

Chair: Councillor John Tanner (Oxford City Council)

Secretary: William Reed (Democratic Services Manager)

Oxford City Council
The Town Hall
Blue Boar Street
OXFORD
OX1 4EY

Telephone (01865) 252230

Email
wreed@oxford.gov.uk

Oxfordshire Waste Partnership

Joint Committee

NOTICE OF MEETING

MEETING Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Joint Committee

DATE/TIME Friday 23rd October 2009 at 9.30am.

PLACE The Old Library, First Floor, Oxford Town Hall, St Aldate's, Oxford

CONTACT OFFICER William Reed (Tel: 01865 252230) E-mail: wreed@oxford.gov.uk

William Reed
Democratic Services Manager
Oxford City Council

15th October 2009

Membership

Councillors:

John Tanner
(deputy: any other member of the City Executive Board)

George Reynolds
(deputy: Barry Wood)

Representing:

Oxford City Council

Cherwell District Council

Ian Hudspeth
(deputy: David Robertson)

Oxfordshire County Council

David Dodds
(deputy: Any Cabinet Member)

South Oxfordshire District Council

Jenny Hannaby
(deputy: Tony De Vere)

Vale of White Horse District Council

David Harvey
(deputy: Barry Norton or Mark Booty)

West Oxfordshire District Council

NOTES

Access to Information

The minutes and reports included in Part I of this agenda are published on the websites of each partner authority.

For enquiries about specific reports: please contact the officers named in the reports.

The timing given against each agenda item is an estimate of the approximate time that the Committee will commence consideration of that item. It is for indicative purposes only, and will change in the event that the running order of the items is revised or additional time is taken on items.

If you are planning to attend the meeting please note there is no car parking at Oxford Town Hall. You should use the park and ride sites on the edge of town and travel to the Town Hall from there by public transport or use public transport for your entire journey.

Guidance for Members

Members are asked to contact William Reed, Democratic Services Manager, Tel 01865 252230, (email to wreed@oxford.gov.uk) to tender apologies or advise of attendance by their named Deputy Members.

Members are reminded that Part II reports (where provided) contain exempt information that is not available to the public or press and should therefore be treated accordingly. They should not be disclosed or passed on to any other person(s). There are no exempt reports for this meeting.

Members are required to consider the implications of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the Human Rights Act 1998 when exercising their functions.

Declarations of Interests

Members are asked to declare any personal interest and the nature of that interest which they may have in any of the items under consideration at this meeting when the "Declaration of Interests" item is reached on the agenda. A member has a personal interest in a matter if that matter affects the well-being or financial position of the member, the member's relatives or people with whom the member has a close association more than it would affect the majority of other people in the ward(s) to which the matter relates.

A personal interest can affect the member, the member's relatives or people with whom the member has a close personal association positively or negatively. If the member or the others would stand to gain or lose by the decision, the member should also declare it.

A member also has a personal interest in a matter if it relates to any interest which the member must register.

A member has a prejudicial interest in a matter if:-

- (a) a member of the public, who knows the relevant facts, would reasonably think the member's personal interest is so significant that it is likely to prejudice the member's judgment of the public interest; and
- (b) the matter affects the member's financial interests or relates to a licensing or regulatory matter; and
- (c) the interest does not fall within one of the exempt categories at paragraph 10(2)(c) of the Code of Conduct.

If a member has a prejudicial interest he or she must withdraw from the meeting. However, under paragraph 12(2) of the Code of Conduct, if members of the public are allowed to make representations, give evidence or answer questions about that matter, the member may also make representations as if he or she were a member of the public. However, the member must withdraw from the meeting once he or she has made your representations and before any debate starts.

A member arriving after the start of the meeting is asked to declare interests as necessary as soon as practicable after their arrival even if the item in question has been considered.

Officers cannot offer advice during the meeting on whether or not a personal interest should be declared, or whether a personal interest should also be regarded as prejudicial.

AGENDA

PART I

Timed for:

9.30 AM 1. MINUTES

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes (circulated, page 1.1) of the meeting of the Joint Committee held on 10th July 2009.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF DEPUTY MEMBERS

The Secretary to report on apologies for absence and on the attendance by Deputy Members notified to him before the start of the meeting.

(Contact William Reed (Tel. 01865 252230) to tender apologies and advise of attendance by the named Deputy Member).

3. ADDITIONAL URGENT ITEMS

The Secretary to advise whether any item of an urgent nature has been proposed for the meeting and the Chair to consider whether the item should be taken as urgent business and to specify the reasons for urgency.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interest and the nature of that interest which they may have in any of the items under consideration at this meeting. Guidance notes follow earlier on the agenda.

5. PETITIONS AND ADDRESSES

Rosamund Weatherall, Acting Chair, OxClean Steering Group has asked to address the Committee on volunteer litter picking. A letter from the Acting Chair is circulated, page 5.1.

9.50 AM

6. INTERNAL AUDIT 2008/09

Report (circulated, page 6.1)

10.00 AM

7. COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF WASTE FROM CHARITIES, SCHOOLS ETC.

Report (circulated, page 7.1)

10.15 AM

8. WASTE PARTNERSHIP FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Report (circulated, page 8.1)

10.20 AM

9. PROCUREMENT UPDATES

(a) Food and Garden Waste Treatment

Report (circulated, page 9.1)

(b) Waste Collection and Recycling (OCC and WODC)

Officers will give an oral update.

(c) Residual Waste Treatment

Report (circulated, page 9.3)

10.35 AM

10. MONITORING PROGRESS – SECOND QUARTER 2009/10

Report (circulated, page 10.1)

10.50 AM

11. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION AND WASTE AND RESOURCES ACTION PROGRAMME – COMMITMENT TO A GOOD WASTE AND RECYCLING SERVICE

Report (circulated, page 11.1)

11.00 AM

12. LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT – STREET CLEANLINESS

Report (circulated, page 12.1)

11.10 AM 13. ZERO WASTE PLACE INITIATIVE

Report (circulated, page 13.1)

11.20 AM 14. SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION OXFORD

Report (circulated, page 14.1)

11.25 AM 15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Friday 15th January 2010 at 9.30 am in the Town Hall, St Aldate's, Oxford

16. MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION

If the Committee wishes to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of any aspects of the preceding agenda items it will be necessary for the Committee to pass a resolution in accordance with the provisions of Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 specifying the grounds on which their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act if and so long, as in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

Friday 10th July 2009

Present: The Chair (Councillor John Tanner, Oxford City Council), the Vice-Chair (Councillor Ian Hudspeth, Oxfordshire County Council), Councillors David Dodds (South Oxfordshire District Council), Jenny Hannaby (Vale of White Horse District Council), David Harvey (West Oxfordshire District Council) and George Reynolds (Cherwell District Council).

Officers Present: Wayne Lewis (Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Co-ordinator), Chris Cousins (Oxfordshire County Council), Ian Davies (Cherwell District Council), Peter Dobson (Oxford City Council), Cath James (West Oxfordshire District Council), Mike Mackay (South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse District Council), Paul Mocroft (Oxfordshire Waste Partnership), Andrew Pau (Oxfordshire County Council) and Ed Potter (Cherwell District Council).

William Reed (Clerk to the Committee, Oxford City Council).

ACTION

63. MINUTES

- (1) The Committee confirmed as a correct record the minutes of its meeting held on 27th March 2009 subject as follows:-
 - (i) To the inclusion in minute 55 (LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT 1 – REWARD GRANT FUNDING BID) of a reference to the Committee supporting the bid to fund new food waste collections and treatment;
 - (ii) To the inclusion in minute 54 (OXFORDSHIRE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD – THEMATIC PARTNERSHIPS – MERGER OF WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIPS) of a reference to Oxfordshire District leaders having accepted the principle that in new thematic partnership arrangements, membership of them should be kept to

the minimum possible commensurate with sound governance.

- (2) Arising from minute 55 (LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT 1 – REWARD GRANT FUNDING BID), resolution (2), the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Co-ordinator reported that the bid to fund new food waste collections and treatment was not being supported by the Public Service Board.

The Committee noted the position.

64. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF DEPUTY MEMBERS

There were no apologies for absence from members of the Committee. The Chair reported that Councillor Robert Belson had been replaced as the County Council's representative (and Vice-Chair of the Committee) by Councillor Ian Hudspeth.

The Committee thanked Councillor Belson for his services to the Committee over the years.

Apologies for absence were received from officer attendees, namely Carolyn Baxter (Oxfordshire County Council), Steve Bishop (South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse District Council) and Tim Sadler (Oxford City Council).

65. ADDITIONAL URGENT ITEMS

There were no additional urgent items for certification as urgent business and discussion at the meeting.

66. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest by members present.

67. PETITIONS AND ADDRESSES

There were no petitions or addresses to the Committee.

68. OXFORDSHIRE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD – THEMATIC PARTNERSHIPS – MERGER OF WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP

The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Co-ordinator and the Environment Partnership Co-ordinator submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended).

The Committee resolved:-

- (1) To note that the Environment Partnership did not favour the merging of the Partnership with this Committee to form a new Environment and Waste Joint Committee;
- (2) Noting the content of resolution (1), that the two Partnership committees should meet separately, on the same day and at the same location, with one meeting following the other, and that both meetings be chaired by the same person following the arrangements set out in the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Joint Agreement (i.e. each Oxfordshire local authority chairing and servicing the partnership meetings for a two year period, noting that as from 2010/11 the partnership meetings would be chaired and serviced by Oxfordshire County Council);
Clerk
- (3) That for the remainder of 2009/10 the Environment Partnership be serviced by the County Council and not by the City Council;
County
- (4) That a single progress report on waste and environment local area agreement targets be produced and presented to the two
WL

meetings and then reported upon to the Public Service Board.

69. ANNUAL REPORT

The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Co-ordinator submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended).

The Committee resolved:-

- (1) To thank the officers for their achievements on waste matters over the past year;
- (2) To approve the annual report and the statement of accounts and to note that it would be presented to the next available meeting of Oxfordshire leaders; WL
- (3) That the budget underspend of £82,541 be placed in reserve where it could potentially be used to offset to forecast growth in partner council contributions in the next two financial years. WL

70. ANNUAL EXTERNAL AUDIT RETURN

The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Co-ordinator reported that the stage had not yet been reached where the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership statement of accounts and governance statement for 2008/09 could be signed off because the public deposit period had not yet come to an end.

The Committee resolved in the circumstances to authorise the Chair and Vice-Chair to sign off the 2008/09 statement of accounts and governance statement once the public deposit period had ended. Chair
Vice-Chair
Clerk
WL

71. PROCUREMENT UPDATES

(a) Food and Garden Waste Treatment

Carolyn Baxter (Oxfordshire County Council) submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended).

The Committee resolved to:-

- (1) Note and support progress on the food waste project;
- (2) Ask that Oxfordshire local authorities should now sign the agreement confirming each Council's commitment to the food waste project (paragraph 2.3 of the report refers). WR co-ordinate

(b) Waste Collection and Recycling

Officers from Oxford City Council and West Oxfordshire District Council submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended).

The Committee resolved to note the contents of the report.

(c) Residual Waste Treatment

Andrew Pau (Oxfordshire County Council) submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended). He reported that, subject to the outcome of the evaluation exercise, the County Council's Cabinet would be taking the decision on procurement at a special meeting in August.

The Committee resolved to note:-

- (1) And support progress on the procurement of residual waste treatment;
- (2) That transfer arrangements to the selected site would be pursued after the procurement decision had been reached. AP

72. MONITORING PROGRESS – FIRST QUARTER 2009/10

The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Co-ordinator submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended).

The Committee resolved:-

- (1) To agree revised target completion dates for three projects, as follows:-

(a) revised waste reduction strategy and promotion of voluntary sector waste service providers – complete by October 2009 (revised from May 2009);

(b) reduction of trade waste entering the municipal waste stream – complete by April 2010 (revised from June 2009);

(c) managing and promoting assisted collection services – complete October 2010;

- (2) To postpone work to establish whether the County in whole or in part should be designated a “zero waste place” until an evaluation of the first round of designations had been completed and the Government’s intentions on the future of the initiative were known; WL
- (3) With reference to table 3 of the report (new initiatives funded projects) to ask the Co-ordinator to develop a formal process of learning from the outcome of NIF funded projects; WL
- (4) To note that County Councillor Hudspeth would consider what might be done to increase the provision of waste recycling centre facilities in South Oxfordshire in order to reduce the distances South Oxfordshire residents had to travel to deposit waste and recyclables; Vice-Chair
- (5) In order to enable meaningful monitoring to take place, quarterly performance details should be set against the year end target and quarterly profiling. WL

73. HOUSEHOLD WASTE AND CHARITY WASTE

Carolyn Baxter (Oxfordshire County Council) submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended)

The Committee resolved;-

- (1) To note the officers’ intention to submit a further report to the next meeting. CB

- (2) That the report submitted to the next meeting should:-
 - (a) Indicate the impacts of the revised arrangements on the key performance indicators referred to in paragraph 5.1 of the report;
 - (b) Set out the arrangements being put in place by each Oxfordshire district;
- (3) To record that:-
 - (a) The arrangements put in place by each Oxfordshire district should be as consistent countywide as was possible; WL co-ordinate
 - (b) Arrangements for charities should be addressed first and then schools and other educational establishments.

74. LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT – STREET CLEANLINESS

The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Co-ordinator submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended)

The Committee resolved:-

- (1) To note with regret the failure to meet the local area agreement target for street cleanliness;
- (2) That a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee setting out:- WL
 - (a) The targets for litter and detritus;
 - (b) What reward grants there were for achieving or exceeding targets;
 - (c) What uplift in performance was needed, and how this could be done in order to meet/exceed targets;
- (3) That NI195 inspections should take place on a monthly basis and reports upon performance against NI195 WL co-ordinate

should be made to each Committee meeting;

- (4) That Oxfordshire districts should all participate in the peer review system by the Environment Quality and Cleansing Group (paragraphs 2.4 and 2.10 refer) All Oxon districts

75. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Committee noted that it would next meet at 9.30 a.m. on Friday 23rd October 2009 at the offices of Oxford City Council.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and closed at 11.09 am.



8 Richmond Road, Jericho, OXFORD OX1 2JJ
environment@oxfordcivicsoc.org.uk

2 July 2009

Councillor John Tanner
Member for Cleaner Greener Oxford
Town Hall
St Aldate's
Oxford OX1 1BX

Dear Councillor Tanner

Litter on Oxford's by-pass

I am writing to you, as Chair of the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership, to ask you to stop the buck passing that has led to the dire state of Oxford's bypass and the main roads in Oxfordshire. There is visible litter on verges and in bushes.

For over a year, we have been told that the Districts and the County cannot coordinate road closures for grass cutting and litter picking. We have also been told that the setting of Oxford is a low priority for the surrounding District Councils, who have responsibility for most of the major roads and for the side of the bypass away from Oxford City. On top of this, councils seem to be unfamiliar with their boundaries.

To illustrate with a personal experience, I cycle weekly to Eynsham along the A40 cycle path. Twice so far this year, the grass verges have been cut without collecting the litter beforehand. The litter is now shredded into smaller bits. I am told it is picked up before grass cutting, but it very obviously wasn't. On top of this, each district I approached tried to persuade me that I should talk to another district.

We organised very successful Spring Cleans in March 2008 and 2009, but as City Works officers were concerned about safety for community groups working along main roads, we were discouraged from recruiting volunteers to clean up the by-pass.

We live in a beautiful city with 9 million visitors a year; many of whom comment on the litter on the approaches. It shames us all.

-2-

Councillor John Tanner
Member for Cleaner Greener Oxford

2 July 2009

We would like:

- a published regular programme of cleaning up litter on the by-pass and other main roads in Oxfordshire;
- co-ordination of litter picking with grass cutting (which clearly does not happen);
- clear acceptance of responsibility - at present anyone who reports litter on main roads gets passed from council to council.
- signage and bins in laybys to remind drivers of their responsibility. It is not acceptable to litter, even from a vehicle.

We will be organising another Spring Clean in 2010 (5 and 6 March) with support from the City Council. What about the bypass?

The OxClean Steering Group looks forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Rosamund Weatherall
Environment Secretary, Oxford Civic Society
Acting Chair, OxClean

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23 October 2009

INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT 2008/09

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To receive the internal audit report for 2008/09 detailing a review of procedures, controls and the management of risk within the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership (OWP).

2 Background

- 2.1 The Vale of White Horse D.C is the current "Auditing Authority" for the OWP and as such has conducted an audit of the OWP's financial activities for 2008/09. A report detailing findings is attached at appendix 1.
- 2.2 The report found that two of the three recommendations made the previous year (2007/08) had been implemented. These were:
- i. That the budget monitoring process be formalised to include diarised formal budget monitoring meetings for the whole financial year, that these be minuted and that monthly budget monitoring reports be provided to the OWP Co-ordinator, and;
 - ii. That a risk register be completed for the OWP function as a whole.

A third recommendation made in 2007/08 had not been implemented, but the report acknowledges that this has now been superseded by events. This recommendation was that consideration be given to providing the OWP Co-ordinator with read only access to the relevant part of Oxfordshire County Council's financial information system. This did not prove possible, but was resolved by instead holding regular budget monitoring meetings.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

- 2.3 A **satisfactory** level of assurance has again been obtained for 2008/09. This means that there is basically a sound system of internal control although there are some minor weaknesses and/or there is evidence that the level of non-compliance may put some minor system objectives at risk. Six recommendations were raised. One High risk, four Medium risk and one Low risk. These are listed in table 1, together with a response from the OWP coordinator.

