

Report of the Scoping Exercise for the  
Review of the Joint Municipal Waste  
Management Strategy for Merseyside

## Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Aims and Objectives	1
2.1	Aim	1
2.2	Objectives	1
3.0	Methodology	2
4.0	Key Challenges to be Addressed in the JMWMS Review Process	3
4.1	Integrating the JMWMS and Halton's MWMS	3
4.2	Legislation and Policy	3
4.2.1	European	3
4.2.2	National	5
4.2.3	Regional	7
4.2.4	Sub Regional	7
4.2.5	Local	8
4.3	Climate Change	10
4.4	Sustainable Consumption, Production and Procurement	11
4.5	Recycling and Composting	12
4.5.1	Changes in the household waste stream	12
4.5.2	Food waste	12
4.5.3	Household waste recycling centres	13
4.6	Collection Systems	13
4.7	Landfilling of Residual Waste	14
4.8	Procurement and Planning	15
4.8.1	Procurement and the SEA	15
4.8.2	Planning risks	15
4.9	Governance	16
4.9.1	Governance Opportunities	16
4.9.2	The Levy	17
4.10	Monitoring and Evaluation	17
4.11	Communications	18
4.12	Consultation	19
5.0	Potential Risks to the JMWMS Review	20
6.0	Summary of Recommendations for Strategy Review Activities	21
7.0	Timescales and Resource Implications	22
7.1	Estimated Consultancy Costs of JMWMS Review	27
Appendix 1	Documents reviewed during the scoping exercise	30

## 1.0 Introduction

The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) for Merseyside was originally published in 2005 and updated in 2007/08 to bring it into line with subsequent changes in legislation, policy and performance. The JMWMS 2008 retains the original aims and objectives but new commitments have been added in light of recent developments and good practices.

The JMWMS 2008 commits the Merseyside Waste Partnership (MWP) to a full review in 2009/10 because the aims and objectives will have been in place for five years. This review will require consideration of all aspects of the Strategy including key targets and direction. It will, therefore, necessitate a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Halton Borough Council, a unitary authority with responsibilities for both collection and disposal, joined the MWP in 2006. Halton has a separate MWMS that was also updated in 2007/08 and is aligned to the JMWMS.

The review of the JMWMS provides the opportunity for even greater alignment, especially if Halton's MWMS could be fully integrated within the JMWMS. An integrated strategy would strengthen the MWP whereas two separate but aligned strategies could inhibit progress towards the sustainable management of waste throughout Merseyside and Halton with implications for the procurement. In addition reviewing 2 separate strategies could have implications in terms of costs and resources, especially for Halton Borough Council, with these likely to significantly increase if the strategies are reviewed separately.

The MWP considers that the review of the JMWMS will be a complex piece of work and contracted BeEnvironmental to carry out a scoping exercise to inform the development of the specification for the tender that is due to be let in April 2009.

The Scoping Exercise commenced on the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2008 and concluded on the 31<sup>st</sup> October 2008.

## 2.0 Aims and Objectives

### 2.1 Aim

The project aim is to:

Develop a Scoping Report for the review of the JMWMS for Merseyside in line with Defra guidance, which will form the basis for the future tender specification.

### 2.2 Objectives

SMART objectives were developed to support the achievement of the aim and agreed at the Project Inception Meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2008. The project objectives are to:

- develop an outline framework by the 22<sup>nd</sup> September within which to analyse data and information relating to where the MWP need to be by 2020 for the sustainable management of waste;
- finalise analytical framework by the 2<sup>nd</sup> October;
- gather, and review relevant data and information by the end of September;

- analyse data and information relating to where the MWP need to be by 2020 by the 3<sup>rd</sup> October;
- establish a baseline of where the MWP are currently at and carry out a gap analysis of information that will be required to plan effectively for the future by the 10<sup>th</sup> October;
- prepare and deliver a presentation of the findings, recommendations and outstanding issues of the scoping exercise to a meeting of the Senior Officers Working Group (SOWG) by the 16<sup>th</sup> October;
- prepare and submit a draft report to the Waste Strategy Manager by the 20<sup>th</sup> October;
- receive comments from SOWG by the 27<sup>th</sup> October; and
- amend draft report on receipt of comments from SOWG and submit final report by the 31<sup>st</sup> October.

### **3.0 Methodology**

Prior to the start of the Scoping Exercise the consultants recognised that the complex nature of the work would lead to the generation of significant amounts of data and information that would need to be reviewed in order to establish how and to what extent they impacted upon the JMWMS review process. An analytical framework was developed to assist the review process. This was developed as a tool to assist the consultants' understanding, therefore, it is not included within the report but is available as an additional resource. The development of the analytical framework involved the identification of the areas of key challenges to the MWP up to and beyond 2020 in relation to where the Partnership needed to be with regard to various targets and developments in areas such as legislation and policy, economic activity, population growth etc.

The main areas of challenge were identified and agreed with the Project Steering Group. They included:

- Legislation and Policy;
- Climate Change;
- Sustainable Consumption and Production;
- Procurement;
- Planning and Technologies;
- Governance;
- Monitoring and Evaluation;
- Communications;
- Consultations; and
- Resources and Capacity.

The analytical framework was populated with data and information obtained from documentary evidence including research papers, reports and minutes of meetings; face-to-face interviews and telephone interviews. This facilitated the identification of specific challenges and opportunities for the MWP that could be compared against a baseline of where the Partnership is currently in terms of the management of waste and gaps relating to the strategy review process identified. It also served to reveal overlaps and inter-relationships between the different challenges.

## 4.0 Key Challenges to be Addressed in the JMWMS Review Process

### 4.1 Integrating the JMWMS and Halton's MWMS

Halton Borough Council has its own MWMS which was updated at the same time as the JMWMS and aligned to it. For the planned review it will be necessary for a decision to be made regarding whether the two strategies should be integrated.

A meeting was held with Senior Officers of Halton Borough Council as part of the scoping exercise. Four options were identified.

- Fully integrated joint strategy with joint governance. The JMWMS and Halton MWMS would be merged into one strategy during the review process and options for joint governance (Waste Board, JWA) would be explored.
- Fully integrated joint strategy without joint governance. The JMWMS and Halton MWMS would be merged into one strategy during the review process but Halton would retain independent governance. This would still allow for exploration of governance between MWDA and any of the other Districts, or between the Districts.
- Two separate aligned strategies with joint governance. The JMWMS and Halton MWMS would be reviewed as separate strategies but aligned to each other throughout the process and options for joint governance (Waste Board, JWA) would be explored.
- Two separate aligned strategies without joint governance. The JMWMS and Halton MWMS would be reviewed as separate strategies but aligned to each other throughout the process but Halton would retain independent governance. This would still allow for exploration of governance between MWDA and any of the Districts, or between the Districts.

It was agreed that Halton would reduce these options to two in the near future with a final decision to be given no later than the beginning of February 2009 so that the tender specification could be developed by MWDA.

### 4.2 Legislation and Policy

Legislation and policy are, and will continue to be, key drivers in how waste is managed. During the updating process of the JMWMS and Halton's MWMS the legislation and policy sections of the Strategies were updated so that full account was taken of the implications of any changes since the publication of the original Strategies. However, changes and ongoing developments in legislation and policy at a European, national, regional, sub-regional and local level will need to be reviewed because the implications for the implementation of the future strategy/ies could be far-reaching.

