cafes in government buildings with single use cups. - Fund research into life cycle analysis of single use cups and different reusable cups to help people make good choices. - Develop case-studies, webinars, work with national level industry organisations and trainers. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

In Wanaka we have 9 cafes who have already transitioned away from use of single-use coffee cups and 3 more about to make the switch. The most effective way to support businesses to transition away from hard to recycle single use items is to use legislation to enforce a ban on single-use cups. In support of legislation the following initiatives would help businesses to transition: - Make it easier by taking the choice of a single-use cup away, so customers only had the choice of a sit, BYO or borrow. - Establish think tanks, advisory groups, networks to share information and resources - Provide information to the hospitality sector to help them understand the problem with single-use cups and the impact on the environment and climate. - Provide resources and information to help frontline hospitality staff educate their customers and be SUCfree ambassadors. - Consider starting with a levy on single-use cups and then transition to a total ban. Support individual towns that are already working with each other by funding the cost of collaboration and coordination. - Provide funding to support community groups working on the ground to help their communities change behaviours and create social norms. - Invest in education and awareness campaigns to prepare people for the change. When the plastic bag ban came into effect in July 2019 the Wanaka community adopted the change with very little resistance. This was due to the work that had been done on the ground for many years by local groups and organisations like Wastebusters, Sustainable Wanaka and Plastic Free Wanaka. These groups helped to establish social norms and create peer pressure which created the tipping point for an easy transition to plastic bag free. The same can be done for single use coffee cups.. Restaurants have benefited from small amounts of funding for paid coordination, community engagement, social media, administration and support.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups We at Plastic Free Wanaka and SUCfree Wanaka have set an ambitious goal of making Wanaka Single-use Cup free by 2022. We believe that other towns, with support, can adopt our model and meet their goal of being a single-use cup (SUC) free. With Government regulatory, policy and financial support for replicating the successes of those towns, we could have a SUCfree Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing

plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 399

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling: ● The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. ● To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support. Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics: ● Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end use, volumes and types of plastic exported. ● This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. ● The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Thier Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: ● Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user buisnesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; ● Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a ‘world leading’ exemplar model of reduction. A “circular approach to resource management” and “reduced public confusion” are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: ● Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. ● This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: ● Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. ● To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: ● Education ● Support (financial and logistical) ● Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) ● Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) ● Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

- The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted.
- For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): ● innovators, ● producers, ● suppliers/logistics bodies, ● commercial end-users, ● consumer end-users, ● recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We/I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a 'cost-benefit' analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." ● Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 400

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The phase-out should happen as soon as possible.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The range of items being phased -out should be far wider, including all PVC and polystyrene.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Single-use packaging is basically a scourge on the environment. These products shouldn't be produced or used at all.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: Environmental benefits of less litter. Creating a model of a "way forward" and an example for the world by implementing more recycling. Costs: Costs to businesses as they transition.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The benefits do not mention the positive effects on NZ's marine wildlife. Forest and Bird have presented evidence that NZ's seas are the worst in the world in terms of risk to seabirds from plastics. Plastic debris also threatens our already-endangered marine mammals.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The availability of alternatives, and a reduced cost.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list needs to be expanded to include all single-use plastics, (apart from some controlled exceptions such as medical

supplies).

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Why aren't coffee cups, their lids, and especially wet wipes included?

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

The phasing out should be as soon as possible, but a blanket timeframe is counterproductive. Those "easiest" to remove should be acted upon first.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

These should be included in a mandatory phase-out. It would make the alternative products, (already available), the only choice.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

They should be included in the initial ban.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Serious fines should be the method to ensure compliance.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 401

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling: ● The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. ● To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support. Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics: ● Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end use, volumes and types of plastic exported. ● This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. ● The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Thier Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: ● Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user businesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; ● Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a ‘world leading’ exemplar model of reduction. A “circular approach to resource management” and “reduced public confusion” are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: ● Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. ● This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: ● Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. ● To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: ● Education ● Support (financial and logistical) ● Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) ● Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) ● Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted. ● For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): ● innovators, ● producers, ● suppliers/logistics bodies, ● commercial end-users, ● consumer end-users, ● recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We/I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a 'cost-benefit' analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." ● Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 402

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

- The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted.
- For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): ● innovators, ● producers, ● suppliers/logistics bodies, ● commercial end-users, ● consumer end-users, ● recycling or end-of-life processors

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a 'cost-benefit' analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." ●
Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 403

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The scope needs to be broadened beyond a cost benefit analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

Na

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

See above

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups- agree with all options listed

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 404

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The aim is to improve the recovery of resources, to give them a valuable life after their use. If hard to recycle plastics could be reused and reformulated into another product, we could change the waste collection system.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Definitely switch away from polystyrene. they are terrible.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Incentives to recycle and reuse. Find a quick alternatives to plastic straws for disabled peoples.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The longer it is prolonged, the longer the environment suffers and we bring up another group of people who are reliant or familiar with these product. we need to normalise doing without these materials quickly. Banning is the way to go as we cannot rely soft targets and voluntary action to get results. We need to do this before 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

It has an impact on people purchasing cheap goods overseas that use this type of packaging.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If industry wished to collect it and redistribute the material into a circular system.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

It is good to consider these items but they still end up in the landfill even though they say they are compostable. Need to encourage residents to compost or access a council funded compost system.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Too limited, needs to include more things.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Product stewardship: industry does not want to lose revenue so they can contribute by coming up with new product formulations that are not as harmful as single use cups or wet wipes currently are.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

Government grant and better networking with universities who do research on material science and can look into packaging that is derived from renewable resources with the ideal qualities of the current single use products.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

0-18 months

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Community can help notify MfE for breaches. Proper enforcement should be left to MfE but please use your powers to regulate and punish when there are breaches.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 405

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government gave a good description of the problems the targeted plastics can cause. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms Papatūānuku. I urge the Government to consider the broad impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material types used, and to propose more concrete policy & regulatory actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The Government's objective to reduce hard-to-recycle & single-use plastics by eliminating some of them is VITAL for a circular economy. But, eliminating things is only part of the picture. I urge the Government to set the equally vital goal of increasing access to reusable alternatives & the systems that support them. Embracing reuse is key to reducing single-use plastics & plastic pollution, and will help NZ move up the waste hierarchy & avoid false solutions like single-use items made of other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The options list covers key actions I'd expect to see. Two concerns, however: There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time, e.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labelling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. The list is missing some key policy options that could really help grow reuse - deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets, and "reusables only" for dine-in situations or public buildings, like university campuses and government offices.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I support banning all the items listed except for plastic straws. Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community. But, I urge the Govt not to take a 'ban only' approach & instead multi-task & take forward more than one

option at the same time. The EU did it with their Single-Use Plastics Directive - we can too! A 'ban only' approach probably won't be enough to lift up the best alternatives, and it leaves the Govt without tools to tackle problem items it isn't ready to ban yet. The Govt can level the playing field between single-use & reuse, and reduce the negative impact of a wider range of items, by combining bans with regulatory policies like levies, deposit return systems & labelling requirements.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The two-stage approach makes sense as some items are easier to phase-out than others. But, the timelines proposed are too slow. Think of all the targeted plastic items that could enter our environment before 2023 and 2025. Right now, the world is on course for global plastic production to double in the next 20 years, and for the flow of plastic into the ocean to triple by 2040. We need to reverse these trends, fast. The EU will ban many of these same items by July 2021. I suggest bringing the Stage 1 and 2 timelines forward to June 2021 & June 2023, respectively.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Loads of alternatives exist to the hard-to-recycle packaging the Government wants to ban. But, the best alternatives are reusable/refillable & accessible, followed by highly recyclable with recycled content. If the Govt wants these best alternatives to be everyone's go-to, practical option, then it must act to level the playing field between single-use & reuse, e.g. invest in reuse systems, levy single-use, put deposit return systems on all food & beverage packaging, mandate reusables for 'dine-in' contexts, introduce reuse quotas/targets & implement mandatory recycled content regulations. I'd like to see Government oversight to ensure reuse systems & products are designed to maximise accessibility & minimise GHG emissions.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

The MAIN thing that would help NZers embrace reusable & refillable packaging is if Government gave reusables some love through the power of regulation, policy & investment. This would help reuse systems compete against single-use, & catapult reusables from the niche to the mainstream. Also, reusable products & systems must be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles. The Government has suggested it could do some public education about sustainable packaging... Thanks Government, but heaps of NGOs & community groups do this mahi already! We need you to back us up by focusing on your unique superpowers of regulation, policy & investment.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. I believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. I do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

A big YES to banning oxo-degradable, degradable, biodegradable & compostable plastic versions of the listed items. All these different degradable plastics are hardly ever disposed of correctly. They can still harm wildlife if they get into the environment, they contaminate recycling & organics collections, and they're still single-use items that waste energy & resources. The plastic straw definition proposes exemptions to allow access for disabled persons & medical purposes. If the Government does decide to ban plastic straws then we would support an exemption because some people need a straw to drink. However, poorly drafted exemptions can be stigmatising & expose people seen using a plastic straw to possible public backlash. The proposed exemption has not been drafted for inclusion in the consultation document, so it's impossible to assess its potential impact. This submission form also contains no question on the appropriateness of banning plastic straws or an exemption, indicating the Govt isn't taking this issue as seriously as it should. Overall, we don't believe this consultation process upholds the active participation of the disabled community. I do not support exempting disposable coffee cups & lids from a ban (see our answer to Q16). I also don't support exempting single-use cups made of plastic 1, 2 & 5. Also, this exemption definitely shouldn't cover lids as their size & detachability make them hard-to-recycle & prone to becoming litter. The definition of single-use plastic tableware should be broadened to include plastic-lined cardboard bowls & containers.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

I believe a 12 - 18 month time period would be achievable for most items. For some items, the Government needs to have conversations with parties likely to be affected by the ban, which may require a longer timeframe. For example, if plastic straws

are to be banned, the Government must take the time to properly draft the exemption to ensure access for the disabled community (see our answers about this in Q17).