Table 1 2008/09 internal audit recommendations

| Recommendation | Rationale | Risk level | OWP response |
|---|--|-------------------|--|
| 1. That an exercise be undertaken to ensure that all invoice payments have been correctly coded. | Some invoices, totalling £3,500 were found to have been miscoded. | Low | OWP Coordinator now checking detail coding of each invoice. Reconciled quarterly with Cherwell D.C and Oxfordshire C.C finance systems. |
| 2. That consideration be given to creating an asset register for items of value, and in addition, the issue surrounding the insurance of the street cleaning machine be resolved. | A street cleaning machine was purchased using LAA pump-priming funding by Oxford City on behalf of OWP partner councils. Ownership and insurance of this asset needs to be resolved. | Medium | Discussions with Oxford City now nearing completion. Asset will be owned and insured by Oxford City and loaned to other partners on a short term hire agreement. There are no current plans for further capital purchases by OWP, so an asset register will not be developed at this stage. |
| 3. That a payment schedule is created to ensure that payments to the OWP are made promptly by respective partner members. | Oxford City Council did not pay their contribution of £45,426 for 2008/09 until 28 th April 2009. | Medium | Invoices for 2009/10 have now been raised. Normal terms of payment apply. All Partner Councils are requested to pay their invoices in a timely manner. |
| 4. That a risk management policy should be created. | Without a clearly defined risk management policy, the responsibilities and the risk management process may not be clear to member councils and officers of the OWP. | High | The Oxfordshire Partnership (OP) has been approached and asked whether training and benchmarking in risk management can be developed for its thematic partnerships. OWP has volunteered to pilot/test any work in this area. |
| 5. That appropriate officers within the OWP are provided with training in risk management. | OWP staff members do not currently have any formal risk management training. | Medium | A risk management policy will be drafted for consideration at the next Strategy group and Joint Committee meetings. This will accompany the risk register document developed last year. |
| 6. That the OWP's performance in risk management is measured against best practice. | Currently the OWP's performance in risk management is not measured against best practice. | Medium | |

- 2.4 The OWP Partnership Agreement states that “the role of Auditing Authority will rotate automatically in alphabetical order between the Partner Authorities every two years from the date of the relevant Annual General Meeting.” This is the second audit to be completed by

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

Vale of White Horse D.C. It is recommended that West Oxfordshire D.C be appointed as the Auditing Authority for 2009/10 and 2010/11. Initial discussions with the internal audit team at West Oxfordshire D.C have been held, so that they are able to include this work in their forward work programme.

3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications

- 3.1 Recommendations 1 to 3 in table 1 above have been made to improve OWP's accounting, so that funds are available and reported correctly. These have been classed as Low or Medium risks, which require local management action. Recommendations 4 to 6 aim to improve the partnership's approach to risk management. Recommendation 4 has been classed as high level risk. The partnership's response to this (i.e. the development of a risk management policy) will therefore be considered at a future meeting of the Joint Committee.

4 Areas Affected

- 4.1 All partner councils are affected by these recommendations.

5 Effect on Strategic Policies

- 5.1 Robust financial and internal controls help to support the delivery of each of the OWP's strategic policies.

6 Options or Alternatives

- 6.1 Not applicable.

7 Recommendations

- 7.1 That:
- i. the recommendations summarised in table 1 and detailed in appendix 1 are accepted;
 - ii. the OWP response offered in table 1 is approved;
 - iii. West Oxfordshire D.C be appointed as OWP Auditing Authority for 2009/10 and 2010/11;
 - iv. the internal audit team at Vale of White Horse District Council be thanked for their work as Auditing Authority over the past two years.

8 Reasons for Recommendations

- 8.1 To ensure that adequate financial and other internal controls are in place.

9 Contact Officer

- 9.1 Author: Wayne Lewis Tel: 01295 221903
Email: Wayne.lewis@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

Background Papers:



Ridgeway Shared
Service
Partnership



Internal Audit Report

Oxfordshire Waste Partnership 2009/2010

VALE OF WHITE HORSE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Final Issued: 9 July 2009

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| Management Summary | 2 |
| Observations and Recommendations | 6 |
| Appendix 1 – Audit Framework | 9 |
| Appendix 2 – Staff Interviewed and Report Distribution | 10 |
| Statement of Responsibility | 11 |

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report details the internal audit review of procedures, controls and the management of risk in relation to the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership (OWP). The audit has been undertaken in accordance with the 2009/2010 Audit Plan agreed with the Audit and Governance Committee of Vale of White Horse District Council (VWHDC). The audit approach is provided in the audit framework in Appendix 1.

1.2 The following areas have been covered during the course of this review:

- Appropriate books of account have been properly kept throughout the year.
- The body's financial regulations have been met, payments were supported by invoices, expenditure was approved and VAT was appropriately accounted for.
- The body assessed the significant risks to achieving its objectives and reviewed the adequacy of arrangements to manage these.
- The annual taxation or levy requirement resulted from an adequate budgetary process; progress against the budget was regularly monitored; and reserves were appropriate.
- Expected income was fully received, based on correct prices, properly recorded and promptly banked; and VAT was appropriately accounted for.
- Salaries to employees and allowances to members were paid in accordance with body approvals, and PAYE and NI requirements were properly applied.
- Periodic and year-end bank account reconciliations were properly carried out.
- Year-end accounts were prepared on the correct accounting basis (receipts and payments/income and expenditure), agreed with cash book, were supported by an adequate audit trail from underlying records, and, where appropriate debtors and creditors were properly recorded.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The Vale of White Horse District Council is appointed as OWP's auditing authority, and as such holds the authority to review OWP's financial and other internal controls. The OWP is a relatively recent arrangement between the county and district councils of Oxfordshire. The OWP has a number of core objectives including:

- To reduce waste.
- Promote waste reduction.
- Seek sustainable solutions for waste.
- Meet or exceed targets for waste reduction and work together through the provision of co-ordinated services to maximise the efficient use of resources.

- 2.2 Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) is the appointed accounting authority and Cherwell District Council (CDC) is the employing authority for OWP officers. Many OWP transactions are processed in accordance with OCC's financial procedure rules. Where able, Internal Audit has placed reliance on OCC's internal processes as to the adequacy and effectiveness of controls in place within those systems. Specifically, this applies to the financial records and transactions, budgetary control and bank reconciliation.

3. PREVIOUS AUDIT REPORTS

- 3.1 The OWP was last subject to an internal audit review in May 2008, three recommendations were raised and a Satisfactory opinion was issued.
- 3.2 Two of the recommendations have been implemented and the third did not prove possible and has been superseded by events.

4. 200/2010 AUDIT ASSURANCE

- 4.1 **Satisfactory Assurance:** There is basically a sound system of internal control although there are some minor weaknesses and/or there is evidence that the level of non-compliance may put some minor system objectives at risk.
- 4.2 Six recommendations have been raised in this review. One High risk, four Medium risk and one Low risk.

5. MAIN FINDINGS

5.1 Financial Records and Transactions

5.2 All payments/orders go through the OCC financial information system (SAP). Internal Audit examined transactions for 2008/09, and it was noted that there were a number of miscodings. It is the opinion of Internal Audit that an exercise should be undertaken to ensure that there are no other incorrectly posted entries within the accounts.

5.3 At the time of the previous year's review, the OWP had no fixed assets. Internal Audit was informed that during 2008/09, Oxford City Council purchased a street cleaning machine. Oxford City Council also maintains it, but there are issues and uncertainty over the insurance cover surrounding it. It is thought that in future, more equipment may be purchased under the guise of OWP, and for this reason an asset register needs to be created. Two recommendations have been made as a result of our work in this area.

5.4 Budgetary Control

5.5 At the time of the previous review, the monitoring of the budget had not been formalised and set up. However, this has since changed. Regular reports are received, recharges occur quarterly and there are regular meetings with finance officers. This is a significant improvement. However, it was noticed that Oxford City Council had not made their contribution to the 2008/09 budget within the accounting year. It transpired that their payment of £45,426 was received on the 28th April 2009. One recommendation has been made as a result of our work in this area.

5.6 Risk Management

5.7 At the time of the previous audit, there was no risk register in place for the OWP. This has since changed and a risk register was created during 2008/09, which is reported to Committee and the Officer Group quarterly. However, there is currently no risk management policy. During discussions with officers it also became apparent that the officers of the OWP have not attended any risk management training. Internal Audit also questioned whether performance in risk management is measured against best practice, and this is something that the Waste Partnership Officer is aware of and appreciates the need to benchmark against other organisations. Three recommendations have been made as result of our work in this area.

5.8 Salaries

5.9 Officers of the OWP are employed by and paid by Cherwell District Council. At the time of the previous review, there was one employee but this has increased to three. The salaries were checked to Cherwell District Council's pay scales for both 2008/09 and 2009/10. In addition the March and April salaries for the three employees were checked to ensure all deductions had been correctly undertaken. No recommendations have been made as a result of our work in this area.

5.10 **Bank Reconciliations**

5.11 There is no separate bank account for OWP and all transactions are treated as normal OCC transactions. Therefore, the OWP bank reconciliation is part of the normal OCC bank reconciliation process and is not specific to the OWP. OCC's bank reconciliation process has been subject to review by their own internal auditors, and concerns noted were discussed with officers and the relevant recommendations are being implemented. No recommendations have been made as a result of our work in this area.

5.12 **Year End Accounts**

5.13 All OWP year end figures are produced in accordance with OCC's Financial Procedure Rules. In addition, OCC's Internal Audit team has undertaken work which has addressed certain issues during the 2008/09 financial year, including the classification and revenue and capital expenditure. From the testing undertaken by Internal Audit against objective one, we have no concerns in this area. No recommendations have been made as a result of our work in this area.

6. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

6.1 Internal Audit would like to take this opportunity to thank all staff involved for their assistance with the audit.

7. **CATEGORISATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.1 To assist management in using our reports, we have categorised our recommendations according to their level of priority as follows:

High Risk Fundamental control weakness for senior management action

Medium Risk Other control weakness for local management action

Low Risk Recommended best practice to improve overall control

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINANCIAL RECORDS AND TRANSACTIONS

1. Coding

(Low Risk)

| Recommendation | Rationale | Responsibility |
|--|--|----------------------------|
| That an exercise be undertaken to ensure that all invoice payments have been correctly coded. | <p><u>Best Practice</u> All invoices should be correctly coded and staff should be aware of which codes to use.</p> <p><u>Findings</u> Whilst examining account 12531, Professional Fees, it was noticed that there were a number of payments for advertising, totalling £3,500 which were miscodings.</p> <p><u>Risk</u> If incorrect codes are used to post invoices, the accounts will be misstated and under and overspends may be incorrectly reported.</p> | OWP Co-ordinator |
| Management Response | | Implementation Date |
| Recommendation is Agreed Codings will be checked quarterly. Management Response: OWP Co-ordinator | | June 09 |

2. Assets

(Medium Risk)

| Recommendation | Rationale | Responsibility |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| That consideration be given to creating an asset register for items of value, and in addition, the issue surrounding the insurance of the street cleaning machine be resolved. | <p><u>Best Practice</u> All items that are owned or the OWP has responsibility for above a certain value should be recorded either on an inventory or an asset register.</p> <p><u>Findings</u> At the time of the previous year's review, the OWP had no fixed assets. Internal Audit was informed that during 2008/09, Oxford City Council purchased a street cleaning machine. Oxford City Council also maintains it, but there are issues and uncertainty over the insurance cover surrounding it. Internal Audit was informed that in the future, it is likely that more equipment will be purchased under the guise of OWP.</p> <p><u>Risk</u> If items of significant value are not officially recorded, they may not be accounted for correctly at year end.</p> | OWP Co-ordinator |
| Management Response | | Implementation Date |
| Recommendation is Agreed Will seek resolution of insurance issues for street cleaning machine with Oxford City. Will create asset register only if further items of value are purchased. Management Response: OWP Co-ordinator | | October 2009 |

BUDGET MONITORING

3. Payments

(Medium Risk)

| Recommendation | Rationale | Responsibility |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| That a payment schedule is created to ensure that payments to the OWP are made promptly by respective partner members. | <p><u>Best Practice</u> All partner members of the OWP should pay their contributions promptly and to an agreed schedule.</p> <p><u>Findings</u> Oxford City Council did not pay their contribution of £45,426 for 2008/09 until 28th April 2009.</p> <p><u>Risk</u> If partners do not pay their contribution promptly, there is a risk that funds may not be available to action projects.</p> | OWP Co-ordinator |
| Management Response | | Implementation Date |
| <p>Recommendation is Agreed in Principle All partner councils were invoiced by OCC in a timely manner. There appears to have been an undue delay by debtors at Oxford City Council.</p> <p>Management Response: OWP Co-ordinator</p> | | July 2009 |

RISK MANAGEMENT

4. Risk Management Policy

(High Risk)

| Recommendation | Rationale | Responsibility |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| <p>That a risk management policy should be created which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • defines risk management; • details the role of risk management within OWP; • details the responsibilities for risk management within OWP; • Describes the risk management process. | <p><u>Best Practice</u> The OWP should have a risk management policy in place which defines risk management and the role of risk management within the OWP.</p> <p><u>Findings</u> The OWP has created a Risk Management Strategy in place which has been reported to committee, however, there is currently no risk management policy in place. This is an area that the OWP Co-ordinator intends to review in the near future to ensure that the OWP is fully compliant with all risk management requirements.</p> <p><u>Risk</u> Without a clearly defined risk management policy, the responsibilities and the risk management process may not be clear to member councils and officers of the OWP.</p> | OWP Co-ordinator |
| Management Response | | Implementation Date |
| <p>Recommendation is Agreed Management Response: OWP Co-ordinator</p> | | October 2009 |

5. Training**(Medium Risk)**

| Recommendation | Rationale | Responsibility |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| That appropriate officers within the OWP are provided with training in risk management. | <p><u>Best Practice</u> Appropriate officers should have received training in risk management.</p> <p><u>Findings</u> Currently, officers of the OWP have not attended training in risk management.</p> <p><u>Risk</u> If the relevant officers have not received the appropriate training in risk management, they may be unaware of all that is required to implement an effective risk management regime.</p> | OWP Co-ordinator |
| Management Response | | Implementation Date |
| Recommendation is Agreed Management Response: OWP Co-ordinator | | October 2009 |

6. Performance**(Medium Risk)**

| Recommendation | Rationale | Responsibility |
|--|--|----------------------------|
| That the OWP's performance in risk management is measured against best practice. | <p><u>Best Practice</u> The OWP's performance in risk management is regularly benchmarked against other partnerships and forums.</p> <p><u>Findings</u> Currently the OWP's performance in risk management is not measured against best practice.</p> <p><u>Risk</u> If performance in risk management is not benchmarked the OWP may be unaware of improvements that could be incorporated into its approach.</p> | OWP Co-ordinator |
| Management Response | | Implementation Date |
| Recommendation is Agreed OWP's current approach to risk management is currently being reviewed by the OCC Partnership Unit. Management Response: OWP Co-ordinator | | October 2009 |

APPENDIX 1 – AUDIT FRAMEWORK

1. AUDIT OBJECTIVES

- 1.1 The audit was designed to ensure that management have implemented adequate and effective controls over the OWP.

2. AUDIT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

- 2.1 The audit approach was developed with reference to the Internal Audit Charter and by an assessment of risk and management controls operating within each area of the scope.

- 2.2 The aim of the audit was to establish if:

- there are adequate internal controls in effective and efficient operation;
- the processes are meeting the requirements of internal policy and procedural standards; and
- the processes are meeting external codes of practice, professional and statutory regulations.

- 2.3 The following procedures were adopted:

- identification of the role and objectives of each area;
- identification of risks within the systems and controls in existence to allow the control objectives to be achieved; and
- evaluation and testing of controls within the systems.

From these procedures we have identified weaknesses in the systems of control, produced specific proposals to improve the control environment and have drawn an overall conclusion on the design and operation of the system.

APPENDIX 2 – STAFF INTERVIEWED AND REPORT DISTRIBUTION

1. STAFF INTERVIEWED

- 1.1
- Wayne Lewis, OWP Co-ordinator (Cherwell District Council)
 - Carolyn Baxter, Interim Head of Waste Management (Oxfordshire County Council)
 - Rob Finlayson, Finance Business Partner (Oxfordshire County Council)

2. REPORT DISTRIBUTION

2.1 A copy of this final has been distributed to the following officers:

- Wayne Lewis, OWP Co-ordinator (Cherwell District Council)
- Carolyn Baxter, Interim Head of Waste Management (Oxfordshire County Council)
- Rob Finlayson, Finance Business Partner (Oxfordshire County Council).
- Steve Bishop, Strategic Director (Section 151 Officer Vale of White Horse District Council)

STATEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

Internal Audit takes responsibility for this report, which is prepared on the basis of the limitations set out below.

INTERNAL AUDIT JULY 2009

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Contact Persons: | |
| Harry Oliver | Senior Auditor Tel: 01491 823840 (SODC) / 01235 520202 ext 474 (VWHDC) |
| Adrianna Penn | Audit Manager Tel: 01491 823544 (SODC) / 01235 547615 (VWHDC) |

The matters raised in this report are only those which came to our attention during the course of our audit and are not necessarily a comprehensive statement of all the weaknesses that exist or all improvements that might be made. Recommendations for improvements should be assessed by you for their full impact before they are implemented. The performance of internal audit work should not be taken as a substitute for management's responsibilities for the application of sound practices. We emphasise that the responsibility for a sound system of internal control rests with management and work performed by internal audit should not be relied upon to identify all strengths and weaknesses that may exist. Nor should internal audit work be relied upon to identify all circumstances of fraud or irregularity should there be any, although our audit procedures have been designed so that any material irregularity has a reasonable probability of discovery. Even sound systems of internal control may not be proof against collusive fraud. Internal audit procedures are designed to focus on areas as identified by management as being of greatest risk and significance. Effective implementation of our recommendations by management is important for the maintenance of a reliable internal control system.

This report has been prepared solely for VWHDC use. No responsibility to any third party is accepted as the report has not been prepared, and is not intended, for any other purpose.

AGREEMENT OF AUDITEE

I have been briefed on the findings of this audit and have had an opportunity to discuss them with the auditor. I have read the rationale provided for the recommendations made, and have provided and take responsibility for my management response and proposed implementation dates.