#### 4.2.1 European

At a European level a review of the Waste Framework Directive has resulted in some revisions. A number of key changes are likely to have implications for the MWP in the future.

Firstly, much greater emphasis is placed upon reducing waste arisings. Hence, waste prevention is prioritised and it is likely that in 2014 consideration will be given to the

setting of waste prevention targets. If this happens it is likely that the responsibility for achieving increased levels of waste prevention will be passed on to local authorities and targets set similar to the recycling targets that were introduced previously.

The Audit Commission's Performance Detailed Report of the audit carried out on the MWDA's waste management activities referred to waste minimisation. The Report noted that although household waste arisings had reduced they were still high at 748,855 tonnes in 2007/08 equating to 549.7kg per head of population (this includes waste collected by the waste collection authorities and that delivered to the HWRCs operated by the MWDA). Municipal waste arisings have continued to increase, rising from 842,060 tonnes in 2005/06 to 856,399 tonnes in 2006/07.

In Halton, household waste increased from 66,268 tonnes in 2005/06 to 67,285 tonnes in 2007/08.

Defra waste statistics for 2006/07 place Halton and Merseyside above the national average 441.3 kg per head of population. In 2006/07 Merseyside and Halton waste arisings were 561.7kg and 555.6kg per head of population respectively.

Although the Audit Commission's report acknowledges the waste prevention actions and targets identified in the Waste Prevention Strategy (WPS) the Auditors are critical about the failure to address the main sources and largest components of the household waste stream such as paper and card. Also, not all the activities identified are provided consistently across all the districts and are not co-ordinated as well as they could be.

Secondly, in revisions to the Waste Framework Directive a proposal for setting targets for the recycling of manufacturing and industrial wastes was dropped but there is an increased focus on reducing the disposal of non-municipal wastes.

It is possible, therefore, that within the lifespan of the future JMWMS, that local authorities will be asked to take greater responsibilities for influencing the management of wastes other than municipal wastes. This will involve the development of strategies and action plans for establishing closer links with business and industry throughout the Partnership area.

Potentially, the resource implications could be significant. The North West is the third largest producer of commercial and industrial waste in England but is the second lowest for recycling and reuse.

Plans for the Liverpool City Region must also be taken into account. For example, regeneration activities will result in increases in construction and demolition waste and these have been specifically targeted in the Directive. By 2020, non-hazardous construction and demolition waste must be reused, recycled and recovered to a minimum 70% by weight.

The Waste Framework Directive is also much more prescriptive about recyclable materials that should be recovered from households. By 2020 a minimum of 50% by weight of waste paper, metal, plastic and glass must be recovered from households in preparation for reuse and recycling.

The revised Directive was adopted without discussion on the 20<sup>th</sup> October 2008, however, Article 11, paragraph 2(a) remains controversial. The UK Government has issued a statement confirming that the UK will consider the 50% goal to, “apply to the totality of household waste the requirement to increase, by 2020, to a minimum of overall 50% by weight, the preparing for reuse and the recycling of waste materials from households and, possibly, similar waste streams.

“The four waste streams specified in paragraph 2(a) of Article 11 (i.e. paper, metal, plastic and glass) would be included in that overall target where they originate from households but the 50% target would not apply individually to each of the specified wastes.”

Therefore, according to the UK Government, the 50% target refers all materials recycled and composted, including garden and food wastes.

The Government statement also refers to the collection systems to be used. Separate collection of wastes will be encouraged where this is technically, environmentally and economically practicable but the co-mingled collection of paper, metal, plastic, glass and other recyclable materials will continue where this is the most effective means of increasing recycling rates.

Currently there are differences in the types of recyclable materials collected by the waste collection authorities in the Partnership. Of those identified in the Directive, paper, glass and cans are the only materials commonly collected across all the districts.

#### **Implications and Recommendations for the JMWMS Review**

1. The WPS will need to be updated and the reduction of larger fractions of the household waste stream such as paper and card entering the waste stream will need to be addressed.
2. Opportunities for developing links with businesses and industry will need to be explored to establish how the Partnership could influence increases in non-municipal waste reuse and recycling. An appraisal of good practices in other parts of the UK would serve to inform decisions about future actions.
3. The District Council Action Plans (DCAPs) will need to be revised to ensure alignment with the WPS and consistency in provision of waste prevention activities.
4. The types of materials collected from households will need to be reviewed and the JMWMS will need to address how consistency can be achieved in relation to the types of materials collected for reuse and recycling, the quality and quantity of those materials.

#### **4.2.2 National**

At a national level climate change and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is high on the political agenda and is likely to remain so up to and beyond 2020. Because of the importance of this challenge and its implications for the management of waste it is dealt with in a separate section of this report (see Section 4.3).

The recycling and composting targets referred to in the JMWMS 2008 do not align with national targets. Also, the regional recycling target in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for 2020 is greater than the national target.

*Table1: Recycling and Composting Targets*

	2010	2015	2020
MWP pooled targets (Municipal waste)	33%	38%	44%
National targets (Household waste)	40%	45%	50%
Regional (Household waste)	40%	45%	55%

Current forecasts indicate that, on current performance, the Partnership will not achieve any of these recycling targets. It is anticipated that on current performance the recycling rate will be 37% by 2020.

Modelling of different options will be required to establish what will be achievable in the future. The modelling will need to take account of both the materials collected by the waste collection authorities and those collected through the HWRCs.

Decisions based upon the modelling will need to be made about what the future targets will be and whether they will be set to be easily achievable in the future or be aspirational.

As more materials are recovered from the household waste stream and if waste arisings can be stabilised or reduced the recycling rate should continue to rise. However, once the capture of the larger recyclable fractions such as garden waste and paper are maximised it will become harder to push up the recycling rate even by a few points. It may become necessary to consider the introduction of incentive schemes and enforcement activities.

New legislation under the Climate Change Bill will, for the first time, allow five local authorities in England to trial specific charge-and-rebate schemes whereby those householders who throw away least waste will be given a rebate. Defra is currently consulting on, "Waste Incentive Pilot Schemes: draft recycling service guidance". Depending upon the outcome of the consultation exercise and the findings of future trial schemes, charge-and-rebate schemes may become common practice by 2020.

Regardless of the quality of recycling schemes provided to householders there will always be a small proportion that will not recycle for a variety of reasons. Ultimately enforcement schemes may need to be considered by the MWP.

Some local authorities are now using the powers available to them under S46 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to issue fixed penalty notices for a failure to recycle and/or for contaminating recycling containers. Other authorities may take less stringent measures but may try to enforce recycling through non-collection of contaminated containers, closed lid, no side waste policies for residual waste and/or restricting the size of containers for residual waste.

Restricting the waste accepted at HWRCs has also become a focus of attention with permits being required in some areas for the depositing of non-household waste.

### **Implications and Recommendations for the JMWMS Review**

1. Carry out modelling to inform decisions about future recycling/composting targets. Any future modelling will need to ensure that full account is taken of the current approach used in procurement.
2. Monitor findings of Defra consultation on charge-and-rebate schemes and findings of trial schemes.
3. Review other incentive schemes in operation and evaluate opportunities for the introduction of a "basket" of schemes from which Partner authorities can "pick-and-mix".
4. Review and evaluate the effectiveness of different enforcement schemes and their relevance across the Partnership or within different areas within Merseyside.

