

MARINE ACTION NETWORK LITTER



MLAN 2016 Session Reports



Thanks to the following organisations for their support of the Action Network:



Executive Summary

35 delegates from 28 organisations attended the second annual networking workshop on 26th May 2016 at the Custard Factory in Birmingham. Among some of the topics under discussion were financial incentives and behaviour change, tackling litter at sporting events, maximizing the impact of Beach cleaning volunteers, litter recycling on beach cleans, litter monitoring methods in estuaries and innovative ideas for dealing with ghost fishing gear.

MCS staff will be concentrating on two of the outcomes of the meeting – intended to further raise the profile of marine litter to the public.

Litter Innovation Award

MCS Director of Conservation and Campaigns Carrie Hume led a session to explore whether, as a sector, we could better recognise the work of our volunteers and supporters, as well as stimulate and reward innovative approaches to combating litter both at source and once in the sea. There was strong support for this idea, since our collective volunteers do sterling work in cleaning up litter, and think of all kinds of ways to make this activity fun and engaging. We need to better reward them, and we don't appear to be doing this as a collective right now. Also, how can we better cultivate and engage the great British entrepreneurial spirit to help combat the growing problem of litter? We are a nation of great ideas and have innovated out of more than one 'fix' in the past - can we better turn that attention on litter? And can we attract businesses to this to finally support and lead the charge? MCS are seeking to explore these ideas further.

The Water Code

The aim of the project is create a suite of simple pollution messages that would really drive home our central idea: wherever you are in the country, in the city, at home or on the beach your actions have an impact on rivers, beaches and the sea. Many organisations already advocate the various actions people can take to reduce litter and improve water quality in their area. This code is intended to build upon and consolidate the messages already being promoted, by providing a consistent message across the many organisations involved in the Marine Litter Action Network and beyond.

What's next?

73% of delegates that attended were confident that MLAN will continue to make a positive difference but in terms of all the other ideas what's next?

It is down to all of us, as MLAN members and the proposers of these ideas to work together and take things forward to create even more positive actions to address marine litter. MLAN is a communications hub and can only do so much, so it really is down to all of us to help make it a success. Workstreams will continue to meet as suggested by the groups. Please do let us know if you wish to further develop a project through a funding bid or if you would like an MLAN teleconference organized to further discuss ideas and MCS will continue to provide monthly updates.

Thank you to everyone who completed a feedback form, the workshop evaluation can be viewed in [appendix 1](#).

We would also like to invite you to feedback and report on progress with existing or new ideas as often as you can using the template in [appendix 2](#). This will then allow us to update everyone in the network regularly.

To ensure key insight is inputted into future debates on relevant topics, please do use the following notes (and all reporting notes from MLAN located on our [resource page](#)) for future reference.

Workshop sessions held on 26th May, Custard Factory, Birmingham.

Overview of sessions held

1. [Financial incentives and behaviour change](#). Proposer: Chiarina Darrah (Eunomia), *discussion with suggestions for future debate.*
2. [How can we tackle litter at sporting events?](#) Proposer: Elle McCall (Hubbub), *there were no specific outcomes from the discussion, more that the discussion raised questions and food for thought that hopefully could be introduced into a pilot trial when the opportunity arises.*
3. [Communication \(Bring Sexy Back\)/Improving our reach/Using the term Marine Plastic Pollution](#) – (3 proposed similar ideas amalgamated) – Proposers Domino Albert (ProjectAWARE), Suzanne Roberts (KSB) and Michelle Cassar (City to Sea) *outcome: Produce simple messages to be agreed on by all organisations*
4. [Working with the Government / The National Litter Strategy](#). Proposers: Julia Hunt (Defra) and MCS (2 proposed similar ideas amalgamated) – *ideas and actions to take forward.*
5. [Beach Cleans - maximising take up, impact and litter recycling](#) (3 proposed similar ideas amalgamated). Proposers Sam Fanshawe (MCS), Sue Kinsey (MCS) and Harriet Yates-Smith (Litter Free Coast & Sea - Somerset), *ideas and actions to take forward.*
6. [Litter Monitoring Methods in Estuaries](#). Proposer: Tanya Ferry (PLA) *ideas and actions to take forward.*
7. [How do marine focused organisations create behavioural change in the wider public?](#) Proposer: Ali Murrell (Riz Boardshorts) *discussion with suggestions for future debate.*
8. [Water Code](#). Proposer: Emma Cunningham (MCS) – *outcome - being taken forward as joint project with Water UK. Similar to number 3 suite of simple pollution messages, likened to the countryside code.*
9. [Litter Innovation Award?](#). Proposer: Carrie Hume (MCS) – *ideas and actions to take forward.*
10. [Can voluntary measures reduce pollution?](#) Proposer: Dan Steadman (FFI) *discussion with suggestions for future debate.*
11. [What innovative ideas can we come up with for dealing with ghost gear?](#) Proposer: Chris Dixon (WAP) – *discussion with ideas and actions to take forward.*