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Signed: | |
| Job Title: | |
| Date: | |

Please return this signed report to the Audit Manager, and keep a copy for your records.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23rd October 2009

Collection and disposal of waste from Charities, schools etc (Schedule II Waste)

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To set out how district councils can begin collecting waste from schedule ii sites in a consistent way, without charging for disposal from October 2009.

2 Background

- 2.1 This paper is part of the ongoing Oxfordshire Waste Partnership response to Defra guidance (see appendix i) sent to all waste authorities setting out its views on the operational aspects of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 with particular reference to waste from sites listed in schedule ii of the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992 (see appendix ii).
- 2.2 Sites listed in schedule ii are sites considered to produce household waste for which a collection charge, but no disposal charge can be made.
- 2.3 Officers from OWP member authorities undertook a scoping exercise to ascertain the impact of schedule ii waste from charities reporting their findings to the OWP Strategy Group, 19th June 2009. Following this meeting officers have begun setting up systems to allow for the collection & disposal of charity waste to begin from October 2009. In conjunction with this officers have also progressed work on the collection of other types of schedule ii waste.
- 2.4 This paper outlines how the schedule ii collection systems will work in practice and is based on the agreed principles for progressing this work outlined below:
- A co-ordinated approach needs to be developed as far as is possible
 - No council is to profit at the expense of another
 - The need to encourage maximum landfill diversion
 - The new arrangements need to be customer friendly
 - Agreed charges are to be smaller for recycling than landfill refuse, centring on the Polluter-Pays Principle

3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications

- 3.1 There should not be any financial implications to district councils because the Controlled Waste Regulations allow for the cost of waste collection to be passed on to sites listed in schedule ii. Costs of disposal have already had budget for 2009/10 allocated by the county council.
- 3.2 There may be some financial issues due to inflexibility in collection contracts in some districts. However, since the Controlled Waste Regulations allow for all collection costs to be passed on to the site receiving the service this should be an operational rather than financial issue.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

4 Areas Affected

- 4.1 It is proposed that wastes as listed in schedule ii of the Controlled Waste Regulations be treated, by OWP Partner Councils, as household waste for which a charge for collection may be applied subject to the guidelines listed in appendix iii.
- 4.2 A detailed definition of each type of schedule ii waste can be found in appendix iv. Details of collection, in each OWP member area, including cost, scope and frequency can be found in appendix v.
- 4.3 Schedule ii waste is likely to come from a wide variety of institutions and come in various quantities so it is difficult to forecast, with reasonable accuracy, the expected tonnages that may arise as a result of the proposed schedule ii policy. However, some analysis of schedule ii customers with existing Oxfordshire local authority collections has been undertaken.
- 4.4 It is estimated that up to 8 per cent of waste from existing commercial customers is *prima facie* schedule ii waste and that each schedule ii institutions produces up to 6 tonnes of landfill waste per annum. If this is extrapolated county wide it means that of Oxfordshire's 20,000 businesses, 1,600 could be eligible for schedule ii collection and will produce in total 9,600 tonnes of landfill waste. This falls within the budget allocated by Oxfordshire County Council to cover the disposal costs of this waste. As stated above, the collection costs of this waste can be recovered, by the collection authority from the waste producer.
- 4.5 Oxfordshire County Council will ensure that Household Waste Recycling Centres offer a schedule ii compliant service as per the principles agreed in paragraph 2.4.

5 Effect on Strategic Policies

- 5.1 By defining waste from schedule ii sites as household waste, Oxfordshire landfill waste arisings may be affected by up to 9,600 tonnes of additional waste to landfill at a cost of £672,000.

6 Options or Alternatives

- 6.1 The proposed roll out of collections to schedule ii sites where no disposal charge is levied varies from district to district and is set out in appendix v. These have been developed in order to meet the principles listed in paragraph 2.4.

7 Recommendations

- 7.1 OWP members implement the collection plans as set out in appendix v as per the guidelines in appendix iii from October 2009.
- 7.2 OWP members agree to monitor schedule ii waste arisings & develop plans to divert as much as possible from landfill.

Appendix 1 Letter from DEFRA to Local Authorities on CWR schedule ii

Dear Sir or Madam

Classification and reporting of waste

1. I am writing to remind all authorities with waste collection and/or disposal duties (hereafter referred to as waste authorities) of existing legislation and guidance in relation to certain aspects of classification and reporting waste. Waste authorities have statutory obligations to report waste data. This letter provides important information that waste authorities should take note of when reporting waste data. This is not new guidance and does not replace existing guidance.
2. In recent months Defra has received a high volume of enquiries seeking further clarification on household and commercial waste. In addition a variety of sources, including the Audit Commission (AC) and the Greater London Authority, have brought to Defra's attention a number of waste classification and data reporting issues.
3. An ongoing AC investigation of practice has revealed that even within a single county area there is a wide variation in interpretation and understanding of the legislation.
4. There is variation in how some regulations are currently being interpreted by waste authorities. In the light of this I am writing to all waste authorities in England to ensure a consistent approach is being used throughout the country.
5. I am writing to clarify Defra's interpretation of a number of issues related to:
 - section 45 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA)
 - section 51 of the EPA
 - schedules 1 and 2 of the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992 (CWR) and
 - the Household Waste Recycling Act 2003 (HWRA)

Section 45 of the EPA

Making Arrangements for Commercial Waste Collection

6. Defra has carried out an informal survey and found that a number of waste authorities have posted on their websites a statement to the effect that the authority does not provide a waste collection service for commercial waste (trade waste) and in some cases directs enquirers to Yellow Pages. Defra believes this does not fulfil the authority's duty under section 45(1)(b) of the EPA.

7. Defra published updated guidance on municipal waste in June 2006.¹ Regarding commercial waste, the guidance states that waste collection authorities (WCA) have a duty under section 45(1)(b) of the EPA to arrange for the collection of commercial waste where requested to do so. Section 75(7) of the EPA defines commercial waste as “waste from premises used wholly or mainly for the purposes of trade or business or the purposes of sport, recreation or entertainment”. This definition excludes household waste, industrial waste, agricultural waste and waste from any mine or quarry.
8. If a WCA declines to collect commercial waste when requested to do so, and does not arrange for its collection by a private sector contractor, it is likely to be acting in breach of its duty under section 45(1)(b).
9. Any WCA thinking of operating a selective service for commercial waste would need to satisfy itself that it was not breaching its duties under the EPA. If a request is made of the authority to collect commercial waste, the authority must have in place arrangements to meet the request. Telling enquirers that the authority does not offer a commercial waste service or, for example, to look in Yellow Pages or providing a list of waste contractors in the area is not sufficient to comply.

Reporting arisings of commercial waste

10. Commercial waste which is collected by a WCA itself will be waste which comes into the possession or under the control of a waste authority, and therefore in Defra’s view qualifies as municipal waste² and falls within the Landfill Allowances Trading Scheme (LATS). This waste must be reported to the Environment Agency (the Agency) by the waste disposal authority (WDA) that holds the allowances.
11. Furthermore, because the duty in section 45(1)(b) of the EPA is to arrange for the collection of commercial waste, it also follows that waste will come into the possession or under the control of a WCA if it is collected by a private sector contractor on behalf of the WCA.
12. This is because:
 - a. the waste will be collected as a means of meeting the WCA’s obligations under section 45(1)(b) of the EPA; and
 - b. in two-tier areas the WCA will need to ensure that all the waste is delivered as directed by the WDA, or recycled in accordance

¹ www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/localauth/lats/pdf/lats-municipalwasteguidance.pdf

² A consultation on the definition of municipal waste as set out in Defra’s guidance on LATS closed on 21st September 2007. Some local authorities are concerned by the apparent difference between the practical definition used in Defra’s guidance and the legal definition set down in the Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003. The consultation puts forward proposals to amend the definition of municipal waste to resolve the apparent tension with Defra’s interpretation.

with section 48(2) of the EPA. In single-tier areas the waste will need to be managed in accordance with section 51 of the EPA.

Reporting commercial waste where the authority has “made arrangements” for its collection

13. Any waste collected by a third party on behalf of the waste authority, in response to a request according to section 45(1)(b) of the EPA, is municipal waste. It should be reported as collected municipal waste for the purposes of LATS (see paragraphs 3.7 and 3.8 of the June 2006 guidance on municipal waste).
14. The Environment Agency (the Agency) has recently completed detailed audits of waste data reporting by 24 WDAs. These have found generic issues associated with interpretation of guidance specific to LATS. The Agency plans to publish frequently asked questions to help local authorities interpret the waste reporting requirements soon.

Classification of waste from Army barracks³

15. The MoD reports some waste authorities are either charging for the collection of or refusing to collect waste from army properties known as Single Living Accommodation (SLA). This is in contrast to the treatment of waste from army properties known as married quarters, where, the evidence suggests, waste authorities are collecting free of charge in accordance with the EPA. Under section 45 of the EPA the WCA has a duty to collect household waste in its area. Section 75(5) of the EPA clarifies the meaning of household waste. The relevant subsection in the case of SLA is 75(5)(a) which states that household waste means waste from a *domestic property, that is to say, a building or self-contained part of a building which is used wholly for the purposes of living accommodation*. This clearly includes SLA and therefore under the EPA authorities cannot charge for the collection of this waste or refuse to collect it.

Section 51 of the EPA

Acceptance of waste at Civic Amenity sites

16. There is no legal requirement on a waste authority to accept waste free of charge at sites provided under section 51(1)(b) of the EPA⁴ from any source other than residents in the area. However, the authority running the site has the right to accept waste from other sources if it so chooses and it can make a charge for deposit⁵ of such waste.

³ The position set out here applies to all military bases not just Army barracks.

⁴ These places are generally known as Civic Amenity (CA) sites or Household Waste Recovery Centres (HWRC).

⁵ In the case of household waste brought to the site by an organisation such a charity shop for example, this is not a charge for disposal. Rather it should be seen as a charge for deposit of the waste at a location from where it will be responsibly treated and so the depositor will not be charged with fly-tipping.

17. Defra has been asked to clarify its interpretation of the term 'resident in the area' specifically whether or not this can apply to organisations. Defra's view is that the term applies to people only and does not apply to organisations.
18. Defra has been approached by the Furniture Re-use Network (FRN) which has pointed out that its members are generally subject to charges at CA sites in spite of the fact that they are frequently dealing with household waste that arises from residents in the area and reducing the authority's waste arisings in the process. Any such waste which they deposit at CA sites is waste which would otherwise have been domestic household waste and thus not legally subject to any charge.
19. The FRN believes that it has developed a robust record-keeping system that demonstrates the source of the material its members collect and the diversion resulting from their reuse and recycling activities. It is thus possible, in the FRN's view, to demonstrate which of the waste taken to CA sites by its members would otherwise have been domestic household waste.
20. Defra does not intend to instruct local authorities to accept such household waste at their CA sites free of charge for FRN members. However, we know that some authorities have recognised the advantage to their own waste objectives of encouraging reuse groups by waiving charges where waste can be shown to have arisen in local households.
21. There are other voluntary groups who have also found their activities limited by some waste authorities' insistence that they cannot deposit waste at the local CA site without paying a charge. An example is Age Concern⁶ which through its 'buddy system' tries to provide a free bulky waste delivery (to the CA site) for the elderly in the area who do not have the means to transport the waste to the CA site themselves. Where a local authority does not offer free bulky waste collections for the elderly or infirm, the work of voluntary groups can cost-effectively supplement the services offered by the authority. Waste authorities will wish to consider the scope for showing flexibility in the way they handle such issues. Provided the third party group has an accurate record-keeping system, the authority can count wastes treated or diverted through these groups towards its own waste performance indicators and LATS landfill diversions.

Schedules 1 and 2 of the CWR

22. Defra is aware that inconsistency of interpretation exists on certain issues related to the schedules.

⁶ The organisation would of course have to apply to the EA for a waste carrier licence but as a charity it would be exempt from the fee.

Schedule 1 of the CWR

23. Schedule 1 of the CWR⁷ sets out those sources of waste to be considered as household waste.

Waste from places of religious worship

24. Defra is aware of confusion in some waste authorities over the status of waste from premises used as places of religious worship.

25. Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the CWR classifies as household waste from a hereditament or premises exempt from local non-domestic rating by virtue of, in England and Wales, paragraph 11 of Schedule 5 to the Local Government Finance Act 1988. In practice, this means waste from places of religious worship. Authorities with waste collection duties must collect this waste and may not charge for its collection or disposal.

26. Under paragraph 11(1)(b) of Schedule 5 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988, the provision in paragraph 25 above also applies to buildings used in connection with the conduct of public religious worship such as an office or church hall. However, if the church, mosque, synagogue etc hires out such buildings to other groups not connected with the conduct of religious worship this would be a commercial activity and any waste arising from such use would be commercial waste for which a charge for both collection and disposal can be made.

27. Paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 of the CWR⁸ classifies waste from premises occupied by a charity as household waste for which an authority may charge for collection (but not disposal).

28. However, Defra is aware that some authorities are charging for collection of waste from charities located in places of worship. If the activities of the charity are in connection with the conduct of public religious worship the charity would be entitled to free waste collection as well as free disposal.

Schedule 2 of the CWR

29. Schedule 2 lists those types of household waste for which an authority can currently⁹ make a charge for collection.

Educational establishments and hospitals

⁷ www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si1992/Uksi_19920588_en_2.htm

⁸ www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si1992/Uksi_19920588_en_3.htm

⁹ Defra has recently consulted on proposals for local authorities to introduce financial incentive schemes for household waste.

30. Paragraph 5 lists –“*Waste from residential hostels, a residential home or from premises forming part of a university, school or other educational establishment or forming part of a hospital or nursing home*”. Some authorities have interpreted this to mean that only waste from the residential parts of educational establishments and hospitals should count as household waste for the purposes of Schedule 2 and the rest of the waste from these sources should be treated as commercial waste.
31. The existing guidance (see footnote 11 below) is clear and states – *When considering whether waste from a particular site or part of a site is household waste, the question to be asked is “do the premises in question form part of a university, hospital etc?” If the answer to this question is “yes” then, subject to the provisions of the 1992 Regulations, the waste may be considered to be household waste. Among the provisions of the 1992 Regulations which may be relevant are those which classify clinical waste and waste arising from works of construction or demolition as industrial waste.*
32. Therefore, Defra’s view is that all waste arising from premises forming part of a school, university, other educational establishment¹⁰, hospital or nursing home, that is owned and operated by that organisation is household waste falling within paragraph 5 of Schedule 2, except any clinical, construction or demolition waste arising from the premises.
33. Where an educational establishment or hospital allows a business or businesses to operate from its buildings e.g. a book shop in a university or snack bar in a hospital, waste arising from these sources would be commercial waste and the WCA would be entitled to charge for both collection and disposal of this waste.
34. Defra has also been asked to clarify the situation where an educational establishment hires out its residential facilities outside term time. This will depend on whether the service(s) offered by the educational establishment qualifies it as a hotel within the meaning set out in section 1(3) of the Hotel Proprietors Act 1956. If it does, waste arising from the premises when used in this way would fall under schedule 4 of the CWR and so should be treated as commercial waste. Otherwise it would be a residential hostel which is covered by the same paragraph in schedule 2 of the CWR as educational establishments and therefore would be household waste for which a charge for collection could be imposed.

Caravan and camp sites

35. There is also evidence that some waste authorities have classified waste from caravan and camp sites in a variety of ways. Domestic

¹⁰ This applies to all educational establishments, including those in the private sector not just those under Local Education Authorities (LEA) control.

property on the site, which could include caravans used as permanent homes, would be entitled to free waste collection like any other home.

36. Defra's view regarding waste from the tents, caravans and chalets used for holiday accommodation is that such waste falls under paragraph 6 of schedule 2 and therefore into the category of household waste for which a charge for collection can be made.
37. Waste from commercial facilities on caravan or camp sites, such as shops, bars, clubs and restaurants should be classified as commercial waste and therefore can incur a charge for waste disposal as well as collection.

Charities and charity shops

38. Paragraph 15 lists "*waste from premises occupied by charities and used wholly or mainly for charitable purposes*". While most waste authorities do classify waste from charities as household waste, numerous waste authorities have chosen to classify waste from charity shops as commercial waste. In Defra's view this is an incorrect interpretation of the regulations, and in 2006 Defra issued an email to those authorities it was aware of, drawing their attention to this.
39. Section 64(10) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 confers "charitable purpose" status on premises which sell wholly or mainly donated goods, and where the proceeds themselves go to a charitable purpose. Therefore waste from charity shops should be treated the same as waste from charities, namely as household waste. Schedule 2(15) of the CWR allows waste authorities to make a charge for the collection of household waste from charity shops.

Prisons and other penal institutions

40. Paragraph 16 lists "*waste from a prison or other penal institution*". The issue here is whether the waste arising from the office, workshops or other facilities of a penal institution should also be included in this category (household waste for which a charge for collection can be made). As the reference is simply to "*waste from a prison...*", there is a very strong case that a prison office forms part of the prison. It is Defra's view that waste arising from the prison office etc is included in the category and so a charge for collection may be made but not for disposal.

The Household Waste Recycling Act (HWRA)

41. The HWRA amended the EPA to place a duty on all English waste authorities with a duty under section 45(1)(a) of the EPA, to make arrangements for the collection of at least two types of recyclable waste together or individually separated from the rest of the household waste. Some waste authorities have asked whether this duty extends

to household waste listed under Schedule 2 of the CWR (household waste for which a charge for collection can be made). Defra confirms that the duty in section 45A of the EPA also applies to this waste. However, unlike the household waste falling within schedule 1 of the CWR, the authority is entitled to charge for collection of this waste. This means that any holder of household waste that requests an authority with waste collection duties in the area to collect it, and where the exceptions set out in section 45A(2) of the HWRA do not apply, can expect the authority to provide a separate collection of at least two recyclates by 31 December 2010.

