



LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS

The public sector delivery specialists



DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES IN WASTE SERVICES IN THE EAST OF ENGLAND

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	Context	3
1.2	East of England profile	4
1.3	Waste management profile	5
1.4	Waste partnerships in the region	6
2	DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCIES	7
2.1	National picture	7
2.2	Regional comparisons	9
2.3	Success through partnership working	10
3	DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES IN THE EAST OF ENGLAND	15
4	LESSONS LEARNT	24
5	SUMMARY	29
6	APPENDIX 1: LOCAL AUTHORITY PROFILES	32
7	APPENDIX 2: LOCAL AUTHORITY SERVICE SUMMARY	61
8	APPENDIX 3: RECYCLING PERFORMANCE	63



East Anglian Centre

We wish to express our thanks for the support received from
CIWM East Anglian Centre

Disclaimer

This report has been produced and published in good faith by Local Partnerships and Local Partnerships shall not incur any liability for any action or omission arising out of any reliance being placed on the report (including any information it contains) by any organisation or other person. Any organisation or other person in receipt of this report should take their own legal, financial and/or other relevant professional advice when considering what action (if any) to take in respect of any associated initiative, proposal or other arrangement, or before placing any reliance on the report (including any information it contains).

Copyright © Local Partnerships LLP 2015

For further information contact

John Enright Project director, Local Partnerships
John.Enright@local.gov.uk 07824 371 720

Dr Jane Beasley Beasley Associates
jane@beasleyassociates.com 07946 217 275

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

This is the sixth regional review undertaken by Local Partnerships focusing on efficiencies achieved in waste management. The previous five reviews, focusing on the North West, Yorkshire and the Humber, North East, West Midlands and London provided a wealth of information to decision makers and stakeholders; this review continues the work of the previous reports in terms of building upon a comprehensive of knowledge being generated in this area. Further details of the previous studies can be found at localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/infrastructure.

Throughout the East of England authorities have successfully delivered efficiencies in a number of areas. The examples provided throughout this report will enable others to benefit from these experiences; particularly in terms of examining their own services and seeing if the experiences here could be applied to their authority and support them in making their own savings. As with the previous reviews the examples shown by authorities in the East of England have not just focused on one specific area or aspect of waste management, but have explored a range of options to achieve efficiencies. This is clearly reflected in the wide diversity of examples featured.

All authorities in the region were given the opportunity to contribute to the review; a profile was supplied for each authority with a request for information to highlight the progress made to date and any lessons learnt which can be shared with others. A workshop was also held to provide feedback on the information provided, offer the chance for authorities to benchmark themselves and provide any final pieces of data and information.

A total of 28 authorities responded, including district and borough councils, county councils and unitary authorities, as can be seen in Table 1; a number of those delivering a shared service submitted a joint response.

As with the previous review in the North West, there were a number of authorities in this region who expressed a desire to take part in the project but felt that either the timing of the review was not right in terms of service changes they were currently delivering or that they had no spare capacity in terms of staff time to pull together the information required. Whilst every attempt was made to ensure that the data and information required for this review was not too onerous, it is appreciated that for some authorities their staffing levels have been cut so significantly that there is no resource available outside of what is required to deliver the day job. The challenge posed by staff capacity has increased in significance over the last couple of years and clearly the ability of staff to deliver anything more than the day to day requirements could adversely impact the development of a long-term strategic approach.

The individual profiles for the authorities who took part can be found in Appendix 1, and examples of their achievements are featured in the main body of the report. Please note that as with the reviews conducted in other regions, the responses from the authorities have not been audited and therefore the information presented in this report is based on the information that the authorities kindly provided.

Table 1: Authorities featured in the East of England efficiency review

Waste collection authority		Waste disposal authority	Unitary authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babergh District Council & Mid Suffolk District Council • Basildon Borough Council • Brentwood Borough Council • Broxbourne Borough Council • East Cambridgeshire District Council • Fenland District Council • Forest Heath District Council & St. Edmundsbury Borough Council • Great Yarmouth Borough Council • Huntingdonshire District Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ipswich Borough Council • Maldon District Council • North Norfolk District Council • Norwich City Council • South Cambridgeshire District & Cambridge City Council • South Norfolk Council • Suffolk Coastal District & Waveney District • Three Rivers District Council • Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council • Hertfordshire County Council • Norfolk County Council • Suffolk County Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Bedfordshire Council • Peterborough City Council

1.2 East of England profile

The East of England is the second largest region by area, covering 19,100 square kilometres (sq. km), with a population was 5.8 million (mid 2010 data). The region is a mix of urban and rural areas, and population density ranges from 100 people per sq. km in Breckland to 4,014 people per sq. km in Watford. With an average population density of 305, this is below the English average of 401 but above the UK average of 257 (2010 figures).

Notable geographic features include the Fens in the central northern part of the region and the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads providing a focal point for tourism. A large expanse of arable land is also characteristic of the region and there is one national park.

The region is home to major seaports and international airports, providing employment and also attracting visitors to the area.

Serving the region there are currently six Unitary authorities, five County Councils and 41 District, Borough, and City Councils. A number of the District, Borough and City councils have come together to provide shared services and there are also a number of large partnership arrangements in place.

1.3 Waste management profile

1.3.1 Waste services

As with the previous reviews in the North West, North East and Yorkshire and the Humber virtually all authorities currently provide an alternate weekly collection service for residual, dry recyclables and garden waste. For a significant proportion of authorities who took part in the review (70%), the garden waste service is a charged for service; this is higher than national figures which showed 42% charged for organic collections in England in 2015/16 (WRAP data – portal.wrap.org.uk/Statistics.aspx). In terms of food waste collection more than two thirds provide this service at the kerbside, mostly through a separate collection on a weekly basis but with a small number providing a mixed collection with garden waste. Again, this is higher than national figures which showed 48% of authorities collecting food waste either separately or mixed in 2015/16 (WRAP data – portal.wrap.org.uk/Statistics.aspx).

There is a mix in terms of collection being delivered in-house or outsourced; unlike the other regions there is not a dominance of one approach over the other.

For residual collections 240l wheeled bins are generally offered as standard, although there are some authorities who have reduced capacity through the issuing of 140l or 180l wheeled bins, plus a couple of the more urban densely populated authorities use sack collections.

For dry recyclables, most of the authorities in the review use 240l wheeled bins as standard, although a small number of authorities use 55l boxes and sacks.

Refer to Appendix 2 for an overview of the waste collection profiles of the district and unitary authorities that took part in the review.

1.3.2 Performance

The East of England achieved a recycling rate of 49.2% in 2015/16, placing the region as the highest performing in England. However, whilst the percentage of waste to landfill has been reducing significantly over the last few years, at 23.4% the region is still ranked third highest. The 'kg per household' has remained fairly constant over the last three years with only a slight increase, and at 532 kg per household the region is ranked third lowest in England.

On an individual authority level, according to the latest figures from Defra for 2015/16, the majority (just over 60%) of the authorities who took part in this review are achieving recycling rates between 40 and 50%. Just under a third are achieving recycling rates over 50% with a significant proportion very close to achieving 60%. Only two authorities who took part have yet to reach 40%, although of these one authority is very close. The lower performing authority does not currently offer a separate food waste collection, which can be an effective means to increase the recycling rate. This region has a higher proportion than other regions in terms of providing a food waste collection service at the kerbside. Where this service is currently not provided, the appetite to implement this service varies widely due to capital and revenue costs required. It is worth noting that the overwhelming driver for most of the authorities in the review is economics; a need to generate financial savings, while safeguarding the existing level of service where possible.

In terms of changes over time, for half of those authorities who took part in the review recycling rates appear to have stagnated a little over the last three years; a trend that has been seen in many authorities across the UK. For some who have implemented service changes, this appears to have had a positive effect on recycling rates, with 25% of authorities in the review showing an increase in recycling rates. However, for the remaining 25%, they have experienced a decrease in recycling rates over the last three years. Various reasons were given for this, notably reduced staffing and resources impacting upon communication and engagement, service changes, enforcement and training. In addition, it is worth noting that charging for garden waste services, which feature prominently in this region, can have an impact on tonnage collected from the kerbside and therefore recycling rates being achieved. An overriding concern for many is making significant financial savings from an already depleted budget for waste services.

For further information on performance data refer to Appendix 3; the table includes all authorities in the region, with those who participated in the review highlighted.

1.4 Waste partnerships in the region

There are a number of strategic waste partnerships in place in the region:

- ▶ RECAP – a two tier plus unitary partnership consisting of Cambridgeshire County Council, five district and city councils of Cambridgeshire, and neighbouring unitary authority of Peterborough
- ▶ Norfolk Waste Partnership – a two tier partnership consisting of Norfolk County Council and seven Norfolk district, borough and city councils
- ▶ Hertfordshire Waste Partnership – a large two tier partnership consisting of Hertfordshire County Council and ten Hertfordshire district and borough councils
- ▶ Suffolk Waste Partnership – a two tier partnership consisting of Suffolk County Council and the seven Suffolk district and borough councils
- ▶ Essex Waste Partnership – a large two tier plus unitary partnership consisting of Essex County Council, 12 Essex district and borough councils and the neighbouring unitary authority of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

The partnerships range in terms of the extent of joint working being delivered and how far reaching their focus is. Where responses have been provided in relation to partnership working these are featured as case studies in section 2.3.

2 DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCIES

2.1 National picture

All authorities are required to continue to deliver good quality waste services, building on current levels of performance, whilst at the same time delivering significant financial savings. Budgets have been cut and look set to continue to decrease over the coming years and all departments have to demonstrate savings through efficiencies.

The Association for Public Services Excellence (APSE) carries out regular reviews¹ of its members refuse services and asks the question 'What efficiencies are you currently working towards or proposing?'. The last three reports (2013, 2015 and 2016) identified the different areas where authorities have been, and continue to focus on to generate efficiencies. These are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Areas where authorities are generating efficiencies – APSE member's surveys

2013	2015	2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route optimisation and rationalisation • Changing working days, shift patterns and staff reductions • Introduction of income streams (trade waste, green waste, replacement bins, developer contributions and maximising material re-sale) • Review of bring banks and HWRCs • Changes to collections (comingling, alternate weekly collections, types of containers, side waste policy and reduced frequency collections e.g. on green waste in the winter) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route optimisation leading to reduction in crews and vehicles and the introduction of double-shifting • Increasing income from chargeable services • Closing or reducing operational hours of HWRC's • Renegotiation of contracts and reduced landfill disposal costs; • Introducing fuel saving technologies • Merging services with neighbouring authorities to reduce costs, brought about by shared service structures • Reductions in management structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route optimisation/ double shifting of vehicles • Increasing income generation opportunities (charging for green waste collections/ wheeled bin replacement/commercial waste contacts) • Reducing hours and reviewing provision of HWRC's • Moving to alternative weekly collection of recyclables and three weekly collection of residual waste • Introducing new technologies e.g. Big-belly bins, in-cab CCTV

¹ State of the Market Survey 2016 – Local Authority Refuse Services, September 2016. This can be accessed through apse.org.uk/apse/index.cfm/members-area/briefings/2016/16-37-local-authority-refuse-state-of-the-market-2016

State of the Market Survey 2015 – Local Authority Refuse Services, May 2015. This can be accessed through apse.org.uk/apse/index.cfm/members-area/briefings/2015/15-27-local-authority-refuse-and-recycling-services-state-of-the-market-survey-report-2015

State of the Market Survey 2012 – Local Authority Refuse Services. This can be accessed through apse.org.uk/briefings/09/09-06%20State%20of%20the%20market%20survey%20-%20Allotments.pdf

2013	2015	2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of transport, vehicle utilisation, extending the life of vehicles and in-cab technology) • Joint working, partnerships and joint procurement • Waste prevention and education to encourage participation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing contamination levels and introducing no side waste collection policies • Reviewing staffing and fleet levels

The focus is clearly on identifying areas where, for example: services can be optimised and changed to generate savings through crews, vehicles, and time; resources can be shared or maximised; existing services can be used better; and, opportunities to generate income to offset service costs can be realised.

In 2014 the Chartered Institution of Wastes Management with Ricardo AEA² undertook research into local authority austerity measures and found similar results, with savings and efficiencies being realised through:

- ▶ Finding innovative ways to deal with capacity issues as a result of reducing staff numbers, such as shared posts, increase in automation of administrative processes, increase in use of technology, use of secondments to plug skills gaps
- ▶ Delivery of more targeted and focused communications and engagement, with budgets in this area being severely restricted, and consulting with the public on the cuts required so they are brought into the decision-making process
- ▶ Route optimisation and asset sweating in terms of vehicles and staff
- ▶ Service changes including changes to frequency of collection, reducing capacity of residual, implementing more efficient collection policies
- ▶ Charging for garden waste collections and bulky waste collections. In addition, outsourcing bulky waste to third sector providers
- ▶ Reviewing HWRCs including number of facilities, optimising their use, daily and seasonal opening times, permitting requirement, contract conditions and incentives, reuse opportunities, and potential to implement charges for specific waste streams
- ▶ Reviewing and renegotiating contracts and contract conditions and managing risk effectively
- ▶ Maximising recycling and diverting from more costly treatment and disposal options
- ▶ Increased partnership working, including joint delivery of services, joint procurement, sharing resources and skilled personnel

² CIWM & Ricardo-AEA, Waste on the Front Line – Challenges and Innovations, The impacts of austerity across local authority waste, recycling and street cleansing services, February 2015

The research found that the biggest savings delivered to date have resulted from major changes, such as re-letting contracts or making material changes to services, changing opening hours for household waste recycling centres (HWRCs) and charging for garden waste collections.

2.2 Regional comparisons

The authorities who took part in this review are realising efficiency savings through:

- ▶ Route optimisation and round reconfiguration
- ▶ Service changes: container changes, frequency of collection, bring site rationalisation, seasonal variations
- ▶ Maximising recycling
- ▶ Partnership working
- ▶ Shared services
- ▶ Joint procurement
- ▶ Charging for garden waste
- ▶ Maximising income opportunities
- ▶ HWRC changes
- ▶ Contracts: retenders, renegotiation and new arrangements
- ▶ New finance models
- ▶ Technology improvements
- ▶ Changing behaviour
- ▶ Communications rationalisation

There is clearly a lot of parity between the focus of efficiencies in the East of England and the findings of both the regular APSE surveys and the CIWM/Ricardo-AEA research.