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive; we agree with them all. I appreciate the recognition of the potential cost savings for retailers if more reusables are used & the cost savings for the wider community from reduced waste & litter. I like how the Government has recognised that bans help put all retailers in the same boat. However, I am surprised that this list does not acknowledge how a plastic straw ban could negatively affect individuals who need a plastic straw to drink. And the extra potential benefit offered by the new opportunity for businesses & communities to develop reuse schemes & reusable alternative products (i.e straws, co-designed with the disabled community) to replace the banned items. Reuse schemes reduce waste & costs for local government & ratepayers. They also create more jobs than recycling or landfilling packaging.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is needed because the range of products being proposed for a ban is quite wide and will impact a variety of sectors, industries, businesses, organisations and individuals. So, the potential for non-compliance to slip through the cracks is quite high. We saw with the plastic bag ban that some businesses did push the limits of the law and after a year, 400 breaches were reported. Given the scope of the present proposal, that goes well beyond the plastic bag ban, we support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers, alongside relying on community members to report breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 406

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I agree that we should certainly wherever possible look to eliminate, reuse or recycle. However at this stage this is not always possible and there are other alternatives that are available that will minimise the effect on the environment (see below).

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

As above however I do believe that there is also some part that can be played by compostable alternatives where the eliminate, reuse, recycle is not a reasonable option.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I would add compostable however this does not align with the single use objective but can play a significant part in eliminating some hard to recycle plastics and the effect these can have on the environment

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Reasonable but how achievable of course for different items. Where feasible to eliminate at reasonable cost then Mandatory Phase Out is an easy decision. Personally targets for reduction should be developed and then plans developed based on each area that take into account the feasibility. They should not be easy targets. Good business responds to hard but reasonable targets because this is how business operates.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

As above. Good sensible evaluation to determine targets and then how to achieve. This will include mandatory phase out for some areas, mandatory recycled content, levy/taxes, labelling etc for different areas.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with the setting of targets but these should be done in consultation with business. The problem may be how quickly they are being instituted for certain products. Businesses should be asked: 1. To evaluate all their PVC and Polystyrene in their business and then to provide their plans to eliminate these by the proposed date. 2. Advise their plans to eliminate by the proposed date 3. Outline any issues that may prevent them from achieving 4. The responses should be reviewed and suitable targets set in stone.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Agree with the current list but we would add PVC cling film wrap. A new fully compostable cling film (both industrial and home compostable certified) able to be used on fully automatic wrapping machines, ie, for supermarket butcheries, mushroom factories etc, has been developed in Europe. Certification is from TUV Austria and BS EN13432 Compostable standard, both of which are WasteMINZ recognised standards. Whilst this cling film is single use it does not include PVC and has a chemical composition of polymers based on biodegradable and compostable polyester. This is proven technology and is now being used in Supermarkets in Europe. This product will remove a product that is not breaking down now, and will be very hard to eliminate and is very obvious product for people in their everyday life. The product can be identified very easily by fully compostable messaging printed on the film and home compostable labels are also available for sticking on the product to identify it.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We believe these are probably suitable targets for some products but potentially not all. Also some products PVC cling film can be added. Also see answer under Q.6.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

I believe the exercise in Q.6 should be completed and then a more accurate assessment could be done. If people are not going to answer the survey then they have the issue that they may lose their product through their own fault (a powerful incentive to actually respond).

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes there are alternatives available for a lot of products however are they really feasible? Not all will be feasible and timeframes will be important.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

There are always things that haven't been thought of and the exercise in Q.6 should be completed first.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

As a family we would really like to see more focus from government on recycling and identification of recyclable products which would include education, and availability of recycling resources. As a business as long as all parties have to play by the same rules we will make it work. We just need appropriate timeframes and targets to get there.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Where possible we should eliminate single use. Where not always possible an alternative can be fully compostable so at least the item will not be around for any length of time and eliminates some of the on-going pollution of our environment.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

If the alternatives are proven to be feasible then the period should be as short as possible but you do have to give a business time to "pivot". 18 months should be sufficient as most businesses involved in these products must have known this will be happening and they can sell their stock. Months should give the appropriate businesses time.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

All businesses submit to the MfE that they have plans and dates in place to comply and if there are any issues with this compliance they should be providing further plans and dates to achieve. Government should work with all businesses, certainly for a period, to make the plans referred to above work. Everything businesses would be doing here is improving our world and we need to ensure that there is suitable pressure but not overly oppressive where businesses have extremely tough options.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 407

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The Warehouse Group agrees with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items. According to the 2020 Colmar Brunton Better Futures survey, nearly 70 percent of New Zealanders are concerned about the build-up of plastic in Aotearoa. The build-up of plastic in the environment will not only have significant impacts on the marine environment and wildlife, but also affect the wellbeing of New Zealanders. Aotearoa is in a unique position where we have inconsistent kerbside collection around the country, which causes confusion for consumers and retailers. Our limited onshore recycling capacity means we are vulnerable to the change of the international recycling market. These problems are exacerbated by hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The Warehouse Group agrees that the correct objectives have been identified. The main objective looks at reducing the use of hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items to reduce the impact they have on New Zealand's resource recovery system. The secondary objectives can help reduce contamination in our recycling stream, and improve the recyclability of existing materials by higher uptake and reducing confusion across the country.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The options have been selected based on best practice from the global community, which have been tested with different levels of objective achievement shown based on the researches.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The Warehouse Group agrees that overall the right criteria and weightings have been selected for the assessment with the exception of the enclosed remarks about broadening the stage 1 scope for PVC and allowing exemptions for EPS where a regulated product stewardship scheme is in place.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There are many product categories wherein expanded polystyrene packaging can be readily displaced by more readily recyclable alternatives. However there are some : e.g. physical shock sensitive consumer electronics such as large flat screen televisions where industry has yet to develop a functional and volume and mass efficient alternative. There are likely to persist. However EPS can be recycled provided efficient logistics and regionalised processing is in place. We suggest an exemption be provided for EPS where the end seller or brand owner can demonstrate they have a Regulated product stewardship (EPS recycling) scheme in place that can be accessed by consumers and retailers alike. The Stage 1 phase out of PVC packaging should be expanded beyond Food and beverage - for example PVC packaging is widely used in very high volumes in home textiles / Manchester and be easily replaced by recyclable or reusable alternatives. TWG is already well advanced in the development of alternatives to these forms of PVC packaging. Without regulation ""freeloaders"" who continue to use PVC packaging may enjoy cost and marketing advantages.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Notes

The Warehouse Group is supportive of the intent to remove the most problematic plastic packaging types. The removal of PVC, polystyrene packaging, and oxo-degradable plastics will reduce the confusion amongst retailers and consumers, but also reduce the level of contamination in our recycling stream caused by these plastic types. We have concerns that removing hard-to-recycle plastics will lead to an increase of other hard-to-recycle plastic packaging. For example, an alternative of an EPS food containers could be a fibre-based container with a plastic liner, which is neither compostable or recyclable. This will impose the same risks of PVC, EPS and oxo-degradable packaging to our resource recovery networks. At the same time, we recommend to take other PVC packaging that is outside of the food and beverage scope into consideration. For example, a large volume of home textile products such as bed linens and pillows, are often packaged in large volumes of PVC products.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

As mentioned in the previous answer, we believe the ban on PVC plastic should include some other packaging categories, such as home textile product packaging, due to its significant volume. Also, we recommend to keep the focus of banning polystyrene packaging on the expanded polystyrene type, as this is the material that's likely to be leaked into the environment and takes up a significant amount of space in the landfills.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

"The Warehouse Group is already shifting some of our PVC and polystyrene packaging towards environmental friendly alternatives, such as reusable packaging, cardboard, PET or HDPE.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

We believe there are alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging. However this will come at different levels of costs that will be either beared by the businesses or the consumers. For example, expanded polystyrene is broadly used in the food industry for temperature control, and the alternative, wool insulation, is significantly more costly than expanded polystyrene.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The ban will bring multiple benefits and costs to New Zealand. The consultation document has identified the key elements, including from the high benefit for the environment, to low-medium cost on retailers, importers and brand owners. The Warehouse Group sees this as an opportunity to bring a paradigm shift to New Zealand, that will benefit Aotearoa's people and environment in the long run.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The Warehouse Group's major concern has been mentioned in our previous answers. We are cautious of the also-hard-to-recycle, alternative materials utilised by businesses, which will defeat the objective of such a ban. Also, when products come from overseas, it difficult for businesses to influence the packaging used. Because New Zealand is a small market, and it limits our bargaining power, especially when the requirements in Aotearoa are significantly different from those in other countries and regions.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

We would like to see a national standard for kerbside recycling, as currently the resource recovery system in New Zealand is fragmented and confusing for both consumers and businesses. Having a consistent message across the country could benefit the efficiency and uptake of better resource recovery greatly. We would also like to see more engagement with the business on how the government and businesses can partner together to make positive impacts on waste minimisation and reduce risks for New Zealanders.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

The Warehouse Group is supportive of the seven plastic items identified for phase out. The Warehouse Group has already moved away from selling many of the proposed items because of our belief in sustainability, particularly in waste minimisation for both of our own operations and our customers.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

2 years

Notes

The Warehouse Group thinks 2 years is reasonable for businesses to sell through current stock that will be uncompliant in the future. Otherwise these products will be turned into waste to landfills with a short timeframe. Also, businesses can act now to start phasing out these banned products in their sourcing practice.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

