

Appendix 1: List of all questions from the key-issues section

Key Issue 1: Objectives of the CDS

Preferred option – Modernise the features of the CDS

Questions

1.1 Do you think the CDS should be supported and recognised as a key pathway for supplying recovered materials to remanufacturers and to achieve state and national resource recovery targets by:

1.1.a supporting and building on existing beverage container resource recovery investments and infrastructure

1.1.b optimising the recovery of high-value beverage container materials that support a circular economy

1.1.c continuing to enable opportunities for local employment within the CDS and more broadly within the resource recovery and recycling sector

1.1.d enabling opportunities for community groups, not-for-profit organisations and charities to benefit from the CDS through direct participation and the development of partnerships within the CDS?

Key Issue 2: Containers Included in the CDS

Preferred option – Review and clarify the CDS scope to support the circular economy principles

Questions

2.1 Should plain unflavoured milk containers up to 3 litres continue to be excluded from the CDS? If not, why not?

2.2 Do you think the diversion of glass from the co-mingled recyclables bin is best achieved through the CDS or a fourth kerbside bin dedicated to glass?

2.2.a Do you agree that all glass beverage containers up to 3 litres should be included in the CDS (wine, spirit and cordial)? If not, why not?

2.2.b Alternatively, if a fourth kerbside bin collection system dedicated to glass was made available, who should pay for it?

2.3 Do you agree that all plastic fruit/vegetable juice and cordial containers [in addition to soft drinks, fruit juice drinks and water] up to 3 litres should be included in the CDS? If not, why not?

2.4 Do you think a contemporary CDS education and awareness campaign that incorporates the proposed new inclusions would divert more beverage containers away from the kerbside co-mingled bins and residual waste bins towards CDS depots? What media platforms should be used for such a campaign?

Key Issue 3: Scheme Approvals and Container Markings

Preferred option – Maintain the current refund marking, replace the container application fee, introduce limited term for approvals and subsidise smaller beverage producers and suppliers

Questions

Scheme approvals and scheme cost recovery

3.1 As a beverage producer or supplier, do you support the CDS subsidising new-entrant small to medium beverage suppliers and producers in the form of scheme induction and initial preparation costs? If not, why not?

3.2 As a beverage producer or supplier, do you agree with the application of a scheme compliance fee paid by the super collectors to cost recover the scheme compliance and enforcement costs? If not, why not, and what alternative method of cost recovery could be applied?

3.3 As a beverage producer or supplier, do you support the removal of the container approval application fee and incorporation of these assessment costs as part of the scheme compliance fee? If not, why not?

3.4 If the SA Government introduces a limited term for approvals, do you think a five year term, in line with other state and territory schemes, is a suitable time period? If not, why not, and what would you suggest?

Container refund marking

3.5 As a beverage producer or supplier, super collector or depot operator, do you support the alignment of CDS-eligible beverage container refund markings nationally, and why?

3.6 What potential container branding would you recommend that could be used to promote and raise awareness of the CDS and the circular economy?

Key Issue 4.1: Deposit Value and Refund Amount

Preferred option – Maintain the alignment of the deposit value and refund amount

Questions

4.1.1 Does the current deposit amount of 10 cents influence whether you return empty beverage containers for recycling via CDS depots? If so, how does it influence your participation? If not, why not?

Key Issue 4.2: Ease of Container Return

Preferred option – Maximise CDS container return point accessibility

Questions

4.2.1 If the existing depots were supplemented with new return points, which types of location/s would you find the easiest to return eligible beverage containers to? For example:

- supermarket or shopping centre
- local retail outlet, for example, newsagency or convenience store
- entertainment and sporting events
- waste transfer station
- home pick-up service [for fee].

4.2.2 Would you use self-service return points (for example, reverse vending machines or 'drop and go' stations) located in one of the above locations to divert more of your containers from the kerbside waste system to the CDS?

4.2.3 Will promotion and consistent branding of return points, including information about locations, operating hours and beverage container return requirements, assist you in returning eligible containers and accessing the refund?