As this is the sixth review, it was thought useful to retrospectively consider where the focus of efficiency savings has been for the previous studies. This is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Overview of efficiencies across the six regional reviews

Efficiency areas	West Midlands 2012	London 2013	North East 2014	Yorkshire and the Humber 2015	North West 2016	East of England 2016
Route optimisation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Service changes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Charging for green/bulky			✓	✓	✓	✓
Joint procurement and partnerships	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Shared services						✓
Operation of HWRCs				✓	✓	✓
Contracts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maximising recycling	✓		✓		✓	✓
Maximising income	✓		✓		✓	✓
Enforcement			✓			
Staffing rationalisation		✓			✓	
Maximising reuse					✓	
Different finance models						✓
Technology improvements						✓
Changing behaviour						✓
Comms. rationalisation						✓

There is clearly a significant overlap between the regions with a number of constant areas identified across all reviews. However, it is also clear that within the East of England review the range of efficiency areas is much broader.

2.3 Success through partnership working

The opportunities presented to deliver efficiencies through joint working have been increasingly documented. The LGA report "Services Shared: Costs Spared?" provides a detailed analysis of five high profile shared service arrangements; clear financial benefits have been achieved with the five shared services saving £30 million between them.

Lessons learnt from this LGA study include:

- ▶ The set up and integration costs for merging services are modest with less than a two year payback period for all the shared services analysed
- ▶ The shared services have succeeded in providing the same or better levels of performance at less cost
- ▶ These initial benefits are typically delivered rapidly with strong top-down leadership

- ▶ Baseline financial and performance information is essential to make the case for change and track the benefits of shared services in terms of efficiencies and service improvements
- ▶ Expanding established shared services to provide services for other public sector partners in a locality is a useful way to generate income and ensure efficiencies through greater economies of scale. In addition to the efficiencies which can be achieved, other advantages to joint working at this level include the opportunity for partners to harmonise best practice across their services, making adjustments where practicable and sharing best practice to a greater extent. In addition, coming together as a partnership and delivering the service 'as one' may make the addition of a particular material or change in a service more affordable and appropriate than when acting alone

Partnership working is not without its challenges in terms of successfully bringing authorities together who may have different operational practices, budgets, political preferences and local geography and circumstances. There are a number of active partnerships in the East of England and some of the examples included in the review and in the individual authority profiles in Appendix 1 allude to both the challenges of working together and also the benefits. In addition, specific examples of partnerships finding ways to address the need to deliver efficiencies through joint working are discussed in more detail in case studies 1 and 2.

Case study 1: Norfolk Waste Partnership

The Norfolk Waste Partnership (NWP) is a traditional two tier partnership between the WDA and seven WCAs within Norfolk. The NWP makes recommendations and gives direction for its eight authorities to consider, it does not have decision making powers but has adopted a shared approach to meeting costs associated with partnership activities. To deliver further change the NWP is using a total system approach and is looking at the experiences in other parts of the country as part of a process to transform waste services in Norfolk. As such the Partnership Board is currently overseeing work on four agreed priorities:

1. *Developing reuse, repair and recycling systems: A key initiative to develop reuse, repair and recycling systems across a wide range of areas including household collection, community facilities, businesses and third sector organisations.*
2. *Assessing food waste collections and collection frequency: Research and development of sound and detailed business plans to help inform decisions about how future services are best delivered. This key project will examine the impact that introducing more regular food waste collections, and improving the quality and proportion of waste being recycled, could have on the amount of residual waste that needs to then be collected by local authorities. This will also include a consideration of whether refuse collections can be reduced in frequency taking into account the huge range of materials that could be placed in recycling bins if these services are further enhanced.*
3. *Developing a communications strategy for the NWP: This project will develop and deliver a communications strategy for the Partnership. Early priorities include recruiting suitable support to develop and oversee a programme of activities which will include detailed mapping of countywide recycling performance and developing a behavioural change strategy to allow targeted campaigns to be delivered that support improved performance and participation in initiatives or service changes. The scope will also include*

looking at experiences in other parts of the country where a step change to waste services have been delivered.

4. Review infrastructure need for depots, transfer stations and recycling facilities: This project is a feasibility study with the aim of rationalising the number of public sector depots and facilities across Norfolk. Its focus will be depots for waste collection services, waste transfer stations, recycling centres and as a part of the 'One Public Estate' the link with other fleet services will be made where possible.

The partners have also come together to form a joint venture, Norse Environmental Waste Services (NEWS), and all seven WCAs collectively process dry recyclables through a contract with this joint venture.

Case study 2: RECAP

RECAP is a two tier plus unitary partnership between Cambridgeshire County Council, the five Cambridgeshire district and city councils and the neighbouring unitary authority of Peterborough. It is a long-established partnership and the governance structure is representative of other similar partnerships that have not formalised their joint arrangement in that RECAP has no delegated or Executive Powers; it operates on a voluntary basis and as such all decisions need to be taken back and agreed at individual partner level.

The partnership is resourced through contributions from each partner authority and in the recent past has employed partnership staff to drive forward joint initiatives.

In terms of achievements, significant success has been realised through joint bidding in securing government funding for investment in services and infrastructure and there has been evident success in joint procurement, specifically the MRF contract jointly procured by all six partners with collection responsibilities. In addition, RECAP, has been active in carrying out specific projects to improve service use across the partnership. For example, the partners were recently engaged in a joint project aimed at reducing contamination in the co-mingled food and garden waste collections. This was achieved through a collaborative approach to rejecting contaminated bins at the kerbside and the collection of data along with consistent messaging across the county. There was a significant reduction in the number of repeat contamination incidents and a reduction in levels of contamination identified through the visual assessments of the material deposited at our treatment and transfer facilities.

RECAP is currently reviewing its activities with a focus on increasing the opportunities that could be realised in terms of efficiencies and performance improvements through greater joint working.

Case study 3: Suffolk Waste Partnership

The Suffolk Waste Partnership (SWP) is a two-tier partnership between the seven Suffolk District and Borough Councils and the County Council. Established in the late 1990's the SWP initially worked to create and adopt a Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy in 2003. The SWP has no formal or executive powers but an Inter Authority Agreement in 2013 outlines the current ethos for joint working and details the economic relationship between the two tiers, promoting a whole system approach to considering service options.

The SWP considers options collectively and where agreed positions are reached, either wholly or in part, recommendations are passed back to the individual member authorities for ratification. This approach ensures individual authority sovereignty is respected at all times.

Suffolk's partnership approach has allowed efficiencies to be collectively delivered in the following ways:

- ▶ *Joint procurement: the partnership has collectively let several strategic contracts, including joint contracts for MRF arrangements, glass bring banks, street sweeping recycling and organic waste processing*
- ▶ *Joint communications: a collective annual fund for communications and partnership development is in place, based on a 50/50 share of budgeted costs between the County Council and the seven District and Borough Councils collectively. This arrangement has supported countywide communication projects for plastic recycling, food waste minimisation, flytipping, kerbside recycling and contamination reduction. More recently it has also supported a successful countywide home composting promotion and subsidy*
- ▶ *Joint approach to waste infrastructure: the SWP fully supported the development of Suffolk County Council's EfW facility and worked collectively to develop the supporting transfer station network in such a way that it delivered mutually beneficial outcomes. This Transfer Station development also acted as the catalyst for Suffolk County Council, St Edmundsbury Borough Council and Forest Heath District Council to propose the development of a joint waste hub which, when finalised, will deliver depot facilities, a transfer station and a Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) for West Suffolk. The SWP is also creating countywide waste technical guidance for use by the planning services. The intention of this document is to ensure domestic or commercial developers receive clear instructions on waste service requirements across the whole of Suffolk*

In addition, the SWP procured co-terminus current contracts for MRF, Transfer and Haul, Organic Waste and HWRC services and is currently reviewing strategic options for future waste services.

Case study 4: Hertfordshire Waste Partnership

The Hertfordshire Waste Partnership (HWP) was formed in 1992 between the ten borough and district councils and the county council as the waste disposal authority. The HWP has no authority over individual services and instead considers matters of strategic importance, opportunities for joint working (for example, recyclable consortium contracts) and makes recommendations about the long-term development of waste services in pursuit of targets detailed in both the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy and Hertfordshire Waste Partnership Agreement and also in response to legislative changes. WasteAware is the public face of the HWP and concentrates on changing 'waste behaviour' by focusing on the 4Rs including reduction, re-use, recycling and recovery. With particular emphasis on actions before waste is generated the HWP hopes to reduce the amount of waste that needs to be recycled or disposed of through prevention.

The partnership has achieved success in its consortiums for the processing of dry recyclables and led by a sub group of partners, HWP recently developed

a new consortium for full and partial comingled dry recyclables, based on a new financial model which consisted of three elements:

- ▶ a gate fee paid in full by the HWP and indexed each year less a 1% efficiency target
- ▶ a basket price based on an HWP composition reset annually and priced according to HWP specified indices from Letsrecycle.com (100% of the basket value will be paid to the HWP with payments based on 'quarterly averages')
- ▶ transport, with the specification stating how transport would be priced accordingly to which partner authorities had to bulk

The bids received varied mostly in terms of the cost of transport, highlighting the inherent value in developing local processing assets that would minimise the distance that Hertfordshire waste has to travel before being processed. The new consortium started on 1st February 2017 and will run for seven years with an option to extend for a further three years.

In addition, a different sub group of HWP Partner Authorities came together to deliver the 3rd phase of the HWP's paper consortium. The consortium included a 'lot' for newspapers and magazines and two 'lots' for mixed paper grades with and without tetra paks. Between the seven participating authorities the new contract covers a projected 24,400 tonnes of material. Somewhat unusually the initial contract period is only for 18 months, starting December 2016 and ending in May 2018. This is to accommodate potential changes for two of the partners as part of their transition to a new joint waste and street cleansing contract. However, the contract has options for two x 12 month extensions for the remaining Partners on an opt in basis.

The initial procurement process was based around use of the open procedure and included a requirement for tenderers to submit opening bids for the lots they were interested in to gain entry into an E-Auction which was conducted on Wednesday 7th September 2016.

As a result of the auction the annual value of the HWP's separate newspaper and magazine tonnage increased from the current £1.715 million to £2.10 million; a 22.4% increase of £385,000 per annum or £577,500 over the initial duration of the contract up until May 2018.

As with current and previous consortiums Welwyn Hatfield is lead authority for both consortiums with their remuneration addressed as part of the annual HWP budget setting process.

3 DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES IN THE EAST OF ENGLAND

As already highlighted in Section 2 and as demonstrated in the other five regional reviews, the manner in which efficiencies can be delivered varies, as of course does the financial saving which can be made. The range of examples of what authorities have successfully achieved in delivering efficiencies in the East of England are broad and details of their successes are given below.

Route optimisation and round reconfiguration

Identified time and again in the APSE reviews and also a feature of the five previous regional reviews, ensuring rounds are fully optimised in terms of the time it takes to collect the waste or recycle and number of vehicles and crew required continues to be a priority for a lot of authorities and the East of England region is no exception.

In **South Norfolk**, a complete re-optimisation of the household waste and recycling collection routes was required in response to a number of issues including: a variation in the disposal point; increasing households; and, an increase in the commercial collection services. The optimisation resulted in the collection taking place over four days as opposed to five (but with the same contracted hours), enabling further staff savings and a reduction in disruption resulting from Bank Holidays as collections now take place Tuesday to Friday). The new service routes have just been put into situ but with a projected annual saving of circa **£300,000**.

Also in **South Norfolk**, commercial collection services have been reviewed and are now being provided with a mixture of stand-alone commercial collection vehicles (for weekly/non-household frequency of collection) and with other household-style collections integrated into the household rounds to reduce collection overheads per customer. This has enabled sufficient capacity to absorb future customers, where suitable, into the household collection vehicles. This has enabled over 200 additional customers to be added to the service in the past year.

For **Huntingdonshire**, round reconfiguration has delivered **£180,000** in efficiencies by reducing a collection round on household and green waste collections. This corresponds with reduction of household waste and increase in recycling.

In **Fenland**, an 11% saving in costs was achieved through moving domestic waste collection to a '4 over 5' shift pattern with seasonal hours that allowed for a reduction in fleet size. This was successfully achieved because it built upon previous work involving logistics software jointly procured with RECAP to develop a move to 'zonal working' with 70% of customers changing their collection day at that point. This large-scale change now allows for re-routing to absorb development without the need for customer collection day changes and re-routing for efficiency is now a twice-yearly activity.

Ipswich has also undertaken a complete re-route of all rounds and has introduced a four-day week for domestic collections, with all rounds collecting the same material across the Borough in the same week; this has delivered significant savings.

Service changes

Service changes is a relatively broad term and covers a range of different actions focused on for example: containers, collection frequency, seasonal variations and bring site rationalisation.

Container changes

In an effort to reduce costs, **Brentwood** has stopped providing biodegradable sacks for garden waste to every household; they are now available to buy from retail outlets. This has generated savings in the region of **£40,000**. In addition, the provision of sacks for mixed dry recyclables has been reduced and this has generated additional savings of **£33,000**.

In **Peterborough**, the decision was taken to provide residents with free food caddy sacks, after initially only supplying a six months' supply, in order to improve participation. However, by working with the treatment partner it has been possible to move away from bio-degradable bags to standard plastic bags which reduces the cost considerably therefore allowing the authority to fund the bags from a portion of the savings made through reduced waste treatment costs. Similarly, in **Central Bedfordshire**, changing from corn starch to polythene liners provided free to residents who receive a food waste collection is forecast to save **£25,000** in 2016/17.

For **East Cambridgeshire**, changing the dry recycling and organics collection services from box based separate collections of dry recyclables and paper sack based organic collections to wheeled bin services between has had a significant impact on performance, improving the recycling rate substantially and reducing residual tonnage.

Frequency of collection

Collection frequency remains a much-discussed area as authorities have moved to alternate or fortnightly collections and reaped the financial benefits of doing so. In February 2017 **Maldon** changed contractors and during the procurement process they looked at the possibility of continuing a weekly collection compared to a fortnightly one. A fortnightly service was selected due to the savings which could be realised.

For **Suffolk Coastal and Waveney** moving to a 4-day alternate weekly collection services has delivered a combined **£500,000** savings per annum since 2013/14, (achieved with no changes to staff existing T&C's). This breaks down further as £0.3 million per annum in Suffolk Coastal and £0.2 million per annum in Waveney.

Bring site rationalisation

Bring sites are a service provision that has been much reviewed with a number of authorities removing this service altogether. In **Brentwood**, planned closure of three bring sites which had problems of contamination, with one remaining and improvements scheduled, will generate savings circa **£16,000** which can be deployed as a resource elsewhere in the service.

Broxbourne has also reduced the number of bring sites, going from 23 to 12. This has enabled an increased frequency of collections and cleansing at the remaining sites, with sites being easier to manage and residents noticing an overall improved condition. Rather than produce an efficiency saving the resource used to maintain the sites has been deployed to the remaining sites to improve the quality of the service for residents.