We support the consultation document's approach that a ban is not proposed at this stage on plastic lined coffee cups, as we propose any timeframe should be put forward when more sustainable alternatives are available. We would like to see the government encourage and support the options mentioned in the document. At the same time, we believe there are more sustainable alternatives available for plastic based wet wipes, such as viscoses, bamboo fibres. We will support a ban by the government moving forward. Due to the pressure that wet wipes impose on our sewerage systems and wastewater treatment plants, we suggest public education to be promoted in Aotearoa for raising awareness.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

2 years

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 408

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Wastebusters would like to acknowledge the excellent work done by the Ministry for the Environment in researching and writing the comprehensive consultation document; Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment – moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items. This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. However better outcomes would be achieved if we look at the problems associated with recycling and single-use in a holistic way. It's not only the type of plastic which determines whether something is hard to recycle, but a much more complex combination of factors including system design, mindset and knowledge of people interacting with the system, decisions by producers, transparency, markets and reprocessor requirements. Until we address all of these factors, recycling will remain problematic and piecemeal, and will not be able to meet the requirements of a circular economy. The proposed policy should be supported by a comprehensive regulatory roadmap to reduce reliance on single-use products, encourage reduction of virgin plastic resin usage and shift to a transparent, cohesive and trustworthy recycling system.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. However we need to focus on solutions higher up the waste hierarchy, rather than just swapping one single-use product for another. Community initiatives should be supported and prioritised, to build resilience, connection and confidence in local solutions. These qualities will be invaluable in the future when facing the challenges of a changing climate, which will force communities to adapt and change. The connections and organisations which are being created now to tackle waste minimisation in their communities are preparing the way for future local solutions around climate change mitigation and adaptation. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban, for example by combining a ban on some items with support for community initiatives and nationwide reuse systems.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC being phased out by June 2021 Until PVC is phased out, Wastebusters can't accept plastic PET trays (eg meat-trays) and punnets for recycling, due to the potential for contamination by PVC. They are not accepted for kerbside recycling in the Queenstown Lakes or Central Otago district's either, so all of the PET trays and punnets in our district are going to landfill. This is a terrible waste of resources, as clear PET is an easily recycled plastic which we have a market for onshore. We would like to see all other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging. Currently PVC is a major issue for us as a recycler and potential contamination is preventing recycling of PET trays and punnets by us, and also other recyclers without optical sorters. Allowing non-food/beverage packaging to continue using PVC would continue to pose a contamination risk if any containers looked similar to recyclable PET packaging. This could potentially result in many thousands of potentially recyclable PET trays and punnets continuing to be sent to landfill, even if PVC was banned from food and beverage packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: For Wastebusters as a recycler, phasing out PVC would have a direct impact on the amount of PET that we can recycle, and would reduce the amount of plastic from our communities that go to landfill. Once PVC is removed from use, our PET reprocessor Flight Plastics would be able to accept our PET trays and punnets for reprocessing (so long as producers made the choice to use PET trays and punnets after the phase-out was made, rather than replacing the PVC ones with other plastics eg PP or PLA). Support of the ban with education for producers when they make packaging choices is therefore critical to reaping the full benefits. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. This is particularly noticeable whenever we have participated in litter clean-ups, including near the banks of the Cardrona River. EPS degrades over time into many, many, tiny balls of polystyrene which are nearly impossible to pick up. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils. Wastebusters currently provides a recycling service for our community for white EPS packaging. We compress EPS in a baler: some is sent overseas for reprocessing (into products like picture frames) and some is sent locally to Expol to be manufactured into insulation. We provide this service as a solution to our community, however we still support the phase-out of EPS due to the potential impact of plastic litter on our waterways and soils.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes - especially for plastic trays. The vast majority of these are already made from PET which are recyclable onshore. There is no justifiable reason to use PVC trays, which only create contamination. PVC and polystyrene packaging can also be easily replaced by easily recycled plastics, if decisions are made on the basis of the waste hierarchy and a circular economy. Choosing to use a hard-to-recycle plastic for packaging because of the "snap" sound when small pottles of yoghurt are separated is not a decision that could be justified in a circular economy.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021. We have talked to many retailers over the past decade who have chosen these bags in mistaken belief that they are better for the environment. We have never talked to anyone who has been fully informed about the properties of oxo-degradable plastics and still chosen to use these bags. We're stoked to see the Government taking action on oxo-degradable plastics.

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful. We have found the concept of Doughnut Economics by Kate Raworth helpful; "The essence of the Doughnut: a social foundation of well-being that no one should fall below, and an ecological ceiling of planetary pressure that we should not go beyond. Between the two lies a safe and just space for all." Current and future generations can only thrive in this space which requires a shift to regenerative design and a circular economy. It would be beneficial to have a way to assess how far different policies could move our economy along this road, and could assist with comparing different blended options.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Phasing out these plastics will result in additional benefits to recycling in general as it will: reduce contamination of easily recycled plastic streams, resulting in them going to landfill reduce confusion about which plastics can be recycled across New Zealand: build transparency, confidence and goodwill in our recycling system reduce cost of communications about which plastics can be recycled encourage better packaging choices by producers An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

This shift will potentially save our community recycling organisation money by reducing contamination in our recycling stream. It will also open the door for us to accept PET meat-trays and punnets for recycling, providing a more comprehensive recycling service for our community. We support increased scale and uptake of reusables, plus additional funding to support locally-based community engagement. We would also like to see information and resources available for businesses to help them to make good packaging choices. We would also like better design of recycling collection and sorting systems to produce quality recycling which suits the needs of reprocessors, which would help ensure that plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed. Collecting data and releasing on quantities of materials recycled would improve transparency in the system. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products would also help drive quality recycling systems.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Having seen the success of SUCfree (single-use-cup-free) Wanaka in getting our community onboard with their goal of Wanaka going single-use cup free, we recommend that single use coffee cups are added to the list of items to be phased out. Wastebusters fully supports the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: Single-use coffee cups & lids Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: Plastic lollipop sticks Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic Single-use plastic water bottles Balloons and balloon sticks Glitter and plastic confetti Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement and support cafes, restaurants and bars.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups Wastebusters would like to draw attention to the success of the Wanaka SUCfree campaign in encouraging cafe customers to avoid single-use cups, and instead choose to "Sit, BYO or Borrow". Their positive and collaborative campaign has been well-received by our community and visitors, and is a shining example of community-driven behaviour change. Wastebusters has collaborated with SUCfree Wanaka to produce two videos explaining the steps they have taken, and the key factors in making the campaign a success. Please contact us on gina@wastebusters.co.nz for a copy. We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy and investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste. This would include: supporting exemplar programmes to share their knowledge/experience and funding a SUCfree network coordinator to facilitate collaboration, and to connect with hospitality education providers to incorporate SUCfree education into their courses. investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities, and cup-lending systems. implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, providing more education on the problem - single use coffee cups can't be recycled. They are very unlikely to end up in a compost facility as the logistics of gathering up compostable cups and ensuring they're getting to the industrial composting facility is complex and extremely unlikely to occur. This makes it extremely likely that single use coffee cups will go to landfill, even if they are compostable. lead by example - eg no takeaway cups in government buildings and no cafes in government buildings with single use cups. Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

The most effective way to support businesses to transition away from hard to recycle single use items is to use legislation to enforce a ban on single-use cups. When the plastic bag ban came into effect in July 2019 the Wanaka community adopted the change with very little resistance. This was due to the work that had been done on the ground for many years by local waste minimisation organisations like Wastebusters, Sustainable Wanaka and Plastic Free Wanaka. These groups helped to establish social norms and create peer pressure which created the tipping point for an easy transition to plastic bag free. The same can be done for single use coffee cups, with just a small amount of funding to support engagement, education and collaboration

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups 2023 Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 409

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling: The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support. Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics: Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end use, volumes and types of plastic exported. This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Thier Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user buisnesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a ‘world leading’ exemplar model of reduction. A “circular approach to resource management” and “reduced public confusion” are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: Education Support (financial and logistical) Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted. For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): innovators, producers, suppliers/logistics bodies, commercial end-users, consumer end-users, recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We/I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a 'cost-benefit' analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 410

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We oppose "Polystyrene is difficult to recycle". According to Plastics New Zealand, the recycling of EPS is a possible concept. <https://www.plastics.org.nz/environment/faqs> Disposable plastics should be considered separately for food and beverages that are disposed of and are not suitable for recycling because of foodborne contamination, and for electrical equipment that is properly collected. "Reject unnecessary disposable plastic items" but one-way packaging materials (EPS) are required for reasonable transportation throughout the global supply chain. According to Plastic waste imports from land to the ocean Jenna Jenna R. Jambeck and others, marine plastics are emitted by 65% of the countries in China and ASEAN, and it cannot be understood that marine plastics are reduced even when regulated in New Zealand in response to issues connected in the oceans. We should work towards the same goals globally under international cooperation. Although EPS is difficult to recycle, it may be necessary to make an effort to recycle. For carcinogenicity of PS, SDS(Safety Data Sheet) is not carcinogenic.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Cannot identify. Polystyrene is recyclable.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We oppose the ban on the use of PS. It cites examples of prohibited use of PS in other countries, which are related to food and beverage, and differs from EPS of packaging materials for electrical products.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We don't agree. Polystyrene is recyclable and does not need to be banned. The evaluation criteria are based on regulations. Is the cost evaluation standard a policy, a material, and what cost?