42. The exceptions to the duty to make arrangements for the separate collection of recyclable waste set out in section 45A(2) of the EPA, as amended by the HWRA, are broadly the same as the exceptions in section 45(1)(a) of the EPA. Therefore as a rule of thumb where a general household waste collection is provided the authority will be required to provide a collection of at least two recyclates separate from the rest of the waste by 31 December 2010. Furthermore, in cases falling under Schedule 2 where the authority is entitled to recoup its collection costs for the service, it is unlikely that the exception in section 45A(2)(a) would ever apply. After 31 December 2010 any waste collection service from sources covered by schedule 2 of the CWR must include a separate collection of at least two recyclates.

43. All household waste recycled or composted counts towards the authority's household waste recycling and composting performance indicators.

Additional information

44. Defra's interpretation of the regulations set out above

1. has followed consideration of the original guidance issued by the Department of the Environment (DoE) when the EPA and CWR came into force¹¹
2. is in response to a request from the AC for clarification of the CWR and
3. a request from the Ministry of Defence to investigate the difference in approach taken by authorities when collecting army waste, and
4. concerns raised by a number of voluntary organisations at the variation in the way they are treated by waste authorities.

¹¹ For reference, the original guidance issued by the Department of the Environment in 1992 is DoE Circular 14/92. There does not appear to be a website that offers free access to this document; the link below is to one that requires the user to subscribe to the site <http://www.tionestop.com/argon/srch.asp?newsaction=2&hc=0&No=200&help=30&N=4294966869&qs=1&Ne=43&Ny=1&R=1&Ns=%7C0&suppl=5>. You can obtain a paper copy of the Circular from HMSO; the ISBN is 0-11-752665-7

Please note that the views expressed in this letter are those of Defra. It is for waste authorities to have regard to this guidance in exercising their functions under the EPA. Ultimately it will be for the courts to interpret the relevant provisions of the legislation. Your authority should seek its own legal advice if it takes issue with the interpretation set out here.

Statutory Instrument 1992 No. 588

The Controlled Waste Regulations 1992 - *continued*

SCHEDULE 2

Regulation 4

TYPES OF HOUSEHOLD WASTE FOR WHICH A CHARGE FOR COLLECTION MAY BE MADE

1. Any article of waste which exceeds 25 kilograms in weight.
2. Any article of waste which does not fit, or cannot be fitted into—
 - (a) a receptacle for household waste provided in accordance with section 46; or
 - (b) where no such receptacle is provided, a cylindrical container 750 millimetres in diameter and 1 metre in length.
3. Garden waste.
4. Clinical waste from a domestic property, a caravan or from a moored vessel used wholly for the purposes of living accommodation.
5. Waste from a residential hostel, a residential home or from premises forming part of a university, school or other educational establishment or forming part of a hospital or nursing home.
6. Waste from domestic property or a caravan used in the course of a business for the provision of self-catering holiday accommodation.
7. Dead domestic pets.
8. Any substances or articles which, by virtue of a notice served by a collection authority under section 46, the occupier of the premises may not put into a receptacle for household waste provided in accordance with that section.
9. Litter and refuse collected under section 89(1)(f).
10. Waste from—
 - (a) in England and Wales, domestic property forming part of a composite hereditament;
 - (b) in Scotland, the residential part of part residential subjects.
11. Any mineral or synthetic oil or grease.
12. Asbestos.
13. Waste from a caravan which in accordance with any licence or planning permission regulating the use of the caravan site on which the caravan is stationed is not allowed to be used for human habitation throughout the year.
14. Waste from a camp site, other than from any domestic property on that site.
15. Waste from premises occupied by a charity and wholly or mainly used for charitable purposes, unless it is waste falling within paragraph 1 of Schedule 1.
16. Waste from a prison or other penal institution.
17. Waste from a hall or other premises used wholly or mainly for public meetings.
18. Waste from a royal palace.

[Continue](#)

[Previous](#)

[Contents](#)

[Other UK SIs](#) | [Home](#) | [National Assembly for Wales Statutory Instruments](#) | [Scottish Statutory Instruments](#) | [Statutory Rules of Northern Ireland](#) | [Her Majesty's Stationery Office](#)

We welcome your [comments](#) on this site

© Crown copyright 1992

Prepared 20th September 2000

Appendix III Guidelines for collection of Schedule ii Household Waste

1. Waste will be collected from the following sites:
 - private residential homes, residential hostels, nursing homes, private hospitals
 - independent schools
 - state funded universities
 - properties/caravans used to provide self-catering holiday accommodation
 - halls or premises used for public meetings
 - royal palaces
 - charities and charity shops
 - waste from events held for charitable purposes

2. In relation to waste from Oxfordshire County Council funded institutions including care homes and LEA schools, our obligations under the Controlled Waste Regulations are being discharged under existing arrangements. So, except in circumstances where an existing commercial waste collection exists, it will not be necessary to provide such institutions with a schedule ii collection. Enquiries from Oxfordshire County Council funded institutions should be referred to Oxfordshire County Council's waste management team.

3. Waste from MOD, Ministry of Justice or NHS funded institutions is the subject of current negotiations between the LGA and central government. Therefore a schedule ii collection service should not be provided until these negotiations have concluded.

4. It is not necessary to advertise schedule ii collections and, except in circumstances where an existing commercial arrangement exists, should be provided upon enquiry.

5. Where a local authority has an existing commercial waste collection arrangement with a schedule ii site it will be necessary to revise this service to ensure compliance with the Controlled Waste Regulations.

6. In order to ensure waste reduction principles are central to schedule ii collections it is necessary to maintain a direct relationship between the waste producer and the collector. Therefore billing arrangements should be between producer and collection authority only with no third party involvement.

7. Organisations benefiting from a schedule ii collection service must receive at least one recycling container in order to divert recyclable waste from landfill. Service recipients should be encouraged to reduce waste as much as possible, see paper from 19th June for analysis of waste reduction potential from schedule ii sites.

8. Collection arrangements will be made available, upon enquiry, from October 2009.

9. Collection of schedule ii waste needs to be undertaken in accordance with waste minimisation best practice. OWP members will develop strategies to ensure this waste is, as much as possible, diverted from landfill. Possible strategies for minimisation may include the provision of waste audits to schedule ii customers.

10. Waste collected as schedule ii household waste will be presented to the county council for disposal as household waste with the exception of

i. West Oxfordshire

- Commercial & domestic residual waste currently co-mingled using agreed average weights. This will be readjusted to reflect schedule ii household status of some customers.
- Schedule ii recycling will be collected as domestic waste and presented to county with other domestic recycling.
- Schedule ii billing will begin from 1st October, although some waste has been presented to county council as commercial. West Oxfordshire will request this to be refunded subject to provision of documentation.

-

ii. Oxford City

- Residual waste will be collected on a dedicated vehicle and presented to the County Council as household waste
- Recyclate will be collected on a commercial round using new 'POD' vehicle with on board weighing. This data will be recorded manually and passed to County Council to arrange payments. An 'in-cab ICT solution' is currently being set up, when this is up and running it will send data automatically.

Appendix iv, types of schedule ii waste

| Where an <i>existing commercial collection exists</i>, offer schedule ii collection beginning 1/10/9 | Provide schedule ii collection <i>upon enquiry only</i> beginning 1/10/9 | Offer holding response upon enquiry |
|---|---|---|
| Waste from a private residential home, residential hostel, nursing home, hospital | Waste from a private residential home, residential hostel, nursing home, hospital | Waste from a prison |
| Waste from an Oxfordshire County Council funded institution | | Waste from an Oxfordshire County Council funded institution |
| Waste from a state funded university | Waste from a state funded university | Waste from an NHS funded residential home, residential hostel, nursing home, hospital |
| Waste from an independent school for 4-18 year olds registered under 2000 Education Act | Waste from an independent school for 4-18 year olds registered under 2000 Education Act | |
| Waste from a property/caravan used to provide self-catering holiday accomadation | Waste from a property/caravan used to provide self-catering holiday accomadation | |
| Waste from a campsite (domestic property on campsite must not be charged for collection). | Waste from a campsite (domestic property on campsite must not be charged for collection). | |
| Waste from a hall or premises used for public meetings | Waste from a hall or premises used for public meetings | |
| Waste from a royal palace | Waste from a royal palace | |
| Waste from charities including charity shops | Waste from charities including charity shops | |

Appendix v, District Collection Details

| Waste collection authority | Lead Officer | Frequency | Charges |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Cherwell | Craig Stephens | Fortnightly | £104 per year + VAT |
| Oxford | Nathalie Desenclos | Collections can take place as the customer requires | Refuse from £3.80 to £ |
| South Oxfordshire | Fred Thompson Brown | Refuse fortnightly, recycling fortnightly, weekly food | Bins 180l-360l £21.65- £57.65, Food bin £3.50. Collection Refuse £21.33 pa (180l) Recycling £19.43pa (240l or 360l available) Food£10.44pa Total: £51.20 (must receive all 3 services) Delivery charge £14 (one off) Admin charge 15% |
| Vale of the White Horse | Dave Wilson | Weekly | £9 for 10 bags landfill, recycling box free |
| West Oxfordshire* | Jon Dowell | Weekly / fortnightly basis. | Proposed disposal charges from £1.32 to £8.23 and recycling from £2.98 to £7.76. |

| Container sizes | Role out timescales | Charging mechanism |
|---|---------------------|---|
| From 1 x 240lt residual and up to 2 x 240lt bins recycling to 1 x 1100lt and more than 1100lt of recycling capacity | <i>October</i> | Quarterly invoicing |
| Can choose the size of bin required for either | October | Quarterly invoicing |
| Refuse/recycling f/nightly Food weekly | <i>October</i> | Annual invoicing |
| Bagged refuse and 55lt recycling box | <i>October</i> | Pre-paid sacks |
| Refuse - sacks and 240 Litre, 360 Litre, 660 Litre and 1100 Litre Bins, Recycling - 240 Litre, 360 Litre, 660 Litre and 1100 Litre Bins | <i>October</i> | Customers are invoiced on a twice yearly basis unless they wish to set up a standing order. |

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23 October 2009

Waste Partnership Financial Arrangements

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update on the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership (OWP) financial arrangements that began in April 2009.

2 Background

- 2.1 The new financial arrangements were agreed by the partnership on 29th Feb 2008. The arrangements are based on the payment of a recycling credit for every tonne recycled & composted, plus an incentive or penalty payment set at 50% of the recycling credit value for each tonne of residual waste below or above target.
- 2.2 The landfill diversion rate required to meet the 2009/10 Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy target is 40%. In order to set an equivalent tonnage based target, a forecast of total waste arisings for 2009/10, together with the current actual number of households on each district's council tax base was used to calculate a residual waste tonnage target for each waste collection authority. OWP agreed the 2009/10 targets on 27th March 2009. There will be a requirement for a year end adjustment of payments to account for any difference between the forecast and actual total waste arisings for the year.
- 2.3 The financial arrangements apply only to household waste. A definition of household waste for the purposes of the new arrangements was also agreed on 27th March 2009. The value of recycling credit payments and financial arrangements bonus/penalty payments for 2008/09 were set at £40.60 and £20.30 respectively.
- 2.4 The performance figures for the first four months of this year (April to July) are given in appendix 1. From this it can be seen that four out of five district councils have received bonus payments each month for over performing against their residual waste target. West Oxfordshire District Council is the only authority to have currently exceeded its landfill allowance. It is worth noting the sharp increase in bonus payments to South Oxfordshire D.C from June onwards, which coincides with the launch of its new collection service contract. The alternate weekly collection of refuse and dry recyclables from wheeled bins, together with a weekly food waste collection has so far lead to a dramatic reduction in waste sent to landfill.

3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications

- 3.1 The financial impact for each district council is set out in appendix 1. This has so far been a positive impact for all except West Oxfordshire D.C, which has incurred penalty payments. From April to July, Oxfordshire County Council has paid £167,282.44 bonus payments to districts under this local arrangement. This represents a pass through to district councils of approximately 50% of saved disposal costs achieved through over performance against the 2009/10 landfill diversion target of 40%.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

4 Areas Affected

4.1 All Partner Authorities are affected by the matters within this report.

5 Effect on Strategic Policies

5.1 The new financial arrangements have been designed to help meet many of the policies within the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy that relate to waste reduction, increased recycling & composting and landfill diversion. The new arrangements specifically support policy 14, which states that "The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will develop methods of working together to improve the level of service through effective and efficient use of resources within Oxfordshire".

6 Options or Alternatives

6.1 N/A

7 Recommendations

7.1 That the payments under the financial arrangements from April to July are noted.

8 Reasons for Recommendations

8.1 To develop the best overall waste management outcomes for Oxfordshire taxpayers and to develop incentivisation arrangements that help achieve this.

9 Contact Officer

9.1 Author: Wayne Lewis Tel: 01295 221903

Email: Wayne.lewis@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Appendix 1 Financial arrangements performance April to July 2009

| Cherwell | | | | | 2009/10 | April | May | June | July |
|----------------------------|----------|------------|---------|---------------|---------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Residual waste | Target | 32,584 | Target | 2,822.34 | | 2,878.27 | 2,973.62 | 2,891.84 | |
| | Actual | 9,588 | Actual | 2,485.50 | | 2,258.17 | 2,310.24 | 2,534.03 | |
| | Variance | 22,996 | Diff | 336.84 | | 620.10 | 663.38 | 357.82 | |
| Reward/penalty per tonne | | £ 20.30 | Payment | £ 6,837.85 | | £ 12,588.08 | £ 13,466.69 | £ 7,263.66 | |
| | | | | | | | | Total Apr - Jul | £ 40,156.29 |
| Oxford City | | | | | 2009/10 | April | May | June | July |
| Overall residual waste | Target | 32,409 | Target | 2,807.11 | | 2,862.74 | 2,957.57 | 2,876.23 | |
| | Actual | 9,586 | Actual | 2,312.41 | | 2,224.49 | 2,412.38 | 2,636.50 | |
| | Variance | 22,823 | Diff | 494.69 | | 638.24 | 545.19 | 239.73 | |
| Reward/penalty per tonne | | £ 20.30 | Payment | £10,042.25 | | £ 12,956.34 | £ 11,067.39 | £ 4,866.47 | |
| | | | | | | | | Total Apr - Jul | £ 38,932.45 |
| South Oxfordshire | | | | | 2009/10 | April | May | June | July |
| Overall residual waste | Target | 31,507 | Target | 2,729.03 | | 2,783.11 | 2,875.31 | 2,796.23 | |
| | Actual | 7,029 | Actual | 2,274.43 | | 2,305.25 | 1,290.75 | 1,158.88 | |
| | Variance | 24,478 | Diff | 454.60 | | 477.86 | 1,584.56 | 1,637.36 | |
| Reward/penalty per tonne | | £ 20.30 | Payment | £ 9,228.40 | | £ 9,700.58 | £ 32,166.54 | £ 33,238.36 | |
| | | | | | | | | Total Apr - Jul | £ 84,333.88 |
| Vale of White Horse | | | | | 2009/10 | April | May | June | July |
| Overall residual waste | Target | 28,143 | Target | 2,437.61 | | 2,485.92 | 2,568.27 | 2,497.64 | |
| | Actual | 8,618 | Actual | 2,128.34 | | 2,087.60 | 2,107.43 | 2,294.92 | |
| | Variance | 19,524 | Diff | 309.27 | | 398.32 | 460.84 | 202.72 | |
| Reward/penalty per tonne | | £ 20.30 | Payment | £ 6,278.16 | | £ 8,085.93 | £ 9,355.09 | £ 4,115.18 | |
| | | | | | | | | Total Apr - Jul | £ 27,834.35 |

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

| West Oxfordshire | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------|----------------|---------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | 2009/10 | | April | May | June | July | |
| Overall residual waste | Target | 25,060 | Target | 2,170.63 | 2,213.64 | 2,286.98 | 2,224.08 | |
| | Actual | 10,076 | Actual | 2,528.34 | 2,406.29 | 2,408.32 | 2,733.40 | |
| | Variance | 14,984 | Diff | 357.71 | 192.64 | 121.34 | 509.32 | |
| Reward/penalty per tonne | £ | 20.30 | Payment | -£ | -£ | -£ | -£ | |
| | | | | 7,261.52 | 3,910.67 | 2,463.17 | 10,339.17 | |
| | | | | | | | Total Apr - Jul | -£ 23,974.53 |
| Totals for All WCAs | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2009/10 | | April | May | June | July | |
| Overall residual waste | Target | 149,703 | Target | 12,966.71 | 13,223.69 | 13,661.76 | 13,286.02 | |
| | Actual | 44,898 | Actual | 11,729.02 | 11,281.80 | 10,529.12 | 11,357.72 | |
| | Variance | 104,805 | Diff | 1,237.69 | 1,941.88 | 3,132.64 | 1,928.30 | |
| Reward/penalty per tonne | £ | 20.30 | Payment | £25,125.14 | £ 39,420.25 | £ 63,592.54 | £ 39,144.50 | |
| | | | | | | | Total Apr - Jul | £167,282.44 |

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23 October 2009

Food and Garden Waste Treatment Update

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update the OWP on progress on the food waste project.

2 Background

- 2.1 The Food Waste Treatment contract has now been signed and the project has moved to an implementation stage. Agrivert Ltd is the successful company with their variant bid to provide three food waste recycling plants within the County. Agrivert have now reached financial close with their funders, mitigating the last major risk to the project.
- 2.2 Collections started in South Oxfordshire on 8 June 2009 with over 2,000 tonnes of food waste diverted from landfill in the first four months. Feedback from all parties involved is positive with the collections going well, and the food waste being mostly free of contaminants. Cherwell will be rolling out their fortnightly food and green waste collection from 22nd October, with Oxford City planning to follow with their collection scheme in November. Interim arrangements are in place for the treatment of food and green waste from these schemes.
- 2.3 At the OWP meeting in July, all parties agreed to sign the written agreement between the County and Districts regarding the delivery of food waste and provision of facilities. This document confirms each party's commitment to delivery of food waste, and acknowledges the implications of any deviation from these plans to either party.
- 2.4 The first food waste treatment plant in Oxfordshire will be the In Vessel Composting plant in Ardley, where construction has started and opening is anticipated for January 2010. The second plant will be the Anaerobic Digester at Cassington, which is planned to open in July 2010. The third reception point for food waste will be Crowmarsh from July 2011.