Session reports 1: Financial incentives and behaviour change

Proposer: Chiarina Darrah (Eunomia), **Reporter:** Elisabeth von der Ohe (student)

Session Attended by: Chiarina Darrah (Eunomia), Natalie Poulter (Litter Free Coast & Seas, Dorset), Sue Kinsey (MCS), Fiona Wheatley (M&S), Madeleine Berg (Fidra), Ali Murrell (Riz boardshorts), Emma Cunningham (MCS), Simon Preddy (KWT), Elisabeth von der Ohe (student)

Notes: Public awareness raising:

- Often not very effective (e.g. adverts, boards, posters etc.)
- Resource intensive (example questionnaire on wet wipes by Emma)
- Activities are closely linked to personal benefits and are financially driven, e.g. B&B owner cares about the beach close to his hotel but not about the beach a bit further away.

Division of incentives in:

- Positive incentives
- Negative incentives
- Deposit schemes
- Status incentives

Positive Incentives:

- Seem more effective on a small scale
- There are effective local examples, e.g. at festivals
- Awards for innovative solutions can be a positive incentive

Negative incentives:

- Examples: taxes, fines – e.g. on carrier bags
- Extended producer responsibility can be an incentive through:
 - o Resource costs
 - o Fines, e.g. for pellet loss □ obligatory abatement systems
 - o Rewards for proof of effective systems to stop pellet loss
 - o Internalization of clean-up costs • Problem: companies might stop to report openly and start to move to countries with lower environmental regulation

Deposit schemes:

- Have to be thought through and practicable

Status incentives:

- Assessment e.g. on Trip Advisor can be an incentive, e.g. “sustainable hotel”
- Awards for sustainable entrepreneurship can be a status incentive

Further points of discussion:

- How do we pay for abatement strategies?
 - o Communities are often under a lot of financial stress
 - o Voluntary measures are not enough
- Prioritising is necessary □ what are good regulations? What do we really need?
- What are the effects we want to achieve?
- Good practice needs to be communicated more openly, example Starbucks
- How can we generate evidence to show effects of incentives?
- Peer to peer support and pressure can be an effective way to change behavior

Actions: *None submitted, however please see further points for discussion. If members are keen to explore this further and see potential solutions arising as a result, then the group may wish to consider reconvening at a mutually agreeable time via teleconference.*

2. How can we tackle litter at sporting events?

Proposer: Elle McCall (Hubbub), **Reporter:** Ali Murrell (Riz Boardshorts)

Session Attended by: Fiona Wheatley (M&S), Clare Cavers (Fidra), Ian Fraser (MCS), Elle McCall (Hubbub), Ali Murrell (Riz Boardshorts), Michelle Cassar (City to Sea)

Notes: The question was raised as to why it appears to be a socially accepted behaviour to discard bottles when participating in sporting events in places where you would never consider littering under other circumstances.

The group focused on two main avenues; how to bring the issue of event waste into the public consciousness and how to develop / offer easy and convenient alternative ways of disposing and recycling waste?

Public consciousness: ideas that were raised by the group included; creating artwork based on the litter produced to display at events, asking competitors to pledge zero waste approach and / or include in the terms and conditions of entering competition. Also discussed was the idea of raising the litter to the level of the eye-line (i.e. hanging displays from trees) as it is very easy to see only what you want to see at ground level. It was suggested that it is better to try and influence behaviour prior to the actual events themselves as during the events people tend to have one point of focus and that is completing the physical challenge not respecting the environment and disposing of their plastic bottles responsibly. It was suggested that engaging with groups such as PARK RUN or trying to build behaviour into people’s training routines could help influence behaviour on the event day.

Disposal / recycle: this is a complex problem as needs to be feasible for the event organisers but at the same time easy and convenient for the participants. Considering the nature of outdoor sporting events in that they typically cover large and often difficult to access areas there is no single, simple solution.

Various ideas were discussed; return to the days of water tables and cups (that could be recycled

similarly to the simply cups (closed loop process); propose and incentivise use of camel / platypus packs to carry water; set up collection stations on the route such as nets for bottles to be thrown into or even just more temporary bins. The difficulty with any alternative options is the level of inconvenience that any participant is willing to accept when they are competing in one of these events. In reality, this is likely to be very low.

