

JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY REVIEW
WDA/71/08

Recommendation

That:

1. Members note the findings and the indicative costs in the Scoping Report for the Review of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Merseyside (2009-11).
2. To seek Members approval for the inclusion of £341,500 in the proposed Revenue Budget (2009/10) for the first year of the review and note the requirement for a further £127,500 (in 2010/11) to complete the review.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY REVIEW
WDA/71/08

Report of the Director

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To advise Members on the findings of the Scoping Exercise Report into the Review of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS)
- 1.2 To seek Members agreement to commence the full review of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy during 2009-2011 based on the timetable and costings of the Scoping Exercise Report.

2. Background

- 2.1 MWDA and the Merseyside Waste Collection Authorities are required by law (Waste Emissions Trading Act 2003) to produce a joint strategy for the management of municipal waste. The JMWMS for Merseyside was published in 2005 and included a commitment to a full review after five years.
- 2.2 The JMWMS 2008 was updated in 2007/8 and approved by Members on 1st February 2008 (Report WDA/04/08). The Strategy was published on 17th November following ratification by all Districts. The Update retained the aims, objectives and key targets of the 2005 Strategy approved by Members but brings it into line with current data, levels of performance and new legislation. The 2008 Strategy reconfirmed the original Strategy intent to conduct a full review of the Strategy by 2010.
- 2.3 There have been significant legislative changes since the original Strategy was written which the review will need to consider. The Waste Strategy for England 2007 was published; the EU Waste Framework Directive was agreed in autumn 2008; landfill taxes will continue to rise beyond 2010 and challenging targets for carbon reduction have been introduced for 2050.

- 2.4 Halton has a separate but aligned Waste Management Strategy which was ratified in 2008. The review of the JMWMS for Merseyside could provide the opportunity to produce a joint strategy for Merseyside and Halton.

3. Current position.

- 3.1 MWDA commissioned a Scoping Study in autumn 2008 for the Review of the JMWMS in line with DEFRA guidance. Three quotes were sought from BeEnvironmental, Enviros and Gordon Mackie Associates based on a project specification. The proposals were evaluated and BeEnvironmental were awarded the scoping project at a cost of £9,100.
- 3.2 Key challenges identified by the Scoping Report to be covered in any review of the JMWMS (See Appendix 1) include:
- 3.2.1 Options for integration of the Merseyside and Halton strategies;
 - 3.2.2 Legislation and Policy including the EU Waste Framework Directive;
 - 3.2.3 Climate Change;
 - 3.2.4 Sustainable Consumption, Production and Procurement;
 - 3.2.5 Recycling and Waste Prevention and changes in the household waste stream including issues on kitchen waste;
 - 3.2.6 The need to undertake a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (legal requirement);
 - 3.2.7 Communications and extensive public consultation on the revised aims and objectives as well as the Strategic Environmental Assessment;
 - 3.2.8 Planning risks;
 - 3.2.9 Governance opportunities; and
 - 3.2.10 Monitoring and Evaluation.
- 3.3 The Scoping Report has identified the estimated costs for the core and additional elements of the Review up to March 2011. The breakdown of costs covers an integrated Merseyside and Halton Strategy and separate costs for Halton to undertake their own Strategy review. Halton MBC has

indicated that a view on a joint strategy will be made by the end of 2008 and prior to our Authority's budget setting meeting.

- 3.4 The costings identified in the Scoping Report are expected to be the maximum required to undertake the Strategy Review. There will be a further evaluation with partner authorities for the need of the range of additional activities listing in the scope before a project specification is finalised by the end of February. A tender procurement process will be undertaken in March/ April 2009 using appropriate evaluation criteria for appraisal of the submitted tenders and a further report will be submitted to the Authority at that time. These processes should help to reduce overall costs and ensure Best Value.