#### **4.2.3 Regional**

The RSS was recently reviewed and a revised Strategy adopted in September 2008. In addition to recycling targets other targets have been established that relate to waste management activities. These include:

- a target of zero waste growth by 2014;
- value is to be recovered from 53% of MSW by 2010; 67% by 2015; 75% by 2020;
- 35% of commercial and industrial waste is to be recycled by 2020; and
- value is to be recovered from at least 70% of commercial and industrial waste by 2020.

Integration of the RSS with other regional strategies is currently ongoing so that ultimately there will be a single Integrated Regional Strategy (IRS). As part of that process the Regional Intelligence Unit (RIU) has commissioned several evidence papers to inform the focus and the content of the IRS. Most, if not all, will have implications for the management of waste and the JMWMS. For example, the IRS will establish the baseline on which predicted waste arisings will be forecast and where waste management facilities will need to be located.

#### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. Review relevant reports (such as Issues and Options) generated by the RIU and evaluate implications for the JMWMS in relation to forecasting future waste arisings, reducing waste growth and siting of waste management facilities. In addition consider the implications of the Broad Locations study, which is helping to inform future IRS policy and is relevant to the siting of facilities.
2. Review opportunities for the MWP to influence the management of wastes other than municipal wastes to encourage increased waste prevention, reuse and recycling.
3. Evaluate whether the waste treatment facilities to be procured in 2010 will have spare capacity and the potential to use it for the treatment of commercial and industrial wastes.

#### **4.2.4 Sub Regional**

Planned, significant economic development during the period 2008 – 2011 for the Liverpool City Region has been outlined in the “Action Plan for the Liverpool City Region”. This sets out the investment framework to deliver an envisaged £4bn to the City Region’s economy. This will include development in industry, housing, business and commerce. With a possible implication of changes to the Waste Framework Directive being an increase responsibility for local authorities in the management of wider wastes over which they can exert some influence, any additional construction and demolition waste or industrial waste from increased investment and economic development in the area will have to be considered in the Strategy Review. This could be in the form of both working with industry and business to ensure greater sustainability in the treatment and disposal of waste from these sectors as well as the implications for capacity of treatment and disposal infrastructure in the area.

Priority 5 of the action plan, Environmental Performance, links directly to the JMWMS where the benefits of sustainable waste management through the JMWMS are cited with an emphasis placed on waste prevention, sustainable consumption and production and recovering more energy from waste. It has been identified that MWDA, as the single greatest area of expenditure in terms of environmental performance across the city region, and, therefore, the JMWMS as a key driver for the partnership, could contribute to the Liverpool City Region Action Plan in 3 key headline areas:

- climate change, through carbon and methane reduction;
- natural resource protection, through waste prevention, reuse, recycling and composting; and
- transportation, through reduction in waste miles and reducing emissions.

The waste collection authorities’ expenditure was not included in the action plan.

Monitoring of this action plan will take place bi-annually; the current review document was launched 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2008 by the Mersey Partnership.

The Merseyside Waste Development Plan Document (MWDPD), which will establish where and what sort of waste facilities can be developed within the sub-region is currently under development. As the timescale for the development and ratification of the MWDPD is planned to run concurrently with the strategy review, close attention will have to be paid to updates in its development, especially in terms of the timing of consultation on both documents (see section 7.1).

#### **Implications and Recommendations for the JMWMS Review**

1. Review developments in the Liverpool City Region Action Plan and ensure impacts of planned developments are included in waste forecasts.
2. Monitor progress of the MWDPD and ensure that alignment can be achieved in terms of any new facilities which may need developing in light of JMWMS recommendations.

#### **4.2.5 Local**

Local Area Agreements (LAAs) are the delivery mechanism for the Sustainable Community Plans. They must include ‘up to’ 35 designated targets, together with 16 statutory children/education indicators, drawn from the 198 performance indicators in the new National Indicator (NI) set. All 198 will be monitored by the Government, but only those selected and negotiated as part of the LAAs will have targets attached against which the Government will expect a quantified and specific level of

improvement. The LAAs are central to the new National Performance Framework and Comprehensive Area.

*Table 2: LAA National Indicators*

Local Authority	Indicator	08/09	09/10	10/11
Halton	192	28%	31%	34%
Knowsley	192 (Household waste recycled and composted, 15.99% 2008 baseline) 186 (Per capita CO2 emissions in the LA area, 7.9 tonnes per capita 2008 baseline)	25% 4.72%	30% 2.68%	35% 2.68%
Liverpool	192 (Household waste recycled and composted, 12.72% 2008 baseline) 188 (Adapting to climate change)	25% Level 0/1	30% Level 1/2	35% Level 2/3
St. Helens	192 (Household waste recycled and composted, 21.6% 2006/07 baseline) 185 (Percentage CO2 reduction from LA operations – target deferred, baseline and target to be set in year 1)	30% 0	32% 0	34% 0
Sefton	193 (Municipal waste land filled Baseline 06/07 68%) 188 (Adapting to climate change)	62% Level 1	60% Level 2	55% Level 3
Wirral	192 (Household waste recycled and composted, 14.2% 2006/07 baseline) 186 (Per capita CO2 emissions in the LA area, 6 tonnes per capita 2005 baseline)	34% 3.7%	35.5% 7.5%	37% 11.4%

The LAA's agreed by each district focus on different NI's. This has implications in terms of monitoring and recording of waste and climate change data. The review of the strategy will have to take this into consideration so as to not stand in juxtaposition to any targets established by the LAAs.

The MWP is on the cusp of signing an Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) developed from a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for closer working relations across Merseyside. The MoU was developed to support partnership working between the MWDA and the Partner waste collection authorities in furtherance of the JMWMS but was not a legal document. Following ratification of the MoU, the Partners agreed that they would work towards developing a more detailed IAA which would have legal status. The IAA with Halton is at the same stage. The signing of the IAAs is essential for the smooth and timely progression of the procurement process.

As part of the update of the JMWMS in 2007, the DCAPs underwent a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Changes to the JMWMS will dictate the need for an update to all DCAPs to ensure they are delivering the priorities laid out in the updated strategy/ies in the most effective way and to include wider implications such as waste prevention. In order to ensure that the delivery of the priorities is carried out in a sustainable manner, contributing positively to sustainable development by integrating social,

economic and environmental considerations, updated DCAPs will need to undergo the sustainability appraisal process again.

Delays in the signing of the IAAs will result in delays to the next stages of the IAA development i.e. financial review and will impact on the strategy review process.

#### **Implication for the JMWMS Review**

1. Review and update the DCAPs as appropriate and include wider implications such as waste prevention.
2. Undertake SAs of DCAPs in light of changes made since the 2007/08 Strategy update.
3. Incorporate any review of targets set by LAAs in terms of their implications for development of JMWMS targets.

### **4.3 Climate Change**

The implications for waste management of the ever increasing focus on climate change from a European to a local level will be far reaching. The UK is currently on track to meet targets for reduction in carbon agreed through the Kyoto Protocol of 12.5% by 2012. Furthermore, new targets developed as part of the Climate Change Bill aim to reduce carbon emissions by:

- 26% by 2020 (1990 baseline); and
- 60% by 2050.

It has recently been agreed to increase the long-term target to an 80% reduction by 2050. Specific policy measures include the provision of powers to local authorities to pilot incentives for household waste minimisation and recycling.