Actions: There were no specific outcomes from the discussion, more that the discussion raised questions and food for thought that hopefully could be introduced into a pilot trial when the opportunity arises.

3. Communication (Bring Sexy Back)/Improving our reach/Using the term Marine Plastic Pollution – (*this was an amalgamated*)

Proposer: Domino Albert (ProjectAWARE), **Additional proposers** Suzanne Roberts (KSB) and Michelle Cassar (City to Sea)

Reporter: Clare Cavers

Session Attended by: Ian Humphreys (KNIB), Elle McAll (Hubbub), Carrie Hume (MCS), Daniel Steadman (FFI), Helen Jordan (BPF), Jan MacLennan (NE), Suzanne Roberts (KSB), Sam Fanshawe (MCS), Ian Fraser (MCS), Michelle Cassar (City to Sea), Laura Foster (MCS), Domino Albert (ProjectAWARE), Clare Cavers (Fidra)

Notes - Main emphasis: how to engage the public's attention more effectively. Example given of recent publicity around the edible six-pack rings by Saltwater Brewery in Florida, which gained a lot of publicity and had a lot of appeal as a long-standing and familiar problem.

How can we better educate? Need a good programme on the issue, and innovative ideas. May be worth revisiting actions and activities of previous campaigns to get ideas, and co-ordinate findings.

Could co-ordinate messages or share information on campaigns (requires high level of trust). Wouldn't work in a marketing sense. Collective campaigns (for example using Lottery funding) may require sacrificing some organisations' messages.

- Could marketing agencies be asked to do pro bono work "for the cause"?
- Do we need to work on the message rather than the marketing?
- We need to make messages as evidence-based as possible.
- Suggested a trip-advisor-style platform to share messages. The Global Litter Interaction Network tried a similar scheme but unsuccessfully, as organisations had to upload their own information.
- Suggested consulting Bob Earll on how organisations can engage with each other.
- Look at events such as Zero Waste Europe's event at end of June for how to co-ordinate and find crossovers.

Accept it's a long-term campaign and strategise accordingly. Lack of divers sharing information on extent of litter they come across could be due to view of diving as a closed group, so data is not shared outwith.

Project AWARE has 2 years of good data from its citizen science program.

People tend to share if onus is not on them.

Microplastic attention and coverage in the media is maybe making marine litter seem more shocking. Some things do get a lot of reaction like the video of the turtle with the straw up its nose. "The ugly journey of our trash" video by Project Aware worked to attract the attention of divers.

- Could action be increased by getting someone like David Attenborough on board (by co-ordinated letter writing)?
- Use of powerful images such as plastic in Mediterranean trenches.
- Plastic Oceans film due for release in June.
- Experience in Forest of Dean litter found reactions vary to terms "litter" and "plastic".

Behaviour is the main issue, not the source of type of litter (90% of marine litter is plastic).

Issue may be around terminology, i.e. "litter" seems less powerful than "pollution". Do we need to change our message?

Need to **increase awareness and visual impact.**

- Need more imagery?
- How to translate imagery into a message and change behaviour is challenging.
- Imagery of plastic ingestion by wildlife is tricky as it is internal, and you can't see the effect compared to oil spills. Should we be translating plastic pollution in terms of oil, i.e. show images of plastic and show equivalent amount of oil?

Need information on demographics of who litters.

- Keep Scotland Beautiful did surveys in 2008, results are on their website.
- Keep Northern Ireland Beautiful has just completed surveys and will make results available.

Actions: Produce simple messages to be agreed on by all organisations: assigned to Suzanne Roberts. *Emma from MCS will speak to Suzanne further on any links with Water Code.*

4. Working with the Government / The National Litter Strategy & marine litter – what do we want to achieve? (These two ideas were amalgamated)

Proposer: Julia Hunt (Defra) **Additional Proposer** Chiarina Darrah (Eunomia), **Reporter:** Madeleine Burg (Fidra)

Session Attended by: Chiarina Darrah (Eunomia), Dan Steadman (FFI), Dilyana Mihaylova (FFI), Tanya Ferry (PLA), Sam Fanshawe (MCS), Harriet Yates-Smith, (Litter Free Coast & Sea - Somerset), Carrie Hume (MCS), Adrian Whyle (PlasticsEurope), Laura Foster (MCS), Sue Kinsey (MCS), Christina Dixon (WAP), Jennifer Lonsdale (EIA), Michelle Cassar (City to Sea), Julia Hunt (Defra) & Madeleine Burg (Fidra).

Working with the Government sub notes

- Do we already
- What works, what doesn't
- How can we help?