4. Risk Implications

Description of Risk	Likelihood (1=Low 4=High)	Impact (1=Low 4=High)	Preventative Action
Lack of project management overseeing the review and failure to keep within approved budgets and agreed timescales.	2	4	Ensure project management systems and plan in place overseen by senior level project steering group.
Delay by any of the partner authorities in agreeing elements of the revised strategy and ultimately failing to ratify the Strategy.	2	4	Ensure appropriate member and officer engagement, communications and consultation processes in place. Flexibility in timescales to allow some further engagement on any outstanding issues.
Financial and resource requirement by MWDA and partner authorities not committed.	2	4	Gain Directors/Members/LA support and commitments through budget, service plan and Project Initiation processes.
Insufficient consultation with Public	2	4	Ensure appropriate time and staff resources for consultation with public and to evaluate responses and handling media enquiries.
Lack of commitment to the	1	4	Raise awareness of the

review process by members and officers across the Partnership so Waste Strategy Review not seen as a priority.			project and its significance ahead of requests for support and ensure high level backing.
Lack of consideration of the impact on other waste management activities during the Strategy review e.g. Waste Local Development Document Examination in Public; planning applications and procurement.	1	3	Ensure regular communications with other teams working on these projects and set timetable for Strategy Review to avoid conflicts and confusion in other waste management consultations with stakeholders.

5. HR Implications

- 5.1 The Authority will be working alongside the other six members of the Merseyside and Halton Waste Partnership and therefore must ensure that adherence is given to all relevant employee legislation.

6. Environmental Implications

- 6.1 There are no environmental implications in conducting the review of the JMWMS. Any consultants appointed will be required to abide by the Authority's sustainability policies.
- 6.2 The review of the strategy will be subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment with the aim of ensuring positive environmental outcomes from the sustainable management of waste on Merseyside in the future including carbon and natural resource savings and sustainable procurement.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 Appendix 2 maps the costs of the Strategy Review against the two year timeline of activities. The Scoping Report estimated the average consultancy costs for the Review as £469,000 over two years for an Integrated Strategy and £409,000 for a Merseyside only review. The budget requirements for 2009/10 will be £341,500 for an Integrated Strategy or £292,000 for a Merseyside only review.

- 7.2 Expenditure of the order of £469,000 requires a saving of 6700 tonnes of waste if it is to pay for itself. As the expenditure is a one off in nature, whereas the tonnage saving is continual the budget could prove to be an “investment to save” project over several years.”
- 7.3 It is recommended that the Authority agree to the £469,000 costs for an Integrated Strategy for Merseyside and Halton. If Halton decide they want to progress with a separate but aligned strategy then the budget will be reduced accordingly to the cost of £ 394,500 identified in the Scoping Report plus design and publication costs of £15,000.

8. Conclusion

- 8.1 The JMWMS published in 2005 and 2008 committed the Waste Partnership to a review of the Strategy after five years.
- 8.2 The budget and resources for the Review will be spread over two years. Key elements in the budget requirements is the statutory requirement for a Strategic Environmental Assessment and the need to conduct an extensive public consultation on new and revised aims and objectives to deliver sustainable waste management on Merseyside and Halton.
- 8.3 A decision needs to be made by Halton whether it agrees to the development of a Joint Strategy or continue with a review of two aligned Strategies. It is recommended that Members agree a budget and review process for an Integrated Strategy until Halton have reached a decision.
- 8.4 A full review of the Strategy will ensure that the Merseyside Authorities maintain an agreed focus on the future development of waste management on Merseyside and Halton, will have considered options to improve outcomes by the Waste Partnership and address longer term issues such as carbon management and the impact of climate change.

The contact officer for this report is: Stuart Donaldson.
6th Floor, North House, 17 North John Street, Liverpool, L2 5QY
Email: stuart.donaldson@merseysidewda.gov.uk
Tel: 0151 255 2570
Fax: 0151 227 1848

The background documents to this report are open to inspection in accordance with Section 100D of The Local Government Act 1972 –

1. Scoping Report on Review of Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

