



Executive
10th April 2006

**Report from the Director of
Environment and Culture**

For Action

Wards Affected:
ALL

Authority to tender Contract for Waste Services

Forward Plan Ref: E&C - 05/06- 045

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report concerns the provision of Waste Management Services to the Borough. These Services include:

Household Waste Collection
Bulky Household Waste Collection (known locally as Special Collections)
Household Clinical Waste Collection
Street Cleansing
Winter Maintenance
Bring Bank Recycling Collection

(the above services are currently provided by Veolia Environmental (previously known as Onyx UK Ltd).

plus:

Kerbside Collection of Dry Recyclables
Kerbside Collection of Organic Waste

(the above services are currently provided by ECT Recycling Ltd)

- 1.2 This report requests approval from the Executive to commence a tendering process and invite tenders in respect of the Council's Waste Services Contract as required by Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Executive gives approval to the pre-tender considerations and the criteria to be used to evaluate tenders as set out in paragraph 3.22 of the Report.
- 2.2 That the Executive gives approval to officers to invite tenders and evaluate them in accordance with the approved evaluation criteria.
- 2.3 That the Executive approve the 20 specific recommendations shown at paragraph 3.21 of this Report, which will provide for proposals and costs to be submitted in respect of the kerbside dry recycling service (i.e. the range of collection methods proposed to service properties of a different type that will capture the maximum amount of material), and the frequency of street cleansing generally across the Borough (i.e. by asking for separate prices for [a] a twice per week frequency, and [b] a three times per week frequency).

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 The purpose of this report is to request approval from the Executive to commence a tendering process and invite tenders in respect of the Council's Waste Services Contract as required by Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89.
- 3.2 As an outcome from this process, the Council is seeking a joint commitment with the Contractor to meet the Council's recycling targets, to achieve the Best Value requirement for service improvement during the life of the Contract, to meet the needs of our customers and to achieve a high standard in comparison with other authorities.
- 3.3 The Council is looking for proposals that will achieve a high level of recycling and a measurably higher quality of service together with suggestions for flexibility that will be in place throughout the life of the contract.
- 3.4 The specification for the services to be provided will deliberately not be made too prescriptive and should be considered as guidance to the **minimum** level of service deemed acceptable by the Authority when Contractors are developing Operational Plans.
- 3.5 There are currently two Waste Services Contracts, let respectively, to Veolia Environmental (formerly Onyx UK Ltd), and ECT Recycling Ltd. Both Contracts expire on 31st March, 2007.
- 3.6 The services described at paragraph 1.1 above do, in effect, combine these respective services and it is proposed that the services are combined into one single Contract with effect from 1st April, 2007. The Council's Waste Management Inspection in 2003, and the "informal" follow-up inspection in 2004 recommended that our waste management services be integrated, and reflected that the higher performing local authorities had integrated and seamless services. There may also be economies of scale in supervisory and management costs.
- 3.7 The services to be tendered will reflect the Council's approved Municipal Waste Management Strategy (MWMS) (approved by the Executive on 13th February, 2006).
- 3.8 The Council's main objective, as set out in the MWMS, is to empower the Contractor to minimise the amount of waste being sent to landfill and maximise the amount of waste recycled to comply with regional, national and European requirements.