Notes: Attendees have worked with: DEFRA, Environment Agency, MMO/IFCAS (although less in relation to marine litter), Westminster (Env Audit Committee), Scottish govt and regulators (Marine Scotland, Marine Litter Strategy, SEPA).

Experience of working with these bodies:

- Positive experience of government approach to littering initiatives, need stronger enforcement of littering, more leadership from govt/ third party companies hired by govt to enforce (Plastics Europe).

- Defra's MSFD 'programme of measures' was very disappointing, with few tangible targets put forward.
- General lack of communication between different departments.
- Lack of transparency, data sharing, reports not published - "Defra are doing things, but not telling us"
International reputation poor - Defra not seen as doing enough, UK are seen as reluctant/slow to act.

What can be done to improve the situation?

- More specific actions. Measurable, aspirational targets.
- Defining terms:
 - Use the term "aquatic litter" rather than marine litter, to broaden reach
- Does "littering" cover issues such as lost/abandoned fishing gear, microbeads? Different term required?
- Connect separate departments of DEFRA; make marine litter a cross-departmental problem making links between circular economy, waste, and marine litter departments.
- Break-down of "them vs. us" attitude and link more closely with external groups
- Consult NGOs in decision making for e.g. OSPAR measures.
- Could DEFRA provide more support to projects? Not necessarily financial, but PR-based?
- NGO awareness that there is a limit to resources available, and ask for support appropriately.
- Can DEFRA /CEFAS provide data / share equipment to help with projects?
- General increase in transparency from DEFRA/CEFAS

The National Litter Strategy Draft outline has been created, 3 sections: Education & Awareness, Punishing Offenders and Infrastructure. General invitation to contribute ideas / projects that cover these aspects. NLS combines both marine and terrestrial strategies. 3 staff members at DEFRA work on the strategy, plus advisory groups meeting for past 18months.

What do we want from the National Litter Strategy? Where can improvements be made?

- Tangible targets resulting in direct action, with steps showing how they can be reached.
- A knowledge of timescales/ resources / budgeting for contributors to know how best to ask for support
- 3rd party facilitation of advisory group meetings suggested
- Provide greater transparency of process of NLS creation - e.g. a website summarising results of meetings, providing information of work in progress.
- Use starting point of recognising the importance of this issue to all including local councils, NGOs, public, how the issue can affect UK as a whole (international reputation, tourism, economy).

Actions:

- **Julia** - Find out what has happened to the microplastics reports at DEFRA and release if possible. **Additional notes:** Reports mentioned included monitoring data from Richard Thompson, Thomas Maes, and a report on sources of aquatic litter co-authored by MCS members.
- **All** - Send more feedback or ideas /suggestions for contributions to National Litter Strategy to Julia - General feedback is appreciated and welcomed.

5. Beach Cleans - maximising take up, impact and litter recycling (adjust title to reflect 3 in one) (this was amalgamated)

Proposers: Sam Fanshawe (MCS), Sue Kinsey (MCS) and Harriet Yates-Smith (Litter Free Coast & Sea - Somerset), **Reporter:** Sam Fanshawe (MCS)

Session Attended by: Harriet Yates-Smith, (Litter Free Coast & Sea - Somerset), Simon Preddy (KWT), Tamzin Phillips (NT), Domino Albert (Project AWARE), Clare Cavers (Fidra), Sue Kinsey (MCS), Sam Fanshawe (MCS)

Notes: Setting up a beach clean group:

Noted that there were likely to be some interested beach clean organisers already involved in beach cleans with other organisations, but how do you easily find them?

Suggested:

1. Contacting MCS and NT direct to find names of existing Beachwatch organisers or NT events in the area.
2. Asking car park attendants along the beach to promote initiative.
3. Holding a first meeting of interested people in a café
4. Speaking to local authority for support with equipment and litter collection.
5. Setting a target to have enough groups to clean the whole 7 mile Burnham-on-Sea to Brean coastline.

Maximising impact of beach clean volunteers:

- Noted that for many volunteers they are only interested in doing a beach clean and not getting involved in campaigns or taking follow up actions. Many are not hooked into online communications.
- Need a central point (webpage) where litter campaigns can be signposted - barrier being resources to maintain it.
- Be good to know how many volunteers and beach cleans have taken place every year - collate this information somehow.
- Be good to have a way of logging all beach cleans carried out by the different organisations. MCS Good Beach Guide aims to provide information on activities at beaches, could add something to the site that allows other volunteers and organisations to upload info about upcoming beach cleans.
- Agreed the resources/logistics to try and get volunteers on the beaches to take further campaign action outweighed the likely take up and impact, so best to concentrate on co-ordinating information about beach cleans taking place.