Seasonal variations

Reviewing service provision and its use across the year has led to a many authorities operating a seasonal service for some waste streams such as garden waste. **Central Bedfordshire** is no exception, implementing a suspension to the garden waste collection service for three months, allowing resources to be diverted on to other duties and forecast to save **£60,000** this year.

Maximising recycling

Reviewing waste streams and ensuring that recycling services are optimised and opportunities to divert material from treatment and disposal are maximised, has the potential to realise significant financial savings.

Within **Cambridgeshire County Council**, the decision was taken to divert street sweepings from landfill to recycling, providing a more sustainable solution and a cost saving to Cambridgeshire County Council estimated at over **£180,000** per year. The site where the street sweepings are treated is within Cambridgeshire, also allowing one of the Waste Collection Authorities to directly deliver their waste with an added benefit of helping to improve their sweeper vehicle utilisation.

Hertfordshire County Council has taken a similar approach in targeting street sweepings for recycling. Procurement of new disposal contracts allows for mechanically collected street sweepings to be processed and diverted from disposal whilst attracting a significantly lower gate fee. The new contract commenced in January 2016 and whilst the impact is not fully known, it is projected that around 10,000 tonnes of street sweepings will be diverted from disposal per annum saving around **£450,000** per annum.

In an effort to increase diversion of organic waste, **Great Yarmouth** has taken the decision to ban garden waste from the residual bin which has doubled the take up of the garden waste collection service, increasing diversion from disposal, and also generating additional funds for the authority from recycling credits. Any additional costs and resources generated as a result of expansion of the garden waste collection service have been absorbed from time and vehicle savings made through reviewing and requiring residents to ensure bins are presented properly at the kerbside.

For **Norwich City**, introducing the collection of WEEE and textiles is expected to both reduce contamination within the mixed dry recycling collections and increase the amount of waste that Norwich City Council recycles. As part of the reconfigured fleet, the contractual cost of the service will reduce at the same time as enhancing the service provided to the residents.

Partnership working

The **Norfolk Waste Partnership** is looking at the benefits of a total systems approach to delivering weekly food waste collections in all WCA areas combined with a change to the frequency for collections of residual waste, which has been estimated to be capable of delivering savings of more than £3 million per annum. Coming together does mean that the financial case is more likely to stack up for rural districts in the partnership such as North Norfolk, but with the savings that the County could achieve through reduced disposal costs, the benefit to the taxpayer can be more clearly defined and evaluated.



The **Hertfordshire Waste Partnership** has three recycling partnership arrangements in place which are considered to have helped extract greater interest in providing services to Hertfordshire authorities in the form of more competitive bids from contractors or purchasers of material. The partners are confident that savings, whilst considered hard to assess, have been realised through the partnership working. For example, the most recent arrangement for managing newspaper added over **£300,000** to the partner's bottom line in the first 18 months. In addition, it is believed that the new MRF arrangement has probably enabled the partners to get gate fees at half the market is charging councils in the UK.

In June 2015; six of the **Suffolk WCA's working with Suffolk County Council** entered into a contract for the provision of glass recycling with Indigo Waste Services Ltd replacing the previous local ad-hoc arrangements. The service also includes a shared marketing and communications plan and budget between the partner authorities and contractor. This arrangement is considered to be more efficient both financially and in terms of performance.

Suffolk County Council has adopted a more collaborative approach to considering key waste infrastructure (in line with 'One Public Estate') which has resulted in the planned construction of a joint facility incorporating a new waste transfer station, household recycling centre and district operational depot. This facility will serve three authorities requirements' (St Edmundsbury, Forest Heath and Suffolk County councils), replace the use of at least four existing sites, accommodate future population growth and increase service efficiency. Other joint infrastructure options are being considered across Suffolk.

Shared services

For **South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City**, the creation of a shared service has, so far, comprised of three elements to bring about efficiencies with the aim to generate a saving of **£700,000** over three years. The three elements are: relocation to a shared depot; management restructure; round re-routing.

For **Babergh and Mid Suffolk**, they consider that the single largest efficiency and benefit has been from the joint waste contract between the two authorities with its shared management, staff and the operational benefits of joint working. This has generated economies of scale, more efficient utilisation of workforce and vehicles, with cross boarder working and round optimisation.

Similarly, **St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath** have developed and implemented a single staff structure for waste and street scene services as part of the development of the West Suffolk councils. This has contributed significantly to efficiency savings being realised.

Joint procurement

Procurement costs can be high and negotiating with the market place can be a challenge in terms of securing a good deal. Therefore, working together, to jointly procure a service or a product, reduces overall procurement costs and also has the potential to attract a better market price as a result of economies of scale.

Procurement of the joint MRF contract with **RECAP** partners has increased the range of materials within its collection scheme, as well as bringing to market a significant volume of material allowing improved economics as well as improved market interest. No specific savings were expected from the procurement however

bids were competitive, tonnage recycled has increased and services are delivered in a more uniform manner across the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire area for the benefit of its residents.

For **Brentwood**, a similar procurement exercise with Basildon, Uttlesford and Rochford led to joint procurement process for a MRF contract on the basis that working together generated a better deal for the authorities.

Three Rivers joined a consortium with three other local councils to procure a seven year contract with a MRF for dry recycling. Again, working together has been of benefit, securing a better price than previously improved services from the contractor.

The **Suffolk Waste Partnership** collectively let a single countywide MRF contract which commenced in November 2014. The new arrangements ensured that all partners have benefited from increased economies of scale and net gate fees below the WRAP median average for the last three years. In addition, the Partnership agreed an equitable transfer and haul cost apportionment mechanism which ensured all partners paid equally irrespective of whether they direct delivered to the MRF or used transfer facilities.

Charges for garden waste

One area where there has been an increase in activity across all the regions that have been reviewed, is charging for aspects of the waste service where this is legally allowed; specifically garden and bulky waste collections and replacement containers for collection. The general aim for most authorities when introducing a charge is for this aspect of the service to be self-financing at the very least and to potentially support delivery of another aspect of the service.

Broxbourne has introduced a charge for green waste collections from April 2017 – based on a 30% participation rate and a charge of £34/£39 per green wheeled bin, this scheme has the potential to generate income between **£326,400** and **£374,400**, which will finance the cost of separate weekly food waste collections as well as assist to retain other key services the authority currently provides.

Similarly, **Three Rivers** introduced a charge for garden waste in July 2016 with £35 as the annual charge and an initial target of signs-ups of 14,500 out of an eligible 29,000. By early October the number of residents signing up to the service had far exceeded this target, reaching around 21,000.

Following a countywide strategic review of organic waste and subsequent **Suffolk Waste Partnership** led procurement, **West Suffolk** introduced a garden waste collection subscription service (in conjunction with **Waveney**, **Babergh** and **Mid Suffolk** already have a subscription service). This service change is projected to save the public purse in excess of **£1 million per annum** across the two tiers.

Fenland has recently completed a public consultation in relation to implementing a chargeable garden waste service where 14,000 responses were received and 60% of customers would pay for the service. A chargeable service will commence in April 2017.

Maximising income opportunities

Considering different means to generate income from waste services is an area increasingly being explored by authorities and includes reviewing collection schemes to ensure maximum value from materials is being obtained and also identifying new business opportunities.

In **Broxbourne**, cardboard, which was originally collected with the garden and food waste is now collected separately with paper. This has delivered savings of around **£200,000**, as increased income from sale of material, in addition to additional recycling credits and incentive payments from Hertfordshire County Council (Waste Disposal Authority).

For **Babergh and Mid Suffolk** the growth of the business waste service through targeted field sales and a marketing campaign, has led to a 15% increase in revenue, 130 new customers, and the introduction of a Glass collection service aimed at hospitality industry.

Three Rivers brought a consultant in to review the trade service offered by the council, with the aim to identify ways of making the waste department more commercial going forward; the final report was issued in March 2017.

HWRC changes

Reviewing operational costs associated with running HWRCs has enabled decisions to improve the overall cost and efficiency of these sites. In **Central Bedfordshire**, reducing opening hours and closure of the sites for two days per week has helped ensure the facilities remain viable.

For **Hertfordshire County Council** the award of a new contract to manage the HWRCs included a requirement to provide financial efficiencies and as such the contractor proposed a number of service changes to the delivery of the HWRS including the closure of the two HWRCs, standardising hours to eight hours a day all year round and closing all sites two days a week. Following a public consultation process Members agreed that the two sites should remain open but the opening hours would change and two closure days would be retained to make the required savings of **£750,000**. Other changes introduced by the contractor included the introduction of a van permitting scheme in an attempt to control misuse by businesses and other traders, a legitimate commercial waste service at their St Albans depot and the implementation of reuse facilities across the network.

Contracts: retenders, renegotiation and new arrangements

Securing new contracts provides a major opportunity for reviewing service delivery, securing new and additional income and making considerable savings on the cost of delivery as a result of more favourable conditions. In addition, reviewing existing contract terms and conditions and negotiating changes or extensions with the contractor also provides an excellent opportunity to reduce costs and deliver efficiencies in the immediate to long term.

For **Suffolk County Council** renegotiation of the HWRC contract led to various service changes including closure of 7/18 sites; reduction in opening hours; introduction of chargeable trade waste service generating **£1.4 million per annum** savings.

In addition to delivering a new EFW facility and moving away from landfill disposal, which will reduce council costs by an estimated £350 million over 25 years, further contract efficiencies include delivering a proportion of Norfolk's disposal function under delegation, driving economies of scale in contract to benefit of both councils and saving **£500,000 per annum**, and partial refinancing by the Suffolk County Council of project capital will generate a saving **£1.5 million per annum**.

In **Peterborough**, the development of the long-term treatment contract through the Viridor PPP ERF facility supports the vision of high recycling and composting with the minimum of waste going to landfill untreated whilst also delivering significant financial benefits of circa **£30 million over the initial contract term**. Efficiencies may be increased where the council is able to achieve higher than expected electricity income.

Central Bedfordshire has retendered the HWRC management contract, and a new pricing schedule is expected to provide **£435,000 savings in 2016/17**. A new contract for street sweeping treatment rather than sending to landfill will generate a saving of **£85,000 over this year and next**. Re-tendering the residual and recycling disposal contracts provided **£1.2 million** savings in 2013/14 from moving to treatment rather than landfill and from cost to income for recycle. In addition, renegotiating the collection contract generated **£250,000** savings and an additional **£80,000** though rationalising the food collection resource in 2015/16. Reduced landfill site management costs saved **£50,000** in 2012/13, and a negotiated share in landfill gas income generation **£25,000** in 2013/14. Finally, annual renegotiation of the food waste disposal gate fee saved **£20,000** in 2015/16.

Cambridgeshire County Council is currently undertaking a fundamental review of the waste PFI contract with support from the Waste Operational Savings Programme (WOSP) and Local Partnerships. The review is seeking to identify and deliver savings increasing over the next 3 years to reach **£5 million per year by 2019/2020** financial year. These savings will be achieved through reducing the cost of disposing of residues from the waste treatment processes and improving the operational efficiency of all services delivered through the contract.

For **Norfolk County Council**, a procurement of residual waste treatment service for 2016 to 2020 **saved £2 million + per annum** and delivered improved performance by moving from a mix of landfill and Energy from Waste to an approach based on export of Refuse Derived Fuel and zero waste direct to landfill. The approach used competitive dialogue and split treatment solutions from haulage to allow a more competitive procurement for the treatment costs which represented the greater part of the service costs. The approach also allowed proposals to be priced in bands to ensure a greater number of bids to be viable and for flexibility to be retained.

In addition, the delegation agreement with **Suffolk County Council** for treatment of 40,000 tpa of Norfolk's waste under Suffolk's Waste PFI contract delivered savings for each WDA of **£2 million** spread over the first two years of the agreement from 2014 to 2016 and is set to continue to deliver savings to 2020. The delegation of functions is pursuant to section 9EA of the Local Government Act 2000 and Regulation 5 of the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2012 and is not a contract for services and sees the discharge of functions by Suffolk County Council on behalf of Norfolk County Council.

For **North Norfolk**, procurement of a new MRF contract, carried out as a partnership activity with all Norfolk districts along with the County Council, led to an associated removal of glass bring banks. Whilst it is difficult to quantify financial impact due to changes in commodities markets impacting upon income, it is estimated that the saving is around **£250,000 per annum**.

Finance models

Different finance models are emerging as authorities find new ways to work together and with the private sector.

For **Suffolk Coastal and Waveney**, working in a Joint Venture partnership with Norse under a 50% annual profit share arrangement between Norse and each of the authorities has allowed the release of efficiency savings, benefits to be realised from economies of scale, and profits to be realised on commercial contracts. Tracked benefits to East Suffolk in terms of savings made over the last 5 years have averaged **£1.4 million per annum**.

Hertfordshire County Council operates an 'Alternative Financial Model' (AFM) which is designed to incentivise lower performers to improve, support more directly those authorities that pursue higher recycling targets and prioritises specific waste behaviours that recognise relative value, i.e. genuine waste minimisation being worth more than recycling. Payments made through the model reflect savings in disposal costs and have directly incentivised all ten WCAs to make service changes to lower costs and improve performance with Hertfordshire as a whole achieving its target of a 50% recycling rate in 2015/16. The model has evolved since its introduction in 2007/08 and has made payments of circa £21 million to WCAs. Due to the success of the model, and the need for HCC to make savings, in 2016 it was agreed to reduce payments by £1 million over the next four years. This recognised that 80% of HCC's costs are demand led and that savings need to come from discretionary payment such as this.

Technology improvements

Ipswich has focused on how residents can access the authority and the degree of automation of this service. The authority introduced significant process change to make it easier for residents to engage, including online reporting and ordering via a newly introduced customer portal, with automatic job creation in our in-cab system. In addition, they amended the policy of sending a letter after each 1st and 2nd recorded contamination occurrence of a dry recycling bin within a 3-month period. Replace with new policy of only sending a letter after each 3rd contamination occurrence of a recycling bin within three months. Projected saving of around **£2,500 per annum** in printing and postage in addition to around 21hrs of officer time each year.

The **West Suffolk** councils have incorporated in-cab technology, online application and payment systems linked to a new back office CRM system to improve efficiency, customer access and revenue opportunities from the commercial services we provide. This links with a wider customer access strategy that makes accessing council services far easier and more convenient for our customers and through the application of technology, seamlessly connects customer services with frontline service delivery.

Changing behaviour

Stimulating behaviour change and maximising participation in recycling can be achieved by a number of different means, including targeted campaign work. With support from WRAP a series of 27 trial areas were developed in 2015 in **Fenland** to explore how to exploit the readily recyclable materials that remained within the residual waste stream. This resulted in an evidence based campaign to improving dry recycling in terms of both the quality and quantity; the impact to date has been very positive.