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We don't agree. It is difficult to replace the buffer material EPS.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We oppose EPS regulations for electronic equipment. Since it is supplied with global specifications, there is not enough time to change the specifications to New Zealand. The cost to producers becomes enormous, and only producers are forced to bear the burden of social issues. It is difficult to replace the buffer material EPS. Changes to substitute materials due to the abolishment of EPS are risky from the viewpoint of the current materials. The period of consideration is also short when packaging volumes are equalized and replaced. The larger the packaging volume, the greater the CO2 emissions during transport, and other adverse effects. New Zealand has a PNZ in the International Recycling Agreement, but we do not understand why the EPS is abolished. Regarding EPS, we believe it is important to strengthen the recycling system, including efficient recovery, such as volume reduction. Polystyrene can be recycled. It should not be abolished before in other parts of the world.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We don't agree to the regulation of electronic equipment. Since it is supplied with global specifications, there is not enough time to change the specifications to New Zealand. The cost to producers becomes enormous, and only producers are forced to bear the burden of social issues. It is difficult to replace the buffer material EPS. Changes to substitute materials due to the abolishment of EPS are risky from the viewpoint of the current materials. The period of consideration is also short when packaging volumes are equalized and replaced. The larger the packaging volume, the greater the CO2 emissions during transport, and other adverse effects. For disposable plastics, the phasing out of food and beverage products that have been disposed of and are not suitable for recycling due to food staining can be understood, but EPS for electronic devices that have been properly recovered and for which there is no practical alternative should be excluded. EPS for electronic equipment is managed in accordance with a collection system that is free of contamination as is the case for food products. Polystyrene can be recycled and should be excluded. If repeated reuse of durable PP (EPP) as an alternative described in the text is considered to reduce waste, countries with large imports of electrical appliances such as New Zealand may expect an increase in CO2 from return shipments, which could adversely affect the environment.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We don't agree to the regulation of electronic equipment. Since it is supplied with global specifications, there is not enough time to change the specifications to New Zealand. The cost to producers becomes enormous, and only producers are forced to bear the burden of social issues. It is difficult to replace the buffer material EPS. Changes to substitute materials due to the abolishment of EPS are risky from the viewpoint of the current materials. The period of consideration is also short when packaging volumes are equalized and replaced. The larger the packaging volume, the greater the CO2 emissions during transport, and other adverse effects. For disposable plastics, the phasing out of food and beverage products that have been disposed of and are not suitable for recycling due to food staining can be understood, but EPS for electronic devices that have been properly recovered and for which there is no practical alternative should be excluded. EPS for electronic equipment is managed in accordance with a collection system that is free of contamination as is the case for food products. Hard polystyrene can be recycled and should be excluded.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The elimination of EPS is expected to increase the cost of substitution materials and storage, handling and transportation due to increased packaging volume. When products imported from overseas are reused as cushioning materials, costs are expected to increase in terms of import/export procedures and control.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The substitution of EPS is difficult in terms of buffer characteristics, moldability, and cost. Due to the influence of humidity,

variations in the quality of paper-based cushioning materials also occur. You have decided that recycling is difficult, but why not develop technology for recycling, construct recycling systems, and conduct educational activities?

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

No comment.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Only the food industry is mentioned due to the impact of brand owner costs. EPS combines both buffering and creeping functions. With respect to buffering, it is necessary to absorb consecutive and multiple shocks in the long supply chain, and paper-based materials are not recyclable. Humidity is also greatly influenced by characteristics, and there is a high risk of increasing the problem of market quality. Depending on the characteristics of the product, if the material is changed, the product may be damaged due to vibration during transportation.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There is no advantage. Substitution of EPS is expected to increase CO2 and may adversely affect the environment. It is important to correct the excessive use of plastics, to make it appropriate for quality assurance, and to reduce external forces in distribution (to improve the handling of goods by logistics companies).

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Recycling will reduce the disposal of final garbage and reduce the extraction of new petroleum resources, thereby switching to a Circular Economy. Material identification and labeling that can be easily separated by general consumers are provided.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

No comment.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

No comment.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

No comment.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

We oppose the phasing out of the PS. Some countries recognize that PS can be recycled.
https://www.verpackungsregister.org/fileadmin/files/Mindeststandard/Minimum_standard_Packaging-Act_2020.pdf Plastic packaging materials used to protect the product can be substituted for a large disadvantage. Packaging volume increases to protect the product, transport efficiency decreases, and CO2 emissions increase, which can adversely affect the environment.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

No comment.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 411

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Response regarding the proposed projects (no space provided): Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling: The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support. Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics: Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end use, volumes and types of plastic exported. This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Thier Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and faciliation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user buisnesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a 'world leading' exemplar model of reduction. A "circular approach to resource management" and "reduced public confusion" are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: Education Support (financial and logistical) Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted. For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): innovators, producers, suppliers/logistics bodies, commercial end-users, consumer end-users, recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We/I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a 'cost-benefit' analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 412

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. This proposal takes a comprehensive look at the plastic issue we are facing as a nation and the proposed changes would move us more in line with the "clean, green New Zealand" we strive as a country to be.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes in part This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use itemsthrough significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systemsthat support the increased recyclability of each product. " An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assistings communitiesto use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunitiesthat reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Yes. I believe that the proposed ban is the best way to make timely change. I also believe these options should be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items. This ban in conjunction with levies, measurable targets and financial support for deposit/return schemes would be nessisary to move this country away from the current linear based approach to waste, and towards a circular system. We should also be - financing a deposit scheme for the collection of easy the recycle item, with a focus on ensuring our recyclables do get recycled. - levies on targeted single use items, not just the hard to recycle ones - mandatory reusables in a done in setting - option to put fees in place for items that have not clear easy to recycle alternative eg cigarettes. This money should be put back into clean up and environmental protection efforts.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. This ban is a good idea, one that would be better if used alongside policy that encourages a move away from single use plastics altogether. I support moving forward with reduction targets for plastic items that are not to be banned

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes, However the proposed time-frames are too slow. I suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023 This has been a massive issue, one that is having a lasting impact on our environment and has been for a long time. Time has been wasted here and to get on top of things we need to move fast. I believe the above targets are achievable and will put us on track for the next steps we need to take to reduce our footprint on our country.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. My thanks for such a comprehensive proposal.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can and does become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. This would reduce financial strain on local government and those working in the recycling industry. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Birds and fish often mistake it for food and it is very hard to collect once it is out in the environment. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways, soils and our marine ecosystems.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes. We already have the framework to replace these plastics with reuse schemes. More investment is needed to scale these up, and make them more accessible to everyone. Targets for upping the recycled content of remaining plastic packaging would also be a useful step. More focus on sustainable product design, with an emphasis on end of life solutions also needs to be part of the plan going forward.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes! This is unnecessary stuff, and often marketed as a cleaner alternative to plastic, which is not the case. I fully support the mandatory phase out of all oxo-degradable plastics. However 2023 is not soon enough. There are sufficient alternatives, so a complete phase out would be achievable by June 2021.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More clarity in regards to what is and is not recyclable. Removing hard to recycle plastics would assist in this, however clearer labeling, education and engagement on how the system actually works, and one unified system that accepts the same things no matter where you live would be required to really clear up the confusion and streamline our recycling system. More on shore recycling facilities would help as well. In addition to this we need more policy and investment to support reuse schemes. There are fantastic community based schemes that are having a great impact environmentally as well as normalising the idea of reuse schemes to the everyday consumer. Investment is needed to upscale these schemes and create new ones, and with this will come the attitude changes we need to see. The framework is there already. We know how to do this, but need government support to make it more widespread and a more appealing option for businesses and customers.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Agree I fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 I support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks and chewing gum containing plastic ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys I would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets and plastic strapping.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Yes with changes I strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. I would also like to see changes to the following definitions - Single-use plastic tableware: suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings - Single-use plastic produce bags: suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags - Single use cups. Should include ALL single use cups not disclose recyclable 1, 2, and 5. I also think it would be valuable to look at the definition of recyclable and consider not just the recyclability of the material, but also the likelihood of an item actually being recycled. For example recyclable coffee cups are often not cleaned before being disposed of, and are often used away from the home, so the likelihood of the making it into a recycling bin in a usable condition is low.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement. This has been a big issue for too long. Let's not waste

any more time.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups I believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. I support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change - develop official reusable guidelines with MoH and MPI so that businesses and the public have clear, scientific information about these schemes. This is even more important since the covid 19 pandemic, which has unnecessarily limited access to reuse schemes. I do not support investment in down cycling or composting systems. Replacing single use plastic with single use compostable does not get us closer to the circular economy we need to be creating. Wet wipes I support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, I would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word "flushable" on the product packaging

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, I believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes I would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form 'fat bergs') as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist with the reporting of any breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 413

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

While I wholeheartedly agree with the ideology in the proposal of banning hard to recycle plastics and single use packaging it would be better if we had a circular framework to work within as opposed to a linear economy. The banning of these products will only be another "ambulance at the bottom of the cliff" scenario unless we have action points to move our systems to banning all single waste products.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

There needs to be more policy around embracing re-use systems and following the waste hierarchy.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Could there not be blended options? Or perhaps we could apply all of them. This mahi needs to come from every side, grassroots, business, government etc. Is there an option for funding return and re-use systems so that we can replace the current system with something that is better for Papatūānuku.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree with the assessment of the options BUT there needs to be a multifaceted approach with options ready to go to replace the status quo. If you are going to ban a specific item there needs to be a level playing field for all businesses and an offered solution. It can't be left to small businesses to pick up the cost of change when large corporations can afford it.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Could we not ban them sooner eg. 2021 and 2023... Papatūānuku is dying right now.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Could you add Bread tags to the polystyrene list.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes**Clause**

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

The cost would be that there is another 4 years of polystyrene being imported into NZ and dumped in landfill.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Replace current linear systems with re-use systems with infrastructure supported by the government.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Create reusable products & systems that are be accessible & affordable for everyone in our community, and reflect Universal Design principles.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Not sure why single use coffee cups and lids aren't on the list. SUCs are the next low hanging fruit. Also small throwaway items like soy sauce fish and lollypop stick seem to have been left off the list. Once again these items could be phased out very simply.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