Recycling litter collected from beach cleans:

- Quality of litter collected from beaches is a barrier as much of it is in pieces or covered in sand/algae.
- A feedstock recycling process is being developed which breaks down larger plastics into smaller plastics that can be used as recycled feedstock for fuel.
- Increased provision of recycled stations at beaches would allow at least good quality litter to be recycled at the point of collection.
- Some local authorities might agree to take separated litter and recycle what they can e.g. collect plastic bottles in a clear bin liner.
 - When speaking to the local authority about some solutions, present the proposal in terms of the income to be gained from recycling plastic bottles and alu cans.
 - Add guidance to MCS Beachwatch organiser packs suggesting they call the Local Authority to find out what could be done.

Actions:

- **Harriet** - Contact MCS and NT to find out if there are active beach clean organisers on the Brean - Burnham coast.
 - **Sue Kinsey** - Explore how to upload info about different organisations beach clean events on the Good Beach Guide – **additional notes:** Information would only include date, time and location of beach clean, and organiser contact details - nothing more complicated. Would require organiser to upload information not MCS. – *BW organisers events now show up on GBG*
 - **Sue Kinsey** - Add guidance to beach clean organiser guidance pack about contacting LA about how to recycle plastic bottles and alu cans collected from beach cleans – **additional notes:** be specific that it is probably only practical to recycle whole plastic bottles and alu cans, as other litter is not of good enough quality to be recycled.
-

6. Litter Monitoring Methods in Estuaries

Proposer: Tanya Ferry (PLA) **Reporter:** Kimberly Ferran Holt (Thames Estuary Partnership)

Session Attended by: Harriet Yates-Smith - (Litter Free Coast & Sea), Tamzin Phillips - (NT), Madeline Berg - (Fidra) Tanya Ferry (PLA) and Kimberly Ferran Holt (Thames Estuary Partnership)

Notes:

- Port of London Authority is responsible for safe navigation on the Thames, including river and shoreline activities. This differs considerably from other port authorities who are only responsible for their facilities and port activities.
- In terms of other entities that manage activities on or near shore, one example is the National Trust which has a claim to the land to the high tide. The National Trust has a coastal and marine issues group, with a coastal advisor - Phil Dyke.
- Alternatively The Crown Estate has a claim to the land from high tide towards the body of water.
- PLA has recently recruited an MSc student to work towards establishing a method for monitoring the litter that is currently collected by the Passive Debris Collectors (PDC) which are in use at hot spots of litter accumulation. The methods established will be used by the PLA crew that is responsible for these devices.
- Issues revolve around actively engaging and retaining the crew's interest and commitment to carry out this monitoring in a way that provides regular data that can be incorporated with other litter monitoring in the Thames to determine the source, destination and any negative impacts of litter in the Thames.
- Sources of litter have shifted over the years from industry and fly tipping to land based sources from wind blown & drainage debris and lack of duty of care.

Several suggestions were made to address the issues presented:

- Look into The Create Centre at the Resource Centre in Bristol who did an analysis of types of beach litter for the National Trust and found that 13% of the weight was from sand.
- Lobby for riverside Local Authorities to align event permits, licenses and management with the PLA to include waste management and duty of care on the Thames.
- Contact Radio 4 / Costing the Earth for media engagement and raising awareness of the issue.
- Look into Big Belly Bins that are solar powered and have sensors to indicate when full.

Suggestions for monitoring included:

- Take an average day or some time scale and record debris in PDC, or take a record of debris before & after major events.
 - Student could research archives of the PDC crew vessel to determine number of times a PDC has been emptied or for other useful information.
- Look at ways to incorporate the 2-3mm size range of microplastics that are currently missed by both Thames 21 and PLA.
- And finally a note on bins, they are absent from major venues (the example was Euston Station) due to security concerns. Which is why all the bins are now open hoops with clear plastic bags and in a line of site and not in crowds such as seating areas in food courts.

Actions: **Tanya:** Contact other Port Authorities in estuaries in the UK to see if they have any methods in place.

Kim: Contact other NGO's & academic institutions to see if they have similar issues or methods in place.

All: Request materials and spread information regarding plastic pellets (2-3mm) and refer queries to Madeline Berg with Fidra

7. How do marine focused organisations create behavioural change in the wider public?

Proposer: Ali Murrell **Reporter:** Elle McAll

Session Attended by: *not reported*

Notes: KEY AREAS OF DISCUSSION:

1. EDUCATING YOUNG PEOPLE

We need to collectively influence younger generations; building awareness, innovation and problem solving into the curriculum. Focus should be on inspiring examples and solutions (example: edible beer holders in America), showcasing the art of the possible.