- 3.9 This contract specification will provide the initial framework for strategic decisions to be taken on the management of municipal solid waste (MSW) in Brent over the next 7 years. It must necessarily adopt a flexible approach, recognising the need to respond to rapid developments of new ideas and opportunities.
- 3.10 Targets set under the Government's Waste Strategy require Brent to improve its recycling rate from approximately 20% at present to 33% by 2015/16. Interim targets include 18% for this year (Best Value Performance indicator, BVPI Targets) and 30% by 2010/11 (Waste Strategy 2000 targets).
- 3.11 Other major drivers for improvement include the annual Landfill Tax increase set at £3 per tonne as from 2005-06, which will increase Landfill Tax from its current level of £21 per tonne to at least £35 per tonne. In addition, the Government has introduced the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS) which will significantly limit the amount of municipal waste that can be disposed of to landfill. Failure to reduce the landfilling of waste to a level within an agreed allocation could see the Waste Disposal Authority, West London Waste, and in turn Brent, being subject to significant fines.
- 3.12 In order to meet these targets, the Council will seek to minimise waste at every opportunity and will expect the service provider partner to co-operate flexibly in achieving the requirements of the Government's 'Waste Strategy' and the 'Landfill Directive' and any subsequent policy documents related to Waste and Recycling.
- 3.13 In addition, the Government's modernisation agenda for local authorities includes Best Value and Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA), which are designed to drive improvement in services. Best Value places a duty on local authorities to secure continuous improvement in services. CPA is about helping local Councils improve services for their communities.
- 3.14 The rigorous specification of methods, timings, equipment and other resources tends to reduce flexibility and inhibit innovation on the part of the Contractor.
- 3.15 Whilst the Council recognises that removing some of these constraints will increase flexibility and increase the chances of services being improved, it also recognises that there are important characteristics relating to methods, timing, equipment, resources and management that will play a significant role in helping the Council achieve its objectives. Therefore, it would not be in the best interests of the Council to give an incoming Contractor *'carte blanche'* over the manner in which services are to be delivered. Instead, a balance must be struck where the Council identifies any particular constraints in the way services are to be delivered (for robust and rational reasons) and leaves the Contractor to design the service within these constraints.
- 3.16 Tenderers will therefore be encouraged to be innovative in designing their methods of service delivery to respond to the Council's requirements along with any appropriate environmental initiatives. The specification will indicate the current levels of service but provide for tenderers to offer an improved level of service to that currently being provided which will satisfy the budgetary constraints and which the Council's customers will find acceptable; and offer options that may be considered at any stage in the future if and when funding becomes available and when legislation or customer demand dictates.
- 3.17 It is proposed to use the Competitive Dialogue Procedure for this procurement process, on the basis that the Council cannot fully specify certain aspects of the service, such as the best method of collecting dry recyclables.

- 3.18 As part of the preparatory arrangements for the new Contract, a consultation exercise has been undertaken. This is described further at Appendix A. The response to this consultation has not identified any significant additional issues that impact on the specification or tendering process.
- 3.19 A number of details for the new Contract have been subject to scrutiny through discussion at:
- a Waste Contract Procurement Away Day on 20th November 2005
 - a High Level (Waste) Meeting held on 19th December 2005
 - a meeting of the Corporate Management Team on 12th January 2006
 - a meeting of the Policy Coordination Group on 23rd February 2006
 - a meeting of the Forward Plan Select Committee on 28th February 2006
- 3.20 Work has been undertaken to summarise the specific enhancements that are intended to be included within the new Contract Specification. The following information outlines the most significant changes between our current service specification(s) and those proposed in the new Contract to address the questions about what will be new/different/better:

Refuse, Recycling, and Composting Collections

- (a) We propose to change to same day collections for these services.
- (b) We propose to return bins to within the curtilage of property, as opposed to the point of collection. However, the return point must not obstruct pedestrian or vehicular access to a resident's property. This may be a contentious issue for some residents, but it is important to note that an enhanced service will continue to be available for disabled or elderly residents.
- (c) We propose to include plastics in our kerbside collection system. This is not currently available.
- (d) We propose to offer tenderers an option to put forward proposals for a combination of co-mingled collections or a box-based system as independent research has confirmed that there is limited local available capacity to process co-mingled recycle with the over-riding aim of capturing maximum material for recycling.
- (e) We propose introducing tougher targets for failing to collect on the scheduled day of collection.

Special Collections

- (f) We will specify that once a visit has been carried out, the crew will report to the contractor's office (via radio or hand-held device) that the job has been carried out/ not carried out. Where a job has not been able to be completed, the contractor's office will contact the customer and explain why, and update the system database with these details immediately. Where necessary to complete a Special Collection, an appointment will also be made for completion of the job within one working day unless a later date is agreed with the customer.
- (g) We will introduce stringent financial defaults for service failure in any respect – be it missed collections, or failure to update the (shared) database record.

Street Cleansing

- (h) We will consolidate the existing enhancements for Town Centre and Secondary Area Cleansing within our new Specification.
- (i) We will specify our street cleansing schedules over a 7 day, rather than 5 day week, whilst not inconveniencing residents.