3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications

- 3.1 As previously reported, shared commitment to this project is important as the contract requires the County Council to deliver minimum tonnages of food and food and garden waste to the facilities, with penalty payments incurred for failure to meet these.

A food waste agreement has been drawn up to demonstrate the Partnership's commitment to the initiative.

4 Areas Affected

- 4.1 County wide

5 Effect on Strategic Policies

- 5.1 The procurement of food waste processing capacity is in accordance with policy 6 of the

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy, to increase recycling and composting.

6 Options or Alternatives

6.1 N/A

7 Recommendations

7.1 To note and support the progress made on the procurement of the food waste treatment contract.

7.2 That Members of the OWP confirm they have all signed the WDA/WCA food waste agreement

8 Reasons for Recommendations

8.1 To demonstrate OWP support for the treatment of food waste within Oxfordshire.

9 Contact Officer

9.1 Author: Pamela Lloyd Tel: 01865 815349

Email: pamela.lloyd@oxfordshire.gov.uk

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23 October 2009

Residual Waste Treatment Project Update

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update the OWP on progress on the residual waste treatment procurement project.

2 Background

- 2.1 Diversion of waste from landfill is essential to reduce the risk of fines for exceeding targets for limiting the amount of biodegradable waste that is landfilled under the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS). It is also essential to reduce the amount of methane gas produced. Methane gas is a greenhouse gas over 20 times more powerful than CO₂.
- 2.2 As previously reported the technical solutions being offered are both incineration with energy recovery. Both use established technology providers with a proven track record in incineration.

3 Progress and future actions

- 3.1 Following a detailed evaluation and clarification process the evaluation of the final tenders received from Viridor and WRG was concluded. On 7 September the County Council's Cabinet was asked to endorse the officer recommendation to select Viridor as the preferred bidder for the residual waste treatment contract. After full and careful consideration of the issues Cabinet unanimously endorsed the recommendation.
- 3.2 This decision was called in and scrutinised at the Growth and Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee meeting on 16 September. Again after full and careful consideration Scrutiny Committee decide that no further action was necessary.
- 3.3 Fine tuning of the contract has now commenced with Viridor to clarify and confirm their commitments and to prepare the final contract documentation. This process is expected to last until Christmas. The County Council will then need to formally decide to enter into contract. The contract is expected to be awarded in March 2010.
- 3.4 Planning permission and Environment Agency permits will be required before any facility can be built. The county council as waste planning authority will determine the planning application unless it is called in by the Secretary of State. The planning and procurement processes are kept entirely separate in terms of key officer, teams and governance, with the Cabinet taking decisions on the procurement process and the Planning and Regulation Committee determining the planning applications. Planning decisions are made on planning grounds and are guided by local, regional and national planning policy and other material planning considerations. Planning and Regulation Committee are to consider Viridor's application at their meeting on 19 October.
- 3.5 More information about the project is available on the Council's web site – www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/alternativestolandfill

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23 October 2009

PERFORMANCE MONITORING – SECOND QUARTER 2009/10

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide a quarterly update on the performance of Oxfordshire Waste Partnership (OWP).

2 Background

- 2.1 This report provides an update on OWP's progress over the previous quarter against its agreed Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) Action Plan. A budget statement is included, together with a summary of performance against National Indicator (NI) and Local Area Agreement (LAA) targets.

2.2 JMWMS Action Plan

The 2009/10 Action Plan is attached at appendix 1. Each action has been assigned a "traffic light" score to indicate whether the project is:

- Completed or on track (green)
- Progressing, but with some outstanding issues or concerns (amber)
- Not progressing as planned (red)

Following a request at the March 2009 OWP meeting, an additional column has been added to highlight projects that contribute to the achievement of our LAA2 targets.

Some of the main areas of success and concern are set out below.

Successes

- The Love Food Hate Waste Campaign continues to be a success, a series of countywide roadshows through September and October have been completed, where OWP officers, accompanied by a local chef, have demonstrated how to make better use of leftovers and reduce food waste. So far, around 4,000 residents have pledged to reduce their food waste.
- DEFRA funding has been obtained to set up a Zero Waste Place project based in Dorchester-on-Thames, near Wallingford.
- Food waste collections have helped to greatly increase levels of landfill diversion in South Oxfordshire, whilst a food waste collection scheme is also underway in Cherwell.
- A preferred bidder (Viridor) has been appointed in the Residual Waste Treatment Procurement project.
- New and extended commercial waste recycling schemes are reducing the amount of trade waste landfilled by district councils.

Concerns

- The target date to develop minimum environmental standards for OWP printed literature has not been met. A revised completion date of January 2010 is proposed.
- The target date to develop and implement a revised waste reduction strategy has slipped. A revised completion date of December 2009 is proposed.
- Completion dates for work to support and promote the activities of voluntary sector waste management service providers have slipped. Work is ongoing and a revised

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

completion date of Mar 09 is proposed.

- The target to complete 300 further business waste audits this year is at risk as the subsidy previously provided by OCC has not been continued in 2009/10.
- The delivery date for the “Cash for Trash” scheme has been deferred. A revised start date of January 2010 is proposed.
- A gap analysis undertaken to establish whether additional materials could potentially be recycled through waste recycling centres and kerbside collections has not yet reported. A revised completion date of November 2009 is proposed.
- An anti-litter campaign targeting young people has yet to be delivered. A revised completion date of March 2010 is proposed.
- Lobbying government on strengthening the current code of practice on fast food litter and also on introducing a fixed penalty notice for small scale fly-tipping has yet to be completed. Revised completion dates of October (31st) are proposed.

2.3 Risks

A risk register that identifies risks associated with the delivery of the 2009/10 JMWMS Action Plan has been prepared by the Officer Strategy Group. Risks are scored according to their likelihood and the impact that they would have should they occur. Mitigation measures are set out to reduce the effects of these risks. The highest scoring risks (i.e. those that are either most likely or might have the most dramatic impact) are reported to the Joint Committee. The following high level risks have been identified.

Table 1 High level risks

| No. (from JMWMS Action Plan) | Action (from JMWMS Action Plan) | Risk | Possible Consequence | Mitigation | Status at Sept 09 |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| 2.2 | Introduce a food waste packaging reduction campaign as part of wider work on reducing food waste. | Lack of impact of campaign. | Waste arisings are unaffected. | Researching and publicising practical alternatives to heavily packaged foods. | Risk score increased based on recent review of waste reduction strategy. This questioned likely impact of local campaign. This activity may best be conducted at a national level. |
| 6.3 | Procure a facility for the acceptance and reprocessing of food waste. | Facilities are delayed. | Interim transfer and treatment arrangements needed. | Contractual conditions in place to cover this issue. | Previously a high level risk, the likelihood has now been reduced as interim and contingency arrangements are in place. Construction of Ardley facility currently on-track. |

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

| No. (from JMWMS Action Plan) | Action (from JMWMS Action Plan) | Risk | Possible Consequence | Mitigation | Status at Jan 09 |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| 8.5 | Provide advice and recommendations to Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs) to enable them to reduce waste. | Removal of subsidy for commercial waste audits might result in lower take up by SMEs. | Failure to influence/reduce commercial waste arisings. | Explore third party funding. Good publicity, demonstrating savings made by previous customers. | Audit work currently being re-tendered. No performance information yet available. |
| 14.3 | Improve the quality of waste data management through the provision of a shared data management system. | Councils do not reach agreement on the proposed system; waste data management does not improve. | Poor decision making resulting from poor data quality. | Prior consultation with other partner councils before reaching a decision on the purchase of new data systems. | A number of councils are currently procuring systems, with limited consultation with one another. |

It is recommended that work on action number 2.2 (within table 1 above) is suspended until a revised waste reduction strategy is in place and more is known of national activities being coordinated by the Waste and Resources Action Programme and the Local Government Association. The risk score for action number 6.3 has been reduced, so that it is no longer considered a high level risk and will not be reported to the Joint Committee (unless it is rescored in future). Performance information will be requested for action 8.5 in order to help mitigate this risk. For action number 14.3 it is recommended that Oxfordshire County Council holds a series of bi-lateral meetings with districts currently procuring software systems in order to ascertain compatibility with one another.

2.4 Budget statement

The current budget position is shown in table 2 below. The Waste Reduction Pack and Communications Plan items are currently under spending. Further information and, if necessary, a revised budget profile will be brought to the next meeting. Income has been received from three of the five partner councils. Payments are currently outstanding for Oxford City and South Oxfordshire.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

Table 2 - Budget statement at September 09

| | 2009/10 budget | Quarter 1 Expenditure | Quarter 2 Expenditure | Expenditure yr to date | Variance | Comments |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Expenditure | £ | £ | £ | | £ | |
| Core Budget | | | | | | |
| Partnership Officer | 59,625 | 14,821 | 14,821 | 29,642 | -29,983 | |
| Training and support costs | 4,120 | 334 | 1,362 | 1,696 | -2,424 | |
| Admin Support | 5,150 | 1,127 | 2,126 | 3,253 | -1,897 | Temp for reuse guide. |
| OWP Host Authority admin costs | 2,060 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2,060 | End of year recharge |
| OWP Accounting Authority costs | 2,060 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2,060 | End of year recharge |
| OWP Auditing Authority costs | 1,030 | 1,000 | 0 | 1,000 | -30 | End of year recharge. |
| Clean & Green Officer | 35,737 | 7,678 | 7,681 | 15,359 | -20,378 | 08/09 audit was not invoiced for until 09/10. |
| Communications Officer | 39,150 | 9,785 | 9,780 | 19,564 | -19,586 | |
| Sub-total Core Budget | 148,932 | 34,745 | 35,770 | 70,514 | -78,418 | |
| Development Budget | | | | | | |
| Wild Waste Show | 128,600 | 32,150 | 32,150 | 64,300 | -64,300 | Paid quarterly. |
| Waste Reduction Packs | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -20,000 | |
| Home composting | 18,500 | 15,018 | 6,666 | 21,684 | 3,184 | |
| Communications Plan | 164,900 | 3,829 | 15,530 | 19,359 | -145,541 | |
| Contingency/Opportunities | 17,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -17,500 | |
| Sub-total Development | 349,500 | 50,997 | 54,346 | 105,343 | -244,157 | |
| Total Expenditure | 498,432 | 85,742 | 90,116 | 175,857 | -322,575 | |
| Income | | Income received | Income received | Income received | | |
| Carried forward from previous year | 40,232 | 0 | | | | |
| Partner council contributions (WPEG) | | | | | | |
| Cherwell | 45,820 | 0 | 45,820 | 45,820 | 0 | |
| Oxford City | 45,820 | 0 | | | -45,820 | |
| Oxfordshire County | 229,100 | 0 | 229,100 | 229,100 | 0 | |
| South Oxfordshire | 45,820 | 0 | | | -45,820 | |
| Vale of White Horse | 45,820 | 0 | 45,820 | 45,820 | 0 | |
| West Oxfordshire | 45,820 | 0 | 45,820 | 45,820 | 0 | |
| Sub total partner contributions | 458,200 | 0 | 366,560 | 366,560 | -91,640 | |
| Total Income | 498,432 | 0 | 366,560 | 366,560 | -91,640 | |

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

2.5 New Initiatives fund

Table 3 provides a summary of the New Initiatives Fund (NIF) budget position. From this it can be seen that £408,489 of revenue and £399,299 of capital funding currently remains available for projects. The value of the fund includes the LAA1 Performance Reward Grant (PRG) for the recycling target that was achieved. The seventeen projects funded to date are listed in appendix 2.

Table 3 – NIF summary budget statement

| | <u>Revenue</u> £ | <u>Capital</u> £ | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Total fund value | 793,230 | 793,230 | £1,586,460 |
| Total commitments | £ 298,568 | £ 314,500 | £ 613,068 |
| Total expenditure | £ 86,173 | £ 79,431 | £ 165,604 |
| Remaining funds | £ 408,489 | £ 399,299 | £ 807,788 |

2.6 NI Target performance

Performance against National Indicators is summarised in table 4 below. Detailed performance by local authority is included at appendix 3. From table 4 it can be seen that the recycling rate (NI 192) has increased so far this year, whilst the % of waste sent to landfill (NI 193) has decreased. The amount of residual waste per household has reduced compared to the equivalent period for last year. Litter levels (NI 195a) are showing a slight improvement and there has been a considerable improvement this year to levels of detritus (NI 195b), which have so far reduced by 6.4%). The NI 195 figures do not include information from South Oxfordshire, so may differ when this information is added. Whilst the number of fly-tipping incidents is not increasing, a number of authorities are not currently maintaining an effective grading, as the number of enforcement actions is down compared to the equivalent period for last year.

Table 4 National Indicator performance

| NI number | NI description | 08/09 performance | Performance year to date |
|------------------|---|--|---|
| NI 191 | Residual waste per household | 632.96 kg | 198.50 (April to Jul) |
| NI 192 | Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting | 43.53% | 48.49% (April to Jul) |
| NI 193 | Percentage of municipal waste landfilled | 56.46% | 51.51% |
| NI 195 | Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of litter, detritus, graffiti and | Litter – 4.2% Detritus – 15.4% Graffiti – 2.2% Fly posting – 1.0% | Litter – 3% Detritus – 9% Graffiti – 1% Fly posting – 1% |

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

| | | | |
|--------|---|--|---|
| | fly posting) | | |
| NI 196 | Improved street and environmental cleanliness – fly tipping | Total incidents: 6344 (Grading: Effective) Cherwell - 670 (Grading: Not Effective) Oxford City – 1807 (Grading: Very Effective) South – 731 (Grading: Very Effective) Vale – 583 (Grading: Effective) West – 602 (Grading: Effective) | Total incidents: 1665 (Grading: Effective) Cherwell – 179 (Grading: Effective) Oxford City – 663 (Grading: Not Effective) South – 441 (Grading: Not Effective) Vale – 240 (Grading: Very Effective) West – 231 (Grading: Poor) |

2.7 LAA2 target performance

Table 5 sets out current performance against LAA2 targets. Annual improvement targets have been set, but it is only the outturn performance in 2010/11 that determines reward grant payments. Performance against each target is strong. All are within 09/10 targets at present, except for detritus levels. This has shown good improvement this year but currently remains 1% outside of target.

Table 5 LAA 2 targets

| Target | Description | 08/09 target | 09/10 target | 10/11 target | Current performance | Notes |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| NI 191: Residual household waste per household Defra | To reduce the amount of residual waste collected to 715 kg per household or less by 2010/11. | 730 kg | 723 kg | 715 kg | 198.50 (April to Jul) | Currently within target for 09/10. |
| NI 192: Household waste recycled and composted | To achieve a 45% recycling & composting rate by March 2011. | 40% | 42% | 45% | 48.49% (April to Jul) | Currently within target for 09/10. |
| NI 195: Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting) | To ensure that the percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having deposits of litter and detritus that | Litter 5% Detritus 9% | Litter 4% Detritus 8% | Litter 4% Detritus 7% | Litter 3% Detritus 9 % | Only the litter component attracts reward grant. Litter within 09/10 target. Detritus improving, but just |

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|------|------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | falls below an acceptable standard (below grade B) by March 2011 are 4% and 7% respectively, or less. | | | | | outside 09/10 target. |
| NI 196: Improved street and environmental cleanliness – fly tipping | To reduce the number of incidents of fly-tipping by 10% by March 2011. (from baseline no. of 6370) | 6154 | 5969 | 5730 | 1665 (Grading: Effective) | Currently within 09/10 target. |

3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications

3.1 No direct implications resulting from the report.

4 Areas Affected

4.1 All Partner Authorities are affected by the matters within this report.

5 Effect on Strategic Policies

5.1 The Action Plan has been developed to progress each of the strategic policies within the JMWMS and to support delivery of NI and LAA targets.

6 Options or Alternatives

6.1 Not applicable.

7 Recommendations

- 7.1 That the following action plan revised target completion dates be approved:
- January 2010 to develop minimum environmental standards for OWP printed literature;
 - December 2009 to develop and implement a revised waste reduction strategy;
 - March 09 to complete work to support and promote the activities of voluntary sector waste management service providers;
 - January 2010 to launch the “Cash for Trash” scheme;
 - November 2009 to report on a gap analysis to establish whether additional materials could be recycled through waste recycling centres and kerbside collections;
 - March 2010 to deliver an anti-litter campaign targeting young people;
 - End of October to Lobby government on strengthening the current code of practice on fast food litter and also on introducing a fixed penalty notice for small scale fly-tipping.
- 7.2 That the proposals for managing the risks detailed in paragraph 2.3 are agreed. These are

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

that:

- Work on a food waste packaging reduction campaign is postponed until the revised waste reduction strategy is agreed.
- The risk score for procuring a food waste treatment facility is reduced (as a contract with interim and contingency measures is now in place).
- Performance information be sought from business waste audit providers in the Oxfordshire area; and that
- Oxfordshire County Council holds a series of bi-lateral meetings with districts currently procuring software systems in order to ascertain system compatibility.