East Cambridgeshire is currently running a recycling reward scheme funded through a DCLG grant until July 2017. This aims to increase participation rate and capture of target materials whilst reducing contamination. Households correctly presenting recycling bins for collection are entered into a monthly prize draw with a first prize of £250. Although difficult to quantify the results of this initiative, East Cambridgeshire was highlighted in 2016 as continuing to improve its recycling performance against a national trend of decline. Contamination rates for dry recyclables have also remained low at an average of 4% and the scheme is believed to have contributed to this.

In **Maldon**, hot foil printing on the lid of the bin 'No Food Waste', to encourage residents to use the food caddy has been very successful in diverting food waste from the general refuse and into the anaerobic digesting facility generating savings at the WDA level.

Communications rationalisation

Ipswich worked with other Suffolk Waste Partnership members to plan, coordinate and launch all communications in such a way that there is one consistent recycling message across Suffolk. Successful campaigns have included plastic recycling, Making Food Waste History, Getting Your Recycling Right, and a Home Composting Campaign that included a subsidy for residents purchasing home composting equipment).

In **North Norfolk**, they ceased the delivery of collection day change notifications for each and every bank holiday, instead relying on the annual collection calendar to inform householders of the day changes, along with website and social media promotion. In order to facilitate this, they also changed the time of year for calendar delivery to households from April to December (so that we had certainty around changes at Christmas). This saved **£10,000 per annum**.

4 LESSONS LEARNT

This report highlights a number of areas where authorities in the East of England have successfully taken on the challenge of delivering better value in waste services in this very difficult economic climate. The experience of the projects featured in this report shows that significant savings can be achieved, whilst continuing to deliver high and in some cases improved performance. However, it is fair to say that a number of lessons have been learnt along the way, and the authorities have been very open in identifying key considerations which hopefully others can learn from. These lessons include:

Contract reviews

As identified by **Central Bedfordshire**, being tied in to long term contracts does not necessarily mean savings and efficiencies cannot be achieved through this route. It is important to negotiate reductions in base prices based on current market value, renegotiate terms if they are outdated, investigate how services could be delivered differently and work in partnership with contractors to get mutually beneficial cost savings. However as noted by **Cambridgeshire County Council** change within long term complex contracts can require significant time and resources to complete. This is especially so when partners or other 3rd parties are involved in agreeing a change.

Dealing with the market

Peterborough advises that approaching the market with confidence in relation to the service or facility being procured, is key, alongside sensible apportionment of the risks between both parties where each is best placed to handle that element. Inappropriate risk apportionment can increase costs or potentially lead to failed procurements so it is of utmost importance to get right.

For **Basildon**, they have learnt that they need to be prepared to expose themselves to some element of risk if they are to reap any rewards. It is acknowledged that they do not have control over markets and therefore can expect for these to have an impact on their ability to deliver savings and efficiencies. This view is mirrored to an extent by **Great Yarmouth**, who acknowledge that whilst the plan with their Joint Venture with NEWS was to secure a profit share, as a result of the downturn in the market price of secondary materials the profit streams have yet to be realised. This needs to be prepared for when dealing with the market.

Having good commercial negotiation skills and getting the right team who understand about using leverage to secure a position whilst appreciating the others sides position is key for **Suffolk County Council**.

Invest to save

Three Rivers recognise that investment up front can support the effectiveness of a service in the long run. For example, investment in a new IT system vastly improved the online sign up option Three Rivers were able to give residents signing up to the garden waste service.

Communications and engagement

The value of communications on the success or otherwise of a new service or service change cannot be underestimated. For **Maldon**, extensive communication planning and implementation ensured residents knew what to do and adopted the new system readily, resulting in high recycling rates and greater income from recycling credits. Similarly, in **East Cambridgeshire** service changes were supported by a high level of promotional work and it is believed that this contributed significantly to the smooth introduction of service changes and to recycling performance exceeding expectations.

Three Rivers ensured that residents were brought along with the process from very early on, for example through a consultation as part of the garden waste charging.

South Norfolk have found that continuous engagement of all stakeholders helps to manage expectations and reduce any further unnecessary delays.

Great Yarmouth goes further to say that no matter how much you think you're doing around publicity for changes and new schemes you can never do enough. One size publicity does not fit all and councils must do a mix to reach all demographic groups.

Project management

Good project management processes should be applied to major projects such as route optimisation and round reviews. For **South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City** moving to a shared service led to a particularly big change with for 82% of households being affected. Effective implementation required involvement and coordination of many people across departments and therefore good project management was essential.

Three Rivers concur with this, identifying that good project planning is required to get all departments that are needed to run a project on board from the very start.

South Norfolk adds to this by stating that project contingency time needs to be built into any large-scale project.

For **Cambridgeshire County Council** they specifically consider that delivering change to a project requires well-structured governance arrangements and strong communication channels. It is important that these are put in place from the outset and are adhered to throughout.

Working with others

In terms of working with others, it is acknowledged by **Basildon** that a shared approach to tendering and genuine willingness to have a homogeneous approach when carrying out tender exercises is more likely to be beneficial than carrying on with localised nuances.

However, ensuring there is mutual trust between the partners, is fundamental to **Welwyn Hatfield**. In addition, partners have to have a say in the specification, assessment and allocation of contract award and a saving has to be made, for partners to re-join or join future partnerships. **North Norfolk** note that whilst it helps, it is not necessary to get buy in from every member of a partnership for every project. They recognise that things can be done on a slightly smaller scale and still achieve good results. They also go on to consider that partnership working would likely be easier and achieve quicker results within a structure with some sort of executive powers.

For **Norwich City**, having a group of individuals who are prepared and able to provide the commitment and momentum is what is needed to drive changes forward. **Suffolk County Council** go on to consider that effective partnership working dynamics are based on joint project teams that are fully engaged, developing a shared evidence base to work from, and ensuring each partner has sovereign decision-making over agreed options.

St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath promote the principle of working in collaboration with others to learn from experiences and to share knowledge. Whilst **Babergh and Mid Suffolk** recognise that joint working between authorities has clear advantages and opportunities for efficiencies and savings, to maximise these alignment of service provision and policies is crucial

For **Suffolk Coastal and Waveney** partnership working to outcome based specifications can allow strategic downsizing of central client functions, significantly reducing overheads and creating headquarters capacity. They go on to consider that when services are bundled together further efficiency savings and resilience can be created that may not have been achievable as separate departments. In addition, procuring Teckal compliant partnerships and contracts can create significant procurement savings, whilst creating a flexible working arrangements that can allow services to be more easily adapted to meet future demand and funding availability.

For **Norfolk County Council**, a total systems approach is considered to be a must to delivering improved performance and savings required in the public sector. This does not just mean reducing unit costs. A growing focus is required on demand management and effective behavioural change and ensuring that services designed today are genuinely future proof and flexible enough to accommodate significant change rather than compromising future choice. **Norwich City** support this view that working together, from a loose to a fully integrated partnership, where the overall cost is considered and not just an individual authorities' position, can yield benefits for the local taxpayer.

Norfolk County Council go onto consider that authorities need to look at regional and sub-regional approaches to designing, managing and delivering services, including collective procurements and effective use of delegations. There is no apparent funding available to incentivise or facilitate this type of activity as many schemes, such as those supported by Defra, Wrap or DCLG have been limited to a single authority or single partnership. As much potential exists at the sub-regional scale local authorities either need to make a case for a change to this approach to funding or recognise and pursue the business cases for change to avoid an ad hoc and sporadic approach to delivering efficiencies at this scale. This approach also allows authorities to recognise and seek to address regional issues such as lack of treatment or processing capacity or competition that affects individual authorities more local costs.

Norfolk County Council notes that it can take only a few people with a compelling vision and strong drive to help set the agenda that delivers the most significant changes that deliver the greatest efficiencies. They consider that this is particularly the case in the absence of performance related targets being imposed on local authorities and a key part of establishing objectives is that all stakeholders and partners can relate to them. Whilst in the past targets have generally been expressed as a recycling percentage looking forwards they consider that a more suitable target is how much waste is left over by each household, as this captures

the effects of not just recycling performance (whether that be dry recyclables, garden waste or food waste), but also waste reduction, repair and reuse programmes as well as producer responsibility schemes and therefore provides a better reflection of the waste hierarchy principles and allows for a stronger link to be made with total system efficiencies in a way that a recycling target can't.

In terms of specific projects, ensuring engagement and input by all partners at all times is crucial. Ipswich found that with one County wide communications strategy it is imperative that sufficient time is allowed for all stakeholders to comment on drafts that are produced and feel that their comments are taken into consideration in the final design.

Two tier working

When implementing efficiencies at WCA or WDA level, the potential for cost shunting needs to be taken into consideration. For example, **Hertfordshire County Council** have agreed long term contracts with conditions applied to those contracts. Any decisions taken at WCA level which will impact on the waste being delivered to these contracts could cause significant risk to the WDA. Use of Service Level Agreements is a potential means to ensure that WCAs are clear as to what has been agreed and what is required of them.

In addition, with the Alternative Finance Model in place, the WCAs in Hertfordshire have been incentivised to make service changes to reduce costs and improve performance. However, in doing so the vast majority of savings are passed back to the WCAs limiting the potential for WDA to make savings. Savings have subsequently been agreed through consultation but for others considering this route they could be included as part of the model mechanism. In addition, moving forward, the consideration of the 'taxpayer first', on a holistic basis, is important to avoid 'cost-shunting' between those areas with tiers of local government.

Capacity to deliver

The ability to deliver multiple efficiencies at the same time can be constrained by the resources available. For **Broxbourne**, although it was intended to deliver the review of bring sites alongside the October 2015 service change, the full impact of the changes at the bring sites were not delivered until February 2016 due to resources being allocated to tasks associated with the main service change. In hindsight, Broxbourne feel it may have been beneficial not to plan for both projects to occur simultaneously.

Cambridgeshire County Council recognise that there is continued pressure on stretched resources for all authorities to work on collaborative projects in addition to the ongoing demands of service delivery. The levels of commitment from some partner authorities has varied when staff resources are lost and not replaced or the demands of day to day service provision distract officers from partnership projects. This is an important consideration when planning changes, that there is the capacity to deliver.

Establishing a baseline

Norwich City stress the importance of starting from a base of reliable and thorough information and data to enable authorities to understand what and where problems are, and also to enable them to measure the success of any actions they take. **South Norfolk** echo the requirement to have an extensive

and accurate baseline set of information as does **Ipswich** who go further to say that when planning new efficiency initiatives ensure that all crucial baseline data and assumptions used are carefully double-checked (even when there is great time pressure), as even initially minor-appearing errors can add up to large discrepancies.

Generating income

For those authorities considering different means to generate income, **Babergh and Mid Suffolk** have focused on business waste services and stress that the potential of maximising income from this waste stream should not be underestimated. However, they acknowledge the importance of ensuring any associated costs and also the marketplace itself are fully understood. Having a dedicated field sales role for a short period is their response to help stimulate growth in this service, recognising that a very different skill set to traditional local government roles is required.

Channel shift in customer contact

Getting engagement on the need and benefits to be gained from a 'channel shift' in customer contact can be difficult as **Ipswich** found, particularly when internal stakeholders believe that the best solution is for a person to be involved in and process every enquiry. However, being able to demonstrate how categorisation of enquiries can improve the customer experience by simplifying the input of their enquiry and the inefficiencies that can be removed from automating service requests is considered to be imperative to getting engagement in the process.

Member engagement

As experienced by **Hertfordshire County Council** the bid process for the HWRCs contract allowed bidders to suggest any savings options without restriction. However, the reality of local government is that some options have the potential to end up being less palatable than others as they emerge. As a result, a clear steer and involvement from Members is crucial and engaging in meaningful consultation with residents early in the process is important.

St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath concur that authorities need to ensure elected Members are central to the decision-making process and as such are able to make decisions based on reliable and clear evidence where possible.

Planning for growth

Increasing population and planned for increases in housing stock mean that waste services have to be regularly reviewed to accommodate the growth. In **Fenland**, they took the approach to plan ahead for future growth. The move to a zonal collection system, where the collection day covers a large area that crews cover as a team, was an important first step to delivering other efficiencies. It meant in some cases a 70% change to collection services to meet demand, but it allows for vehicles and movement of operatives to be constantly adjusted for maximum efficiency without customers being adversely affected by the changes.

Manage expectations

Maldon are pragmatic when it comes to predicting efficiencies which can be realised from changes being proposed. They recommend that authorities err on the side of caution when anticipating savings, then Members and the Finance team will always be pleasantly surprised with outcome.

5 SUMMARY

As seen in this report authorities throughout the region have successfully delivered efficiencies in a wide range of areas. In all cases not only have savings been realised but services have been maintained or improved upon.

In terms of the value of the savings being realised to date, the table below provides a summary of the area of saving and financial value achieved (as identified by the individual authority).

Table 3: Summary of overall savings identified in the East of England

Areas of saving	Local authority	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
Route optimisation and round reconfiguration	South Norfolk	circa £300,000
	Huntingdonshire	£180,000
	Fenland	Not specified
	Ipswich	Not specified
Service changes: container changes	Brentwood	£40,000 £33,000
	Peterborough	Not specified
	East Cambridgeshire	Not specified
	Central Bedfordshire	£25,000
Service changes: frequency of collection	Maldon	Not specified
	Suffolk Coastal and Waveney	£500,000
Service changes: bring site rationalisation	Brentwood	£16,000
	Broxbourne	Not specified
Service changes: seasonal variations	Central Bedfordshire	£60,000
Maximising recycling	Cambridgeshire County Council	£180,000
	Hertfordshire County Council	£450,000
	Great Yarmouth	Not specified
	Norwich City	Not specified

Areas of saving	Local authority	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
Partnership working	Norfolk Waste Partnership	£3 million per annum
	Hertfordshire Waste Partnership	£300,000
	Suffolk WCA's working with Suffolk County Council	Not specified
	Suffolk County Council	Not specified
Shared services	South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge city	£700,000 over 3 years
	Babergh and Mid Suffolk	Not specified
	St Edmundsbury & Forest Heath	Not specified
Joint procurement	RECAP	Not specified
	Brentwood	Not specified
	Three Rivers	Not specified
	Suffolk Waste Partnership	Not specified
Charges for garden waste	Broxbourne	£326,400 – £374,400
	Three Rivers	Not specified
	Suffolk Waste Partnership, West Suffolk, Waveney, Babergh, Mid Suffolk	£1 million per annum
	Fenland	Not specified
Maximising income opportunities	Broxbourne	£200,000
	Babergh and Mid Suffolk	Not specified
	Three Rivers	Not specified
HWRC changes	Central Bedfordshire	Not specified
	Hertfordshire County Council	£750,000

Areas of saving	Local authority	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)	
Contracts: retenders, renegotiation and new arrangements	Suffolk County Council	£1.4 million per annum £500,000 per annum 1.5 million per annum	
	Peterborough	£30 million over the initial contract term	
	Central Bedfordshire	£435,000 savings in 2016/17 £85,000 over this year and next £1.2 million £250,000 £80,000 £50,000 £25,000 £20,000	
		Cambridgeshire County Council	£5 million per year by 2019/2020
		Norfolk County Council	saved £2 million + per annum
		North Norfolk	£250,000 per annum
	Finance models	Suffolk Coastal and Waveney	£1.4 million per annum
Technology improvements	Ipswich	£2,500 per annum	
	West Suffolk	Not specified	
Changing behaviour	Fenland	Not specified	
	East Cambridgeshire	Not specified	
	Maldon	Not specified	
Communications rationalisation	Ipswich	Not specified	
	North Norfolk	£10,000 per annum	

The estimated savings and avoided costs given in the examples provided by the authorities who took part in this review for the East of England, are in the region of £22 million per annum. It should be noted that a number of authorities have not been in a position to quantify the individual savings so this figure is a conservative estimate. This is a significant sum and reflects the good practice that is being delivered across the participating authorities in the East of England.