- (j) We propose to increase the cleansing frequency in our Industrial Areas from a maximum of two visits per week, to a daily sweep or 'every other day' sweep. These Areas are amongst our worst performers at present.
- (k) We propose to sweep our residential areas three times per week, but will ask tenderers to quote for a twice weekly sweep in case the costs of the former are excessive.
- (l) We will clearly define the term 'sweep', and reduce litter picking as the predominant cleansing regime.
- (m) We propose to specify cleansing zones that are more applicable to Brent, than the broad-brush EPA zoning system.
- (n) We will tighten up remedial times across all zones, and ensure these are more demanding than the existing remedial periods.

3.21 Specific issues discussed, together with the recommendations of the Director of Environment & Culture, are shown in the following table. The tenderers will be asked to price separately for the requirements at items 11 and 17 in the table and the Executive will be asked to decide whether these requirements should be included in the contract when they consider award of contract.

ISSUES / OPTIONS		RECOMMENDATION (see Appendix B for considerations)
1	What is the optimum Contract length?	That the Contract Term is set at 7 years.
2	Should we consider PFI/PPP as contract options?	That the Council does not explore a PFI/PPP in respect of these services.
3	Should we explore an "Open Book" Service Contract or stay with a "Traditional" Service Contract?	That the Council approves a Traditional Service Contract, but replaces the Baxter Index currently in place with Retail Price Index (RPIX).
4	Should the Borough seek to re-introduce a Trade Waste Collection Service having divested itself of this service some time ago?	That the Council does not seek to introduce a Trade Waste Collection Service.
5	Should the Council bring the Street Cleansing service in-house?	That the Council does not bring the Street Cleansing Service in-house.
6	For residual (i.e. landfilled) waste, should the Council provide smaller bins to encourage waste minimisation?	That there will be option to build the provision of smaller bins into the specification during the course of the Contract. In any event, we will give residents smaller residual waste bins upon request.
7	Should the Borough charge for bulky waste collections (i.e. the existing "free" Special Collection Service)?	That the Council does not introduce a charge for Special Collections.
8	Should we specify same-day collections for all waste collection streams?	That the Council specifies same day waste collections, wherever possible.

9	Should we collect side waste (i.e. bagged or loose waste left beside wheelie bins)?	That the Council collects side waste.
10	Should we specify that bins (or boxes, if used) are returned to the edge of property rather than from point of collection?	That bins be returned to within the edge of property, where they do not obstruct pedestrian or vehicle access.
11	Should dry recyclables continue to be collected and sorted at the kerbside, or should we specify co-mingled collections from households for subsequent sorting at a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF).	That the Council invites a combination of options so far as 'dry recyclables' collection system is concerned, and invites tenderers to offer proposals and costs for these alternative methods.
12	Should we include recycling of plastics in the kerbside collection system whilst retaining capacity at Bring Banks?	That plastic be included in the kerbside collection system, with existing capacity retained at Bring Bank sites.
13	Should we synchronise waste collection schedules with street cleansing schedules to ensure the latter follows the former?	That waste collection and street cleansing arrangements be synchronised to ensure that cleansing follows waste collection.
14	Should we continue to place the risk of recycle values and the responsibility for securing end-markets principally with the contractor, or do something different?	That the risk of material values be placed with the contractor.
15	Should street cleansing be specified as a full 7 day per week service across the Borough rather than in certain (e.g. high profile) areas only?	That Street Cleansing is broadly specified as a 7 day service.
16	Zone 1 Cleansing – should we (continue to) specify a high level of service?	That existing Zone 1 areas retain a high level of service for street cleansing.
17	Should we continue to specify "Intensive Cleans" to supplement scheduled cleansing arrangements?	That the Intensive Cleans continue to be an option in the contract, and capable of variation as necessary.
18	Should we provide for the contractor to be required to supply evidence from fly tips to provide pointers to the culprits?	That we encourage the contractor to provide information to enable Council staff to take follow up action.
19	Should the Graffiti Removal Service	That the Graffiti Removal Service be

	and associated cleaning functions be retained in-house?	retained in-house.
20	Should the Gully Maintenance Service be retained in-house?	That the Gully Maintenance Service be retained in-house.