2. KNOWING WHAT MOTIVATES YOUR AUDIENCE

Reach the wider public by tapping into people's passions and priorities, things that have cultural resonance. For example health, families/ children, saving money, love of animals.

3. IMPACT ON PUBLIC

To effectively communicate there's a need to link up the dots, so people are aware of the impact marine litter has on them. Think about benefits to them including incentives, saving money, making people feel good, perception of others.

4. LINKING MARINE LITTER TO LAND LITTER

Need to make more connections between land and marine litter. This could be more storytelling of the journey of litter from land to sea. Should there be more collaboration between inland and coastal campaign groups?

5. IMPORTANCE OF SMALLER WINS

A series of smaller wins needed to achieve progress. Thinking too big and trying to address multiple issues at once can make success more challenging.

6. SIMPLE TARGETED COMMUNICATIONS

Clear communications are vital, people can get easily confused.

7. ROLE OF GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS

Responsible behaviours need to be made easy for people - government and business have an important role in providing supporting infrastructure and policy framework.

Actions: none uploaded, discussion session with useful learning for us all to take on board.

8. Water Code – building on existing work already being taken forward through MLAN

Proposer: Emma Cunningham (MCS) **Reporter:** Natalie Poulter

Session Attended by: Emma Cunningham (MCS), Ian Humphreys (KNIB), Simon Preddy (KWT), Kim Ferran-Holt (TEP), Suzanne Roberts (KSB), Natalie Poulter (Litter free coast and seas), Elisabeth Von De Ohe, Jan MacLennan (NE), Harriet Yates-Smith (Litter Free Coast & Seas Somerset), Tamzin Philips (NT)

Notes: KEY AREAS OF DISCUSSION:

A concept note covering the background and progress to date was provided at the start of this discussion.

Initial feedback was sought from MLAN members towards end of 2014 and a concept note circulated with some simple messages to start with, iteration number two has since been developed taking on board members feedback. Important to note this would not be progressing unless MLAN members thought it was a "goer". Some stumbling blocks were previously encountered including how to incorporate messaging into existing country wide messaging such as "Leave no trace" in NI. We want to produce something that any organisation can use - no logo blocking materials, so a suite of messages that any organisation can adopt and add their logo to. Scotland has a beach safety and water code already so discussion on how this can coordinate existing messaging and not duplicate them was discussed.

Key notes to incorporate as this develops further include: -

Incorporate knowledge people don't know or are not using, e.g. phosphorous in dog food and therefore in dog faeces - linked to causes of algal blooming, poor bathing water quality. –

Unification of existing message (e.g. as per recycling), hosted by Water UK vs. hosted by MLAN/MCS if done through MLAN we think more success in take-up.

Evidencing effectiveness of messaging/campaign - how to evaluate? /suites of campaign messages, switch in and out, monitor views/clicks - keep most popular.

How to get messaging out - embed in curriculum - long range aim, Act as a repository for existing messages -

A gap analysis may also need to be carried out to avoid duplication. Create a toolkit for organisations to endorse and pull out, rather than a panacea. Show the consequences (as we have in iteration no. 2)

Discussion touched on highlighting positive vs. negative imagery but also important to highlight a result of positive behaviour. Incentives discussed - linked to emotion/money, need humour, ideas to re-use old campaigns – wombles.

Actions assigned to Emma –

- The code needs a better name as Water code still sounds like saving water and nothing to do with litter or water quality messaging
- Carry out gap analysis on messages being used and those missing

9. Litter Innovation Award?

Proposer: Carrie Hume (MCS) **Reporter:** Natalie Poulter

Session Attended by: Ian Fraser (MCS), Carrie Hume (MCS), Natalie Poulter (Litter free coast and seas), Christina Dixon (WAP), Kim Ferran-Holt (TEP), Jan Maclennan (NE), Tanya Ferry (PLA) and Suzanne Roberts (KSB).

MCS Director of Conservation and Campaigns Carrie Hume led this session to explore whether, as a sector, we could better recognise the work of our volunteers and supporters, as well as stimulate and reward innovative approaches to combating litter both at source and once in the sea. There was strong support for this idea, since our collective volunteers do sterling work in cleaning up litter, and think of all kinds of ways to make this activity fun and engaging. We need to better reward them, and we don't appear to be doing this as a collective right now. Also, how can we better cultivate and engage the great British entrepreneurial spirit to help combat the growing problem of litter? We are a nation of great ideas and have innovated out of more than one 'fix' in the past - can we better turn that attention on litter? And can we attract businesses to this to financially support and lead the charge? MCS are seeking to explore these ideas further.