There are already business models available for coffee cup re-use systems in NZ.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups should be banned by December 2021.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Due to the nature of the effect of banning some of these items could have on small business, I support the appointment and resourcing of enforcement officers BUT businesses need to be supported.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 414

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes but do not agree with the proposed stages (please comment below)

Notes

The sooner these changes are introduced, the better. No need for different stages - the single use bags ban was taken well with the public and businesses and is possible for this as well.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

It should be widened to include all PVC and polystyrene

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If it can't be recycled or is only for single use, it shouldn't be used.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Increase in recycling knowledge (this will flow on to other items and increased awareness), decreases costs to cleaning public places like beaches etc, environments and wildlife will survive better

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

The marine wildlife in NZ will benefit from the decrease in litter in the sea and waterways. The second largest threat to them are plastics and litter from single use plastics

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Reduce the costs of alternatives and making them easier to access.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

It should be expanded to include all single use plastics except for healthcare and medical items

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

Wet wipes are a massive issue in the pipes and waterways as they have plastic in it. It should be expanded to include these and commonly used items like coffee cup and lids. Kiwi's are transitioning NOW and will support this for the future

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

A blanket timeframe wont work as different items will need lead times for transitioning and production. The sooner the better, we can adapt.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

These should be phased out to the ban. There are alternatives to these that are reusable and realistic. As long as there is plastic in these items, the threat to the environment and wildlife is still there.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

The government should be discussing with manufacturers to develop a timeframe and to support the businesses that need to change. The increase in demand for new and recyclable products will have a major effect on pricing and accessibility. Government financial support is necessary here to help manufacturers make the change.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

They should be included in the first ban, there is no reason to delay it. We have a way to lead the way in the world and not be followers in 15-10 years time when other countries implement bans.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

There should be financial support for businesses leading the way to new changes. Businesses that are slow to change receive less help and then fines for businesses who dont change before the ban date.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 415

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling: ● The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. ● To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support. Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics: ● Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end use, volumes and types of plastic exported. ● This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. ● The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Thier Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: ● Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user buisnesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; ● Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a ‘world leading’ exemplar model of reduction. A “circular approach to resource management” and “reduced public confusion” are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: ● Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. ● This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: ● Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. ● To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: ● Education ● Support (financial and logistical) ● Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) ● Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) ● Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted. ● For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations).

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition based phase-out. However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): ● innovators, ● producers, ● suppliers/logistics bodies, ● commercial end-users, ● consumer end-users, ● recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. We/I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a cost-benefit analysis for this solution to succeed in its exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

NA

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." ●
Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing temporary use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item. Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

NA

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

For regulation to be successful, the agencies responsible for compliance, monitoring and enforcement need to be adequately educated, resourced and empowered. These are a major flaws in our existing regulatory system that urgently require addressing for this to succeed (see Brown, M. A., Clarkson, B. D., Barton, B. J., & Joshi, C. (2013). Ecological compensation: an evaluation of regulatory compliance in New Zealand. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 1-11). Likewise, those being monitored need the education and support to achieve compliance. Further response requires consultation that cannot be adequately addressed through submission.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 416

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Could be extended to "single-use material". Plastic is the biggest of these issues, but all material used once then discarded is problematic.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Banning or eliminating wrong materials/material use is good. But a more vital objective would be the normalization of reusable materials and the systems which support this.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Two key concerns: CONCERN 1 There is currently no 'blended' Option where the Government does more than one thing at the same time. E.g. banning the targeted plastics, but also implementing levies, reduction targets, compulsory labeling & product stewardship requirements for other troublesome items. CONCERN 2 The list is missing some key policy options that could help grow reuse. E.g. deposit return systems for takeaway packaging, mandatory reuse targets & "reusables only" for dine-in situations. Did you know that there are international examples of disposables being banned in some public places, Government offices & university campuses?

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Banning only starts the change. Supporting better alternative options though levies and compliance requirements would facilitate a greater and quicker change.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

This is too slow. International precedent is much faster (EU - July 2021). In the presence of other less bad options, the low hanging fruit should get the chop in short order.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Notes

Not my area of expertise.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Not my area of expertise.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We are heartened that you are viewing plant-based and petroleum-based plastics as equally worthy of being banned.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

There is an omission of the opportunity for businesses and community groups to develop and commercialize systems of reusable serveware and packaging. And also the potential of developing third-party sanitisation systems and services. Both will create employment and revenue that will be amplified in the presence of banning single-use items.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Banning single-use items will make it easier as this will level the playing field with the better alternatives that already exist, and the resulting reduction in the price of this will make it cheaper as well.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

We strongly feel that the omission of single-use coffee cups is deeply flawed. We can not see a substantive difference between single-use COFFEE cups that have been omitted and single-use plastic cups and their lids (for cold drinks?) that have been included. Both have the same implications and alternative options available. We believe that both are close to having market acceptable alternatives and that in both cases they can be banned in a moderate time frame. 295 Million single-use cups go to landfill in NZ each year. It is too big of a segment to give up on because they are a channeling waste stream to address. Indeed,

including them in a ban with an appropriate time period allowed, will facilitate the market solution to this moving faster and with a wider range of solutions. Already 50 cafes nationally have voluntarily removed single-use coffee cups, and are trading successfully, and for the most part more profitable. Derisking this move across the entire industry by leveling the playing field will allow all cafes to access this advantage. We are in support of all those other items proposed for banning, except for straws in certain circumstances, such that the disability community is not disadvantaged. We would like the ban to extend to condiment containers like soy fish and single-serve jam/butter containers.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We very much support all types of plastic being considered for banning. Plantbased, oxy-degradable, and biodegradable plastics offer such a tiny improvement on petroleum-based plastics that they need to be considered as the same. As per our response in Q16, the definition of single-use cups should be extended to include coffee cups.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Other (please specify)

Notes

6-12 months for all items which currently have alternatives. 24 months for single-use cups, for which the alternatives need development. 36 months for cafes trading on an NP1 licence, who will therefore need to also solve the sanitation part of the problem.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Please see document attached. This document includes commercially sensitive data, including financial and competitor analysis. We believe it is important for the government to have this information with respect to understanding the commercial implications of the issues under discussion. However, we request that this document remains confidential only to those assessing the submission and is not made publicly available as sharing this information with competitors may put Again Again at a commercial disadvantage. All other questions have been answered within the online submission tool, and we are happy for our responses in that forum to be shared publicly.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

We are not. But if we were, banning single-use cups will drive a whole new market in reusable cups. This will enable me to pivot and step into that market.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

24 months for single-use cups, for which the alternatives need development. 36 months for cafes trading on an NP1 licence, who will therefore need to also solve the sanitation part of the problem.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There is an omission of the opportunity for businesses and community groups to develop and commercialize systems of reusable serveware and packaging. And also the potential of developing third-party sanitisation systems and services. Both will create employment and revenue that will be amplified in the presence of banning single-use items.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

A compliance and enforcement strategy is required. We support the model used in the ban of handled shopping bags.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 417

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand closer to overseas current best practice and our 'Clean Green' advertising. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage. This could be achieved through encouraging adequate collection systems and creating the market for recycled products by mandating recycled plastic content in manufacturing - e.g. 30% of packaging must be recycled plastic. This document does not mention climate change despite the plastic industry's and single use items contribution. It's an emergency now, let's make sure the final document reflects this.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increase recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assist communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

There is no discussion of education, mandatory reuse systems, reuse targets, government procurement targets, public institution targets or options for multi layered approaches e.g. better labelling for misused/misunderstood products like wet wipes. We believe these options could be added and then blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

No, there are so many more policy tools available in the act for items that mfe isn't ready to ban yet. E.g. include levies on single use items- so we can use the money to offset the cost of disposal and clean up of those items.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Why is only food and beverage items included? As this identified PVC as a problem it should be applied much more broadly for consistency. Oxo-degradable will be banned in Europe in 5 months, why the hesitation? Agree that a two phased approach makes sense, but I strongly believe it should be shifted forward - give us a 100 day plan and changes for 2021 and 2023.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

As above, this document is currently not ambitious enough. It does not meet the needs of future generations of New Zealanders. In the same vein it does not honor the governments obligations under the treaty.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Absolutely, as mentioned previously.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Huge benefits to local businesses setting up alternatives to single use (e.g. small businesses like Again Again, Reuseabowl...) and save businesses money as they would not need to procure cups, bags etc etc. Additionally it will level the playing field for businesses who want to change their way of working, but are effectively punished for doing so.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

All suppliers will adapt to the market, markets change, there is evidence all around (compostable chip packets etc)

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Agree with the concept but this is too late, we should be aiming to fall in line with Europe.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Not have PVC/ Hard to recycled available. Reuse and refill systems everywhere due to regulation, policy and investment. Make it mainstream. Standardization of items - e.g. swappa crates - could be wine bottles.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

While this is the right direction there are so many products excluded. I do not understand why coffee cups are excluded when reusable cups are a proven concept and there are schemes like Again Again for those who forget them/dont carry them. How does the government expect people to change when they are not compelled to? This is a leadership vacuum, not a life safety or impossible to replace situation. Also very easily repllaced with non plastic alternatives: Toothbrush, floss, plastic lollypop sticks, produce bags, Hard to recycle packaging - soft plastics - chip packaging, Plastic tea bags Single serve PCU condiments...

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

Support banning compostable alternatives as they essentially have the same issues as the original items, as the systems are not there to ensure they are actually safely composted.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Plastic bag ban was 12 months .