8 Reasons for Recommendations

8.1 To provide a performance monitoring system to support the delivery of the OWP's objectives.

9 Contact Officer

9.1 Author: Wayne Lewis Tel: 01295 221903

Email: Wayne.lewis@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Appendix 2 NIF funded projects

| Bid Ref no. | Bidding authority | Bid partners | Project | Funding awarded | Funding spent | Funding yet to be claimed |
|-------------|----------------------------|--|---|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| NIF001 | Vale of White Horse D.C | - | Hessian sack recycling containers for flat dwellers | £ 2,475 | £ 2,475 | £ - |
| NIF002 | Oxford City | - | Food waste collection trial | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| NIF003 | Cherwell D.C | Kidlington Versus Climate Change, Kidlington P.C | Recycling containers at bus stops | £ 9,878 | £ 9,878 | £ - |
| NIF004 | Oxfordshire County Council | Cherwell D.C | Study and compositional analysis of Waste Recycling Centre residual waste | £ 35,000 | £ 35,000 | £ - |
| NIF005 | Cherwell D.C | Bicester Town Council, Oxfordshire Highways | Lay-by recycling containers | £ 10,000 | £ 10,000 | £ - |
| NIF006 | Oxford City | - | Door knocking survey to flats and houses of multiple occupancy | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| NIF007 | Cherwell D.C | Oxford City, South Oxfordshire & West Oxfordshire | Christmas sacks for kerbside recycling collections. | £ 7,550 | £ 7,550 | £ - |
| NIF008 | Cherwell D.C | Oxfordshire C.C, EiE, Kidlington Parish Council, Bicester Town Council & Banbury T.C | Trade waste recycling | £ 7,250 | £ 7,250 | £ - |
| NIF009 | Oxford City | - | Trade waste recycling | £157,000 | £ - | £157,000 |
| NIF010 | West Oxfordshire | Oxfordshire C.C and Oxford City | Trade waste recycling | £ 9,975 | £ - | £ 9,975 |

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

| | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| NIF012 | Cherwell D.C | Kidlington Parish Council, Bicester Town Council & Banbury T.C | Food waste collections. | £120,000 | £ - | £120,000 |
| NIF013 | South Oxfordshire D.C | - | Food waste collections. | £106,000 | £ - | £106,000 |
| NIF014 | Oxford City Council | - | Food waste collections. | £204,188 | £ - | £204,188 |
| NIF015 | Cherwell D.C | OWP | Targeted doorstepping | £ 6,000 | £ - | £ 6,000 |
| NIF016 | Cherwell D.C | Oxfordshire C.C | Battery recycling containers | £ 7,046 | £ 7,046 | £ - |
| NIF017 | Cherwell D.C | - | Cigarette litter reduction | £ 6,310 | £ 6,310 | £ - |
| | Totals | | | £778,672 | £ 161,327 | £617,345 |

Appendix 1
Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy
Action Plan 2009/10 -2011/12

| No. | Actions | What is the outcome of the action? | SMART targets | What resources are required? | What are the risks associated with achieving this action? | When does the action need to be completed? | Who is responsible for the action? | LAA/NI priority | Progress Sept 09 | Comments |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|------------------|---|
| Policy 1 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will encourage the efficient use of resources, reduce resource consumption and take responsibility for the wastes they produce. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Show case best practice on waste reduction to Oxfordshire residents & businesses. | OWP exemplar project presented to local community. | To publicise OWP in house waste reduction project findings by Jan 2010. | Officer time, plus marketing budget of approx £2,500. Support from CAGs. | Dependency - reliant on successful completion of earlier project phases (internal waste audits and reporting). | Jan-10 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Amber | Not yet progressed |
| 1.2 | To hold/sponsor awards recognising green business and commercial waste reduction in Oxfordshire. | Awareness raised of commercial waste reduction possibilities. Green businesses recognised and rewarded. | To hold an awards ceremony by December 2010. | Officer time, plus OCC commercial waste reduction budget of £6,000 (subject to 09/10 OCC budget settlement). | 1. Failure to engage - limited take up. 2. Manageability - over subscription and limited support resources. | Dec-10 | OCC Waste Reduction Team & Waste Reduction Projects Group. | | Green | OWP sponsored the sustainable business award at the Oxfordshire Business awards in June. Agreed to sponsor next year in return for further "greening" of the awards. |
| 1.3 | Share best practice on buying recycled. | Best practice on buying recycled established. | Complete best practice guidance, using case studies from other councils if required, by Jul 09. | Officer time. Support from procurement officers. | 1. Duplication - work may already have been completed by procurement officers or others. | Jul-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | Current practices established and shared amongst partner councils. Discussion held on including buy recycled policies within council procurement strategies. |
| 1.4 | Develop a buy recycled buyers guide. | The production of a buy recycled buyers guide for distribution to Partnership councils. | To produce a buy recycled buyers guide by Oct 09. | Officer time. Support from procurement officers. | 1. Increased costs - recycled options may be more expensive. | Oct-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Amber | Not yet progressed |
| 1.5 | Introduce buy recycled and buy local policies to main council contracts and functions. | Buy recycled guide is used to inform decision making when procuring goods and services. | Each partner council to use buy recycled guide from Dec 09. | Officer time. Support from procurement officers. | Possible adverse publicity if fail to change suppliers to ones providing 'greener' products. | Dec-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Amber | Dependent upon completion of action 1.4 above. |
| 1.6 | Show case best practice on buying local and buying recycled. | OWP exemplar project presented to local community. | To publicise the project findings by Oct 10. | Officer time, plus marketing budget of approx £2,500 | Dependency - reliant on successful completion of earlier project phases. | Oct-10 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Amber | Not yet progressed |
| 1.7 | Develop minimum environmental standards for OWP and partner council printed literature. | Environmental standards are in place and adhered to by each partner council. | OWP and partner councils to apply minimum environmental standards for printed literature by Oct 09 | Officer time | Adverse publicity from failing to change suppliers to ones providing 'greener' products. | Oct-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Red | Not yet progressed. Revised completion Jan 10. |
| Policy 2 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will lobby Central Government to focus on waste as an integral part of sustainable resource management. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Issue joint responses to relevant Government consultations. | Joint consultation responses. | To respond to relevant consultations within their specified timescales. | Officer time (approx 3 days per consultation). Consultation with bodies such as LARAC, NAWDO, National Partnership Officers Group, LGA. | Staff Resources - ability to respond within the specified timescales. | - | Strategy Group | | Amber | No responses issued this year to date. |
| 2.2 | Introduce a food waste packaging reduction campaign as part of wider work on reducing food waste. | A campaign leading to a decrease in the amount of waste food packaging. | To have a food packaging reduction campaign in place by Sep 09. | Officer time, communications plan budget allocation. Support from CAGs. | Public confusion/mixed messages - the validity of the campaign may be challenged by packaging industry. | Sep-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Amber | Not yet progressed. Recent review of waste reduction strategy suggested time may be better spent focussing on food waste reduction. |
| 2.3 | Lobby government on increasing the recyclability of food packaging | Increase in recyclability of food packaging, through policy change | To lobby government by Jun-09 | Officer time | Effectiveness- minimal impact if lobbying as a single county | Jun-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | DEFRA has issued a packaging waste reduction strategy. |
| Policy 3 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will help householders and individuals to reduce and manage their wastes through the provision of advice and appropriate services. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Implement revised Joint Waste Reduction & Reuse plan.(incl. home composting, smart shopping, real nappies etc) | Relevant and effective waste reduction policies, communications and tools. | Begin implementation of Joint Waste Reduction & Reuse plan by May 09. | To be identified within the new plan. | 1. Resources - staff time to implement. | Oct-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Red | Review of current strategy completed. Work is ongoing on the development of a revised strategy, but agreement and implementation of revised plan now likely to be Dec 09. |
| 3.2 | Recruit local recycling champions to promote and "trouble-shoot" waste reduction, recycling & composting services. | Involvement of residents in the local promotion of services. | To recruit a further team of recycling champions by Jun 2010. | Officer time (approx. 15 days), plus support from the CAG project. | 1. Failure to engage - limited take up. 2. Manageability - over subscription and limited support resources. | Jun-10 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | More Master Composters have been trained. The number of CAGs is increasing. |

Appendix 1
Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy
Action Plan 2009/10 -2011/12

| No. | Actions | What is the outcome of the action? | SMART targets | What resources are required? | What are the risks associated with achieving this action? | When does the action need to be completed? | Who is responsible for the action? | LAA/NI priority | Progress Sept 09 | Comments |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|------------------|---|
| 3.3 | To continue to provide a local "Love food Hate Waste" campaign. | A campaign leading to a reduction in the amount of food thrown away. | To introduce a further promotional campaign by Jul 2009. | Officer time, comms plan budget allocation. Support from CAGs. | Limited impact due to poor take up by local media. | Jul-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Green | Ongoing promotion through roadshows, web and council magazines. |
| 3.4 | Support Real Nappy week | Increased public awareness of the scheme | To promote and publicise the campaign by April each year. | Officer time, comms plan budget allocation | Limited impact due to poor take up by local media. | Apr-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | Nappy trial packs developed and launched during Real Nappy week. |
| 3.5 | Support Recycle Now Week | Increased public awareness of the scheme | To promote and publicise the campaign by June each year | Officer time, comms plan budget allocation | Limited impact due to poor take up by local media. | Jun-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | Number of events and related PR were held. |
| 3.6 | Support Compost awareness week | Increased public awareness of the scheme | To promote and publicise the campaign by May each year. | Officer time, comms plan budget allocation. Support from CAGs. | Limited impact due to poor take up by local media. | May-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | A number of compost giveaways were held around the county in partnership with Agrivert Ltd. |
| 3.7 | Improve quality of waste management advice provided to customers by council admin/customer service teams. | Customers provided with accurate and up-to-date information on disposing of unwanted goods. | Provide admin/ customer services staff with regularly updated information on waste management services from April 09. | Officer time and the support of customer service teams at partner councils. | Resources - staff time for regular updates and training of customer service teams. | Apr-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Red | OCC staff plan to visit district staff to exchange info., but this has not yet taken place. |
| Policy 4 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will encourage the controlled reuse and reclamation of items through the provision of advice and appropriate services. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Where appropriate, promote the waste management services offered by voluntary sector organisations. | A promotional campaign promoting voluntary sector services. | To introduce a promotional campaign by Jun 2009. | Communications plan budget provision of 5K per annum. Support from CAGs. | Increased demand - ability of sector to respond to increased demand/workloads. | Jun-09 | OCC Waste Reduction Team & Waste Reduction Projects Group. | | Red | Reuse guide is currently being developed. Revised completion date Nov 09. |
| 4.2 | Support the voluntary sector in growing their skills and capacity. | More waste recovered by the voluntary sector. | To have a package of support measures in place by Jun 2009. | Officer time (20 days). Support from CAGs. | Managing expectation - risk of raised expectation and relationship damage if unable to deliver. | Jun-09 | OCC Waste Reduction Team & Waste Reduction Projects Group. | | Red | Reuse guide will advertise services provided by voluntary sector. Scoping options to work with voluntary sector provider on bulky waste reuse. Revised completion date Mar 10 |
| 4.3 | Promote suitable reuse schemes at WRCs. | Greater reuse of materials delivered to WRCs through partnership working with voluntary sector. | To further expand current arrangements by Mar 10. | OCC Officer time, plus buy-in from voluntary groups and site contractors. | Customer care - reclamation needs to be controlled. | Mar-10 | OCC Service Delivery Team | | Amber | Trial with Emmaus at certain WRC sites is on-going. |
| 4.4 | Introduce a waste exchange for businesses. | A forum for businesses to arrange the exchange of materials, by-products and wastes. | To introduce a waste exchange by Jan 10. | Officer time (largely OCC), plus support from regional agencies. | Poor take up by local businesses. | Jan-10 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | BREW project funding obtained. Post recruited and project developing well. |
| 4.5 | Support the CAG county wide swap shops. | Increase number and scope of swap shops and increase the amount of materials both reused & recycled. | To deliver support measures by Mar 10. | Officer time, comms plan budget allocation. Support of CAGs. | Capacity - demand may outstrip our capacity to support and deliver events. | Mar-10 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Green | Regular liaison with CAG project through Waste Reduction Projects Group |
| Policy 5 - In accordance with regional policy, OWP will seek to reduce the growth of municipal waste across the county to 0% per person per annum by 2012. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Continue to deliver a Countywide communications campaign promoting waste reduction, reuse & recycling services. | A communications campaign leading to a decrease in the amount of residual waste collected. | To have a communications plan for the 2009/12 period in place by April 2009. | Total comms plan budget provision of 150K per annum. OWP Communications Officer post. | Consistency - ability of Partner Councils to abide by OWP Media Protocol and key messages of the Communications Plan. | Apr-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | Communications plan in place. Approved by Officer Strategy Group. |
| 5.2 | Develop common policies and consistent approaches to limit the impact of any amendment to the definition of household waste. | Minimise waste increases resulting from the re-definition of household waste. | To have policies relating to the collection and disposal of relevant waste streams drafted and agreed by April 09 | Officer time and increased waste disposal budget provision. | Increased costs (largely disposal). | Apr-09 | Officer Strategy Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Green | Consistent policies developed for approval on all schedule ii premises. All authorities have developed collection/acceptance schemes. Meetings being held with key customers. |
| 5.3 | Promote home composting as an ongoing option when food waste collection schemes are introduced. | Householders continue to home compost after the introduction of food waste collections | To introduce a campaign by Aug 09 | Officer time, comms plan budget allocation. Support of CAGs. | Public confusion - need to ensure that promotions are kept simple/concise and do not have too many messages within them. | Aug-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Green | New Home composting bin promotion commences Oct 09 and Master Composter scheme continues to flourish. |

Appendix 1
Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy
Action Plan 2009/10 -2011/12

| No. | Actions | What is the outcome of the action? | SMART targets | What resources are required? | What are the risks associated with achieving this action? | When does the action need to be completed? | Who is responsible for the action? | LAA/NI priority | Progress Sept 09 | Comments |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|------------------|--|
| 5.4 | To share knowledge on the inclusion of waste collection facilities within (Town & Country Planning Act 1990) s.106 agreements (eg. Provision of home composters, bring sites etc.) | Information exchange on the successful inclusion of waste collection facilities within s.106 agreements. | Knowledge exchange by Oct 10 | Support from planning officers | Strength of the economy resulting in less new housing. | Oct-10 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Green | Work undertaken by partner councils, with information exchange undertaken by Waste & Recycling Operations Group. |
| 5.5 | Consider development of an Oxfordshire zero waste place. | An assessment of the potential for a zero waste place within Oxfordshire. | A decision reached on whether to apply for zero waste place status by Jun 09 | Officer time and information from the BREW centre. | Raised expectation that a zero waste place will be developed. | Jun-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | Further funding announced by DEFRA. Bid based on Dorchester on Thames, near Wallingford has been successful in obtaining funding. |
| Policy 6 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will provide an integrated system of collection and processing of household waste which will achieve, as a minimum: By 31 Mar 2010: recycle or compost at least 40% of household waste; By 31 Mar 2015: recycle or compost at least 45% of household waste; By 31 Mar 2020: recycle or compost at least 55% of household waste. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 | Implement collection schemes for food waste. | Collections of food waste from households. | To commence food waste collections from Aug 09. | Costings to be provided on a scheme by scheme basis. | 1. Public participation and buy-in 2. Risk of impact for other partners' schemes (positive and negative). | Aug-09 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | LAA/NI 192 Household waste recycled and composted. | Green | Food waste collections commenced in South Oxfordshire. OWP New Initiatives Funding awarded to Cherwell and Oxford for schemes launching this autumn. |
| 6.2 | Increase on-street recycling systems. | More on-street recycling facilities in the county's main centres of population. | Each partner council to introduce at least one additional on-street recycling facility by Mar 2010. | Approx £500 for purchase and installation of each bin. Costs to be met by each Partner Council. | 1. Siting - Conservation area issues. 2. Resources - cost of purchasing and installing containers, fit with cleansing/operations. 3. Quality - contamination issues. | Mar-10 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | LAA/NI 192 Household waste recycled and composted. | Green | Number of facilities recently expanded in Cherwell. |
| 6.3 | Procure a facility for the acceptance and reprocessing of food waste. | A facility for processing food waste collected from Oxfordshire households. | To ensure that a facility for the treatment of food waste is available in Oxfordshire by Sept 2009. | Procurement project team & technical support financed by OCC. | Deliverability - Short timescales, planning and construction risks. | Sep-09 | Strategy Group & OWP | LAA/NI 192 Household waste recycled and composted. | Green | Contract awarded. Planning permission granted for two of three sites. Ardley IVC on track for Dec 09 opening. |
| 6.4 | Undertake a programme of WRC refurbishment. | Refurbishment of a further 3 WRCs. | To complete refurbishment by Mar 2010. | Capital programme budget at OCC. | Sites may have to be closed during refurbishment. This may result in increased fly-tipping and reduced levels of recycling. | Mar-10 | OCC Service Delivery Team | | Green | Refurbishment of Oakley Wood site completed June 09. |
| 6.5 | Continue to deliver a Countywide communications campaign promoting waste reduction, reuse & recycling services. | Increased public participation, increased recycling rates and a further reduction in the amount of residual waste produced. | To have a communications plan for the 2009/12 period in place by April 09 | Officer time, Comms budget. | Consistency - ability of Partner Councils to abide by OWP Media Protocol and key messages of the Communications Plan. | Apr-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | Communications plan in place. Approved by Officer Strategy Group. |
| 6.6 | Implement policies to reduce illegal deposit of trade waste within domestic waste streams | A reduction in the amount of trade waste entering domestic waste streams. | Introduce trade waste reduction policies and plans by Jun 09. | Officer time & member approval of policy implementation. | Adverse publicity surrounding enforcement of new policies. Policies need to be considered reasonable and fit for purpose. | Apr-10 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group & Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Amber | Research work ongoing. Recommendations will be subject to approval by Oxfordshire County Council. Revised implementation date April 10. |
| Policy 7 - OWP will ensure that recycling facilities and services are available to all residents. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1 | Expand the number of recycling facilities provided at flats. | More material collected for recycling from flats. | To implement recycling systems at all flats by Mar 2010. | Approx £500 for purchase and installation of each site. Costs to be met by each Partner Council. | Increased collection costs. | Mar-10 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | LAA/NI 192 Household waste recycled and composted. | Amber | Ongoing within Oxford City. Systems in place at other district councils. |
| 7.2 | Share best practice on managing assisted collection services. | Best practice on managing assisted collection services established. | Complete best practice guidance, using case studies from other councils if required, by May 09. | Officer time | A lack of available information might limit usefulness of this work. | Oct-09 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Amber | Exchange of information undertaken by WROG. |