Notes: Motivation for the session: is there a way to motivate innovations to either

- Remove litter at source (prevent)
- Do something with the existing "resource" of litter

Recognition may be more motivating in some categories than cash prize

- Tie in with other award schemes: - RYA/RNLI - Other sectors beyond marine sector – **action – which sectors/audiences?**
- Sponsors should lead the way – "gateway business"
- What format? Annual? Categories? Scale?
- Outcomes? – What would the winner be able to access as a result of the prize? To grow/fund their idea further (Example – sea change champion)
- Personality like Richard Branson to sponsor?
 - Or company e.g. Land Rover Bar (already sponsor marina and sailing teams)
- Grants available to get going?
 - Dreamfund (people's postcode lottery) – already considering adding a marine trust
 - Innovation is key
- Reward what's been done and allow to grow/spread/scale up
- Best in show concept – collate regional winners & bring together for award ceremony
- Litter not on NERC's list for funding, need another stream
- Needs to be simple application process – as broadly encompassing as possible so as not to exclude
- Definitely a gap for marine/estuarine awards – lots of green/eco
 - Pride of the ocean in shipping
 - probably research awards

Broadly awarded for contribution (through innovation towards reduction of marine litter)

- good to have something backed by whole of MLAN.
 - Board from network (advisory committee)

Possibility to involve Greenpeace/Friends of the Earth. Port of London Auth: industry is suffering, award would incentivize industry to improve – competitive advantage

Polling group together

- Government (Defra)
- Business
- Communities
- Charities

Actions assigned to Carrie

- Develop categories
 - Research industry awards
 - Existing awards and sectors
 - Engage sponsors
-

10. Can voluntary measures reduce pollution?

Proposer: Dan Steadman (FFI) **Reporter:** Emma Cunningham (MCS)

Session Attended by: Dan Steadman (FFI), Emma Cunningham (MCS), Chiarina Darrah (Eunomia), Madeleine Berg (Fidra), Julia Hunt (Defra), Adrian Whyle (PlasticsEurope) and Helen Jordan (BPF)

Notes:

- Hard to measure how successful voluntary schemes are
- How do we audit and know the solution is working?
- No reason that monitoring and evaluation can't be built into voluntary approaches
- Important to share best practice, we can then see where interventions are working

There are currently a groundswell of voluntary initiatives, for example operation clean sweep (OCS), how is this being audited – could we have a stakeholder workshop to share best practice or use of European auditing agency to evaluate sign up (ISO: 14000)

- How do we reach people not interested in best practice? – if it is enforced or legislated this is where everyone has to comply
- Legislation is not the same as enforcement however
- We need to explore barriers as to why some companies are not signing up to OC
 - Reputation of existing standards?
- In shipping, plastic is defined as a hazard so you have to say if you spill plastic in a factory but you are not obliged to notify and the simple measures in OCC are not compulsory
- We need to look at where the leaks are occurring
 - Is there a blame free reporting mechanism? No information on containers lost at sea for example
- Water company reporting – MARPOL– plastic is hazardous
- Plastics industry are sharing best practice but if we can have a map showing where plants and facilities are we could then see if leakages still occurring
 - System mapping helps to support voluntary measures however issues around competition
- Is there a correlation between uptake and pellet reduction?
 - Demonstration of compliance or effectiveness – business as usual vs OCS conditions
- There is an Algalita study to see if OCS was effective in California which came back inconclusive- legislation was brought in as a result of that report but we don't know if the legislation is working
- In addition, the fulmar study shows pellet reduction – is it proportional
- The government is committed to reduce legislation but public pressure means MP's say let's legislate – we are interested to see what the public think is better – voluntary or legislated?
- Deregulatory agenda
 - Public confusion of the effectiveness of voluntary
 - Gov role in improving voluntary scheme

- Financial contributions/incentivisation (EPR)
- You have to show voluntary effectiveness
- Defra don't have evidence of harm to populations or at ecosystem level, threshold difficulties
 - Human health risk is vague so it's hard for Defra to justify
 - Littering as a changeable concept
 - Everyone has to deal with their 1%
 - We're more motivated by risk of getting caught vs size of penalty

Actions: *discussion with suggestions for future debate*

11. What innovative ideas can we come up with for dealing with ghost gear?

Proposer: Christina Dixon (WAP) **Reporter:** same as proposer

Session Attended by: Julia Hunt (Defra), Adrian Whyte (PlasticsEurope) Gareth Hopkins (H&J), Stuart Jackson (H&J), Dilyana Mihaylova (FFI), Jennifer Lonsdale (EIA)

Notes: Introduced the Global Ghost Gear Initiative (www.ghostgear.org) and discussed some of the innovation already in place for dealing with ghost gear, e.g. end of life net recycling, fishing gear innovation to prevent ghost fishing, recycling nets into skateboards, socks, sunglasses, etc. Re-purposing nets into art work or football goals.

