

JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY
REVIEW PROGRAMME AND CRITERIA
WDA/08/09

Recommendation

That:

1. Members note and agree the proposed funded programme of projects for the strategy review: and
2. Members note and agree the proposed evaluation criteria for appraisal of tender returns within the review process.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY
REVIEW PROGRAMME AND CRITERIA
WDA/08/09

Report of the Director

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To advise and seek Members agreement on the scope of the budgeted review programme for the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS); and
- 1.2 To seek Members agreement of the criteria to assess tender returns in procuring services as part of the JMWMS review.

2. Background

- 2.1 MWDA commissioned a Scoping Study in Autumn 2008 for the Review of the JMWMS in line with DEFRA guidance and the requirements of the Waste Emissions Trading Act 2003. (Report WDA 71/08)
- 2.2 Members noted the findings and indicative costs in the Scoping Report and the costs were reviewed and options reported back to Members as part of the budget setting process. Members agreed the revised Strategy Review budget as part of the Authority's Revenue Budget (Report WDA 04/09) and £195,500 was allocated to the Strategy review for 2009/10 with a further £50,000 identified in the forecast Budget for 2010/11.
- 2.3 Members were advised that a tender procurement process would be undertaken using appropriate evaluation criteria for appraisal of submitted tenders. (Report WDA 71/08).

3. Current Position

- 3.1 The revised budget allocation has been set against core elements of the Review to develop an Integrated Merseyside and Halton Strategy. The work programme has also been evaluated with partner authorities and the Senior Officer Working Group to agree the range of activities required and those elements which would be led and funded by the Waste Collection Authorities. A package of work programmes has been developed (Appendix 1) based on the core elements of the Scoping Review which was developed in line with the Practice Guide for the Development of

Municipal Waste Management Strategies (DEFRA 2005). The key elements for the work programme are:

2009-10 ACTIVITY	PROCUREMENT	MWDA BUDGET
Engagement, Consultation and Comms:		
Develop engagement and consultation strategies;	3 Quotes	£19,000
Develop and implement communications strategy;	Tender	£61,500
Implement engagement and consultation with Members and stakeholders.	Tender	£75,000
Sustainability :		
Sustainability Appraisal incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment and Health Impact Assessment;	Tender	£30,000
Life Cycle Analysis	3 Quotes	£10,000
Co-ordination, Monitoring and Evaluation:		
Project Management and Document Development;	Partners	In kind
Develop monitoring and evaluation strategy	Partners	In Kind
Waste Collection Activities:		
District Council Action Plans Review;	Partners	0
Issues and Opportunities Workshops	Partners	In kind
TOTAL COST		£195,500

3.2 Detailed project specifications will be drawn up to invite tenders as specified in Appendix 1 and a set of proposed value for money criteria for evaluation of submitted tenders is attached (Appendix 2). The scoring

criteria weight the scoring 70% to quality and 30% to price in line with the Authority's previous procurements of technical advisors.

4. Risk Implications

Description of Risk	Likelihood (1=Low 4=High)	Impact (1=Low 4=High)	Preventative Action
Failure to review JMWMS will lead to all partners decision making taken against the background of a partially obsolete document which does not reflect current regional and National policy.	1	4	Completion of JMWMS review .
Lack of certainty on development of an Integrated Strategy with Halton and the impact on resources and timetable if Halton decide to develop their own strategy.	2	4	Ensure a decision is made on Halton's agreement to an integrated strategy before commencement of the review. If Halton decide to develop their own strategy, identify opportunities for joint working and tenders.
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 requirements by partners not committed.	2	4	Manage costs and resources efficiently. Gain Member and LA support and commitments through District and SOWG work plan and Project Initiation processes to help keep cost and resource pressures down.
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 review process by members and officers across the Partnership so Waste Strategy Review not seen as a priority.	1	4	Raise awareness of the 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 There are no HR implications associated with this report.

6. Environmental Implications

6.1 A key element of the work programme will be the Sustainability Appraisal incorporating a full Strategic Environmental Assessment and Health Impact Assessment to help ensure positive environmental outcomes from the sustainable management of waste on Merseyside in the future. This will include carbon and natural resource savings, sustainable procurement and impacts on human health of collection, treatment and disposal options.

The outputs from these studies will inform the wider stakeholder and member engagement and the public consultation.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 The expenditure allocated to the review was agreed as part of the Authority's Revenue Budget. Should Halton decide to progress with a separate but aligned strategy there is still likely to be work to be completed by the full Partnership to develop efficiency opportunities and further joint working.

8. Conclusion

- 8.1 In line with the agreed budget for the review of JMWMS, a series of work programme packages and processes have been developed which are considered appropriate by the Senior Officers from the Partner Authorities. These packages are consistent with the scope and review process established in the Scoping Report previously submitted to members.
- 8.2 Key elements which will be put out for tender include the Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating the Strategic Environmental Assessment) and the communications and engagement packages. It is recommended that Members agree the package of measures and the associated evaluation criteria.
- 8.3 Other elements of the work programme will be undertaken through existing resources within the Partnership but the key aim will be that there will be an agreed focus on the future development of waste management on Merseyside and Halton and to have considered options to improve outcomes by the Waste Partnership.

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.