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Ban them both. Neither are life safety items. Wet wipes cost our councils and the Department of Conservation enormous amounts as individuals do not understand their impact, and some may not care. It is in the governments financial interest to ban wet wipes. My views on coffee cups have been expressed above.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

ASAP. we have alternatives available already, 6 months is reasonable in my opinion.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Create a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. Levies on items which cannot be banned but are highly problematic. Levies to fund compliance officers who can also help educate. An educated public can also report breaches to MfE.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 418

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Some packaging, particularly in the dairy product range could be phased out much more quickly. While I want to support our primary producers I have a real problem with often not being able to find any products in recyclable packaging, it's simply not good enough, especially when recyclable alternatives are already available.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Soft plastics are currently take up the most volume in my landfill bin, it would be great to see these types of plastic addressed also, such as Type 4 films.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

To engage the public in the process of recycling it must be simple. If we can make the process simpler by removing confusion and guesswork we should. Removing PVC and PS packaging that 'looks' recyclable will be the easiest way to achieve this.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

As someone for. A blended culture family I do wonder about the implications for imported goods. This could increase the cost of imported goods above the already high costs paid. Overseas exporters may be less likely to export their products to our very small market. But I still support the proposal. Benefits are obvious for our environment, and we cannot continue to bury valuable resources in the ground. There is also huge potential for innovation investment and potential for New Zealand to lead the way in this regard.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Absolutely! There are already people working on great reuse initiatives and developing new eco-friendly packaging.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

If anything I would like to see this happen sooner.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

The government should assist businesses with the transition to alternatives, perhaps a one off subsidy.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

As outlined in Q9 there is a possibility that importers will see the cost as a turn off.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Rewards for good behaviour. Container deposit schemes that are funded by big business would be highly desirable. More plastic free options available at the supermarket. I avoid buying many things because I cannot find them in sustainable packaging. Clearer labeling of recyclability, often symbols are completely missing or symbols are confusing or misleading. While Japan has a propensity to overuse plastic packaging they are very good at listing the components of packaging clearly on the outside of products which allows consumers to be proactive in purchasing decisions and engage in the recycling process.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

Businesses should already be thinking about replacing items, the bag ban happened quite quickly and businesses coped relatively well. 12 months should be a sufficient amount of time to go through stock already ordered and research alternatives.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

More investment and promotion of reuse models such as Again Again and public campaigns to encourage BYO and reuse going forward.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

As soon possible, 12-18months should be sufficient to bring in other alternatives and systems.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Audits and enforcement by special government body or ME.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 419

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Ecoware broadly agrees, but have concerns around the item "Single-use plastic cups and their lids". Provided the goal is to encourage reuse, reduce waste to landfill, and minimise harm to the environment from plastic litter, we caution a potential oversight regarding the value and use of certified compostable plastic; PLA/ polylactide - currently recycling code 7. We believe PLA should be included in the exceptions with plastics coded 1, 2 and 5. PLA is often used in clear cups and clear bowls as an alternative to traditional petroleum-based plastic. We supply thousands of Kiwi foodservice businesses with clear cups and clear bowls for takeaway smoothies, juices, salads and more. Our business can provide alternatives to these products. Those alternatives being paper bowls and cups with a PLA lining. Therefore, we encourage greater consideration for alternatives including PLA.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

1) For the single-use plastic tableware listed on table 7, compostable tableware should be considered as substitutes, because compostable tableware can help to reduce food waste, not just packaging waste, through organics recycling. The main goal of compostable serveware/tableware is to deliver food waste to composting and not landfill. According to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, 30% of food is wasted globally across the supply chain, contributing 8 percent of total global greenhouse gas emissions. If food waste were a country, it would come in third after the United States and China in terms of impact on global warming. 2) Regarding the concerns about quality of the compost, government can set up requirements to qualify compostable tableware by using the Australian Standard AS 4736-2006 to verify the claims of conformance to Biodegradable Plastics suitable for industrial composting. It specifies requirements and procedures to determine the compostability, or anaerobic biodegradation, of plastics by addressing biodegradability and disintegration during biological treatment, and effect on the quality of the resulting compost to make sure there is no heavy metals or ecotoxicity. The end result of composting is carbon dioxide, water and humus, a soil nutrient. <https://bioplastics.org.au/composting/industry-composting/> 3) Compostable food serveware are getting popular in the US and Europe and there are evidences to show the benefits of diverting the food waste from landfill and circularity of the economy. However, a proper infrastructure needs to be set up to take the compostable food serveware (tableware or cups) to the environment that are designed for them to biodegrade fully and responsibly. The Italian infrastructure and CIC (<https://www.compost.it/en/>) may be a good reference. 4) A new study from Wageningen Food & Biobased Research show how compostable products made with PLA disintegrated faster than orange peels or paper <https://www.wur.nl/en/news-wur/Show/Compostable-plastics-disintegrate-fast-enough-in-the-current-Dutch-Biowaste-disposal-system.htm>. 5) For take-away food, it will be difficult to use reusable items. We have fibre alternatives to most items (bamboo, paper, sugarcane), but for some meals such a warm soups and curries, usually coating or lining is required as a barrier for oil, grease and water. Compostable plastic coating or lining should be exemption. 6) Plastic cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene cannot be recycled infinitely and will end-up as waste in a landfill. Recycling is a transient solution, whereas certified commercially compostable PLA (with the right systems) is a complete circular solutions with the ability to be composted. We would like to note once again a distinction between compostable plastics in compostable tableware/serveware versus in other industries (tableware/serveware being packaging used in food service). The main goal of compostable serveware/tableware is to carry food waste to composting and divert from landfill. There are many discussions to be had over what exactly should be deemed "compostable" and accepted into compost facilities. We believe that packaging (like serveware and tableware) that holds the purpose of carrying food waste to compost sites should be supported wherever possible.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest

other options.

Notes

Paper cups with biobased/compostable plastic lining should be considered as substitutes taking into account their plant-based origin. Food soiled paper cups can be composted for organics recovery. While the clean ones can be recycled for fiber recovery. We also need to consider the performance required to replace the conventional single-use coffee cups. In US or Europe, it is common to find paper cups with PLA coating as the option to decouple from fossil-based material for circularity. We suggest that all coffee cups should be certified commercially compostable to international composting standards. Despite Ecoware specializing in single-use packaging, we do support reusable cup-schemes, but not at the expense of single-use. Both solutions play a vital role in the diversion of waste from landfill, and we often say where reusable isn't possible, to choose certified compostable. Refusing plastic and having reusable cups are essential, but there will always be a need for packaging – especially when it comes to takeaway food and drink items. The fundamental purpose of packaging is to protect products, provides safety for handling and transportation, and makes sure our food and beverage are sanitary and safe for people to consume. It is inevitable that there will be situations where washing and sanitising reusable products is challenging or not accessible. Think stadiums, concerts, outdoor events and even the ED ward of hospitals. People need to be able to enjoy food and beverages in a variety of contexts safely.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

We manufacture and supply certified commercially compostable paper cups to 1000's of Kiwi businesses. Our paper cups are made from plants. There is currently no disposable option safe enough to replace paper cups lined with some form of plastic. The lining is designed to prevent the cup from leaking – important for safety when dealing with hot beverages. The innovation around lining-free paper cups is not yet developed enough to make this product mainstream. We believe that all single-use cups should be certified commercially compostable to international standards (including the Australian standard) and be accompanied with a plan for national commercial and local composting.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 420

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Whilst I support this, I would like to see a more general policy around all waste, not just plastic packaging and single-use items.
E.g. textiles

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

NZ is an innovative country with a lot of intelligent people. Surely we could put more resourcing towards figuring out how to eliminate waste altogether, and become more of a circular economy.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Voluntary agreements won't work. We can't wait for people to decide to put the planet before profits. We need them to act now.
More stick. Less talk.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

It's better than not having criteria, but if countries like Samoa can take direct action and ban polystyrene from entering the country...why can't we?

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Bans are a clear, simple way of getting rid of things we don't want in our community.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

If we can't get rid of it without filling up landfills, then we shouldn't have it in the first place. We need to move to a more circular economy, so everything should be considered - not just food.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

We would have less demand on our landfills, less junk filling our houses, more focus on quality, more research towards better sustainable economies (more incentives to change behaviour)

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

If we made circular economies 'normal', then people wouldn't rely so much on 'bad' plastics, and it would become more affordable, and easier to make good purchasing decisions. E.g. one bulk bin in a city is not financially accessible for everyone. If we don't have it available, we won't buy it, and would come up with better solutions.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes**Clause**

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

18 months

Notes

Within this election cycle, so that it actually happens.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Reusable coffee cup schemes where you can return the cup anywhere in the city, or more access to public kitchens where you could wash your own cups. It's hard to carry your own stuff around when trying to travel light (on public transport/cycling).

