

2 Arch Grove
Long Ashton
Somerset
BS41 9BW
4th October 2015

Dear [REDACTED]

IPSO Reference 04989-15

Thank you for your letter of 30th September, and for the continued progress towards a resolution of this complaint.

Again following the numbering used in previous correspondence:

8. I note the quote from the Guardian that you provided, but fail to see its relevance.
 - I have told you exactly what the Waste Strategy 2007 said regarding separate food waste collections; and since these are the policies announced by Mr Miliband, the only relevant consideration is whether Mr Littlejohn's summary of them is accurate.
 - Whether Mr Littlejohn adequately summarises what the Guardian said about what Mr Miliband announced is of no relevance – but even against this standard, the article would be found wanting.
 - The sentence you quoted from in fact reads "Mr Miliband also *suggested* that people *could* collect food waste separately so that councils could harness the gases from its decomposition." This is a reasonable summary of the generally supportive but non-committal stance taken in the waste strategy regarding the separate collection of food waste.
 - The Waste Strategy observed that there were good environmental arguments for separate food waste collections, but made no specific recommendations regarding their implementation, and clearly asserted that the design of waste collection systems was a matter for local authorities.
 - Neither the quote from the Guardian nor the Waste Strategy states that Mr Miliband "proposed that every household should buy a 'kitchen caddy' for food waste". Nor did he propose that every household should "have" a kitchen caddy – which many by that time already did.

I therefore maintain that the best solution would be to delete the section from "It reached its nadir" to "eat the leftovers" in order to remove this inaccurate statement.

9. I am grateful for the offer of an amendment. However, I reject the view that much of the relevant section is comment.

- I highlighted in my original letter of 13th August eight points of factual error. Your proposed amendment perhaps addresses three of them – the rest remain outstanding.
- I can think of no way to remedy the text while preserving anything of substance.

I therefore maintain that the only reasonable solution is to delete the section from “This lunacy...” through to “...emptied daily” and replace it with something along the lines of “The drive to modernise waste legislation began with the 1975 Waste Framework Directive, the goal of which was to reduce the amount of material ending up in landfill.”

10. I am grateful for your suggested amendment. It is far from ideal in giving a sense of what happened (Mr Pickles’ fund had a number of aims and was taken up by a large number of authorities, but none of the bids that progressed involved restoring weekly collections). However, as a gesture of good will I am prepared to accept the proposed wording.

I do hope we will be able to conclude this matter on the basis that I suggest.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'PRH Jones', written in a cursive style.

Peter Jones