3.22 In accordance with Contract Standing Orders 89 and 90, pre-tender considerations have been set out below for the approval of the Executive.

Ref.	Requirement	Response
(i)	The nature of the services.	Waste Services, comprising the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Household Waste Collection • Bulky Household Waste Collection (known locally as Special Collections) • Household Clinical Waste Collection • Street Cleansing • Winter Maintenance (e.g. gritting) • Bring Bank Recycling Collections • Kerbside Collection of Dry Recyclables • Kerbside Collection of Organic Waste
(ii)	The estimated value.	Between £85m and £115m over the proposed life of the Contract.
(iii)	The contract term.	Seven years
(iv)	The tender procedure to be adopted.	EU Procurement (Competitive Dialogue Procedure)

(v)	The procurement timetable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Adverts and notice placed <li>▪ Expressions of interest returned <li>▪ Shortlist drawn up in accordance with the Council's approved criteria <li>▪ Start a structured dialogue process with selected suppliers to identify acceptable solutions that will meet the Council's needs <li>▪ Conclusion of Dialogue declared <li>▪ Invite to tender <li>▪ Deadline for tender submissions <li>▪ Panel evaluation, clarification and contract decision <li>▪ Report recommending Contract award circulated internally for comment <li>▪ Executive approval for the contract award and mandatory standstill period <li>▪ Contract start date 	<p>18 Apr 06</p> <p>30 May 06</p> <p>19 Jun 06</p> <p>21 Jun 06</p> <p>10 July 06</p> <p>14 July 06</p> <p>25 Aug 06</p> <p>26 Aug to 27 Sept 06</p> <p>2 Oct 06</p> <p>Nov 06</p> <p>1st Apr 07</p>
-----	----------------------------	--	---

(vi)	The evaluation criteria and process.	<p>The shortlist will be drawn up in accordance with the Council's Contract Management and Procurement Guidelines namely the pre qualification questionnaire and thereby meeting the Council's financial standing, technical capability and technical expertise. The panel will evaluate the tenders against the following criteria:</p> <p>Most Economic Advantageous Offer, taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Experience in providing comparable services ▪ Proposals to manage environmental impacts ▪ Proposed management structure, taking account of experience, skills and qualifications of senior managers ▪ Proposed staff establishment ▪ Proposed mobilisation and implementation arrangements ▪ Proposed Depot Facilities ▪ Proposed quality control system ▪ Proposed system and arrangements for dealing with enquiries, complaints, and the provision of management information ▪ Proposals for delivering continuous improvement, and "Gershon" savings ▪ Proposals for managing day to day health and safety issues and considerations ▪ Proposed arrangements in response to all other method statements required to be supplied with tender submissions and set out in the Invitation to Tender ▪ Price ▪ References from existing clients
------	--------------------------------------	---

(vii)	Any business risks associated with entering into the contract.	<p>If the contractor performs poorly this could cause various difficulties including household waste remaining uncollected, and poor visual appearance of the street scene. These risks will be reduced by employing a carefully managed and full procurement process, as set out in this Report. Brent Financial Services, Legal Services, and the Procurement Team have been consulted concerning this Contract.</p> <p>At paragraph 3.3 of this Report, an integrated waste management contract (i.e. one single contract including all the individual services) is recommended. This is principally because of operational advantages and economies of scale in supervisory costs and other overheads.</p> <p>However, it should also be recognised that when tenders are received, there may be financial advantages in tendering the individual components of the contract to more than one supplier.</p>
(viii)	Any staffing implications, including TUPE and pensions.	See paragraph 5 of this Report.
(ix)	The relevant financial, legal and other considerations.	See sections 4 and 6 of this Report.

3.23 The Executive is asked to give its approval to these proposals as set out in the recommendations and in accordance with Standing Order 89.

4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 The Council's Contract Standing Orders state that contracts for supplies and services exceeding £500k or works contracts exceeding £1million shall be referred to the Executive for approval to invite tenders and in respect of other matters identified in Standing Order 90.