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within this election cycle

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 421

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Regarding working with industry to provide better on-product recycling labelling, recommend amendments to consider: The key users of recycling labelling are the general public; without clear, universally interpretable and accessible labelling, plastics will continue to be incorrectly disposed of. To be successful, labelling development must take place via transparent, open partnership between the public, industry and government – for example, Thumbs Up Aotearoa already has widespread public and local government support. Regarding implementing the amendment to the Basel Convention re. hard-to-recycle plastics, recommend amendments to consider: Implementation must require full transparency in the fate of exported plastics, including recipient country and region, recipient processor, end use, volumes and types of plastic exported. This includes full ethical transparency regarding social, environmental and economic responsibility. The establishment of a central regulatory body (e.g. via a dedicated branch of the EPA) for oversight of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Thier Disposal and implementation of the above points. Regarding committing businesses to 100% reusable, recyclable and compostable packaging by 2025: Include provisions for ongoing and increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration, including between end-user businesses and packaging/supply chain innovators; Include an objective to establish or improve circular economy education and certification resources and programmes.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

The policy objectives focus on reduction, but objectives are lacking for a) tangible solutions to achieve this, and b) approaches to achieve a ‘world leading’ exemplar model of reduction. A “circular approach to resource management” and “reduced public confusion” are mentioned in the objectives, yet education, which is key to achieving a circular economy (including reduction), is lacking: Add an objective targeting improved education regarding hard-to-recycle packaging and single use packaging. This needs to address both the private and public sectors – accessibility to improved education in schools, via public campaigns, and for businesses needs to be effective and appropriate for its target audiences. To achieve all of the objectives, ongoing and increased innovation is be essential. Innovation, and means/methods to support innovators are lacking from the objectives: Add an objective outlining a key focus on identifying, supporting, and enabling innovators to carry out the essential work to realise this vision. To achieve this, increased funding, support and facilitation of inter- and intra- industry collaboration between end-user businesses and innovators will be essential; recommend amended objective considers this.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. above response. The options focus on reduction, however key themes relating to achieving this are missing: Education Support (financial and logistical) Facilitation (of collaboration and supply chain integration) Feasibility (which relates to, not exclusively, the above three points) Suggest an underlying framework is developed that includes (not exclusively) these themes – this needs to be developed in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The framework detailed in the above response needs to be integrated with the weighting criteria, and options re-weighted. For example, the feasibility of widespread, accessible logistical support for small businesses to comply with product stewardship requirements is an essential consideration for options assessment.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, the implementation of the mandatory phase-out must be carried out in transparent, fair collaboration with the public (general public) and private sectors (including small businesses to large corporations). Recommend amendment to include this directive.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Per. points raised in this submission, support the prohibition-based phase-out. Recommend amendment to scope and inclusion of affected groups per. below: However, for this solution to succeed, a holistic understanding (beyond the 'cost-benefit' analysis) of the education, support, facilitation and perceived/actual feasibility is needed. This can be achieved via thorough consultation with all affected supply chain parties including (not exclusively): innovators, producers, suppliers/logistics bodies, commercial end-users, consumer end-users, recycling or end-of-life processors,

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

No (please comment below)

Notes

The challenges in achieving this ban within the short timeframe are significant. However, the environmental, social, cultural, economic and political consequences of a further two years of poorly managed plastic waste simply cannot be afforded. I fully support this target, and believe that with a collaborative, facilitative, supportive approach for Aotearoa to achieve it together, it will be achievable.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Per. responses above - the lens needs to be broadened beyond a cost-benefit analysis for this solution to succeed in this exemplar vision.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

n/a

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Notes

Please see responses above regarding scope of analysis.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

See above. Education and accessibility are key themes which are inadequately discussed in the document.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding "Cups made from PET, HDPE or polypropylene could be exempt as these are more likely to be recyclable." Remove this as a possible exemption. The ongoing disposable use of these cups means contamination of waste streams is highly likely. Local companies such as Globelet have developed fantastic alternatives to single use plastic cups.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

Depends on the item (please specify)

Notes

Depends on the item, but ideally within three years per. responses above. The response to this question needs to come from those parties who will be impacted.

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups – agree with all options listed. Wet wipes – blanket ban with exemptions for medical reasons. Wet wipes are unnecessary and cause severe infrastructural strain as well as being environmentally degrading. We have abundant alternatives (including cloth or paper towels and water / cleansing solutions) already available. Options need to include directive for education regarding this.

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that

contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

n/a

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Within two years of phase out initiation, effective as soon as feasible.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

Regarding above, the phase out is likely to have implications beyond the 'cost-benefit' framing. Recommend consideration of above responses to address this.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 422

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

I agree hard to recycle plastics cause a huge problem for our environment. But, the problem isn't just about plastic - it's about how all materials are used in a single-use, linear economy. Using any item only once then throwing it 'away' wastes energy & resources & harms our planet earth. The Government urgently needs to consider the vast impacts of 'single-use' systems, regardless of the material types used, and to propose more concrete policy & regulatory actions it will take to create a culture of reuse.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Banning these hard to recycle plastic items will be a good starting point. At the same time we need to increase reusable alternatives and systems that support them. Reuse is key to reducing single use plastics. We need to avoid false solutions such as replacing single use items with other materials.

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

A range of important measures are listed however we also need more blended options such as mandatory take-back service for all takeaway serveware and very importantly, deposit return schemes to stop littering and disposing wrongly.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

I support banning all items listed but we should look at a broader approach to 'ban only' and support more options at the same time to get the best results for reuse and reduce results.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

A two stages approach seems sensible but not the suggested timelines. Our government just declared a climate emergency. We need to act fast now to reverse the already overwhelming plastic pollution. I would suggest to forward this phase-out to 2021.

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

It is very important to include these packaging types too which are still used widely for packaging goods and can easily contaminate our recycling systems and the environment.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

In general the huge benefits for the health of our people, the environment and wildlife phasing out all PVC and polystyrene would surely outweigh the costs.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

There are already many practical alternatives in place and being used. Reusable and Refillable options need to be more widely introduced and accessible to everyone to get away from single use. Deposit return schemes for all food and beverage packaging need to be invested into. Packaging needs to be highly recyclable within NZ also containing recycled content.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, I support this phase-out 100% but would like to see this happening by 2021 at the latest.

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

I can only see benefits in banning these targeted plastics in terms of new opportunities for business and communities to develop reuse schemes. These schemes will reduce waste and create new jobs at the same time.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Making reusable and refillable options mainstream, easily accessible and affordable for everyone. Only provide higher value material and reusable/refillable options. If there are no other more polluting materials available then everyone would naturally move away from harmful alternatives. Compulsory environmental education from primary school level would be very important to create awareness and behaviour change from a young age.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

I agree with all listed items to be banned, but can not believe why single use/ takeaway coffee cups are not included in the ban list! Every year, millions of throwaway coffee cups end up in landfill pollute the environment and contaminate recycling. Single use Coffee cups are one of the easiest items to get rid of as the majority of people have already switched to keep cups and alternatives which many cafes offer such as Again Again a reusable cup system. There are mug libraries, jar swap systems and of course coffee can always be served in a proper ceramic cup in the cafe. Many cafes offer BYO discounts and generally have embraced the change to reusable already. There should be many more harmful items on the ban list such as little condiment jam and butter pottles, sauce sachets, plastic coffee pods, soy fish, plastic wrapped lollies and plastic lollypop sticks (can easily replaced with paper or wooden sticks), plastic cotton buds, all tetra pack packaging, plastic water bottles unless reuse or recycled in a deposit scheme.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

I 100% support the banning of oxo- degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics as they are very confusing for the customer to actually recycle and dispose of properly. They are still harmful to our wildlife and the environment, and still single use items that waste resources and energy in the production. I do not support the exemption of the disposable coffee cups and lids from the ban as mentioned in question 16.

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

The sooner the better. We have waited too long already!!

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

See my suggestions for single use coffee cups in question 16. Please include those in the ban list as well as wet wipes. There are many environmentally friendly alternatives to wet wipes already, such as a simple washable/reusable cotton cloth.

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

An immediate ban please as there are many easy alternatives already in place. Our life surely does not depend on those 2 items but it depends on a clean and healthy environment!!

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

There will be many benefits introducing reuse schemes for communities and organisations by creating more jobs which should be considered.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

I strongly suggest a compliance and enforcement strategy is put in place as there is a wide range of products listed for the ban. It will impact different industries, businesses and organisations that need to comply. To make these bans successful we can not tolerate slips and cheats as we saw with the plastic bag ban. I would support enforcement officers as well as community members reporting breaches including fines and other suitable consequential measurements for repeated breaches.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 423

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

This proposal will bring Aotearoa New Zealand in line with overseas current best practice. The proposed policy should be supported by comprehensive regulatory roadmap to target reliance on single-use products in general and reduction of virgin plastic resin usage.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

This policy is a necessary precondition for the transition to a circular economy. The main objective should be amended to: "reduce the impact on our resource recovery system and environment from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use items through significantly reducing the amount in use, increasing the scale and uptake of reuse systems, and increasing safe recycled content in packaging and systems that support the increased recyclability of each product." An additional secondary objective should also be added: "making affordable reuse alternatives accessible across New Zealand while supporting community-based engagement which assists communities to use them and to benefit from the increased employment opportunities that reuse economies offer."

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

We believe these options could be blended to support a long-lasting and effective move away from reliance on all single-use items and to avoid unintended outcomes from a ban.

Clause

4. Have we identified the right criteria (including weightings) for evaluating options to shift away from PVC and polystyrene packaging, oxo-degradable plastics and some single-use items? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

More weight should be given to how well each option aligns with strategic direction to ensure highest ranking outcomes sit highest up the waste hierarchy.

Clause

5. Do you agree with our assessment of the options, and our decision to take forward only one option (a mandatory phase-out)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

We support mandatory phase-outs of all the items listed (with the exception of plastic straws). We would like to see positive regulatory and policy options implemented alongside a ban to support reuse alternatives and increase recycled content in products.

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

However the proposed time-frames are too slow. We suggest: PVC trays being phased out by June 2021 All other food and beverage items that contain PVC packaging and some food and beverage items that contain polystyrene packaging being phased out by June 2022 Stage 2 by June 2023

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Thank you for this comprehensive list of products proposed for a phase-out.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

PVC is commonly used in consumer packaging in non food and beverage contexts. Any PVC or hard polystyrene packaging can become a contaminant in the 'easy-to-recycle' plastic streams, so it's better to be consistent and phase-out all hard PVC and PS packaging.