Appendix 1
Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy
Action Plan 2009/10 -2011/12

| No. | Actions | What is the outcome of the action? | SMART targets | What resources are required? | What are the risks associated with achieving this action? | When does the action need to be completed? | Who is responsible for the action? | LAA/NI priority | Progress Sept 09 | Comments |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|------------------|---|
| 7.3 | Raise awareness of services such as assisted collections that improve the accessibility of waste collection services. | Increased uptake of assisted collection schemes by those eligible. | Publicise the existence of these services by Jul-09. | Officer time, comms budget | Over-subscription to the scheme, increased expenditure associated with assisted collections. | Dec-09 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Amber | Not yet completed. |
| 7.4 | Complete an Equalities Impact Assessment of OWP. | An Equalities Impact Assessment of OWP. | To complete an Equalities Impact Assessment by Mar 10. | Support from Equalities team at Cherwell D.C | - | Mar-10 | Strategy Group | | Amber | Not yet progressed. |
| Policy 8 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will encourage householders and businesses to separate waste for recycling collections by providing targeted information and awareness raising campaigns. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8.1 | Continue to deliver a Countywide communications campaign promoting waste reduction, reuse & recycling services. | A communications campaign leading to a decrease in the amount of residual waste collected. | To have a communications plan for the 2009/12 period in place by April 2009. | Total comms plan budget provision of 150K per annum. OWP Communications Officer post. | Consistency - ability of Partner Councils to abide by OWP Media Protocol and key messages of the Communications Plan. | Apr-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | Communications plan in place. Approved by Officer Strategy Group. |
| 8.2 | Provide recycling collection services to commercial waste customers. | A greater number of commercial waste customers receive a waste recycling service. | To ensure that all commercial waste customers have recycling systems in place by Mar 2010. | Start up costs to be determined by each Partner Council. Aim for schemes to become revenue neutral. | 1. Take up by commercial customers. 2. Changes to legislation and market trends. | Mar-10 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Green | OWP NIF funding has allowed growth of commercial recycling schemes in Cherwell and Oxford City. Has also funded an options appraisal for West Oxfordshire. |
| 8.3 | Investigate the separate collection of food waste from commercial customers. | Method of recovering food waste from commercial customers established. | A trial collection scheme is delivered by at least one partner council by Mar 2010. | Start up costs to be determined by each Partner Council. Aim for schemes to become revenue neutral. | 1. Availability of outlet for processing of collected material. 2. Take up by customers. | Mar-10 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Green | OWP NIF funded study completed by Oxford City and West Oxfordshire. |
| 8.4 | Reduce the amount of residual waste collected per customer for commercial waste collection services. | Reduced residual waste collected per customer. | To achieve an overall reduction average of 10% of residual waste per customer by Mar 2011. | Officer time and availability of commercial waste recycling schemes. | Take up of recycling initiatives by customers. | Mar-11 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Green | Tonnage figures are being reviewed monthly. Figures to Jul 09 show a 9% reduction in waste landfilled compared to equivalent period last year. |
| 8.5 | Provide advice and recommendations to SMEs to enable them to reduce waste. | Reduction in the amount of commercial waste being sent to landfill. | To audit a further 300 business by March 10. | Officer time, OCC funding with potential external funding and partnership match funding. | 1. Uptake from businesses. 2. Lack of resources and funding to deliver outcomes. | Mar-10 | OCC Waste Reduction Team & Waste Reduction Projects Group. | | Red | Subsidy previously offered by OCC for waste audits has been removed. Businesses now have to pay for this service. New contract for completion of audits being developed by OCC. |
| 8.6 | Introduce a householder recycling incentives scheme (such as "Cash for Trash"). | Increased participation and recycling capture rates as a result of the incentive scheme(s). | To introduce an incentive scheme by Sept 09 | Support of collection and recycling contractors. Communications plan budget. | 1. Potential for adverse publicity (some residents might disagree with the incentives concept). 2. Lack of impact on participation & capture rates. | Sep-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | LAA/NI 192 Household waste recycled and composted. | Red | Revised completion date of Jan 2010 proposed. |
| 8.7 | Explore the feasibility of introducing trade waste recycling facilities at WRCs. | Trade waste recycling facilities at more WRCs. | Produce report detailing feasibility of introducing trade waste recycling facilities at more WRCs by Oct 10. | Officer time and possible OCC budget contribution. | 1. Raised expectation. 2. Increased WRC costs. | Oct-10 | OCC Service Delivery Team & Waste & Recycling Operations Group. | | Amber | Work ongoing at OCC. |
| Policy 9 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will provide a system for recovering value from residual wastes in order to meet LATS targets. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9.1 | Procure and construct a residual waste treatment facility to meet the medium to long term requirements of the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme. | Procurement of a waste treatment facility for Oxfordshire's residual waste. | To reach contract close by April 09. | Procurement project team comprising OCC Officers and OWP Coordinator, plus technical support. Project costs are met by OCC. | A separate risk register is maintained for this project. | Apr-09 | OCC & OWP | | Green | Preferred bidder appointed by OCC and fine tuning work is on-going. Planning permission to be sought in October. |
| 9.2 | Introduce new OWP financial arrangements (in place of recycling credits) that incentivise residual waste reduction. | A new financial model that encourages residual waste reduction. | To have the new financial arrangements in operation by April 2009. | Officer time to develop Agreement & administration measures (approx 10 days). Legal support from OCC. | Affordability resulting from variance from projected performance & payments. | Apr-09 | Strategy group | | Green | New arrangements are now operating. |
| Policy 10 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will ensure optimum use of landfill void. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.1 | To secure sufficient landfill capacity for Oxfordshire's municipal waste. | Procurement of landfill capacity in place of two current contracts that end in 2009. | To have a new landfill arrangements in place by Oct 2009. | Procurement project team comprising OCC Officers and OWP Coordinator. | 1. Sufficient competition. 2. Interface risks with other procurements and contracts. | Oct-09 | OCC | | Green | Procurement completed successfully. |

Appendix 1
Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy
Action Plan 2009/10 -2011/12

| No. | Actions | What is the outcome of the action? | SMART targets | What resources are required? | What are the risks associated with achieving this action? | When does the action need to be completed? | Who is responsible for the action? | LAA/NI priority | Progress Sept 09 | Comments |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|------------------|---|
| 10.2 | To secure ongoing Waste Recycling Centre provision for Oxfordshire's municipal waste. | Re-let contracts for six of the eight WRCs within Oxfordshire. | To have new WRC contracts in place by Oct 2009 | Procurement project team comprising OCC Officers and OWP Coordinator. | 1. Sufficient competition. 2. Interface risks with other procurements and contracts. | Oct-09 | OCC | | Green | Procurement completed successfully. |
| 10.3 | Raise awareness of materials that should not be placed within residual waste as part of wider communications plan. | Increased recycling with a reduction in the amount of residual waste collected. | To devise promotional campaign (as part of wider communications plan) by Jul 2009. | Officer time, comms plan budget allocation. Support of CAGs. | Effectiveness/impact of the campaign. | Jul-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Green | Information produced for lower performing areas within Cherwell and Oxford |
| 10.4 | Introduce enforcement policies to support the reduction of residual waste & the introduction of AWCS. | Enforcement policies used by partner councils to support the reduction of residual waste/ support AWCS. | Introduce a range of relevant policies by Mar 10. | Officer time & member support. | 1. Negative publicity. 2. Insufficient resources to enforce new policies. | Mar-10 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Amber | Policies in place within Oxford City, but not yet developed in other areas. |
| Policy 11 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will seek to provide waste management services for specialised, potentially polluting material streams, such as hazardous waste and WEEE, which meet and exceed legislative requirements. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11.1 | Expand collection facilities for the recycling of domestic batteries. | More domestic batteries recycled. | All Partner councils to have battery recycling facilities in place by Mar 2010. | £150 per site. Costs to be met by Partner Councils. | 1. Legislative uncertainty surrounding EU Batteries Directive. 2. Increased costs. | Mar-10 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Green | OWP NIF funding awarded to expand collections at Waste Recycling Centres across the county and also at bring sites within Cherwell. A number of major supermarkets to introduce in-store take back schemes in the new year. |
| 11.2 | Research the introduction of a community repaint scheme within Oxfordshire. | Feasibility of introducing a community repaint scheme assessed. | To determine the feasibility of an Oxfordshire community repaint scheme by Oct 09. | Officer time, Support of CAGs. | Managing expectation - risk of raised expectation and relationship damage if unable to deliver a scheme. | Oct-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Green | Scheme found to be operating in Oxford (Orinoco scrapstore collects paint for reuse) |
| 11.3 | Introduce Portable Appliance Testing (PAT) at CAG swap shops. | Increased reuse of small electrical appliances as a result of the introduction of PAT testing. | Introduce PAT at CAG swap shops by Jul 09. | Training of CAG volunteers. | Ability of CAGs to meet demand. | Jul-09 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | LAA/NI 191 Residual waste per household. | Green | PAT now operating at CAG swap shops |
| 11.4 | Develop a hazardous waste management strategy, to form a technical annex to the JMWMS | A hazardous waste strategy. | To produce a hazardous waste strategy by Jan 10 | Officer time and possible external technical support. | 1. Insufficient officer time/resources. | Jan-10 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Amber | Not yet progressed |
| 11.5 | Develop proposals to reduce incidents of fly tipped tyres, as part of wider fly tipping reduction strategy. | Proposed actions for reducing the fly tipping of tyres. | To complete a range of proposals for consideration by Jul 09. | Officer time | - | Jul-09 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | LAA/NI 196 Improved street and environmental cleanliness – fly tipping. | Green | Wider fly-tipping campaign delivered. |
| Policy 12 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership, working with the Waste Planning Authority, will ensure that waste facilities are suitably sized and distributed with the aim of minimising the transport of waste. Facilities will be well related to areas of population, given the environmental and amenity constraints, and the availability of suitable sites. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.1 | Procure all waste facilities in accordance with relevant Waste Planning policy & guidance. | Successful procurement and construction of waste facilities. | n/a | Liaison with Waste Planning Officers. | 1. Minerals & Waste Development Framework development has been delayed. | | OCC & OWP | | Green | MWDF recommencing. OWP will inform development of the framework. |
| 12.2 | Complete a gap analysis on services provided by Waste Recycling Centres and Waste Collection Authorities. | A report detailing any gaps in service provision. | To produce a report by Jun 09 | Officer time | Timing - report findings will need to influence WRC refurbishment plans and WCA collection arrangements. | Jun-09 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Red | Work undertaken, but recommendations not yet formed. Revised completion date Nov 09. |
| 12.3 | Implement recommendations from gap analysis of WRC and WCA services. | A coordinated suite of collection & reception facilities for Oxfordshire's household waste. | Complimentary WRC and Collection services in place across Oxfordshire by Mar 2011. | Officer time. | Dependency upon preceding gap analysis. | Mar-11 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group | | Amber | Dependent upon completion of action 12.2 above. |
| 12.4 | Explore opportunities for increased provision of WRCs within Oxfordshire. | An assessment of potential for new WRCs within Oxfordshire. | To complete an assessment by Oct 09. | Officer time and possible technical support (funded by OCC). | 1. Sufficient Officer time. 2. Raised expectations | Oct-09 | OCC Service Delivery Team & Waste & Recycling Operations Group. | | Amber | Work is on-going. |
| Policy 13 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will assist the development of local markets for recovered materials. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13.1 | Explore the potential for residents and local community to buy back composted garden waste. | Recommendations on the viability of providing outlets for the compost. | To form recommendations by Jan 10. | Support of composting contractor(s) and possibly retail outlets. | Dependent on the support of the composting contractor. | Jan-10 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Amber | Compost giveaways proved successful. Plans for ongoing sales or giveaways to be developed. |

Appendix 1
Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy
Action Plan 2009/10 -2011/12

| No. | Actions | What is the outcome of the action? | SMART targets | What resources are required? | What are the risks associated with achieving this action? | When does the action need to be completed? | Who is responsible for the action? | LAA/NI priority | Progress Sept 09 | Comments |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|------------------|--|
| Policy 14 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will develop methods of working together to improve the level of service through effective and efficient use of resources within Oxfordshire. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14.1 | Implement the agreed OWP communications plan. | Residents and other identified stakeholders have a greater awareness of OWP. | Detailed within the Communications plan. | Total comms plan budget provision of 150K per annum. OWP Communications Officer post. | 1. Media interest. 2. Consistency - ability of Partner Councils to abide by OWP Media Protocol and key messages of the Communications Plan. | Ongoing | OWP Communications Officer & Waste Reduction Projects group. | | Green | Communications plan in place and is being implemented. |
| 14.2 | Explore opportunities for joint purchasing of supplies and equipment. | Cost Savings as a result of joint purchasing. | To report on joint purchasing opportunities by Oct 2009. | Officer time (approx. 5 days per authority). | Failure to identify savings. | Oct-09 | Strategy Group | | Green | Regional framework agreement used for purchase of food waste caddies and liners. New countywide home composting sales arrangement now in place. |
| 14.3 | Improve the quality of waste data management through the provision of a shared data management system. | Improved data and information for performance monitoring. | To introduce a shared data management system by Mar 2010. | To be determined following assessment of available software. | 1. Affordability of new software package. 2. Compatibility with other systems in use at partner councils. | Mar-10 | Waste & Recycling Operations Group. | | Amber | Software packages are currently being procured by a number of partner councils. |
| 14.4 | Update branding usage guidelines and press release protocol for OWP and OWP funded projects. | Consistent use of OWP branding and consistent messages within press releases. | To update the current branding usage guidelines and press release protocol by May 2009. | Officer time. | 1. Failure to reach agreement. 2. Failure to embed the guidelines within partner councils communications work. | May-09 | OWP Communications Officer & Waste Reduction Projects Group. | | Green | Completed and agreed by Waste Reduction Projects Group. |
| 14.5 | Review the current Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. | Completion of a scheduled review of the JMWMS. | Complete review by Mar 2012. | Officer time. | Failure to agree upon review findings. | Mar-12 | Strategy group | | Amber | Not yet progressed. DEFRA are currently reviewing the requirement to have a JMWMS. |
| 14.6 | Review the operational effectiveness of OWP. | A review with recommendations of the working of OWP | To complete a review by Mar 10. | Officer time and support from the Partnerships Unit at OCC. | Failure to agree upon review findings. | Mar-10 | Strategy group | | Amber | Not yet progressed. Suitable frameworks are currently being investigated. |
| 14.7 | Support the Wild Waste Show in identifying and securing funding for a replacement bus. | Funding for a replacement bus when the current vehicle reaches the end of its operational life. | To secure funding for a replacement vehicle by mar 2011. | Officer time | Failure to identify and secure sufficient funds. | Mar-11 | Waste Reduction Projects Group | | Amber | No funds have yet been secured. |
| Environmental Quality & Cleanliness | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15.1 | Develop a countywide campaign to reduce fly-tipping. | A communications and enforcement based campaign to deter fly-tipping. | To implement a campaign from Jun 09. | Application to the New Initiative Fund. | Dependent upon approval of NIF bid. | Jun-09 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | LAA/NI 196 Improved street and environmental cleanliness – fly tipping. | Green | Campaign launched in August. |
| 15.2 | Introduce an anti litter campaign targeting young people. | A campaign targeting youth groups resulting in increased awareness and decreased occurrences of littering. | To implement a campaign by Oct 09. | Officer time, comms plan budget allocation. Support of CAGs. | Effectiveness - take up of campaign message by schools and youth groups. | Oct-09 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | LAA/NI 195 Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting). | Red | Plans currently being developed by EQ&CG. Revised completion date Mar 10. |
| 15.3 | Raise awareness that partner councils issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) for littering. | Increased public awareness that littering carries an on the spot fine. | To complete a publicity campaign by Jun 09 | Officer time and communications budget. | Effectiveness - take up by local media. | Jun-09 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | LAA/NI 195 Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting). | Amber | Recent PR following prosecutions by Cherwell D.C. Campaign based on Cigarette litter developed in CDC. Campaign planned for Oxford City. |
| 15.4 | Promotional campaigns to target a reduction of commonly littered items: Chewing gum, cigarette butts & fast food packaging. | Promotional campaign(s) to reduce littering. | To deliver promotional campaigns focussing on at least one commonly littered item by Oct 09. | Officer time and communications budget. | Effectiveness - take up by local media. | Oct-09 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | LAA/NI 195 Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting). | Green | Participated in Keep Britain Tidy car litter campaign in Jul. Cigarette butt campaign completed in Cherwell. Campaign on litter in Oxford City centre being developed. |

Appendix 1
Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy
Action Plan 2009/10 -2011/12

| No. | Actions | What is the outcome of the action? | SMART targets | What resources are required? | What are the risks associated with achieving this action? | When does the action need to be completed? | Who is responsible for the action? | LAA/NI priority | Progress Sept 09 | Comments |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|--|------------------------------------|---|------------------|--|
| 15.5 | Develop multi-agency approach to enforcement (working with the police, trading standards and Environment Agency and British Transport Police) | An integrated approach to environmental enforcement. | To deliver an integrated enforcement campaign by Oct 2011 | Support from relevant partner organisations | Failure to gain support of other agencies. Manageability - complexity of organising a multi-agency approach | Oct-11 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | | Amber | Contact with EA is improving and EA now attend some OWP officer group meetings. |
| 15.6 | Deliver a countywide Big Tidy Up/spring clean campaign. | Volunteers participating in a countywide Big Tidy up/ Spring clean. | To run a campaign during April 09 | Officer time, Comms Budget. Support from CAGs. | Take up - lack of public participation. Resources - sufficient staff and resources to manage the campaign. | Apr-09 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | LAA/NI 195 Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting. | Green | Campaign was completed. Over 40 community groups participated. |
| 15.7 | Develop a programme of cleaning for cigarette butts, using OWP "Glutton" street cleaning machine. | Effective use and efficient sharing of OWP Glutton leading to improved cleanliness standards. | Each partner council to have used the glutton machine for at least five working weeks by Mar 10 | Officer time | - | Mar-10 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | | Amber | Insurance issues nearing resolution. |
| 15.8 | Lobby government on strengthening current code of practice on litter on the go (fast food packaging) | Increased sign-up by fast food retailers to code of practice | To lobby government by Jun-09 | Officer time | Effectiveness- minimal impact if lobbying as a single county | Jun-09 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | | Red | Lobbying ongoing through encams forums and seminars. Letter to government to be drafted. Revised completion Oct 09. |
| 15.9 | Improve partnership working with OCC Highways on the cleaning of fast roads. | Improved cleanliness standards on fast roads. | Options for improved cleaning of fast roads to be trialled by April 09 | Officer time and support from OCC Highways and their appointed contractors. | 1. Increased costs. 2. Failure to work effectively with Highways Authority and contractors. | Apr-09 | Stategy group | LAA/NI 195 Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting. | Amber | Discussions with OCC highways and their contractors are on-going, but communication problems around verge cutting still being encountered. |
| 15.1 | Lobby government on introducing a Fixed Penalty Notice option for low level flytipping | Increased flexibility in enforcement options and more effective use of officer time. | To lobby government by Jun-09 | Officer time | Effectiveness- minimal impact if lobbying as a single county | Jun-09 | Env Quality and Cleanliness Group | | Red | Lobbying ongoing through encams forums and seminars. Letter to government to be drafted. Revised completion Oct 09. |

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23 October 2009

The Waste Collection Commitment

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To give an overview of the Waste Collection Commitment, supported by the Local Government Association (LGA) and Waste & Resources Action Programme (WRAP), to enable partner collection authorities to make an informed decision on whether to sign up to the Commitment.