4.2 The estimated value of this services contract is between £85m and £115m over the proposed life of the contract. Current year costs (2006-07) are shown at paragraph 4.4.

4.3 No external resources are likely to be available for this contract, and it is anticipated that the entire cost of the contract will need to be funded from the Council's General Fund.

4.4 At its meeting on 6th March, 2006 the Council approved the budget for 2006-07. In relation to the services that are proposed to be included in the new Waste Services Contract, the individual service budget allocations for 2006-07 are as follows:

SERVICE COMPONENT	BUDGET 2006-07
Household Waste Collection	£ 3.108m
Bulky Household Waste Collection (Special Collections)	£ 0.342m
Household Clinical Waste Collection	£ 0.033m

Street Cleansing	£ 5.409m
Winter Maintenance	£ 0.187m
Kerbside Collection of Dry Recyclables (including bring banks)	£ 1.531m
Kerbside Collection of Organic Waste	£ 1.172m
TOTAL BUDGET 2006-07 :	£11.782m

4.5 The figures in paragraph 4.4 include recent year enhancements for Town Centre Cleansing, Secondary Area Cleansing, and Intensive Cleaning.

4.6 A number of specific enhancements are identified at paragraph 3.20. It is important to note that the funding to secure these enhancements is not currently provided for, and will flow through in the tender prices received. It will be possible to separately identify the costs of these enhancements in tender prices.

5.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

5.1 There are no staffing or accommodation implications arising from this Report.

5.2 The services are currently provided by two separate external contractors, and it is likely that a TUPE transfer will take place between private sector contractors, with no implications for Council staff.

6.0 Legal Implications

6.1 This is a High Value service contract (over £500,000 over the life of the contract) as such, in accordance with the Council's Contract Standing Orders, any retendering needs Executive approval. The full application of the EU Public Procurement Regulations applies to the services to be procured under this Contract.

6.2 Once the tendering process is undertaken, Officers will report back to the Executive in accordance with Contract Standing Orders, explaining the process that has been undertaken in tendering this Contract and recommending award.

6.3 The Public Contract Regulations 2006 came into force on 31 January 2006. The new regulations replace the previous EU procurement regulations and provide for a new procurement procedure known as the Competitive Dialogue Procedure. Where a contracting authority wishes to award a particularly complex contract and considers that the use of the open or restricted procedure would not enable the award of that contract, the contracting authority may use the new competitive dialogue procedure. The regulations define "particularly complex contract" as a contract where a contracting authority is not objectively able to define the technical means capable of satisfying its needs or objectives or specify either the legal or financial make-up of a project or both. It is intended that this new procedure will be used for the procurement of this contract on the basis that it is not possible for the Council to fully specify which of several alternatives would best satisfy its needs in certain areas of the contract such as the best method of collecting recyclables.

6.4 As this procurement process is subject to the full application of the EU Regulations, the Council must observe the requirements of the mandatory minimum 10 calendar day standstill period imposed by EU Regulations before the contract can be awarded.

6.5 The requirements include notifying all tenderers in writing of the Council's decision to award and providing additional debrief information to unsuccessful tenderers on receipt of a written request.

6.6 The standstill period provides unsuccessful tenderers with an opportunity to challenge the Council's award decision if such challenge is justifiable. However if no challenge or successful challenge is brought during the period, at the end of the standstill period the Council can issue a letter of acceptance to the successful tenderer and the contract may commence.

7.0 Diversity Implications

7.1 Officers have screened the proposed contract specification detail, and consider that the most significant diversity implications can be addressed through continuing the "Assisted Collection" service for residents who are unable – through age or disability – to leave bins in the appropriate place for collection or return the bins to the agreed location.

7.2 Officers have not identified any further specific diversity implications, but advise that Equalities Impact Needs Risk Assessments will be undertaken prior to awarding this Contract.

Background Papers

Report to Executive 13th February, 2006 – Brent Municipal Waste Strategy

Contact Officers

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Keith Balmer, Director of StreetCare, 1st Floor (West), Brent House, 349-357 High Road, Wembley, Middlesex, HA9 6BZ. Telephone 020 8937 5066.