Regional level targets have also been proposed by both the North West Climate Change Action Plan which aims to reduce carbon emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>) per capita to 6.6 tonnes by 2011 and by 4NW who propose that the North West as a whole and the sub-regions individually reduce their CO<sub>2</sub> emission by 30% from 1990 levels by 2020. Work currently being undertaken by the RIU to inform the development of the IRS Environment Paper will develop a set of measures to model how targets could be achieved.

At a partnership level, MWDA have a climate change action plan and policy. No specific targets are outlined but through the policy Members have agreed to give regard to regional and sub-regional climate change action plans. The District Councils' climate change policies and action plans also exist to varying degrees of detail. In addition, each partner District has a climate change indicator as part of its NI set in its LAA.

The emphasis on reduction of greenhouse gases is likely to become a stronger driver through the implementation period of the new JMWMS. It may be that a shift in emphasis is seen from recycling and composting targets, to climate change targets being the key statutory drivers for waste management. This is coupled with the economic implication of climate change impacts from waste management activities. Anecdotal evidence suggests that waste management activities with carbon emission implication have cost implications of £26 per tonne on the global economy. In a recent report submitted to the North West Development Agency by the Merseyside Sub-Regional Partnership entitled 'Action Plan for the Liverpool City Region', (11/2007), it was highlighted in Priority 5 – Environmental Performance (pp25-26)

that MWDA would expend on waste management £220 million of the £225 million pounds highlighted. This would suggest that across the region, MWDA is the single greatest area of expenditure in terms of environmental performance.

Climate change is a challenge that will need serious consideration because it is likely to impact on the aims and objectives of the reviewed JMWMS. This change in key driver along with any model for carbon reduction developed as part of the IRS work will have implications for the JMWMS review in terms of increase focus on waste prevention, the materials collected, the collection systems utilised and technologies favoured to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from waste treatment/disposal facilities. Modelling will have to be undertaken to ascertain which materials should be focused on for collections to reduce carbon emissions, not just those which will increase recycling percentages. This will include looking at what materials have the highest carbon benefits from recycling, tonnages of individual materials, composition of the waste stream to feed treatment technologies which could generate fuel and the most efficient way of collecting the waste to reduce transport emissions from waste management services. Any modelling work needs to be integrated into the modelling work conducted on DCAPs.

Potential increased costs on collection, treatment & disposal options that impact on greenhouse gas emissions will need to be addressed in view of the commitments made in the MWDA climate change policy to adhere to regional targets. Linkage will also need to be made to each WCA climate change plan and sub-regional plan and relevant targets.

#### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. Ascertain which key drivers will form the core emphasis of the JMWMS and impact on the identification of aims, objectives and targets.
2. Ensure any climate change targets are aligned to regional and national climate change target development.
3. Review IRS work to allow the JMWMS to be developed in line with recommendations made to reduce carbon impacts through waste management activities.
4. Undertake modelling work to ensure best carbon benefits in terms of materials collected, collections systems and treatment options utilised.

#### **4.4 Sustainable Consumption, Production and Procurement**

Waste and the management of waste can no longer be considered as an area of activity separate from other economic and environmental activities. The principles underpinning sustainable consumption, production and procurement relating to achieving more with less and decoupling waste generation from economic growth has resulted in a shift in focus that cuts across all waste management activities. The emphasis now, and in the future, will be upon resource management that reduces reliance on virgin materials, the continuous reuse of materials that are available and the recovery of value from waste materials in a way that minimises environmental impacts. There will be greater emphasis on self-sufficiency that encourages the treatment of wastes close to where they arise, reducing regional, sub-regional and local cross-boundary movements.

4NW has commissioned a project entitled, "The Development of a Sustainable Consumption and Production Framework". It was intended to inform the review of,

and revisions to the Regional Waste Strategy for the North West (September 2004) and to build on this and provide recommendations for the development of a regional sustainable consumption and production framework. However, the report is still in draft format and its future status is unclear given that the revised RSS was approved on the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2008 and the development of an Integrated Regional Strategy which is not yet a statutory function

#### **Implications and Recommendations for the JMWMS Review**

1. The review process will need to include a SA and a SEA. Both exercises will need to make clear how the aims, objectives and proposals within the JMWMS will meet sustainable consumption, production and procurement criteria.

### **4.5 Recycling and Composting**

The need to review and revise recycling and composting targets in respect of both national and regional targets and forecasts which indicate a shortfall in meeting both those targets and those referred to in the JMWMS 2008 has been discussed in Section 4.2. However, before new targets can be set it will be necessary to gain a clear understanding about the types and quantities of wastes which can be recovered from the municipal waste stream, especially those collected from the kerbside.

#### **4.5.1 Changes in the household waste stream**

A waste composition analysis was carried out in 2006 but, if a revised JMWMS is unlikely to be adopted before 2011/12 it may be necessary to update understanding about the composition of the household waste stream so that accurate forecasts can be made about what can realistically be recovered for recycling and composting. For example, anecdotal evidence indicates that some local authorities in England are already noticing differences in the types and quantities of municipal waste arisings due to the economic recession. However other influences such as increased population, changes in family structure, increase commercial and industrial activity, greater participation in waste prevention activities etc will also affect the composition of household waste.

Changes in the waste stream are also important in relation to the procurement strategy which was developed on forecasts of types and quantities of wastes arising and types and quantities of materials that would be collected for recycling and composting. Thus, optimum operation of the types of treatment options identified in the outline business case (OBC) submitted as part of the PFI application will require the appropriate and adequate quantities of feedstock. While final decisions are contingent upon the ability of the options chosen to divert waste from landfill the procurement of treatment facilities is well-advanced. Any changes in the types and quantities of waste to be treated will need to be understood before final contracts are signed in 2010.

The waste composition analysis carried out in 2006 showed that the percentage of food waste in the household waste stream in Merseyside is slightly lower than the national average at 17%. This is still a significant proportion of the waste stream. The Partnership has agreed to move towards the kerbside collection of kitchen waste and this is embedded within the JMWMS 2008. However currently only one of the

partners, Sefton, is trialing a food waste collection opt in scheme. Problems at the Bidston IVC plant meant that the Wirral collections reverted to garden waste only.

#### **4.5.2 Food waste**

Decisions about food waste collection will need to be made during the strategy review period. These decisions may be assisted by a review of successful schemes operated by other local authorities and partnerships. If food waste is not to be collected it will be necessary to identify how the shortfalls in forecasts can be compensated for from other fractions of the household waste stream or the wider municipal waste stream.

All the waste collection authorities in the Partnership collect cans, paper and garden waste from the kerbside. But there are no commonalities in respect of other dry recyclables. As discussed in Section 4.2 there is a move through European legislation to impose the recovery of a wider variety of recyclable materials from the household waste stream. This will need to be taken into account during the strategy review process and consideration given to maximising the recovery of the materials highlighted in the revised European Framework Directive.

#### **4.5.3 Household waste recycling centres**

Household waste recycling centres (HWRCs) will play an increasingly important role in achieving higher recycling and diversion rates in the future. There are limits to the types and quantities of materials that can be collected for recycling at the kerbside and as recycling rates increase it will prove more difficult to recover the smaller fractions of the household waste stream. The Partnership recognise this and the MWDA have planned to develop three new HWRCs throughout Merseyside and refurbish two. However, with a current recycling rate of around 40% (excluding rubble) the existing HWRCs are underperforming against a recommended good practice recycling rate of 60+%. It should be noted that under the new contracts the procurement process will specify minimum targets to be achieved at the HWRCs.

#### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. The Partnership will need to reach agreement on whether food waste collections are to be introduced and the timescales for doing so. A review of successful food waste collection schemes introduced by other local authorities and partnerships may assist that decision-making process.
2. If food waste is not to be collected, forecasts will need to establish how that shortfall in tonnages can be compensated for from other waste streams.
3. The revised JMWMS will need to address the development of a common policy on the types of materials to be collected from the household waste stream. This will need to take account of those materials specified within the Waste Framework Directive and the waste treatment options identified in the OBC submitted in support of the PFI application.
4. Explore options for restricting the acceptance of non-municipal wastes at HWRCs (e.g. permit systems) and review good practices that result in recycling rates in excess of 60% at HWRCs.

## **4.6 Collection Systems**

As well as differences in the types of materials collected by the District Council partners for recycling and composting there are also differences between Councils in the systems employed for collections both in terms of the frequency of collections,

type of collection (co-mingled, kerbside sort, single stream etc) and the containers and vehicles used. There will be many different reasons for this (i.e. historical, political, demographic etc) and what works in one area will not necessarily work in another.

The Partnership will need a JMWMS that recognises the differences between the Councils, the reasons for them and be sympathetic to them. However, the MWP should be greater than the sum of its constituent parts with all the partners working together to achieve good practices in waste collection to maximise the recycling and composting rate across Merseyside. The Strategy review process provides opportunities to explore how collection systems could be rationalised to facilitate joint procurement of containers and services, and joint communications campaigns that would benefit all Partners.

The DCAPs have been updated since the publication of the JMWMS 2008 and they will need continuously updating as changes are made to collection activities. SAs of the DCAPs were carried out during the updating of both the JMWMS and Halton's MWMS in 2007/08. These will need to be reviewed and revised but the baseline information exists and can be used to support the SEA (see Section 4.8). WRATE analyses (the Defra-recommended life-cycle analysis tool) will need to be conducted to establish the impacts on climate change.

#### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. Review frequency of collections of recyclable/compostable materials and residual waste to establish the impact of different frequencies on participation and capture rates, and customer satisfaction across the whole of the Partnership.
2. Review the collection systems operated by the Districts to identify joint procurement opportunities of both goods and services, and the implications for joint communications campaigns.
3. Carry out WRATE analyses of collection activities.

#### **4.7 Landfilling of Residual Waste**

The MWP is not self-sufficient in landfill capacity but is reliant upon capacity being available until at least 2017. This is addressed in the Procurement Plan and the landfill tender was let in 2008. Planning permission at the Arpley landfill site ends in 2013 although there is capacity still outstanding at the site. The Broad Location Study does address capacity issues across the North West but potential problems could arise in securing alternative capacity without increasing greenhouse gas emissions from possible increases in the distances that waste may have to be transported.

The MWP will exceed its landfill allowances at least until 2013/14 when planned treatment facilities are due to come on-stream. Provision has been made for this in the LATS Strategy and efficient forward planning means that landfill credits have been purchased for the immediate future.

The LATS strategy is continuously monitored by MWDA and a study was carried out by Deloitte on the risks associated with any delays to the implementation of the Procurement Plan.

The MWP will continue to be reliant on regionally strategic waste disposal sites for around 300,000 tonnes per annum of non-inert municipal waste for some considerable time. Planning permission has recently been granted to INEOUS Chlor for an 800,000 tonnes per annum capacity energy-from-waste (EfW) plant at Runcorn. The plant could potentially accept waste from Merseyside that would otherwise go to landfill.

Revisions to the Waste Framework Directive may influence decisions about residual waste disposal. The Directive lays down the five-step hierarchy of waste management options, with waste prevention as the preferred option, then reuse, recycling, recovery (including energy recovery) and safe disposal, in descending order. It classes "energy efficient" incineration as recovery, in an attempt to reduce consumption of fossil fuels.

Forecasts indicate that Halton Borough Council will exceed its landfill allowances. No provision has been made for this and there is no LATS Strategy in place.

### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. Review and update the Deloitte's study into the risks associated with any possible delays to the implementation of Procurement Plan.
2. Evaluate the implications for the landfill contract and the LATS Strategy in diverting waste from landfill to other proposed facility/ies in the region.
3. If a separate strategy review process is to be undertaken for Halton, the implications of exceeding LATS allowances will need to be addressed and options explored.
4. Whilst making reference to the Broad Locations Study, demonstrate an understanding of the implications of regional policies relating to disposal capacity needs which may mean that because the MWP is reliant on regionally strategic waste disposal sites Merseyside may need to accommodate regionally strategic built industrial scale waste management facilities.

## **4.8 Procurement and Planning**

### **4.8.1 Procurement and the SEA**

As discussed, a SEA will need to be carried out as part of the review process. However, because the procurement process is so advanced only those options already identified for the management of wastes will need to be addressed. An assessment of the technologies to be utilised within each of the options could potentially prejudice the tendering process so all the technologies which could be utilised within each option will need to be reviewed.

Because plans are so well-advanced, with Gilmoor identified as a site for the development of major facilities, procurement is no longer a direct challenge for the MWP. Monitoring of the procurement process has resulted in the production of a number of reports including:

- Deloitte's review of the economic impacts of the PFI process for Merseyside;
- an evaluation of the site acquisition planning and timetable risks by Mouchel; and
- identification of the financial risks to the procurement process and the estimated additional costs of those risks carried out by Ernst and Young LLP.

There will be no need to repeat these studies as part of the Strategy review process but they should be taken into account and updated where necessary.

#### **4.8.2 Planning risks**

Planning-related issues could be potentially problematic. There has been a move recently through amendments to planning regulations and guidance to make the siting of waste management facilities a process that is easier to negotiate. However, the siting of any waste management facility can, potentially, result in delays and refusal of planning permissions as a result of poor public perceptions and local action, even when other planning obstacles have been overcome. In addition, a plethora of planning-related policies and documents need to be taken into account.

Due to delays in the preparation of the MWDPD, the MWDA had to develop its own site selection criteria so that the development of planned facilities could be progressed. The site selection criteria will need to be kept under constant review throughout the JMWMS review period because the MWDPD is unlikely to be ratified before ratification of the revised JMWMS and alignment between the two documents will need to be maintained.

Similarly, the IRS will include a waste facility policy, which could be informed by the report produced on behalf of 4NW (North West Regional Leaders Forum), "Nationally, Regionally and Sub-Regionally Significant Waste Management Facilities". This document identifies the criteria for assessment for defining any strategic regionally significant facility.

Planning policy documents such as PPS10, will need to be taken into account because of the need to adhere to strategic decision-making principles in the preparation of waste plans. Other planning policy documents relating to sustainability, climate change and pollution control such as PPS10, 23 and 26 will also need to be taken into account.

#### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. A SEA will need to be carried out of those waste management options identified and the technologies that could be utilised within each of those options in line with Defra guidance. A full SA, in line with PPS10, requirements would fulfil the requirements of the SEA.
2. Potential planning problems should be identified and addressed in the development of both a public consultation strategy and a communications strategy for the JMWMS.
3. It will be necessary to continuously review siting issues to maintain alignment with the MWDPD and regional policies on the siting of regionally significant waste management facilities.