This is the sixth of LP's regional studies. Previous reports covering authorities in the North West, North East, Yorkshire and the Humber, West Midlands and London plus a number of authority specific case studies can be found at localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/infrastructure. The objective of all these studies is to disseminate information on how authorities are using innovative approaches to deliver efficiencies while protecting, and where possible, enhancing public services.

6 APPENDIX 1: LOCAL AUTHORITY PROFILES

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils

Background

Babergh and Mid Suffolk have a shared service waste collection contract with Serco (joint collection, staff and management) and are members of the Suffolk Waste Partnership. Residual and dry recyclate are collected alternate weekly using 240l wheeled bins as standard. Garden waste collection is through a subscription service and around a third of households are signed up to the service. There is a Business Waste Service collecting residual, mixed dry recyclables, and glass, with around 1300 customers. A clinical waste, bulky waste and hazardous waste kerbside collection are also available. There are glass bring sites as part of a contract with Suffolk Waste Partnership, and also textile banks. Kerbside collection is contracted to Serco and runs from 2007 – 2021 with an option for a further seven years. Residual waste is disposed through Suez Energy from Waste facility, mixed dry recyclables are managed by Viridor (contract with all members of the Suffolk Waste Partnership) and garden waste managed by Material Change (Suffolk Waste Partnership).

Current status

- ▶ Single largest efficiency and benefit has been from the joint waste contract between the two authorities with its shared management, staff and the operational benefits of joint working. (Economies of scale, utilisation of workforce and vehicles, cross boarder working and round optimisation)
- ▶ In June 2015; six of the Suffolk WCA's working with SCC entered into a contract for the provision of glass recycling with Indigo Waste Services Ltd. (the provision and servicing of glass banks at over 1900 sites across Suffolk) replacing the previous local ad-hoc arrangements. The service also includes a shared marketing and communications plan and budget between the partner authorities and contractor. The Suffolk capture rate for glass is 71% (November 16)
- ▶ Growth of Business Waste Service; targeted field sales, sales and marketing campaign, 15% increase in revenue, 130 new customers, introduction of a glass collection service aimed at hospitality industry

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Joint working between authorities has clear advantages and opportunities for efficiencies and savings, to maximise these alignment of service provision and policies is crucial
- ▶ Business Waste Services (Trade Waste) – don't underestimate potential of maximising incoming generating elements of Waste services however ensure costs and marketplace are fully understood
- ▶ Having a dedicated field sales role for a short period help stimulate growth in Business Waste Service, a very different skill set to traditional local government role that doesn't necessarily fit with LG pay structures either

Basildon Borough Council

Background

Residual waste is collected weekly using sacks, and mixed dry recyclables (paper, card, cans, mixed plastics), are also collected weekly using sacks. Textiles are collected alongside the dry recyclables. There is a fortnightly collection of glass bottles and jars using 55l box. Garden and food waste are collected mixed on a weekly basis using a 240l wheeled bin. This is a free service. Bulky waste is collected for a charge of £10 for up to five household or electrical items and £20 for six to ten items.

Current status

- ▶ Moving from a fixed price to a profit share arrangement for mixed recyclables means that when material values improve, the improvement in market conditions is shared with us, as well as when quality materials are captured
- ▶ Partnership working with reuse charities to reuse more bulky furniture
- ▶ Externalising fleet management but retaining a stake in the success of this operation

Lessons learnt

- ▶ A shared approach to tendering and genuine willingness to have a homogeneous approach when carrying out tender exercises is more likely to be beneficial than carrying on with localised nuances
- ▶ We have to be prepared to expose ourselves to some risk if we are to reap any rewards whatsoever
- ▶ We do not have control over markets and can expect for these to have an impact on our ability to deliver savings and efficiencies

Brentwood Borough Council

Background

Brentwood provides an in-house service for weekly collection of mixed dry recyclables (sacks provided), residual (sacks but not provided), food (sacks provided) and bulky waste. Garden waste is collected fortnightly and residents have to purchase sacks which are sold through retail outlets at £2.60/10 sacks or lease a wheeled bin at £41/per annum. Glass is collected fortnightly using a kerbside box. There is an outsourced fortnightly collection of textiles, provided by Essex Textiles, and using sacks they provide. Lighthouse Furniture, a reuse organisation, also provides a weekly collection for specific bulky waste.

There are four in-house bring sites which collect mixed dry recyclables, glass and textiles. There is also an in-house trade waste and recycling service with around 400 customers.

Current status

- ▶ Planned closure of three bring sites by December 2016. One bring site will remain; to be improved. Closures due to contamination issues. Savings circa £16,000, albeit resources deployed elsewhere. Originally there were ten bring sites
- ▶ Measures taken to reduce costs with sacks provided 2016/17. Biodegradable sacks for garden waste no longer delivered to every household FOC – available to buy from selected retail outlets. Additionally, provision of sacks for mixed dry recyclables (MDR) reduced. Saving circa £40 thousand on bio sacks, with a saving of circa £33 thousand for the MDR sacks
- ▶ Joint procurement exercise for a MRF contract commenced May 2015 – Basildon (lead), Uttlesford and Rochford. Robust tender process, aided by consultants White Young & Green. Contracts let individually, nonetheless it's hoped best prices and service were attained. Contract value circa £960 thousand

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Bring sites are an anachronism with the comprehensive kerbside services provided. There are no issues of subsequent fly-tipping occurring at the sites closed
- ▶ Sack provision reduced as recognised there was a high degree of waste; though important to have good access to additional sacks for those residents who participate. To this end a large number of retail outlets assist with the retailing of biodegradable sacks and the DMR sacks (no charge)
- ▶ The partnership approach to procurement, aided by the consultants, ensured confidence in the thoroughness of the tender process

Broxbourne Borough Council

Background

Broxbourne provide in-house fortnightly collections of residual, dry recyclables, and mixed green waste and food. Residual waste is collected using 180l wheeled bin as standard, and dry recyclables are collected using three 55l kerbside boxes (collecting plastics, cans, paper, cardboard and glass). Mixed green and food waste are collected using 240l wheeled bin as standard. There are 12 in-house bring sites collecting: plastics and cans; paper and cardboard; and glass. In addition, an external company collects textiles. Commercial waste and recycling services are offered to businesses. A chargeable bulky waste collection service is available to residents.

Current status

- ▶ Waste and recycling service change - collection of cardboard was transferred from the green waste and food waste bin to a separate kerbside box (collected with paper) and has delivered savings of circa £200,000, as increased income from sale of material, recycling credits and incentive payments from Hertfordshire County Council (waste disposal authority)
- ▶ Review of bring sites – in October 2015 we reduced the number of bring sites from 23 to 12 which enabled an increased frequency of collections and cleansing at the remaining sites. This has resulted in the sites being easier to manage and residents noticing an overall improved condition. Rather than producing an efficiency saving, the resource used to maintain the sites has been deployed to the remaining sites to improve the quality of the service for residents
- ▶ Introduction of a charge for green waste collections from April 2017 – based on a 30% participation rate and a charge of £34/£39 per green wheeled bin, this scheme would generate income between £326,400 and £374,400, which will finance the cost of separate weekly food waste collections as well as assist to retain other key services the council currently provides

Lessons learnt

- ▶ The ability to deliver multiple efficiencies at the same time can be constrained by the resources available. Although it was intended to deliver the review of bring sites alongside the October 2015 service change, the full impact of the changes at the bring sites were not delivered until February 2016 due to resources being allocated to tasks associated with the main service change. In hindsight, it may have been beneficial not to plan for both projects to occur simultaneously

Cambridgeshire County Council

Background

Cambridgeshire County Council is a Waste Disposal Authority and a member of RECAP. In 2008 it secured a 28 year PFI contract with Amey that includes: a Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) facility to treat residual waste; provision an In-Vessel Composting (IVC) facility to treat all the mixed garden and food waste; an open windrow composting facility; two waste transfer stations; nine Household Recycling Centres (HRC); associated transport services; and, conference and education facilities. The authority is also engaged in waste prevention activities with Cambridge Community Reuse and Recycling Network to collect unused paint from HRCs, reuse activities at its HRCs (including reuse shop and scrapstore), and provision of reduced price home composters.

Current status

- ▶ As part of the County Council's Waste Transformation Programme, a fundamental review of the waste PFI contract is being undertaken with support from the Waste Operational Savings Programme (WOSP) and Local Partnerships to identify and deliver savings through reducing the cost of disposing of treatment residues from the waste treatment processes and improving the operational efficiency of the all treatment processes delivered. Expected savings over the next 3 years to reach £5 million per year by 2019/2020 financial year
- ▶ Cambridgeshire have worked with the Contractor and a third party company which operates a street sweepings treatment and recycling facility to process the waste stream that derives from WCA mechanical sweeper vehicles, which would generate savings of £180,000 per year. The site where the street sweepings are treated is within Cambridgeshire allowing one of the Waste Collection Authorities to directly deliver their waste with an added benefit of helping to improve their sweeper vehicle utilisation
- ▶ RECAP carried out a joint project aimed at reducing contamination in the co-mingled food and garden waste collections, through a collaborative approach to rejecting contaminated bins at the kerbside and the collection of data along with consistent messaging across the county. This saved on resources because the communication material was the same for each authority, data monitoring and evaluation tools were streamlined and efficient processes were developed to communicate with residents that repeatedly contaminated their bins. There was a significant reduction in contamination and a reduction in the number of repeat contamination incidents

Lessons learnt

- ▶ There is continued pressure on stretched resources at all authorities to work on collaborative projects in addition to the ongoing demands of service delivery. The levels of commitment from some partner authorities has varied when staff resources are lost and not replaced or the demands of day to day service provision distract officers from partnership projects
- ▶ Although change is possible within long term complex contracts, contractual change mechanism requires significant time and resources to complete. This is especially so when partners or third parties are involved in agreeing a change
- ▶ Delivering change to a project of this scale requires well-structured governance arrangements and strong communication channels. It is important that these are put in place from the outset and are adhered to throughout

Central Bedfordshire Council

Background

Central Bedfordshire Council was formed of Mid-Bedfordshire, South-Bedfordshire Districts and part of Bedfordshire County Council in 2009, therefore there are still legacy contracts and collection systems put in place prior to this time. Residual waste and mixed dry recyclables with separate glass are collected fortnightly. Food waste is collected weekly and garden waste is collected fortnightly. Bulky waste is collected on request. There are a number of bring sites collecting glass. The collection contract is run by Biffa and expires 2019. Residual waste is treated by Shanks in the north and FCC in the south (expires 2017 for both). Recyclables are managed by Viridor (expires 2018) and food waste by Biogen AD (expires 2017). There are two contracts for garden waste; Material Change in the North (2020) and Heathcote Farms (2020). Glass from the kerbside and bring sites is managed by Biffa (2017). There are a number of HWRCs operated by Amey. There is no commercial waste collection offered.

Current status

- ▶ Retenders: re-tendering household waste recycling centre management contract with a unique as far as we know) pricing schedule provided £435 thousand savings 2016/17. New contract for street sweeping treatment rather than sending to landfill saving £85 thousand over this year and next. Re-tendering residual and recycling disposal contracts provided £1.2 million savings 2013/14 from moving to treatment rather than landfill and from cost to income for recyclates
- ▶ Service changes/efficiencies: cut extended summer opening at HWRC's as visitor numbers low 11/12. Suspending winter garden waste collections for 3 months diverting resource on to other duties and forecast to save £60 thousand this year. Changing from corn starch to polythene liners provided free to residents who receive a food waste collection forecast to save £25 thousand in 2016/17. Closure of HWRC's 2 days/week, chargeable green and recycling communications proposed for next year
- ▶ Renegotiated contracts: renegotiated collection contract to make £250 thousand savings and an additional £80 thousand rationalising food collection resource 15/16. Reduced landfill site management costs saved £50 thousand 2012/13. Negotiated share in landfill gas income generation £25 thousand in 2013/14. Annual renegotiation of food waste disposal gate fee saved £20 thousand in 2015/16. Renegotiated outdated bonus scheme for old HWRC contract 12/13

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Be clear about which budgets savings will be taken from and ensure budget managers have ownership and agree savings are achievable
- ▶ Being tied in to long term contracts doesn't necessarily mean savings and efficiencies can't be achieved; negotiate reductions in base prices based on current market value, renegotiate terms if they are outdated, investigate how services could be delivered differently and work in partnership with contractors to get mutually beneficial cost savings

East Cambridgeshire District Council

Background

East Cambridgeshire District Council provides a weekly residual collection (black sacks), fortnightly dry recyclable collection (240l blue wheeled bin) and mixed food and garden waste collection (240l green wheeled bin). An additional garden waste bin is available on request (£48 per bin per year), and bulky waste collection is available for £22 for up to three items. Services are delivered through a combined waste collection and street cleansing contract with Veolia, agreed in 2008 for an initial period of seven years, initially extended to March 2018 and the final year extension option to 31st March 2019 is currently being arranged. Refuse and organics are disposed of through Cambridgeshire County Council's PFI agreement. Dry recycle is processed at a MRF on the same site through a separate contract that was jointly procured by RECAP partners. The council jointly promotes the Love Food Hate Waste campaign with other Cambridgeshire Councils and is a member of Sainsbury's Waste Less, Save More Network.