4.2.4

As a community organisation such as a charity, school or sports club, how do you or would you like to participate in, and benefit from, the CDS? For example:

- by building and operating refund collection points yourself
- by partnering and hosting refund collection points with approved CDS depots
- by carrying out a collection of containers to take to a local collection point
- by registering with the scheme as a nominated donation partner that is eligible to receive electronic funds donations through automated reverse vending machines
- through mobile or 'pop-up' refund points as part of a fundraising drive.

Scheme coordinators and depot operators

4.2.5

The handling fee payable to depots and return point operators is one lever used to influence accessibility and servicing of return points within a community. What other levers or incentives could be used?

4.2.6

What would be the best mechanism to ensure the CDS achieves return rate targets and accountability standards for metropolitan, non-metropolitan and remote areas of the state?

Key Issue 4.3: Payment of Refund Method

Preferred option – Incorporation of non-cash refund payments

Questions

General questions

4.3.1

How would you like to receive your refunds for containers?

- cash
- electronic funds transfer (EFT) / online payment
- direct electronic funds transfer to a donation partner of your choice
- vouchers (for example, for use at local stores)
- all refund options as above.

4.3.2

Is the addition of non-cash refund methods likely to increase the level of convenience for you when returning empty beverage containers to a CDS depot?

For depot owners

4.3.3

Will you need to change the operation of your business to provide for non-cash refund methods such as EFT? If yes,

4.3.3.a

What do you expect to be the nature and cost of providing non-cash refund methods?

4.3.3.b

What would this look like at your depot and how long would this take (for example, 1 year or less, up to 2 years)?

4.3.4

Do you anticipate that a partnership with at least one donation partner could support your local community and increase the customer base at your depot?

Key Issue 5: Governance Arrangements

Preferred option – Modernise the CDS governance to increase transparency and accountability

Questions

Scheme oversight

5.1

Do you think the SA Government should appoint an independent governing body for the existing multiple super collector system or independent not-for-profit scheme coordinator who will have oversight of the scheme, and make recommendations on the performance targets, container return rate targets, scheme costs and the reporting and accountability framework to the SA Government?

5.1.a

If so, do you think the proposed governing body membership is appropriate? If not, what would you suggest?

Scheme auditing and reporting

5.2

It is proposed to require registration of beverage containers (and barcodes if available) within a centralised IT platform as a condition of container approval to enable tracking and counting of containers. If a barcode is not used, what alternative tracking and counting methods would you suggest and where are they in use?

5.3

It is proposed that beverage producers and suppliers, depots, and super collectors or the single scheme coordinator must utilise a centralised IT platform for auditing and reporting purposes in accordance with the supplier arrangement. Do you agree with this? If not, why not?

Scheme coordination

5.4

Which of the scheme coordinator options [option 1: multiple super collectors or option 2: single independent not-for-profit scheme coordinator] do you prefer and why?

5.4.a

What do you see as the risks and benefits of each of these scheme coordination options?

5.4.b

What would be the impacts of the different options on your business?

5.4.c

If option 1 was the model chosen to coordinate the scheme, how should accountability for meeting scheme performance indicators, such as return rate targets, be shared amongst the super collectors?

5.5

The establishment of a single waste management arrangement between depots and at least one super collector (for option 1) or single independent scheme coordinator (for option 2) is proposed to enable depots to contract with a single super collector and remove sorting by container brand.

5.5.a

Do you agree with this change as a way of addressing these concerns? If not, why not? If not, what alternative approach would you suggest?

5.6

The weight-based conversion of container material weight to container number has been the subject of disputes over containers returned. It is proposed to transition to a container-count methodology to report on container return rates and payment for returns.

5.6.a

Do you foresee any issues with this method of payment for returned containers?

5.6.b

How would smaller depots with low container return volumes achieve container counting?

5.7

Do you think the CDS scheme should establish geographical performance targets, including distribution of container return points per region and return rates for regional and remote areas?