## **4.9 Governance**

### **4.9.1 Governance Opportunities**

The responsibility for implementing the JMWMS and Halton's MWMS lies with the SOWG. But the Group does not have any designated or delegated powers. Consequently, decisions made by the SOWG are referred to all members of each partner authority including the MWDA Board for ratification.

This system of governance is not necessarily the most efficient for the MWP and may have contributed to delays in implementing the previous and current strategies, especially those sections that relate to more controversial issues such as AWC and food waste collection.

Some local authority partnerships are already changing their systems of governance through the Local Government and Public Involvement Act 2007 which enables partnerships to be put on a statutory footing and set up new scrutiny functions. The Act allows two or more local authorities to submit proposals to the Secretary of State to transfer one or more of their waste functions (waste collection, waste disposal and/or street cleansing) to a new Joint Waste Authority (JWA).

There are currently a number of expressions of interest from authorities interested in JWA status; the Staffordshire partnership has set up a Joint Waste Board in preparation for JWA status and responsibility for implementation of the JMWMSs has been shifted to Member level.

By the time the tender for the JMWMS review is awarded there will be experiences from other partnerships that the MWP could draw upon to inform decisions about the most efficient and effective form of governance that will result in successful implementation of the Strategy so that aims and objectives are achieved within designated timescales.

#### **4.9.2 The Levy**

The District Councils are currently charged a levy by MWDA that is calculated on tonnages of waste collected, population and recycling tonnages. This results in the Districts paying different amounts. Halton Borough Council pays a management fee to MWDA. It was not part of this exercise to review either the way in which the levy is calculated or the ways in which it is used to support the District Councils either directly or indirectly. Reviews of governance issues could include a review of the levy system that takes account of the differences between the Districts, achievements to date and the resources that will be needed to achieve increased recycling/composting rates.

#### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. Research and critically evaluate governance opportunities for effective and efficient implementation of the revised JMWMS and identify the benefits and disbenefits to the MWP.
2. Review the levy system to ensure that it is the most effective method for supporting the District Councils so that the MWP can achieve the various targets that will be addressed in the JMWMS. If the Partnership consider the Levy to be the most effective delivery mechanisms to deliver the JMWMS, it may be necessary to review the calculation. If other options for cost sharing are explored, there will be a need to establish if these also allow effective delivery of the JMWMS.

#### **4.10 Monitoring and Evaluation**

The MWP either continuously or regularly monitors a range of waste management related activities. As already discussed, the Procurement Plan and the LATS strategy are monitored. Projections and forecasts relating to waste arisings, recycling and

composting are regularly updated. The District Councils and MWDA monitor against a number of National Indicators although there is some inconsistencies because of the different indicators chosen. Hence there is no shortage of data and information. There are some monitoring and evaluation gaps, for example the MWDA has not met its targets for renewable energy but this is not effectively monitored. The biodegradable waste generated, collected by the Partners and disposed of to landfill generates methane gas which is used by the landfill contractor to generate electricity. However, the electricity generated from Merseyside's waste is not monitored, therefore, the contribution made to renewable energy by Merseyside cannot be calculated.

The most serious gap is that there is no strategy for the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the JMWMS or Halton's MWMS. Therefore, it is unclear, at any given point in time, what and how much progress has been made towards achievement of the strategies' aims and objectives.

### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. Identify activities currently monitored and evaluated and those that would need to be monitored and evaluated to provide a clear understanding of progress towards achievement of the aims and objectives of the JMWMS and Halton's MWMS.
2. Develop a monitoring and evaluation strategy to support the JMWMS.

### **4.11 Communications**

MWDA's communications strategy outlines how the MWDA intends to deliver its responsibilities in relation to the JMWMS through effective communications and partnership working and has established mechanisms for monitoring progress on communications initiatives. The Partnership's Joint Communications sub-group is responsible for developing and implementing a communications strategy for the Partnership. A strategy has yet to be developed. Additional resources may be needed to deliver any joint communications activities as a result of implementing the JMWMS strategy e.g.:

- if AWC is implemented by partner authorities additional communications will be needed; and
- if there is a focus on collecting certain materials co-ordinated additional communications will be needed to progress this.

The MWP commissioned a comprehensive communications audit of all seven members of the Partnership (Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St Helens, Wirral, MWDA and Halton Borough Council) in early 2008. The audit gathered information on a variety of issues with its main objectives being to:

- ascertain the commonalities between the Partners' communications campaigns;
- the barriers and issues in relation to effective recycling and waste communications; and
- the support for taking forward joint communications initiatives.

The results of the communications audit have contributed to the formulation of an Action Plan for the Merseyside Waste Partnership that draws on recommendations made in an initial scoping report prepared through the Waste and Resources Action Programme.

### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. Develop a Joint communications strategy that aligns with the revised JMWMS and contributes to the achievement of the JMWMS aims and objectives.
2. Identify and evaluate the communications implications of the revised JMWMS.
3. Prepare a fully costed action plan for implementation of the Communications Strategy.
4. Review the resource implications of delivering communications activities relating to implementation for the JMWMS.

### **4.12 Consultation**

The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes regulations 2004 introduced a requirement for a SEA to be produced for a number of statutory documents including JMWMSs.

Policy Guidance states that waste management options should be evaluated at each tier of the waste management hierarchy. Also, authorities should undertake a thorough evaluation of social and economic factors. The Guidance recommends that authorities should consider undertaking a wider SA which will fulfil the requirements of a SEA.

A SA of the JMWMS 2008 was carried out but a SEA was not because this was not a statutory requirement of the updating process. The SA will provide baseline information for the future review process but it will require a review and a SEA will need to be carried out.

Consultation on the SEA is required and it is in two stages:

Stage 1 is the development of a scoping report which must be sent, at least, to the statutory consultation bodies (the Environment Agency, English Nature, English Heritage and the Countryside Agency) for comment. The minimum consultation period is five weeks.

Stage 2 is a public consultation that involves the preparation of an environmental report that accompanies the draft plan, which would set out the preferred options, the reasons why alternatives were considered inferior, and mitigation measures to minimise negative consequences from the chosen options. No less than twelve weeks should be allowed for this consultation. Following this a report will need to be produced which summarises consultation responses and the changes made to the JMWMS in response to them.

Consultation on the JMWMS should be ongoing throughout the review process. Defra Guidance strongly recommends the involvement of internal stakeholders, especially Members, and communities and external partners from an early stage in the development of MWMS.

However, this is a review of an existing strategy not the development of a completely new strategy for either the MWP or Halton. Therefore, best use of resources will need to be considered. If the aims and objectives of the Strategy/ies and the options

identified do not change significantly and these have already been widely consulted on, it is unlikely that they will need to be consulted on again.

A review of the key issues consulted on previously could be carried out and a consultation strategy developed that guides the attention of consultees to those aspects of the Strategy/ies that are new and have not already been the subject of in-depth consultation.

A number of challenges have been identified in this report that will be of particular concern to Members. Therefore, it may be prudent to develop a separate strategy that addresses how Members may be integrated into the review process in a way that encourages efficient decision-making and facilitates the achievement of consensus.