Current status

- ▶ East Cambridgeshire changed its dry recycling and organics collection services from box based separate collections of dry recyclables and paper sack based organic collections to wheeled bins. Between September and November 2013. Changes were implemented using a £5 million grant from DCLG's Weekly Collection Support Scheme. Since implementing changes, the recycling rate has improved from 34% (2012/13) to 57.1% (provisional 2015/16). The council was 3rd most improved English council for recycling performance in 2013/14 and 2014/15 and of 320 English councils responsible for waste collections moved from 257th to 26th for recycling performance over the same period. From 2012/13 to 2015/16 residual waste decreased by 28% and in 2014/15 has the highest recycling rate of any authority with a weekly residual collection
- ▶ The council is currently running a recycling reward scheme funded through a DCLG grant until July 2017, to increase participation rate and capture of target materials whilst reducing contamination. Households correctly presenting recycling bins for collection are entered into a monthly prize draw with a first prize of £250. Although difficult to quantify the results of this initiative, East Cambridgeshire was highlighted in 2016 as continuing to improve its recycling performance against a national trend of decline. Contamination rates for dry recyclables have also remained low at an average of 4% and the scheme is believed to have contributed to this

Lessons learnt

- ▶ As a high level of promotional activity has been maintained and refreshed using funding provided through DCLG funding; it is believed that this has helped to maintain progress in recycling performance as well as maintaining low contamination levels
- ▶ Changing services from separately collected box based dry recyclables collections and paper sack based organic collections has undoubtedly improved recycling performance and customer satisfaction, as well as reducing street cleansing issues resulting from spilt materials. Providing a simpler to use service has been well received resulting in high participation levels and material capture rates. Conventional thinking would be that recycling rate would be reduced by having an unrestricted refuse collection, however it appears that residents now find the black sack refuse service the least convenient service offered, using recycling services in preference

Fenland District Council

Background

Fenland District Council operate an in-house collection. Residual is collected fortnightly using green 240l wheeled bins, and dry recyclables are collected fortnightly using blue 240l wheeled bins. Materials collected includes: paper, cardboard, newspapers, magazines, envelopes and junk mail, aerosols, tins and cans, glass bottles and jars, plastic bottles, plastic containers, foil and foil containers. At the moment food and garden waste are collected together in a 240l brown bin, but from 3rd April this will convert to a charged for (£40 per annum) garden waste collection service; there will be no separate collection for food waste. A bulky waste collection service is operated in-house and there is charge for the collection of up to four items per visit (including fridges) of £29.50. Additional items are charged at a cost of £14.50 each. There are 28 community bring sites which focus on paper, glass and textile recycling primarily. The council has a commercial waste and recycling service with more than 600 customers. Recyclables are managed through a jointly procured contract for MRF sorting and transport. All other waste streams collected are managed through Cambridgeshire County Council PFI contract.

Current status

- ▶ An 11% saving in costs was achieved through moving domestic waste collection to a '4 over 5' shift pattern with seasonal hours that allowed for a reduction in fleet size. This was successfully achieved because it was built upon previous work involving (RECAP jointly procured) logistics software that was used to develop a move to 'zonal working' with 70% of customers changing their collection day at that point. This large-scale change now allows for re-routing to absorb development without the need for customer collection day changes and re-routing for efficiency is now a twice yearly activity. Over recent years' customer satisfaction with the service has remained above 95% with missed collections well below 1 in 1000
- ▶ With support from WRAP a series of 27 trial areas were developed in 2015 to explore how to exploit the readily recyclable materials that remained within the residual waste stream. This resulted in an evidence supported approach to improving dry recycling in Fenland. The subsequent positive recycling improvement campaign is increasing both the quality and quantity of blue bin mixed recycling in Fenland and reducing landfill as a result
- ▶ The council has recently completed a public consultation in relation to implementing a chargeable garden waste service where 14,000 responses were received and 60% of customers would pay for the service. A chargeable service will commence in April 2017

Lessons learnt

- ▶ The move to a zonal collection system, where the collection day covers a large area that crews cover as a team, was an important first step to delivering other efficiencies. As a step it meant 70% changes to collection days, but it now allows for growth to be absorbed and rounds to be constantly adjusted for maximum efficiency without customers knowing that anything has changed
- ▶ Communications remain important and whilst they can be done efficiently, the best way to communicate about bins is via the bins when supported by something through the letterbox

Great Yarmouth Borough Council

Background

Residual and mixed dry recyclables are collected fortnightly. There is an opt in charged for garden waste collection. There is no food waste collection service. Great Yarmouth Borough Council are in a Joint Venture (JV) with their operational partner GYB Services Ltd (a Norse company) for the collection of the waste which is taken to a local transfer station operated by Norse Environmental Waste Services (NEWS) for bulking and onward transport to a materials recycling facility operated by NEWS or final disposal point. The JV ends in 2023. There are a number of bring sites provided by private companies on council owned land. There is no commercial waste collection service and no paid for bulky waste collection service.

Current status

- ▶ The proposal to enter into a JV was arrived at following a ghost bid exercise in 2012. This did provide savings over the previous arrangements but are not easily quantified as the JV covers many other services in addition to waste. The JV allows for the council to receive a share of the profits from the commercial side of their operation without any financial risk or outlay to the council
- ▶ Banning garden waste from the residual bin in 2014 has doubled the take up of the garden waste collection service which has become a significant earner for the council from recycling credits
- ▶ In 2014 as part of the local response to the Recycling Revolution, the council started a project around bin presentation. This required a review of the current practise of back door collection and required residents to ensure the bin was presented kerb side where possible. Time and vehicle savings have been made through this operation that has allowed GYBS to absorb the additional costs and resources necessary to deal with the expansion of its garden waste collection service

Lessons learnt

- ▶ In October 2014, when the JV with NEWS was started and as part of the Recycling Revolution introduced by the NWP, all the Norfolk Councils started to collect a wider stream of materials in the kerbside bin particularly glass and plastic. The plan was that all the councils would have received a profit share from all NEWS activities a together with a share of the profits from the sale of recycled material. Following the swift downturn in the market price of secondary materials, neither of these profit streams have yet been realised. When the JV was being developed this was hoped to be significant sum. I'm sure councils were looking to the income to help with their overall budgeting
- ▶ No matter how much you think you're doing around publicity wise for changes and new schemes you can never do enough. One size publicity does not fit all and councils must do a mix to reach all demographic groups
- ▶ Need to plan for regular public communication around how to use the recycling bin and the reduction in contamination. Constant reinforcement is needed as folk soon go back to old ways. It must be faced that for some recycling is not a priority

Hertfordshire County Council

Background

Hertfordshire County Council is a member of the Hertfordshire Waste Partnership. As the WDA it provides treatment for residual waste collected by the ten Hertfordshire WCA's; six disposal facilities (three Energy Recovery Facilities and three Landfill Sites), five of which are outside of the county. Hertfordshire County is the client for all organic waste disposal contracts which were procured on behalf of the Hertfordshire Waste Partnership. Organic waste is managed through a combination of In Vessel Composting facilities, Windrow facilities and Anaerobic Digestion facilities. Dry recycling is managed by individual WCAs, although Hertfordshire Waste Partnership Consortium contracts have been procured to assist with this. All 17 HWRCs are managed under contract by Amey including arrangements and costs/income from the reprocessing of all materials, except residual waste which is the responsibility of Hertfordshire County Council.

Current status

- ▶ Street sweeping recycling – procurement of new disposal contracts to allow for mechanically collected street sweepings to be processed and diverted from disposal whilst attracting a significantly lower gate fee. The new contract commenced in January 2016 and is projected that circa 10,000 tonnes of street sweepings will be diverted from disposal per annum saving circa £450,000 per annum
- ▶ HWRC contract savings – in June 2014 the contract, to operate all of HCC's 17 HWRCs, was awarded to Amey; this included a requirement to provide financial efficiencies. Recommendations were made and following a public consultation process Members agreed to changing the opening hours and retaining two closure days to make the required savings of £750,000. Other changes introduced included the introduction of a van permitting scheme in an attempt to control misuse by commercial sector, a legitimate commercial waste service at the St Albans depot and the implementation of reuse facilities across the network
- ▶ AFM review – HCC operates an Alternative Financial Model (AFM) which is designed to incentivise lower performers to improve, support more directly those authorities that pursue higher recycling targets and prioritises specific waste behaviours that recognise relative value. Payments made through the model reflect savings in disposal costs and have directly incentivised all 10 WCAs to make service changes to lower costs and improve performance with Hertfordshire as a whole achieving its target of a 50% recycling rate in 2015/16. The model has evolved since its introduction in 2007/08 and has made payments of circa £21 million to WCAs. Due to the success of the model, and the need for HCC to make savings, in 2016 it was agreed to reduce payments by £1 million over the next four years; recognising that 80% of HCC's costs are demand led and savings need to come from discretionary payments

Lessons learnt

- ▶ The lack of proximate disposal facilities within or near to Hertfordshire has been the council's biggest pressure for a number of years. With a planning system that presents significant challenges and cost to the development of large scale waste management infrastructure, a lack of options does not assist in delivering a competitive environment or provide best value for the taxpayer. Support from government for a more regional than national assessment in terms of need would be preferred

- ▶ The bid process for the HWRCs allowed bidders to suggest any savings options without restriction. However, the reality of local government is that some options have the potential to end up being less palatable than others as they emerge. As a result, a clear steer/involvement from Members and engaging in meaningful consultation with residents early in the process is important
- ▶ The AFM has been instrumental in incentivising WCAs to make service changes to reduce costs and improve performance. However, in doing so the vast majority of savings are passed back to the WCAs limiting the potential for the WDA to make further efficiencies. Moving forward, the consideration of the 'taxpayer first', on a holistic basis, is important to avoid 'cost-shunting' between those areas with tiers of local government



Huntingdonshire District Council

Background

Residual waste, dry recycling and mixed garden and food waste are collected fortnightly, using 240l wheeled bins as standard. For dry recycling, side waste is acceptable (of appropriate materials) and a second bin is available on request free of charge. With the mixed garden and food waste, up to two additional wheeled bins can be requested, however there is an annual charge of £40 per additional bin. There is a charge for bulky waste collection; 1-3 items = £23, 4-6 items = £32, 7-10 items = £48. There is a bulky commercial bulky waste collection which is charged at £105 per hour and includes the time taken to travel to from the depot to the premises, make the collection and take the waste to a disposal site. There is also a standard trade waste service for residual, which is 80% sack collection, and trade waste recycling collection using various bin sizes and charges are per lift; frequency of collection varies. Collection is all in-house. Refuse and organics is disposed of through Cambridgeshire County Council's PFI agreement with Amey at its Waterbeach facility. Dry recyclate is processed at a MRF on the same site through a separate contract, jointly procured by Cambridgeshire Collection Authorities, including Peterborough City Council (unitary) who acted as the lead authority. Huntingdonshire is a member of RECAP.

Current status

- ▶ Current round reconfiguration contract has delivered £180,000 in round efficiencies by reducing a collection round on household and green waste collections. This corresponds with reduction on household waste and increase in recycling

Lessons learnt

- ▶ The campaign to increase recycling was effective at delivering reduction in household waste

Ipswich Borough Council

Background

Residual waste, mixed dry recyclables and mixed garden and food waste are collected fortnightly. Residual waste was collected using 240l wheeled bins but new properties and replacement orders receive 180l wheeled bins. Mixed dry recyclables and mixed food and garden waste are collected using 240l wheeled bins. Flats and multi-occupancy dwellings are provided with larger communal bins for recycling and refuse and some blocks of flats also have glass recycling bins. In certain parts of the town where properties have neither front gardens nor side access, separate sacks for recycling and residual waste are provided. Collection is in-house. Residual waste is taken to EfW plant run by SITA (contract with SCC), recyclables are managed by Viridor, and mixed food and garden is taken to an IVC. In terms of bring sites, there are 22 contractor glass bank sites, 22 in-house glass bin sites, 35 paper banks (no contract), 26 textile banks (Salvation Army, contract under negotiation) and five WEEE bins (emptied by the IFP under above contract). There is a chargeable bulky waste collection service and reuse collection service. Commercial waste is collected in-house.

Current status

- ▶ Introduced a four-day week for household collections, with a complete re-route of all rounds, with all rounds collecting the same material across the authority in the same week that has delivered significant savings. New for 2016: suspension of brown bin collections during the fortnight following Christmas Day with each participating household receiving 25 instead of 26 brown bin collections per year, to allow more effective use of resource to collect additional residual waste and mixed recycling presented by householders over the Christmas period
- ▶ Worked with other Suffolk Waste Partnership members to plan, co-ordinate and launch all communications in such a way that there is one consistent recycling message across Suffolk. Successful campaigns have included plastic recycling, Making Food Waste History, Getting Your Recycling Right, and a Home Composting Campaign that included a subsidy for residents purchasing home composting equipment)
- ▶ Introduced significant process change to make us easier to do business with, including online reporting and ordering via a newly introduced customer portal, with automatic job creation in our in-cab system. Amended policy of sending a letter after each 1st and 2nd recorded contamination occurrence of a dry recycling bin within a 3-month period. Replace with new policy of only sending a letter after each 3rd contamination occurrence of a recycling bin within three months. Projected saving of around £2,500 per annum in printing and postage in addition to around 21hrs of officer time each year

Lessons learnt

- ▶ When planning new efficiency initiatives ensure that all crucial baseline data and assumptions used are carefully double-checked (even when there is great time pressure), as even initially minor-appearing errors can add up to large discrepancies
- ▶ With one county wide communications strategy it is imperative that sufficient time is allowed for all stakeholders to comment on drafts that are produced and feel that their comments are taken into consideration in the final design

- ▶ Getting engagement on the need and benefits to be gained from a 'channel shift' in customer contact can be difficult when internal stakeholders believe that the best solution is for a person to be involved in and process every enquiry. Being able to demonstrate how categorisation of enquiries can improve the customer experience by simplifying the input of their enquiry and the inefficiencies that can be removed from automating service requests is imperative to get engagement in the process



Maldon District Council

Background

In June 2016 Maldon adopted a new service going from a weekly black sack collection to fortnightly refuse collection using 180l wheeled bin, fortnightly co-mingled recycling collection in a pink sack with glass separately in a box, and weekly collection of food waste from a caddy. In addition 42% of properties on a subscription garden waste collection using 240l wheeled bin.