CD gave general overview of how gear is lost (often bad weather, gear conflict, lack of disposal facilities, disincentives for retrieving found gear that isn't yours, snagging on underwater obstacles) and main challenges for recycling or re-purposing old fishing gear; contamination, mixed materials, lack of net recycling capacity within the UK.

Discussed ways lobster pots could be modified to prevent ghost fishing. CD mentioned the project World Animal Protection are involved with in Pembrokeshire (Pembrokeshire Sustainable Shellfish Initiative: <http://www.wwsfa.org.uk/blog/pembrokeshire-sustainable-shellfish-pilot-initiative/>) to modify pots and see how quickly hatches can be re-opened if a pot is lost. AW suggested trialing wool tie for closing the pots if plastic was too durable. JH mentioned a corroding wire, linked to some research undertaken by Cefas.

Question: Would fully biodegradable gear actually promote dumping? What do we mean by biodegradable gear? Could it actually be *more* problematic for the marine environment?

AW mentioned Horizon 20/20 as possible route for contacts for progressing recycling projects

JH told group about Cefas Technology Limited – the research arm of Cefas – suggested they might have data or have trialed things that could inform some of these ideas

Group discussed if we could think more widely about what innovation means, e.g. innovation for prevention of gear loss; e.g. forecasting and alerts to fishermen to gather static gear if severe weather is coming, or innovations around spatial management to prevent gear conflict (CD told the group about the Fishackathon and how the GGGI hoped to trial the tech innovations developed by coders at the 2016 event. More info on the Fishackathon here; fishackathon.co)

Talked about gear marking and recent work at FAO on this issue – how can gear be marked to aid recovery and return to fishermen.

When discussing problem of separation for recycling, AW asked whether nets could be colour coded according to their material so it would be easier to separate and sort for recycling.

What about industry incentives, e.g. deposit return schemes for certain gear types or discounts when old gear is handed in for recycling

Actions:

- CD to follow up with AW about contacts at Horizon 20/20 re; Scottish recycling project by 3rd June
- All - Group to share any contacts or links regarding creative hack groups or potential partners with CD - We discussed hack spaces and alternative ways to generate innovation, new designs, and new approaches. Stuart said he was going to think about a hack collective he'd heard about recently but couldn't remember the name of
- CD to follow up with AW about other plastics contacts who might be able to offer expertise or contacts for this piece of work by 3rd June
- CD to follow up with JH about the litter strategy and how fishing litter could be incorporated by 6th June.

----- **session report notes ends** -----

Appendix 1 MLAN 2016 Workshop Evaluation

Evaluation responses from MLAN workshop 26th May 2016, The Old Library, Custard Factory, Birmingham.

26 respondents

Figures in table represented as percentages

Questions	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	
Q1: The pre workshop organisation and communication was appropriate and helpful			0	4	92	4	100
Q2: The advance papers for today were appropriate and helpful			0	36	64	0	100
Q3: The workshop venue and catering were of an adequate standard and suitable for the purpose			0	58	42	0	100
Q4: The workshop aim was achieved – “Build the best possible platform and momentum to continue working together to reduce marine litter”			4	38	58	0	100
Q5: The format was appropriate, allowed me to contribute and to collaborate with others			0	19	81		100
Q6: The facilitation today was independent, professional and effective			0	12	88		100
Q7: I am confident that MLAN will continue to make a positive difference			0	27	73	0	100
Q8: I am likely to work with others to address marine litter issues as a result of today			4	15	73	8	100
Q9: Overall I am satisfied with the workshop				15	85		100

Appendix 2 MLAN Reporting Template

Title of meeting

To: Emma Cunningham, MLAN Coordinator (email - Emma.Cunningham@mcsuk.org)

Meeting Date/Time: Monday August 1st; 1430-1730

Initiator/Main Contact Person

Attendees: 10

List Attendees (name, job title, organisation)

Executive Overview: *The purpose of this meeting was to XXXX . We need to address this issue because XXXX., We discussed and agreed the following actions in preparation for XXXX:*

Actions and Decisions Arising:

Action / Decision	Who?	By when?	Notes

Next Meeting:

Date/Location