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

Benefits: PVC is a contaminant in the recycling stream. Phasing it out will help to provide high quality PET to reprocessors. EPS is not widely recyclable and creates plastic litter which harms our waterways and persists in the environment for hundreds of years. Phasing it out will help protect our waterways and soils

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

The quicker we get rid of these, the better, so we would like the phase-out of these to happen by June 2021

Clause

12. If you manufacture, import or sell oxo-degradable plastics, which items would a phase-out affect? Are there practical alternatives for these items? Please provide details.

Notes

N/A

Clause

13. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of the targeted plastics? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, though a more holistic assessment of the costs and benefits that does not separate the environment out as an "affected

party" distinct from human society and our economy would be helpful/more meaningful.

Clause

14. How likely is it that phasing out the targeted plastics will have greater costs or benefits than those discussed here? Please provide details to explain your answer.

Notes

An additional benefit is the opportunity for businesses and community enterprises to develop reuse schemes and reusable packaging systems. The mandatory phase-out of the targeted single-use items is likely to also lead to a reduction in other single-use packaging, due to changing social norms and more availability of reuse schemes.

Clause

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

Increased scale and uptake of reusables would assist the move, which would require regulatory and policy measures to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, nationwide infrastructure to support reuse (such as washing facilities), combined with funding for locally-based community engagement. Mandatory recycled content for plastic packaging and products, more transparency & onshore reprocessing facilities and better designed collection and sorting systems for recycling would help ensure that higher value plastics collected for recycling in New Zealand actually get reprocessed.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree with the proposed phase-out of single-use items

Notes

We fully support the mandatory phase-out of all of the listed single-use plastic items, except for plastic straws. We believe that consultation with the disabled community about a possible straw ban and/or exemptions should take place before any decision is made to ban plastic straws. We do not support exempting the following from the ban: ● Single-use coffee cups & lids ● Single-use plastic cups and lids made of plastics 1, 2 and 5 We support the list being extended to include these other single-use plastic items: ● Plastic lollipop sticks ● Single-serve pottles, sachets & containers for condiments and toiletries ● Teabags and coffee pods containing plastic ● Single-use plastic water bottles ● Balloons and balloon sticks ● Glitter and plastic confetti ● Complementary plastic toys We would also support a strategic plan to tackle wet wipes and other disposable sanitary products, and cigarette butts, as well as to reduce the harm from industrial plastics like fishing nets

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes with changes (please specify)

Notes

We strongly support the proposal to include items made of degradable, oxo-degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastics. ● Single-use plastic tableware: We suggest altering the proposed definition to include paper bowls and containers with plastic or wax linings ● Single-use plastic produce bags: We suggest this definition is broadened to include within the scope of the phase-out plastic net bags

Clause

18. What would be an appropriate phase-out period for single-use items? Please consider the impact of a shorter timeframe, versus a longer timeframe, and provide details where possible.

Position

12 months

Notes

12 months for everything except single-use cups 2 years for single-use cups to allow time to implement reuse infrastructure, collaboration with businesses and undertake community engagement

Clause

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Coffee cups We believe the most impactful role for the Government is to use regulation, policy & investment to increase the uptake, accessibility (including affordability), reach and availability of reusable alternatives. We support the Government: - investing in scaling up reuse systems, such as regional/localised washing/sterilisation facilities - implementing regulatory and policy interventions that remove some of the barriers to reuse schemes growing, including a levy or fee on disposable coffee cups, deposit return schemes for takeaway cups, and mandating 'reusables only' for dine-in contexts and public buildings. - providing funding to NGOs and community groups with track-records of engaging their communities on zero waste as the most efficient way to invest in behaviour change Wet wipes We support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not

containing plastic as soon as practicable. In the meantime, we would support: - investment in community engagement around reusable alternatives and the problems associated with wet wipes (i.e. release of plastic into waterways and blocking of sewerage systems) - compulsory labelling requirements to inform users of how to dispose of them correctly and to prohibit use of the word “flushable” on the product packaging

Clause

20. If you are a business involved with the manufacture, supply, or use of single-use plastic coffee cups or wet wipes (that contain plastic), what would enable you to transition away from plastic based materials in the future?

Notes

N/A

Clause

21. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe for working toward a future phase out of plastic lined disposable coffee cups and wet wipes containing plastic?

Notes

Coffee cups With formal Government regulatory, policy and financial support for reuse systems and community engagement, we believe individual towns can meet their goal of being single-use cup (SUC) free by 2022. Replicating the successes of those towns could lead to a SUC free Aotearoa by 2023. Wet wipes We would support transitioning from wet wipes containing plastic to those not containing plastic (and that will not block sewers and form ‘fat bergs’) as soon as practicable e.g. by Jan 2022.

Clause

22. Have we identified the right costs and benefits of a mandatory phase-out of single-use plastic items? If not, why? Please provide evidence to support your answer and clarify whether your answer applies to a particular item, or all items.

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of costs & benefits is comprehensive and we agree with them all. Additional benefits are offered by the opportunity for businesses and communities to develop reuse schemes and reusable alternative products to replace the items that have been phased out. This includes employment opportunities.

Clause

23. How should the proposals in this document be monitored for compliance?

Notes

We support MfE creating a compliance, monitoring and enforcement strategy. The community can assist by reporting breaches to MfE.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 425

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Bottles for bottled water should be included as a single-use item because even though they can be reused, they are frequently binned after one use or are discarded on the street and ultimately end up in waterways.

Clause

2. Have we identified the correct objectives? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

3. Do you agree that these are the correct options to consider? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Do you agree with the proposed phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging as set out in two stages (by 2023 and by 2025)? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

7. Have we identified the right packaging items that would be covered by a phase-out of PVC and polystyrene packaging? If not, what would you include or leave out, and why?

Notes

Include bottled water bottles: These would be difficult to ban, but a return deposit scheme might help reduce the number going to landfill or into the ocean.

Clause

8. Do you think we should include all PVC and hard polystyrene packaging in stage 2 of the phase-out (eg, not just food and beverage and EPS packaging)? Please explain your answer.

Position

Yes (please comment below)

Notes

Yes because of their prevalence in the construction industry, which is responsible for a large proportion of waste plastic.

Clause

10. Do you believe there are practical alternatives to replace hard-to-recycle packaging (PVC, polystyrene and EPS)? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part (please comment below)

Notes

Yes. Some packaging and construction products made of PVC, polystyrene and EPS could be made from other materials using 3D printing.

Clause

11. Do you agree with a mandatory phase-out of all oxo-degradable plastics by January 2023? If not, why?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. What would help to make it easier for you and your family, or your business/organisation to move away from hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and use higher value materials or reusable/refillable alternatives?

Notes

More products available for purchase using a container the customer brings into the shop. Strong discouragement of unnecessary fruit and veg plastic packaging in supermarkets. Many veges keep better in the fridge if tightly packed into a single-use plastic bag, so consumers need alternatives other than hemp, cotton or paper produce bags, which don't work well in the fridge. e.g. Supermarkets could make ziplock plastic bags and non-plastic containers available for purchase at the fruit and veg counters. Also phase out all plastic ties and tapes around things like bananas and celery. Phase out plastic netted bags used, for example, for bunches of garlic and avocados.

Clause

16. What do you think about the proposed mandatory phase-out of some single-use plastic items (see table 7)?

Position

Agree in part (please comment below)

Notes

Include bottled water and beverage bottles. At least those smaller than 1 litre.

Clause

17. Do the proposed definitions in table 7 make sense? If not, what would you change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

19. What options could we consider for reducing the use of single-use coffee cups (with any type of plastic lining) and wet wipes that contain plastic? You may wish to consider some of the options discussed in this consultation document or suggest other options.

Notes

Publicity campaign. That bus some time ago, with coffee cups drawn all over it, was a great educational tool. Take that bus all over and talk to people. Hand out leaflets in the streets where people buy take-away coffee. I can't see why it would be difficult for mobile vendors to have reusable cups available for purchase. I do not support compostable cups (or plates, for that matter) because of the risk they'll be thrown away. The onus is on the consumer to dispose of them responsibly, but this is unlikely if the easy option is the trash can. Wet wipes should simply be banned. They're unnecessary. We're used to hand sanitiser these days.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 428

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 430

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Unclear / Not Stated

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 431

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 432

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 433

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 434

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source:

Overall Position:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 435

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source:

Overall Position:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 436

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 437

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 438

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 439

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause
9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes
n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 440

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 441

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 442

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 443

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 450

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause
9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes
n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 451

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 452

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 453

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 454

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 455

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 456

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 457

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 458

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 459

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 460

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 461

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 462

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause
9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes
n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 463

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 464

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 465

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 466

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 467

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 468

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 469

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Letter

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 472

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 474

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 475

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause
9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes
n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 476

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 477

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 478

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 479

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 480

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 481

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 482

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 483

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 484

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 485

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause
9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes
n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 486

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

1. Do you agree with the description in this document of the problems with hard-to-recycle plastic packaging and single-use plastic items? If not, why?

Position

Yes in part

Notes

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 487

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 488

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 489

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 490

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause
9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes
n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 491

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Unclear / Not Stated

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 492

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 493

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 494

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 496

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 497

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 498

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Unspecified / Other

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 499

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 500

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Unclear / Not Stated

Overall Notes:

Clause
9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes
n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 501

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 502

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 503

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 505

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Local Government

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 506

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 507

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: NGO

Source: Letter

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 508

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 509

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 510

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 511

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 512

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 513

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause
9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes
n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 514

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Business / Industry

Source: Email

Overall Position: Oppose in Part

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 515

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 516

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause

9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes

n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.

Reducing the impact of plastic on our environment: moving away from hard-to-recycle and single-use items.

Submission Reference no: 517

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Email

Overall Position: Support

Overall Notes:

Clause
9. What would be the likely costs or benefits of phasing out all PVC and polystyrene packaging (hard polystyrene and EPS) by 2025?

Notes
n/a

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.