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This submission is on behalf of the Northern Territory seniors approximately 35% of the voters.

We note the large amount work undertaken and the details provided. Not commenting on the individual statements, except for the four questions, and highlighting matters that may have been overlooked regarding Northern Australia.

1. Do you agree with the packaging resource recovery and litter management problems identified above?
	1. Yes, should be further expanded to all types of litter such as;
		1. Litter that may be a serious hazard during cyclones in Northern Australia. Building sites, material collected around building, sheds, industrial sites.
		2. Cigarette butts, confectionary wrappers, newspapers, obsolete signs, dumped vehicles, etc
	2. So an overall guidelines are adopted and communicated
	3. Health issues;
		1. Indigenous (over 30% Northern Territory population) do not have good understanding in cleaning used container for recycling through cultural and lack of water.
		2. High humidity encourages fly breeding in containers held for recycling, thus increase in diseases.
		3. Children raiding rubbish bins likely to encounter used syringes
		4. Water in used stored containers is breeding mosquito which could result in tropical diseases such as; dengue fever.
2. Are there any problems with packaging resource recovery and litter management that have not been identified in Chapter 3?
	1. The increase from 39% to 63% in seven years is an outstanding effort, noting Kerbside recycling as a major contributor. Should there be more emphasis in expanding and improving this service.
	2. Understanding that most dry regional/remote communities there are congregation areas on the fringe of declared area. Consideration needs to be given in ways to incorporate recycling facilities for the large collection of used containers in these areas.
	3. To some degree the recycling campaign is “back to front” create a demand for recycle materials and price and demand will increase.
		1. Not once have we seen tenders for product must be made from recycle material.
		2. Cannot remember any research grants in the development of new/existing products using recycle materials.
	4. Need for improved recycling facilities such as handling, storage and recognition in units, and senior villages.
3. What impacts do fragmented and inconsistent frameworks for packaging resource recovery and litter management have on your business? What are the scale and scope of these impacts?
	1. Restricts local manufacturing as any state/territory deposit/tax is wholly borne by the local manufacturer whereas an interstate/overseas manufacturer spreads the cost across total sales those that incur the deposit/tax and those that do not. Example;
		1. Northern Territory manufacturer pays 10 cents deposit/tax plus approximately 8 cents admin fee.
		2. NSW/Victorian manufacturer supplying Australia incurs the 18 cents on approximately 6% of their total sales thus 1.08 cents/unit
		3. Thus there is an advantage for independent local manufacturers if it is an Australasian system.
	2. All except Parmalet (they have reduced local manufacturing) Northern Territory bottlers have ceased manufacturing operation.
	3. Significant number of people move from one state/territory to another, for work, family and holidays, different requirements is not only confusing it does not encourage recycling.
4. Would inconsistent state-based CDSs impose a cost on your business? How significant would this cost be?
	1. As noted above all Northern Territory bottlers have ceased operation.
	2. Significant portion of potential recycle packaging is imported into Northern Australia;
		1. For a relative small market, the supplies are not interested in changing labelling, thus customer choice is reduced and some importers will suffer.
		2. How will charges be enforced, thus imported product will operate at an advantage.
	3. Darwin survey “Is the Cash for Can scheme a failure” 52% Yes, 48 % No.
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