Current status

- ▶ In February of this year we changed contractors. In the procurement process we looked at the possibility of continuing a weekly collection compared to a fortnightly one. We chose a fortnightly one as this would give us a savings however as we didn't go out to tender for the weekly option it is not possible to state how much the difference was between the two services
- ▶ We hot foil printed on lid of bin No Food Waste to encourage residents to use the food caddy. This has been very successful in diverting food waste from the general refuse and into an anaerobic digesting facility. Whilst this didn't deliver a saving to Maldon DC it has saved Essex County Council the high cost of processing food via the MBT plant and the much cheaper cost of AD
- ▶ Due to the dramatic change from weekly to fortnightly collection we haven't implemented any other efficiency savings. We believe that this is the most efficient and effective service delivery method. We have plans for further improvements such as removal of bring banks, introducing a kerbside textile collection, furniture reuse

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Err on the side of caution when anticipating savings – then Members & Finance team will always be pleasantly surprised with outcome
- ▶ Extensive communication planning and implementation ensured residents knew what to do and adopted new system readily resulting in high recycling rates and greater income from recycling credits

Norfolk County Council

Background

As the WDA Norfolk County Council provides residual waste services for 210,000 tonnes of waste collected by the seven WCAs in Norfolk and from the 20 HWRCs. 40,000 tpa is covered by a delegation agreement with Suffolk County Council and this arrangement extends to until 2020. 160,000 tpa is processed to refuse fuel under three different contracts (until 2020 +1 year extension in each case). <10,000 tpa street sweepings are processed locally and treated in Essex under arrangements with NEWS. Residual waste transfer stations and onward haulage are provided by the WDA and recycling credit payments indexed at 3% pa are paid to the WCAs in relation to dry recyclables, food and garden waste. Of the 20 HWRCs, 19 are operated by NEWS under a Contract Service Level Agreement and one is operated by FCC under contract. The WDA has adopted a waste reduction target of 1kg+ per household per week of residual waste from 10.4kg to <9.4kg by 2018/19 (NI191 definition is the metric) and a £2 million service demand reduction by 2018/19, to help mitigate the effects of economic growth and increases in household numbers.

Current status

- ▶ A procurement of residual waste treatment service for 2016 to 2020 saved £2 million plus per annum and delivered improved performance by moving from a mix of landfill and Energy from Waste to an approach based on export of Refuse Derived Fuel and zero waste direct to landfill. The approach used competitive dialogue and split treatment solutions from haulage to allow a more competitive procurement for the treatment costs which represented the greater part of the service costs. The approach also allowed proposals to be priced in bands to ensure a greater number of bids to be viable and for flexibility to be retained
- ▶ The delegation agreement with Suffolk County Council for treatment of 40,000 tpa of Norfolk's waste under Suffolk's Waste PFI contract delivered savings for each WDA of £2 million spread over the first two years of the agreement from 2014 to 2016 and is set to continue to deliver savings to 2020. The delegation of functions is pursuant to section 9EA of the Local Government Act 2000 and Regulation 5 of the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2012 and is not a contract for services and sees the discharge of functions by Suffolk County Council on behalf of the County Council
- ▶ The Norfolk Waste Partnership is looking at the benefits of a total systems approach to delivering weekly food waste collections in all WCA plus a change to the frequency for collections of residual waste, estimated to potentially deliver savings of more than £3 million per annum

Lessons learnt

- ▶ A total systems approach is a must to delivering improved performance and savings required in the public sector. This does not just mean reducing unit costs. A growing focus is required on demand management and effective behavioural change and ensuring that services designed today are genuinely future proof and flexible to accommodate significant change

- ▶ Authorities need to look at regional and sub-regional approaches to designing, managing and delivering services, including collective procurements and effective use of delegations. There is no apparent funding available to incentivise or facilitate this type of activity as many schemes, such as those supported by Defra, Wrap or DCLG have been limited to a single authority/single partnership. Much potential exists at the sub-regional scale so local authorities either need to make a case for a change to this approach to funding or recognise and pursue the business cases for change to avoid an ad hoc and sporadic approach
- ▶ It can take only a few people with a compelling vision and strong drive to help set the agenda that delivers the most significant changes that deliver the greatest efficiencies. This is particularly the case in the absence of performance related targets being imposed on local authorities and a key part of establishing objectives is that all stakeholders and partners can relate to them. In the past targets have generally been expressed as a recycling percentage; looking forwards it appears a more suitable target is how much waste is left over by each household, capturing not just recycling performance but also waste reduction, repair and reuse programmes as well as producer responsibility schemes



North Norfolk District Council

Background

Residual waste and dry recyclables are collected alternate weekly using 240l wheeled bins. There is an opt-in chargeable fortnightly garden waste service using 240l wheeled bins. There is also a commercial waste collection service with around 1800 customers (turnover approximately £1million). Collection is outsourced to Kier. This is a multi-service contract with Kier, which began in April 2011 and runs through until March 2019. This covers all waste (including bulky) and also street cleaning, public toilet cleaning, grounds maintenance and office cleaning. In terms of bring sites, there are only sites for textiles, and this contract is with Cookstown Textile Recyclers until July 2017; this was procured jointly with three other Norfolk districts (Broadland, Breckland and Great Yarmouth) and moved away from 'charitable' collectors to a contractor paying £400/tonne so this has become a good source of income.

Current status

- ▶ Procurement of new MRF contract – carried out as a partnership activity with all Norfolk districts participating along with the County Council. Associated removal of the glass bring banks from Kier collection contract. Difficult to quantify financial impact due to changes in commodities markets impacting upon income, but had those things been equal, would likely have been a significant saving (>£0.25 million)
- ▶ We ceased the delivery of collection day change notifications for each and every bank holiday, instead relying on the annual collection calendar to inform householders of the day changes, along with website and social media promotion. In order to facilitate this, we also changed the time of year for calendar delivery to households from April to December (so that we had certainty around changes at Christmas). This saved £10 thousand per annum
- ▶ The contract with Kier offered year on year price reductions (although subject to inflation) – as such, we have been under less pressure than many other councils to make changes to our services to reduce costs. Most of the changes we have made to the contract have been in non-waste services (for example, grounds or cleansing). However, as we approach the end of the contract (2019), along with the NWP workstreams detailed above which are likely to have an impact on service design and ultimately costs, we are also in the early stages of exploring potential joint contract/joint procurement options with two neighbouring authorities

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Whilst it helps, you do not need buy in from every member of a partnership for every project. Things can be done on a slightly smaller scale and still achieve good results
- ▶ The biggest potential for savings will come from looking at things as part of the full system for example, food waste collections – the financial case is unlikely to ever stack up for a rural district such as North Norfolk, but with the savings that the County could achieve through reduced disposal costs, the benefit to the taxpayer can be more clearly defined and evaluated
- ▶ Partnership working would likely be easier and achieve quicker results within a structure with some sort of executive powers

Norwich City Council

Background

Residual and mixed dry recyclables are collected alternate weekly, food waste is collected weekly and there is a paid for fortnightly garden waste collection. Food waste is treated through an AD facility (arranged through Biffa Municipal) and garden waste is managed through IVC (NEWS). There is a paid for bulky waste service. There is no commercial service. Collection is outsourced to Biffa Municipal until 2024. An upcoming vehicle replacement process will bring in weekly textile and WEEE collections at the kerbside. There is 1 HWRC within Norwich City Council boundaries, which is managed by Norfolk County Council.

Current status

- ▶ The NWP is researching, in conjunction with WRAP, the impact of food waste collections across the county, combined with changes in residual waste collection frequency. As a Partnership project, it allows all authorities to understand how changes would affect the WCAs/WDA and what opportunities could be exploited (for example, joint procurement of some services)
- ▶ The NWP has worked together on countywide marketing and communications campaigns and projects which separately, the individual authorities are unlikely to have been able to fund or resource (for example, bidding for WRAP funding to improve awareness of plastics recycling and encouraging residents not to bag their co-dry mixed recyclables and better understanding the total system cost of waste in Norfolk)
- ▶ The service change, introducing the collection of WEEE and textiles is expected to both reduce contamination within our co-dry, mixed recycling collections and increase the amount of waste that Norwich City Council recycles. As part of the reconfigured fleet, the contractual cost of the service will reduce at the same time as enhancing the service provided to our residents

Lessons learnt

- ▶ There needs to be a group of individuals who are prepared and able to provide the commitment and momentum needed to drive changes forward
- ▶ It is important to start from a base of reliable and thorough information and data to enable authorities to understand what and where problems are. And measure the success of any actions they take
- ▶ Working together, from a loose to a fully integrated partnership, where the overall cost is considered and not just an individual authorities' position, can yield benefits for the local taxpayer

Peterborough City Council

Background

Residual waste and dry recyclables are collected alternate weekly using 240l wheeled bins. Food waste is collected weekly, with a 23l caddy of food waste on the same vehicle as residual/recyclables in a pod located on the front of the truck. A paid for (£39 per annum) alternate weekly garden waste collection service is available, in 240l wheeled bins; no annual fee for a second bin but a delivery charge is levied. The refuse, recycling and food collection service forms part of a larger Operational Services Agreement held by Amey, which began in 2011 for a period of 23 years, with break provisions around fleet renewal cycles. There are no commercial collections. Almost all bring banks were removed a year ago for financial reasons. Textile Banks remain in some locations provided by other parties. There is one Household Recycling Centre although a procurement is underway to provide an up to date replacement on a site adjacent to the Energy Recovery Facility. Residual waste is managed at an Energy Recovery Facility operated by Viridor under a 30 year DBOM contract. The contract allows Viridor to keep the income from third party waste and Peterborough keeps all energy income subject to a guaranteed volume each year. Viridor arrange for disposal for non-recyclable waste which is not suitable for combustion on an ad-hoc basis. Composting of garden waste from kerbside collections and from the HRC is undertaken by Material Change Ltd; the contract is for a five year plus 2-year optional extension term beginning October 2012. Anaerobic Digestion of kerbside collected food waste is undertaken by Bio-Gen; the contract is for a five year plus 2-year optional extension term beginning October 2012. Dry mixed recycling is bulked and transported to a MRF; the contract was jointly procured by all the District Councils in RECAP along with Peterborough, offering a unified range of materials collected as well as certainty of quality and quantity to prospective processors. This is a 5-year initial term from September 2014 and can be extended for up to another five years, to bring contract dates into line allowing the next procurement to be simpler as one job lot of material.

Current status

- ▶ The development of the long-term treatment contract through the Viridor PPP ERF facility supports the vision of high recycling and composting with the minimum of waste going to landfill untreated whilst also delivering significant financial benefits of circa £30 million over the initial contract term. Efficiencies may be increased where the council is able to achieve higher than expected electricity income
- ▶ The procurement of the joint MRF contract with RECAP partners has allowed Peterborough to increase the range of materials collected from residents, as well as bringing to market a significant volume of material allowing improved economics as well as improved market interest. No specific savings were expected from the procurement however bids were competitive, tonnage recycled has increased and services are delivered in a more uniform manner across the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire area for the benefit of its residents

- ▶ The City Council has begun the provision of free food caddy sacks to residents, after initially only supplying a six months' supply, in order to improve participation. By working with our treatment partner it has been possible to move away from bio-degradable bags to standard plastic bags which reduces the cost considerably therefore allowing the council to fund the bags from a portion of the savings made through reduced waste treatment costs

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Approaching the market with confidence regarding the service or facility being procured is key, alongside sensible apportionment of the risks between both parties where each is best placed to handle that element. Inappropriate risk apportionment can increase costs or potentially lead to failed procurements so it is of utmost importance to get right



South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council

Background

These two authorities have come together to provide a single shared collection service. Residual and mixed dry recyclables are collected fortnightly using 240l wheeled bins as standard. Mixed food and garden waste is also collected fortnightly using a 240l wheeled bin; this service does not attract an additional charge. An additional garden waste bin, 240l or 140l, is provided on request for a charge of £30 per year or £25 per year depending on the size. A bulky waste collection service is available for £30 for up to three items and £5 per additional item. In terms of bring banks, Cambridge City has public sites for dry commingled material emptied weekly, and South Cambridgeshire has paper only banks, emptied as required depending on location. Textile and book banks are provided by 3rd parties. A commercial collection service is available and all collections are in-house. Refuse and organics are disposed of through Cambridgeshire County Council's PFI agreement with Amey at its Waterbeach facility. Dry recycle is processed at a MRF on the same site through a separate contract that was jointly procured by Cambridgeshire Collection Authorities, including Peterborough City Council (Unitary). This is a five year contract expiring in 2019.

Current status

Creation of a Shared Service aims to generate a saving of £700 thousand over three years, and has, so far, comprised of three elements to bring about efficiencies:

- ▶ Relocation to a shared depot: Cambridge City moved from its waste service from the city centre depot to South Cambridgeshire Waterbeach depot in November 2015. This was for both Policy and Operational arm the service
- ▶ Management Restructure: During 2015/16 work was undertaken to secure a new management structure for the new shared service and new staff put in post
- ▶ Round re-routing: Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire have been operating on established existing rounds to date and is currently reviewing its rounds to harmonise routes across the whole service area This ensure round work as efficiently as possible across the whole service area and round are more evenly balanced

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Merging services has brought many challenges in term of I.T. Engagement of I.T. departments at early stages is crucial
- ▶ Good project management process should be applied to the round- routing review. Ours was a particularly big change with for 82% of households being affected. Implementation required involvement and coordination of many people across departments

South Norfolk District Council

Background

Residual and mixed dry recyclables are collected on an alternate weekly basis, using 240l wheeled bins as standard. In addition, there is an opt-in charged for garden waste collection, also provided on an alternate weekly basis using 240l wheeled bins. The collection service is in-house. There is a commercial waste and recycling collection service, partially integrated into the household collection vehicles and collection frequency varies. There is a paid for bulky waste collection service provided by the in-house team. There are also 403 mini recycling centre banks across 120 sites. Materials include: glass, textile, toys, cooking oil, books, lightbulbs and batteries. This is run through individual Service Level Agreements with the relevant contractor.

Current status

- ▶ A complete re-optimisation of the household waste and recycling collection routes. This was required to manage: a variation in the disposal point (3 down to 1 as directed by the WDA), increasing households and an increase in the commercial collection services. The optimisation resulted in the collection taking place over four days as opposed to five (same contracted hours), enabling further staff savings and a reduction in disruption resulting from Bank Holidays (collections to take place Tuesday to Friday). The new service routes have just been put into situ but with a project annual saving of circa £300 thousand
- ▶ The South Norfolk commercial collection services have been reviewed and are now being provided with a mixture of stand-alone commercial collections (for weekly/non-household frequency of collection) and with other household-style collections integrated into the household rounds to reduce collection overheads per customer. This links into the re-optimisation project which projected a number of new customers into each round/area based on the quantity of commercial premises and a projected uptake of the commercial service/likely quantity and type of materials per business. This has enabled sufficient capacity to absorb future customers, where suitable, into the household collection vehicles. This has enabled over 200 additional customers to be added to the service in the past year

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Project contingency time-build ample project contingency time into any large-scale project
- ▶ Continuous engagement of all stakeholders helps to manage expectations and reduce any further unnecessary delays
- ▶ The requirement to have an extensive and accurate baseline set of information

St. Edmundsbury Borough Council and Forest Heath District Council

Background

Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council are working together in a shared service as the West Suffolk councils. Residual and mixed dry recycling is provided fortnightly using 240l wheeled bins as standard. Garden waste is an opt-in charged for service at £40 per year. A bulky waste collection is available at £32 for up to five items; up to an additional five items are charged at £3 each. Collection is in-house. A range of materials are collected at bring sites including paper and textiles and these are a mixture of in-house and outsourced. A commercial waste is available on demand and includes residual, commingled recyclables and single stream recycling collections.