Richard Saunders
Director of Environment and Culture

Waste Contract - Consultation

Environment & Culture Officers have worked closely with Brent's Consultation Team in these consultation arrangements.

The consultation process started during the latter part of 2005 when a number of potential private sector providers, including our two current contractors, were invited to offer views to officers from Environment & Culture and the Council's Procurement Team.

This has been followed by consultation with the Council's "client" staff and through the Council's website for public consultation, and with some Executive Members and Senior Officers at a Waste Procurement Away Day (November 2005), a High Level Monitoring Meeting (Waste) in December, and the Corporate Management Team (January 2006).

Further consultation has taken place through:

- A. The 5 Area Consultative Forums
- B. Resident Associations
- C. The network of local Street Watchers
- D. The GLA Mayor
- E. Adjacent London Boroughs
- F. West London Waste Authority
- G. The Council's BME Forum
- H. The Council's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Forum
- I. Brent Association for Voluntary Action (BrAVA)
- J. Ward Working Meetings
- K. Senior Citizens Forum
- L. Park Royal Partnership
- M. Area Health Forums
- N. Disability & Mental Health Forum

The outcomes of these consultation arrangements have been considered during the development of the contract specifications.

Waste Contract – Discussion of Options

ISSUES / OPTIONS		DISCUSSION POINTS RELATING TO RECOMMENDATIONS AT PARAGRAPH 3.21 OF THIS REPORT
1	What is the optimum Contract length?	7 years. An alternative five year term with a two year option for extension has been considered, but a straight 7 year term should provide for lower annual costs due to the “pay back” period for capital items being claimed over 7 rather than 5 years.
2	Should we consider PFI/PPP as contract options?	No. The fact that this is a “collection only” waste service [and thus, not providing disposal arrangements or physical infrastructure], makes the scope of the service unattractive and unsuitable for a PFI/PPP.
3	Should we explore an “Open Book” Service Contract or stay with a “Traditional” Service Contract?	No. On balance, given that Open Book Contracts are more often found with negotiated contracts (rather than contracts tendered under the EU Restricted Procedure as this one will be), the traditional contract seems to represent greater financial certainty for the Council. It is proposed, however, not to use the Baxter Index currently in place, and replace this with Retail Price Index (RPIX), as this gives greater certainty about the year on year budget requirement and will assist the Council in budget planning.
4	Should the Borough seek to re-introduce a Trade Waste Collection Service having divested itself of this service some time ago?	No. There is no guarantee that there is a market for our service, given our absence for some years and the fact that other providers have an established private trade waste presence. Such providers may wish to tender for Brent’s waste contract and if this was included in the contract they might decide not to tender or if they did tender would be in a conflict of interest position in running the Council’s service.
5	Should the Council bring the Street Cleansing service in-house?	No. Reasons include lack of experience and skills within the Council’s organisation in managing this type of service; costs and risk of HR issues in an area with traditional high sickness absence levels; pensions issues.
6	For residual (i.e. landfilled) waste, should the Council provide smaller bins to encourage waste	The provision of smaller bins would assist with the Council’s promotion of minimising waste.