2 Background

- 2.1 The Waste Collection Commitment (the Commitment) has been developed as a result of recommendations made by the Communities and Local Government Select Committee, which said that *“there is a strong case for moving towards a basic understood standard, if not for collection methods or timings or frequency or type, at least for what the householder who pays, at least in part, for refuse collection through his or her council tax should be able to expect from the local authority.”* In response, Defra invited WRAP and the LGA to develop a set of principles for a good waste collection system.
- 2.2 The Commitment is consumer focused and has been developed out of the findings of comprehensive market research, to better understand those aspects of waste collection services that householders considered most important.
- 2.3 The Commitment is a voluntary, service-level agreement and there are no reporting requirements associated with signing up. By signing up to the Commitment, a local authority is committing to ensuring that the needs of its residents are central to the design and delivery of their waste and recycling collection services.
- 2.4 The Commitment:

“We are committed to providing waste and recycling services which are good value for money and which meet the needs of our residents. This means we will:

1. Explain clearly what services you can expect to receive;
2. Provide regular collections;
3. Provide a reliable collection service;
4. Consider any special requests that individual households may have;
5. Design our services and carry out collections in a way that doesn't produce litter;
6. Collect as many materials for recycling as we can and explain to you what happens to them;
7. Explain clearly what our service rules are and the reasons for them;
8. Tell you in good time if we have to make changes to your services, even temporarily;
9. Respond to complaints we receive about our services; and
10. Tell all our residents about this commitment to collecting waste.”
- 11.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

- 2.5 The Commitment offers a useful opportunity to 'close the gap' for residents between their council tax and the local services it pays for.

3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications

- 3.1 There is no direct cost involved in signing up to the Commitment. The risk is a partner authority not delivering their waste collection services according to the Commitment. This could lead to negative householder opinion of the collection service. All staff involved in the delivery of waste and recycling collection services must be made aware of the Commitment and ensure that their authority is delivering its collection services in line with its principles.

4 Areas Affected

- 4.1 All Partner collection authorities are affected by the matters within this report.

5 Effect on Strategic Policies

- 5.1 Signing up to the Commitment would support the following Policies:

Policy 3 to help householders and individuals to reduce and manage their wastes through the provision of advice and appropriate services;

Policy 5 to reduce the growth of municipal waste across the County;

Policy 6 to provide an integrated system of collection and processing of household waste to achieve recycling and composting targets;

Policy 7 to ensure that recycling facilities and services are available to all residents;

Policy 8 encourage householders to separate waste for recycling collections by providing targeted information and awareness raising.

6 Options or Alternatives

- 6.1 N/A

7 Recommendations

- 7.1 That Partner collection authorities sign up to the Waste Collection Commitment.

8 Reasons for Recommendations

- 8.1 The Commitment aims to clearly set out, through a number of general principles, the standard of service that every household should expect from their waste collection services and provides councils with advice on how to improve their services. This clearer understanding will help to deliver improved customer satisfaction and increase participation in recycling schemes.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

9 Contact Officer

9.1 Author: Sally Wilson Tel: 01491 823833

Email: sally.wilson@southoxon.gov.uk

Background Papers: The Waste Collection Commitment, Waste & Resources Action Programme, September 2009

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23 October 2009

Local Area Agreement Street Cleanliness target

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide an update on work to achieve the Local Area Agreement (LAA) 2 target on street cleanliness.

2 Background

- 2.1 Under LAA1, which ended on 31 March 2009, Oxfordshire Waste Partnership (OWP) had two street cleaning targets. At its meeting on 10th July it was acknowledged that these targets had not been met. The reasons for this and also a number of recommendations for improving future performance under LAA2 were also considered on 10th July. It was agreed that a further update report should be brought to today's meeting.
- 2.2 The street cleanliness target within LAA2, which runs from April 2008 until March 2011 is set out below.

| Target | Description | 08/09 target | 08/09 performance | 09/10 target | 10/11 target | Current performance (April – Jul 09) |
|--|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| NI 195: Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting) | To ensure that the percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having deposits of litter and detritus that falls below an acceptable standard (below grade B) by March 2011 are 4% and 7% respectively, or less. | Litter 5% Detritus 9% | Litter 4.2% Detritus 15.4% | Litter 4% Detritus 8% | Litter 4% Detritus 7% | Litter 3 % Detritus 9 % |

- 2.3 Whilst both Litter and Detritus levels are included within the LAA2 target. Performance Reward Grant (PRG) is only linked to performance against the Litter component of the target. The payment of PRG under LAA2 will be different to that under LAA1. Under LAA1 each target within the LAA had a PRG value attached to it. On achievement of the target, 50% of the associated PRG was paid to the thematic partnership that was responsible for its delivery, with the remaining 50% retained by the Public Service Board (PSB). The PSB subsequently invited bids from thematic partnerships for funding from the PRG that it

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

retained.

- 2.4 Under LAA2 the total PRG available will be smaller. In Oxfordshire, up to £3.74 million will be available. This time, PRG will not be paid on achievement of individual targets. Reward will instead be based upon average performance across all LAA improvement targets agreed by local areas and government (there are 35 targets within the Oxfordshire LAA2). Reward will be payable from an average performance improvement of 60% against baseline targets. 40% is payable at this point, increasing on a sliding scale to 100% if all targets are met.
- 2.5 A contributory factor to the failure to reach the LAA1 street cleaning target was the quality of the performance monitoring information available. The NI 195 indicator is measured on a self assessment basis, based on inspections and gradings undertaken by district council officers. This introduces an element of subjectivity to the scoring, which OWP has sought to overcome by holding joint training days and a series of peer reviews. District officers now undertake an exchange visit with a neighbouring council, once every four months, to help ensure consistent scoring methodologies throughout the county. Additionally, all district councils have now begun NI 195 monitoring and reporting on a monthly basis, rather than on a four-monthly basis. This will improve the timeliness of performance information and allow trends to be spotted quicker. Monthly information will be available from all districts from this month onwards.

3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications

- 3.1 The achievement of the LAA2 street cleaning target, along with the other LAA2 targets that the Environment and Waste Partnership is responsible for will contribute to raising the average performance score of Oxfordshire. This will help secure up to £3.74 million, which will be held by the PSB and be made available for projects that support the delivery of the Oxfordshire 2030 Sustainable Community Strategy. No PRG will be paid directly to thematic partnerships.

4 Areas Affected

- 4.1 All Partner Councils are involved in the delivery of LAA2 targets.

5 Effect on Strategic Policies

- 5.1 The LAA2 targets support a number of key policies within the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy on waste reduction and increased recycling & composting. Street cleanliness is a high local priority for district councils within OWP and contributes to the Oxfordshire 2030 pledge to keep the county clean and green.

6 Options or Alternatives

- 6.1 PRG will be paid to the PSB. Under LAA1, thematic partnerships were then invited to bid for funding from the PRG. OWP submitted a bid, but was unsuccessful. However, the Environment Partnership was successful in obtaining £500,000 funding. The Environment and Waste Partnership may wish to engage with the PSB on developing priority areas for funding from future PRG and if applicable, consider a joint Environment and Waste application.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

7 Recommendations

- 7.1 That the report is noted and that improvements to the monitoring and reporting of NI 195 performance outlined in paragraph 2.5 are endorsed.

8 Reasons for Recommendations

- 8.1 To ensure that the Local Area Agreement 2 target for street cleanliness is achieved.

9 Contact Officer

9.1 Author: Wayne Lewis Tel: 01295 221903

Email: Wayne.lewis@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Background Papers:

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23rd October 2009

Zero Waste Place Initiative

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update the committee on the development of a Zero Waste Place project in Oxfordshire.

2 Background

2.1 The Zero Waste Places initiative and was launched by government in October 2008. During 2008/9 six places were selected as zero waste place projects to go as far as possible to reduce waste in their area. A call for further bids to become a Zero Waste Place was made in September 2009 and it was announced on Tuesday 13th October that a project based in Dorchester-on-Thames, near Wallingford, Oxfordshire is one of six bids to be awarded funding.

2.2 The funding application was developed by a Community Action Group (CAG) based in Dorchester-on-Thames called the Dorchester Carbon Project (DCP). The bid was supported by the CAG Project Manager and OWP coordinator. Oxfordshire C.C and South Oxfordshire D.C have provided some match funding. The CAG project is delivered by Resource Futures and funded by Oxfordshire County Council. DCP is a very active group within a CAG network of 28 groups, which each focus on waste reduction and environmental sustainability in their local areas.

2.3 Since its formation in 2007, DCP has carried out the following activities:

- Swap shops which have diverted a total of 1230kg from landfill;
- Worked with local businesses to become a Plastic Bag Free Village;
- Carried out a carbon reduction pledge in return for a free bespoke jute shopping bag with 70% of the village participating;
- Run a weekly Refill and Recycling Station for environmentally friendly detergents, which have to date, refilled over 750 bottles. The station also provides a collection service for non-kerbside recyclables and has collected over 800 batteries, 300 light-bulbs, 80 water filters and 35 printer cartridges. Before new district council collections started in June 09 over 5,000 tetra paks and 18kg of aluminium foil were also collected and recycled;
- Held a 'Buy Local' and 'Fairtrade for Lent' promotion and market;
- Held screenings and debates of climate change films;
- Surveyed houses with Thermal Imaging Cameras;
- Worked with the local school on achieving Eco School status;
- Established a web site - www.dorchestercarbonproject.org.uk;
- Provided information to residents on how to lower their impact on the environment.

2.4 The successful bid will build on many of these activities. The following outcomes will be delivered:

- A recycling system for the village school comprising dry recyclable collections, wormeries and a food waste composter, which together with educational support will deliver a 100% recycling rate for the school;

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

- Real nappy information and trial packs so that at least ten parents trial real nappies during the project;
- Completion of waste audits at each of the village's three hotels and at two local businesses, which on average can lead to a 50% waste diversion from landfill;
- Expansion of reuse swap shops so that at least 300 kg of materials are exchanged during the project and kept out of landfill. A "swap" notice board will be maintained on a monthly basis by DCP volunteers;
- Promotion of the Mailing Preference Service, so that 40% of villagers sign up to reduce junk mail;
- 3 "Back to Basics" workshops teaching skills such as sewing and cookery (promoting reuse and food waste reduction), so that at least 75 residents attend;
- Refill and recycling stations, so that at least 60 extra containers are refilled over the duration of the funding;
- An information point promoting the projects delivered by the DCP and also local council waste management services. By using the statistics gathered by South Oxfordshire D.C, regular updates on the village recycling rates can be displayed both at the information point and in the parish magazine;
- Monitoring and evaluation of all activities, which will be published in interim and final project reports.

The results of the project will be used by the CAG Project and other community groups nationally for future waste reduction initiatives. Findings will be also be publicised through CAG and OWP newsletters and websites.

3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications

- 3.1 £6,040 has been awarded by DEFRA for the project. Oxfordshire County Council has provided £160 match funding (for a real nappies trial pack) and South Oxfordshire D.C £60 (kitchen caddies for the primary school).

4 Areas Affected

- 4.1 Dorchester–on–Thames within South Oxfordshire. The results of the project will be applicable to, and replicable in, many other communities within Oxfordshire and nationwide.

5 Effect on Strategic Policies

- 5.1 The Zero Waste Place project supports the following strategic objectives within the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy:
Policy 3 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will help householders and individuals to reduce and manage their wastes through the provision of advice and appropriate services.
Policy 4 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will encourage the controlled reuse and reclamation of items through the provision of advice and appropriate services.
Policy 5 - In accordance with regional policy, OWP will seek to reduce the growth of municipal waste across the county to 0% per person per annum by 2012.
Policy 8 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will encourage householders and businesses to separate waste for recycling collections by providing targeted information and awareness raising campaigns.

There is a specific action within the 2009/10 OWP action plan to explore the development of a Zero Waste Place in Oxfordshire.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

6 Options or Alternatives

6.1 N/A

7 Recommendations

7.1 That the report is noted and that OWP offers its continued support to the Zero Waste Place project in Dorchester-on-Thames.

8 Reasons for Recommendations

8.1 To promote waste reduction, reuse and recycling initiatives to Oxfordshire communities to help everyone manage their own wastes

9 Contact Officer

9.1 Author: Wayne Lewis Tel: 01295 221903

Email: Wayne.lewis@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Background Papers:

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

23rd October 2009

Sustainable Construction Oxford

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide details of Sustainable Construction Oxford, 18th November 9am -5pm, Said Business School, Oxford.

2 Background

- 2.1 Professionals from all areas of the construction industry looking to develop their green credentials are being urged to attend the first of a series of conferences entitled Sustainable Construction Oxford, Blueprint for a Green Future.

- 2.2 Hosted by the Oxfordshire Economic Partnership, the event will bring together academics, private sector companies and local government. It will provide an opportunity to attend informative workshops and attend exhibitions on themes including:

- Delivering sustainable affordable homes
- Building for climate resilience
- Designing and delivering sustainably
- Designing for waste site management
- Sustainable energy and buildings

- 2.4 Speakers will include Henry Gordon Lennox, Senior Solicitor at Blake Laphorn, Mark Goldthorpe, Project Officer from the UK Climate Impacts Programme, Councillor David Robertson, the Deputy Leader of Oxfordshire County Council, Liz Reason of AECB and Chindarat Taylor, the Director of Pathway to Zero Waste.

- 2.5 The event runs from 9am-5pm and includes lunch. Tickets cost £25 and are available from Daniel.dempsey@oxfordshire.gov.uk. A promotional flyer for the event is attached at appendix 1.

3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications

- 3.1 None – the event is funded through ticket sales (attendees are required to pay £25 per place) and ERDF/SEEDA funding.

4 Areas Affected

- 4.1 The event is relevant to the work of all partner councils in areas such as waste management, climate change and building control.

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

5 Effect on Strategic Policies

- 5.1 The event encourages businesses to see financial benefits of environmental good practice. It supports the following policies within the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy:

Policy 1 - The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership will encourage the efficient use of resources, reduce resource consumption and take responsibility for the wastes they produce.

Policy 7 - OWP will ensure that recycling facilities and services are available to all residents

The event also helps support the following Oxfordshire 2030 Sustainable Community Strategy Pledges:

- Ensure new development is built to high environmental standards
- Support individuals, businesses and communities to respond to climate change and to improve efficiency in their use of energy and water.

6 Options or Alternatives

- 6.1 N/a

7 Recommendations

- 7.1 The details of the event be circulated to colleagues and that Partner Councils consider attending the event.

8 Reasons for Recommendations

- 8.1 Encourages businesses to see financial benefits of environmental good practice.

9 Contact Officer

- 9.1 Author: Daniel Dempsey Tel: 01865 815959

Email: Daniel.dempsey@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Background Papers: Event flyer

SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION OXFORD

BLUEPRINT FOR A GREEN FUTURE

18th November 2009

Saïd Business School, University of Oxford

Oxfordshire Economic Partnership invites you to the first in a series of conferences on the issues of sustainable energy, waste & climate change-resilient construction.

Sustainable Construction Oxford will provide an opportunity to attend informative workshops and attend practitioners' exhibitions.

WORKSHOP THEMES:

- *Designing for Site Waste Management*
 - *Delivering Sustainable Affordable Homes*
 - *Building for Climate Resilience*
 - *Designing & Delivering Sustainably*
 - *Sustainable Energy & Buildings*

CONFIRMED SPEAKERS INCLUDE:

David Evans - Senior Solicitor (Construction and Development), Blake Laphorn, and Chairman, Constructing Excellence Oxford

Mark Goldthorpe - Project Officer, Business, UK Climate Impacts Programme

Diana Lock - Chief Executive, ReMaDe South East

Jonathan Riggall - Senior Environmental Scientist, Peter Brett Associates

David Robertson - Deputy Leader, Oxfordshire County Council

Vivian Rosser - Managing Director, Ibis

Chindarat Taylor - Director, Pathway to Zero Waste

Tim Fenn - Director, P3ECO

Peter McManners - "Author of *Adapt and Thrive*" and "*Victim of Success*", Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society

Alex Moczarski - Project Officer (Business), UK Climate Impacts Programme, Oxford University Centre for the Environment

To book a ticket email a.goodwin@oep.org.uk. Tickets are subsidised by the Oxfordshire Economic Partnership and priced at £25.00. For further details email Daniel.dempsey@oxfordshire.gov.uk or call 01865 815959.