### **Implications for the JMWMS Review**

1. The SA to be reviewed and updated to ensure that any changes in options are fully evaluated.
2. A SEA to be conducted.
3. A two-stage SEA consultation strategy to be developed and implemented. This is a separate consultation to the JMWMS consultation.
4. A public consultation strategy of the JMWMS to be developed that takes account of previous consultations and addresses how efficient use can be made of resources by avoiding re-consultation.
5. A separate consultation strategy on the JMWMS to be developed to ensure Members are fully integrated into the review process from an early stage.
6. The development of methodologies for dealing with consultation responses to both the SEA and the draft JMWMS demonstrating how comments will be incorporated into the final documents.

## **5.0 Potential Risks to the JMWMS Review**

A register of potential risks to the JMWMS review process will need to be prepared. A template is included as table 3, listing possible risks in the order of high to low impact on the strategy review process. Consultants bidding for the work could be asked to develop this, giving an indication of the likelihood of risks occurring and the potential impacts of these risks on the strategy review process, as part of their tender application or it could be prepared by the SOWG and applicants asked to complete it.

*Table 3: Risk Register Template*

<b><i>Risk</i></b>	<b><i>Local Authority Risk</i></b>	<b><i>Consultant Risk</i></b>	<b><i>Shared Risk</i></b>	<b><i>Mitigation Options</i></b>
Failure to achieve consensus about integrating the JMWMS and Halton's MWMS	X			
Loss of key staff resource during the strategy review	For their staff X	For their staff X		
Lack of commitment to review process by members and key personal	X			
Lack of project management in overseeing the project	X			

<b><i>Risk</i></b>	<b><i>Local Authority Risk</i></b>	<b><i>Consultant Risk</i></b>	<b><i>Shared Risk</i></b>	<b><i>Mitigation Options</i></b>
within the council				
Delay by any of the authorities in approving the new strategy	X			
Negative public perception of waste management options and treatment technologies			X	
Lack of project management in overseeing the project by consultant		X		
Insufficient consultation with the public			X	
Waste Strategy process not priority / emergency becomes a priority			X	
Negative third party influence			X	
Delivery of outcomes within agreed budget		X		
Lack of clarity regarding the internal resource and expertise the advisor expects			X	
Timescale of review is demanding			X	
Unexpected changes in European, National or Regional policy or change to legislation	X			
Appointing suitably qualified consultants to undertake the review			X	
Delay in process due to local/national elections	X			
Foreseeable changes in European, National or Regional policy or change to legislation		X		
Failure to include key publicly available documents within strategy review		X		

## **6.0 Recommendations for Strategy Review Activities**

1. Establish aims and objectives taking account of the key drivers that will impact upon the JMWMS.
2. Review and update the legislation section of the JMWMS 2008.
3. Review and evaluate the implications for waste arisings and the management of those wastes of national, regional, sub-regional and local policies especially in relation to:
  - a. Economic activities;

- b. Demographic changes;
  - c. Climate change; and
  - d. Sustainable consumption, production and procurement.
4. Carry out a waste composition analysis of household waste.
5. Review the types of recyclable materials which could be collected by the Partners and identify opportunities to increase consistency of types of materials collected.
6. Review and evaluate opportunities to rationalise collection frequencies and systems.
7. Review and evaluate incentive and enforcement options to increase kerbside collection of recyclables.
8. Review HWRC operations and develop an action plan for improving performance in line with recommended good practice to achieve a recycling rate of 60+%.
9. Update the SA of the JMWMS.
10. Carry out a SEA, develop a consultation strategy and a methodology for addressing comments in the SEA.
11. Review and align site selection policy and criteria to correspond with that within the MWDPD ensuring that there is correspondence with the RSS.
12. Review governance options for the MWP.
13. Review the way in which the levy is calculated and identify and evaluate alternative options of funding the MWP waste management activities.
14. Prepare a consultation strategy for consulting on the draft JMWMS.
15. Develop a joint communications strategy for the MWP to deliver the JMWMS. Develop a separate consultation strategy for Members.
16. Update DCAPs to align with changes made to the JMWMS and update SAs.
17. Develop a register of potential risks to the JMWMS review process.

## **7.0 Timescales and Resource Implications**

The review of the JMWMS will be a complex process and with the extensive consultation that will be necessary is unlikely to be completed in less than eighteen months. This could be longer given the decision-making procedure, which involves consultation with Members at District level at key stages. Failure to reach consensus on any issue will increase delays.

The resource implications will be significant both financially and in terms of officer time. A budget has yet to be finalised for the process and additional costs will be incurred if the decision is to maintain two separate strategies. It is likely that if Halton decides to maintain a separate strategy the Council will have to bear the costs of its own review and make a contribution to the cost of the JMWMS review. Costs to Halton for a separate strategy review, including consultations on both the SEA and the MWMS are likely to be in the region of £120,000 plus the additional cost of an agreed contribution to the review of the JMWMS. There would also be the resource implications in terms of officer time in managing the review process from tendering for consultancy support through to final adoption and publication of the MWMS. There will also be duplication of activities such as the development of communications and consultations strategies, members briefings, waste composition analyses.

The SOWG is currently reviewing the resource implications of the review. Considerable officer time will be required throughout the review period. The review will need to be closely project managed to ensure adherence to timescales and budgets. The consultants employed will need to be supplied with data and information as well as time with officers and the SOWG in the development of aims, objectives, targets and actions.

Table 4 maps the key stages for the suggested development of the JMWMS and Halton MWMS as identified in this scoping report and from the Practice Guide for the Development of Municipal Waste Management Strategies, Defra. It also outlines concurrent activities which will be ongoing as part of the MWDPD, the on-going PFI process and the MWDA planning applications for large scale facilities<sup>1</sup>. Indicative minimum time frames for the JMWMS and Halton MWMS review are provided and would need to be monitored when the review goes out to tender in light of changes to the other key activities. The siting and planning process is undergoing a full review at the time of development of this scoping report and dates provided in Table 4 may be subject to change. It is essential that consultants constantly monitor progress of these other key activities to ensure there is no conflict with the review process. Particular attention should be paid to any consultation periods to ensure these do not coincide with consultations of the SEA and the draft strategy/ies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Timeframes for MWDPD, PFI and planning development accurate at time of scoping report development from [www.wasteplanningmerseyside.com](http://www.wasteplanningmerseyside.com) and information supplied by MWDA.