	minimisation?	There will be option to build this in during the course of the Contract. In any event, we will give residents smaller residual waste bins upon request.
7	Should the Borough charge for bulky waste collections (i.e. the existing "free" Special Collection Service)?	<p>No, as endorsed at Waste Procurement Away Day. The Service is very popular with residents and there are concerns about the potential impact on fly tipping if a 'free' service was withdrawn.</p> <p>It was also noted that charging for bulky waste collections would incur costs in administration and it might be difficult to find an accessible payment mechanism for many residents.</p>
8	Should we specify same-day collections for all waste collection streams?	Yes, as endorsed at Waste Procurement Away Day. It is important that residents are not confused by separate days for the individual collection services, and there is a detrimental visual impact on the street scene if waste is left out for collection over a number of days. Same day collections also make it easier to schedule street cleaning to follow on.
9	Should we collect side waste (i.e. bagged or loose waste left beside wheelie bins)?	Yes, as endorsed at Waste Procurement Away Day. Leaving waste uncollected would lead to an increase in complaints about dumped waste and reduce resident satisfaction with the service itself and the Council generally.
10	Should we specify that bins (or boxes, if used) are returned to the edge of property rather than from point of collection?	<p>Yes, as endorsed at Waste Procurement Away Day.</p> <p>In order to minimise complaints and time spent returning bins, the contractor will be required to return bins to within the property boundary <u>but</u> in a position that does not restrict pedestrian or vehicle access. This will apply regardless of where the bin was left for collection by the resident.</p>
11	Should dry recyclables continue to be collected and sorted at the kerbside, or should we specify co-mingled collections from households for subsequent sorting at a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF).	<p>The Waste Procurement Away Day referred to in this Report endorsed a co-mingled collection system</p> <p>However, E&C Officers are concerned that there is not adequate local capacity for co-mingled collections at present and that we should allow tenderers to present a combination of options and methods that are required to provide a service to the various property types in the Borough. Officers commissioned an independent research study by Business ECO Network into local capacity for co-mingled recycle.</p> <p>The conclusions of the study were that "there are no existing facilities for the recovery of co-mingled kerbside recycle within a reasonable</p>

		<p>distance of Brent without the use of a transfer or bulking facility”.</p> <p>Different collection systems also carry differing costs and incomes.</p> <p>Officers strongly recommend, therefore, that our options remain open as to the ‘dry recyclables’ collection system and invite tenderers to offer proposals and costs for either method, so that Brent can determine the best deal as part of tender evaluation.</p>
12	Should we include recycling of plastics in the kerbside collection system whilst retaining capacity at Bring Banks?	Yes, as endorsed at Waste Procurement Away Day. There is a frequent call from residents for the Council to provide a kerbside collection system for plastics.
13	Should we synchronise waste collection schedules with street cleansing schedules to ensure the latter follows the former?	Yes, wherever possible.
14	Should we continue to place the risk of recycle values and the responsibility for securing end-markets principally with the contractor, or do something different?	<p>Yes. This has been our approach to date but we <u>must</u> require evidence of the end use of material collected for recycling and composting if we are to avoid having our Statutory Performance Indicators challenged or qualified by audit.</p> <p>In addition, the expertise of the private sector and their contacts & access to markets is likely to be better than an individual local authority trying to establish itself with no track record. This will reduce the financial risk of the Council of fluctuating material values.</p>
15	Should street cleansing be specified as a full 7 day per week service across the Borough rather than in certain (e.g. high use) areas only?	Yes. The nature of our Borough is such that major events and thriving night time and weekend economies make the Borough unsuitable for a Monday to Friday approach to street cleansing.
16	Zone 1 Cleansing (i.e. town centre areas) – should we (continue to) specify a high level of service?	Yes. Recent investment has shown that only by specifying a high input, can we achieve high standards. The Street Cleansing Specification will be drawn up to build upon the success of this investment in our busiest areas.
17	Should we continue to specify “Intensive Cleans” to supplement scheduled cleansing arrangements?	Officers propose that an Intensive Cleaning Service be specified at the outset, and separately costed at two or three frequencies

		as options.
18	Should we provide for the contractor to be required to supply evidence from fly tips to provide pointers to the culprits?	Yes. This is a way to try and reduce fly tipping through partnership working. It may also be possible to incentivise the contractor by sharing fines/costs for successful prosecutions with the contractor, where their evidence has been pivotal.
19	Should the Graffiti Removal Service and associated cleaning functions be retained in-house?	Yes, as agreed at the Waste Procurement Away day. The Service is well used, effective, and assists with other publicity, joint campaigns and preventative work, as well providing a flexible pool of staff to ensure effective traffic management of events at the new Wembley National Stadium, and Arena, as well as other Borough events.
20	Should the Gully Maintenance Service be retained in-house?	Yes. The Service is able to be more flexible if retained in-house, especially as the employees also currently form part of a flexible pool of staff providing the Borough's overnight Highway Emergency Response Team and provide a flexible pool of staff to ensure effective traffic management of events at the new Wembley National Stadium, and Arena, as well as other Borough events. This flexibility will be difficult to specify in an essentially waste contract.