# 12

		2008		2009						2010						2011			
	Evaluate and report on consultation with external stakeholders																		
	Draft revised waste strategy document																		
	Statutory public consultation (Timed to avoid period during procurement of treatment technologies)																		
	Revise draft strategy following consultation																		
	Develop and implement communications strategy																		
	Develop monitoring and evaluation strategy																		
	Adoption and publication of JMWMS																		
Additional Activities	Waste composition analysis (To inform LCA)																		
	Review Governance opportunities and levy system																		
	Review opportunities to improve HWRC recycling performance																		
	Review and align site selection policy and procedures																		
	Review and evaluate opportunities to rationalise collection frequencies, systems and materials collected (To be informed by LCA)																		
	Review and evaluate incentive and enforcement schemes to increase recycling of household waste																		
	Review good practices for engaging with business and industry, and identify opportunities for the MWP																		
Dialogue with Bidders to end, Issue Call for Final Tender, Final Tenders returned																			
Final Evaluation and Advisor Reports due																			
District Involvement																			
Overall Integrity																			
Authority Meeting																			
Preferred Bidder Announced and contract awarded																			
Participants submit Detailed Solutions																			
Evaluation of Detailed Solutions completed																			
Authority Approval																			
Closing Issues Down completed and Issue Call For Final Tenders																			



7.2 Estimated Consultancy Costs<sup>2</sup> for JMWM Strategy Review

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Tasks</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<b>Core Activities</b>		
<b>Scoping Report</b>		
Sustainability Appraisal including SEA	<p>Project inception meeting</p> <p>Initiate engagement with all partners</p> <p>Undertake data collection and review</p> <p>Identify initial options for assessment and develop objectives and criteria</p> <p>Produce Scoping Report</p> <p>Project Steering Group meeting</p>	<b>£17,000</b> (£3k reduction MWP for separate Halton strategy)
Statutory consultation on SEA	<p>5 week period of consultation</p> <p>Refine options &amp; assessment criteria</p>	<b>£2500</b>
Final report inc SEA	<p>Including assessment of environmental, social and economic impacts</p> <p>Incorporation of comments from consultation</p> <p>Project Steering Group meeting</p>	<b>£9000</b> (£3k reduction MWP for separate Halton strategy)
Life-cycle analysis	<p>Modelling using WRATE</p> <p>Interpret results and undertake an internal review</p> <p>Peer review of modelling</p> <p>Project Steering Group meeting</p>	<b>£25000</b> (£2k reduction MWP for separate Halton strategy)
<b>Waste Strategy Review</b>		

<sup>2</sup> At current prices (October 2008)

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Tasks</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Baseline report	Project inception meeting  Initiate engagement with all partners  Undertake data collection and review  Produce report	<b>£11,500</b>
Draft external stakeholder consultation strategy, finalise & implement	Costs will depend upon the level of consultation undertaken and the methods used	<b>£75,000</b> (£15k reduction MWP for separate Halton strategy)
Draft and implement Members consultation strategy	As above	<b>£30,000</b>
Evaluate and report on consultation with external stakeholders	Collate and record responses Analyse results, write, produce and print consultation report (includes internal peer review)  Design and print public consultation report (x 1000)  Project Steering Group meeting	<b>£12,500</b> (£1.5k reduction MWP for separate Halton strategy)
Draft revised waste strategy document		<b>£4000</b>
Statutory public consultation		
Revise draft strategy following consultation		<b>£2500</b>
Develop and implement communications strategy	Costs dependent upon target audiences to be reached, methods of communication used	<b>£55,000</b> (£5k reduction MWP for separate Halton strategy)
<b>Develop monitoring and evaluation strategy</b>	Establish activities currently monitored  Identify activities to be monitored for implementation of the JMWMS  Develop action plan	<b>£15,000</b>
<b>Core Activities</b>	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>£259,000</b>
<b>Additional Activities</b>		
Waste composition analysis		<b>£120,000</b> (£25k reduction MWP for

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Tasks</b>	<b>Cost</b>
		separate Halton strategy)
Review Governance opportunities and levy system		<b>£5000</b>
Review opportunities to improve HWRC recycling performance		<b>£30,000</b>
Review and align site selection policy and procedures		<b>£3000</b>
Review and evaluate opportunities to rationalise collection frequencies, systems and materials collected		<b>£25,000</b>
Review and evaluate incentive and enforcement schemes to increase recycling of household waste		<b>£4000</b>
Review good practices for engaging with business and industry, and identify opportunities for the MWP		<b>£3000</b>
<b>Additional Activities</b>	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£190,000</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>£449,000</b>
	<b>Total excluding Halton</b>	<b>£394,500</b>
Separate review of Halton's MWMS (incl SA, SEA and consultations)		<b>£120,000</b>

## Appendix 1 Documents reviewed during the scoping exercise

1. A Practice Guide for the Development of Municipal Waste Management Strategies. Defra, November 2005.
2. JMWMS for Merseyside 2008. MWDA September 2008.
3. Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority Audit 2007-2008, Performance Detailed Report. Audit Commission, August 2008.
4. North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021. Government Office for the North West, September 2008.
5. Sustainable Consumption & Production – Evidence Paper for the Development of the Integrated/Single Regional Strategy. The Regional Intelligence Unit, July 2008.
6. Energy – Evidence Paper for the Development of the Integrated/Single Regional Strategy. The Regional Intelligence Unit, July 2008.
7. Environment (Introductory Paper) – Evidence Paper for the Development of the Integrated/Single Regional Strategy. The Regional Intelligence Unit, July 2008.
8. Waste PFI Procurement Programme, summary of timetable, risks, costs and wider economic benefits WDA/28/08. Merseyside WDA, Report of the Director of Waste Disposal, June 2008.
9. Land Acquisition and Planning Timescales. Mouchel Planning Consultants, May 2008. Cited in 7.
10. Financial Impacts of Delay to the Merseyside Waste PFI Programme. Ernst & Young, May 2008. Cited in 7.
11. Assessing the Economic Impact of Merseyside Waste PFI's. Deloitte, July 2008.
12. Memorandum of Understanding. Merseyside Waste Strategy Partnership, 2005.
13. Minutes of Senior Officers Working Group. MWDA, 24th January 2008, 6th March 2008, 17th April 2008, 26th June 2008.
14. Senior Officer Working Group, Terms of Reference Final. MWDA, March 2008.
15. Green Vision for Merseyside, MWDA's Contribution to the Liverpool City Region. MWDA.
16. City Region Governance - Developing the Leaders Cabinet and Strategic Sub Boards. Merseyside Chief Executives, 20 JULY 2007.
17. Action Plan for the Liverpool City Region – Merseyside Sub-Regional Partnership. NWDA November 2007.
18. Knowsley Final Local Area Agreement submission to GONW. Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council, June 2008.
19. Liverpool's Local Area Agreement 2008 – Targets. Liverpool City Council, May 2008.
20. Sefton Local Area Agreement Targets, Final Submission. Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council, May 2008.
21. St. Helens Local Area Agreement 2008-2011 - Submission to GONW. St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council, 2008.
22. Wirral's Partnership Agreement 2008/9 to 2010/11 - Submission to Communities and Local Government. Wirral Borough Council, 31 May 2008.
23. Merseyside Joint Municipal Waste Management Project (JMWMS) - Summary of the MWDA Waste Management Facility Sites Selection Process. Mouchel, MWDA, April 2008.
24. Merseyside District Council Action Plan Review - Final Report. BeEnvironmental Ltd, July 2007.
25. Medium Term Strategy and LATS Trading WDA/16/08. Merseyside WDA, Report of the Director of Waste Disposal.

26. MWDA Communications Strategy. MDWA, 2007.
27. Climate Change Policy and action plan, WDA/53/08. Merseyside WDA, Report of the Director of Waste Disposal, September 2008.
28. Briefing Report for Merseyside Waste Partnership Joint Communications Group, Key Results and Recommendations - Joint Communications Audit and Strategy. MWDA Joint Communication Group, May 2008.
29. Consultation structures across Merseyside. MWDA, October 2008.
30. Nationally, Regionally and Sub-Regionally Significant Waste Management Facilities - Final Report. 4NW (North West Regional Leaders Forum), August 2008.
31. Sustainable prosperity in the North West - Developing a sustainable consumption and production framework for the North West - DRAFT. Forum for the Future, 4NW, August 2008.