Both authorities work in partnership with the other district/boroughs and the county council in Suffolk as part of the countywide Suffolk Waste Partnership. A number of partnership projects are delivered including joint procurement, communication and educational campaigns and waste strategy.

Current status

- ▶ Developing and introducing a single staff structure for waste and street scene services as part of the development of the West Suffolk councils
- ▶ Following a countywide strategic review of organic waste and subsequent Suffolk Waste Partnership led procurement, the West Suffolk councils introduced a garden waste collection subscription service (in conjunction with Waveney DC Babergh DC and Mid Suffolk DC already have a subscription service). This service change is projected to save the public purse in excess of £1 million per annum across the two tiers
- ▶ The West Suffolk councils have incorporated in-cab technology, online application and payment systems linked to a new back office CRM system to improve efficiency, customer access and revenue opportunities from the commercial services we provide. This links with a wider customer access strategy that makes accessing council services far easier and more convenient for our customers and through the application of technology, seamlessly connects customer services with frontline service delivery

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Devise lean processes and utilise technology where possible to manage the work and enable customer self serve
- ▶ Ensure elected members are central to the decision making process and are able to make decisions based on reliable and clear evidence where possible
- ▶ Work in collaboration with others to learn from experiences and to share knowledge

Suffolk Coastal District Council and Waveney District Council

Background

Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Waveney District Council (WDC) have worked closely together since 2008, sharing a Chief Executive and other staffing structures. A formal merger has been agreed to form East Suffolk Council in 2029. At present in both authorities residual and mixed dry recyclables are collected alternate weekly using 240l wheeled bins as standard. Garden waste is an opt-in charged for service at £42/year using 240l bins on an alternate weekly basis in Waveney; in Suffolk Coastal garden waste collection is currently free of charge. Collection is by Waveney Norse JVC Teckal public/public partnership and Suffolk Coastal Norse JVC Teckal public/public partnership. Bulky collection is a charged for service. A co-mingled/dedicated commercial trade waste collection and manage brokered services for all trade waste is available in both authorities. In terms of bring sites in Waveney there 84 collect and this is a SWP let contract with Indigo to 2020. In addition, ten textiles banks are provided by ERC (European recycling Company) and there are some independent charity textile-shoe-book banks/sites. In Suffolk Coastal there are 196 glass sites collected by Suffolk Coastal Norse, nine textiles banks with ERC (European recycling Company) and again some independent charity textile-shoe-book banks/sites. Treatment and disposal is managed by the WDA and agreed through an IAA with the Suffolk Waste Partnership. SCDC/WDC work as part of SWP to procure disposal and transfer contracts which benefit Districts through shared pain/gain and economies in contract procurement/management costs, plus joint marketing/educational activities.

Current status

- ▶ Moving to 4 day AWC services in SCDC and WDC has delivered a combined £0.5 million savings per annum since 2013/14, (achieved with no changes to staff existing T&C's). This breaks down further as £0.3 million per annum in SCDC and £0.2 million per annum in WDC
- ▶ The Suffolk Waste Partnership collectively let a single countywide MRF contract which commenced in November 2014. Prior to this, Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils had delivered their dry recyclables to separate facilities under separate contracts. The new arrangements ensured both councils (as well as the whole Partnership) have benefited from increased economies of scale and net gate fees below the WRAP median average for the last 3 years. In addition, the Partnership agreed an equitable transfer and haul cost apportionment mechanism which ensured all partners paid equally irrespective of whether they direct delivered to the MRF or used transfer facilities
- ▶ Working in Joint Venture partnership with Norse under a 50% annual profit share to both WDC/SCDC has allowed; release of efficiency savings, economies of scale, profits on commercial contracts, tracked benefits to East Suffolk per annum over last five years have averaged £1.4 million per annum

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Partnership working to outcome based specifications can allow strategic downsizing of central client functions, significantly reducing overheads and creating headquarters capacity

- ▶ When services are bundled together further efficiency savings and resilience can be created that may not have been achievable as separate departments
- ▶ Procuring Teckal compliant partnerships and contracts can create significant procurement savings, whilst creating a flexible working arrangements that can allow services to be more easily adapted to meet future demand and funding availability



Suffolk County Council

Background

As the statutory waste disposal authority, Suffolk County Council provides a range of countywide services through outsourced contracts. Residual waste is treated through a 25 year contract with SUEZ to 2039 with an extension option to 2044. Mixed dry recyclables are managed by Viridor through a SWP contract (cliented by WDA) until May 2019 with an option to extend until 2021. Garden waste is managed through open windrow, with various contracts which expire May 2019 with an optional two year extension. Mixed garden and food is sent to 2 x IVCs with contracts to end May 2019. HWRCs are provided by FCC Environment, contract expires May 2019. Clinical waste is disposed of through SRCL at Ipswich Hospital. Communications, marketing campaigns and ad hoc PR is undertaken countywide focusing on service delivery, strategy and infrastructure. Customer enquiries are dealt with in-house. Hazardous waste disposal for garden and household chemicals is carried out by Biffa as a subcontracted service under the SUEZ EfW contract. A small amount of WCA collected asbestos is sent to Collins Hazardous landfill; contract to June 2017. With regard to street sweeping there is a contract with Eastern Waste Disposal to collect from WCA depots and process/recycle; contract to September 2019 with two year extension option. Transfer station services are contracted to FCC Environment until May 2019 with an extension option to 2021 Wood processing and treatment from HWRCs only, is through HWRC contract with FCC sub contracted to Hadfields.

Current status

- ▶ Household Waste Recycling Centre contract renegotiation 2011 – various service changes including closure of seven (out of 18) sites; reduction in opening hours; introduction of chargeable trade waste service. £1.4 million per annum savings
- ▶ Collaborative approach to considering key waste infrastructure (in line with ‘One Public Estate’) – has resulted in the planned construction of a joint facility incorporating a new waste transfer station, household recycling centre and district operational depot. This facility will serve three authorities requirements’ (St Edmundsbury, Forest Heath and Suffolk County councils), replace the use of at least four existing sites, accommodate future population growth and increase service efficiency. Other joint infrastructure options are being considered across Suffolk
- ▶ Energy from Waste contract – delivering a new EFW facility and moving away from landfill disposal, and reducing council costs by an estimated £350 million over 25 years. Further EfW contract efficiencies
 - i) delivering a proportion of Norfolk’s disposal function under delegation, driving economies of scale in contract to benefit of both councils. £0.5 million per annum
 - ii) partial refinancing by council of project capital, saving £1.5 million per annum

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Effective partnership working dynamics – joint project teams and engagement; developing a shared evidence base; ensuring each partner has sovereign decision-making over agreed options
- ▶ Commercial negotiation skills – bundling issues; single spokesperson; getting the right team on the job; using leverage; understanding other side’s position; seeking win:win solutions

Three Rivers District Council

Background

Residual waste is collected fortnightly using a 140l wheeled bin as standard. Mixed dry recyclables are collected weekly with a 240l wheeled bin as standard. Food waste collection is also weekly, using a 23l food pod. Garden waste collection is an opt-in chargeable service at £35 per year. Flats may have communal arrangements such as bulk bins for refuse/communal recycling. There is a chargeable bulky waste collection service (based on number of items, requires booking). There is also an infectious waste/sharps collections from the kerbside. All collections are operated in-house. A commercial waste collection service is available for residual, dry recyclables, clinical/sharps, and is provided in-house.

Current status

- ▶ In July 2016 we started charging for garden waste, £35 is the annual charge (although this year it was pro-rata at £25). Our target of sign ups was 14,500 of an eligible 29,000. At the time of writing (early October) we are at around 21,000 sign ups. This has been the main focus over the last few months
- ▶ We have joined a consortium with three other local councils to procure a seven year contract with a MRF for dry recycling. This has given a better price than we previously had and the MRF will be making investment in their infrastructure due to the contract being for a long time with more tonnage
- ▶ We intend to bring in, on a fixed term basis, someone to look into ways of making the department more commercial going forward

Lessons learnt

- ▶ Good planning, get all departments that are needed to run a project on board from the very start
- ▶ Ensure residents are brought along with the process from very early on, we did a consultation as part of our garden waste charging
- ▶ Investment up front can help in the long run for example, investment in a new IT system vastly improved the online sign up option we were able to give residents signing up to the garden waste service

Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

Background

Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council (WHBC) provide an alternate week collection service for residual, mixed dry recycling, and garden waste. Residual waste is collected using a 180l wheeled bin as standard. Dry Recyclables are collected using 240l wheeled bin, plus an inner caddy for newspaper and pamphlets. Garden waste is collected using 240l wheeled bins. The service is outsourced (Serco) and the contract runs to 2020. There are 23 bring sites offering collection of all material, serviced by Serco. Serco also provide a commercial service and bulky collections for households.

It is worth noting that WHBC is lead authority on a number of partnerships with other Hertfordshire councils and in one agreement that also includes Chelmsford, including: MRF processing service contract; Newspaper sales contract; Abandoned vehicles contract; Emptying recycling banks. Hertfordshire councils pay WHBC for the lead role.

Current status

- ▶ The three recycling partnership arrangements has helped extract greater interest in providing services to Hertfordshire authorities. This has resulted in competitive bids from contractors or purchasers of material. They like the fact they have a 'bundled up' number of councils work to bid for, working through one main client
- ▶ The savings are hard to assess, were clearly made. For example, the most recent newspaper arrangement added over £300,000 to the partners bottom line in the first 18 months. The new MRF arrangement has probably enabled the partners to get gate fees at half the market is charging councils in the UK

Lessons learnt

- ▶ They has to be mutual trust between the partners, WHBC has provided a lead role in recycling for over twenty years
- ▶ A saving has to be made, for partners to re-join or join future partnerships
- ▶ Partners have to have a say in the specification, assessment and allocation of contract award

7 APPENDIX 2: LOCAL AUTHORITY SERVICE SUMMARY

Local authority	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged		
Babergh & Mid Suffolk	AWC	mix of 140l, 180l and 240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	No	Outsourced – Serco
Basildon	Weekly	Sacks	Weekly (mixed dry) AWC (glass)	Sacks 55l box	Weekly	240l	Free	Mixed	In-house
Brentwood	Weekly	Sacks (not provided)	Weekly (mixed dry) AWC (glass)	Sack & Box	AWC	Sacks	Charged	Weekly	In-house
Broxbourne	AWC	180l	AWC	3 x 55l boxes	AWC	240l	Charged (from 01/04/17)	Weekly (from 01/04/17)	In-house
Central Bedfordshire	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l or bag	Free	Weekly	Outsourced
East Cambridgeshire	Weekly	Sacks	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Free	Mixed	Outsourced – Veolia
Fenland	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged (from 01/04/17)	No (from 01/04/17)	In-house
Great Yarmouth	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	No	JVC Teckal
Huntingdonshire	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Free	Mixed	In-house
Ipswich	AWC	180l (new and replacements)	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Free	Mixed	In-house
Maldon	AWC	180l	AWC	Sack & Box	?	240l	Charged	Weekly	Outsourced – Suez

Local authority	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged		
North Norfolk	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	No	Outsourced – Kier
Norwich City	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	Weekly	Outsourced – Biffa
Peterborough	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	Weekly	Outsourced
South Cambridgeshire & Cambridge City	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Free	Mixed	In-house
South Norfolk	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	No	In-house
St Edmundsbury & Forest Heath	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	No	In-house
Suffolk Coastal & Waveney	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged (Waveney) Free (Suffolk Coastal)	Limited weekly collection (5000 hh) – Waveney Mixed – Suffolk Coastal	JVC Teckal
Three Rivers	AWC	140l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	Weekly	In-house
Welwyn Hatfield	AWC	180l	AWC	240l (plus inner caddy)	AWC	240l	Charged (from 01/04/17)	No (from 01/04/17)	Outsourced - Serco

8 APPENDIX 3: RECYCLING PERFORMANCE

Regional recycling rates (%)				
Region	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
North East	37.0	37.9	38.0	35.7
North West	43.9	45.6	46.5	46.1
Yorkshire and the Humber	43.3	43.9	43.6	42.2
East Midlands	46.8	46.4	45.2	44.7
West Midlands	43.5	42.2	42.2	41.1
Eastern	48.5	49.3	49.3	49.2
London	34.0	33.9	33.1	32.0
South East	43.4	43.7	45.0	44.5
South West	47.2	46.7	47.6	47.6

Authority	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting (Ex NI192)		
	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14
Basildon District Council	49.10%	51.70%	53.69%
Bedford	37.50%	37.90%	38.29%
Braintree District Council	52.40%	54.30%	56.04%
Breckland Council	39.90%	37.30%	36.18%
Brentwood Borough Council	45.90%	48.60%	50.30%
Broadland District Council	50.60%	46.80%	44.37%
Broxbourne Borough Council	40.30%	35.00%	35.04%
Cambridge City Council	42.70%	43.10%	44.10%
Cambridgeshire County Council	57.30%	58.20%	56.00%
Castle Point Borough Council	47.50%	52.20%	54.58%
Central Bedfordshire	45.00%	48.50%	49.77%
Chelmsford Borough Council	41.60%	46.40%	45.87%
Colchester Borough Council	47.60%	42.50%	41.18%
Dacorum Borough Council	49.10%	46.30%	46.24%
East Cambridgeshire District Council	56.40%	56.60%	45.48%
East Hertfordshire District Council	48.70%	49.50%	48.48%

Authority	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting (Ex NI192)		
	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14
Epping Forest Borough Council	57.70%	58.50%	58.58%
Essex County Council	51.10%	51.10%	51.46%
Fenland District Council	49.40%	50.80%	51.20%
Forest Heath District Council	46.50%	46.60%	46.10%
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	31.20%	26.70%	25.65%
Harlow District Council	44.90%	45.90%	46.71%
Hertfordshire County Council	50.40%	49.40%	49.26%
Hertsmere Borough Council	42.10%	43.30%	43.16%
Huntingdonshire District Council	56.40%	56.90%	57.50%
Ipswich Borough Council	40.80%	40.90%	41.28%
Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council	44.30%	41.90%	43.87%
Luton Borough Council	33.20%	34.40%	33.34%
Maldon District Council	47.00%	46.10%	46.20%
Mid Suffolk & Babergh District Councils	43.40%	43.10%	41.73%
Norfolk County Council	45.80%	43.20%	42.83%
North Hertfordshire District Council	57.60%	58.50%	57.30%
North Norfolk District Council	41.80%	41.40%	40.11%
Norwich City Council	38.30%	35.00%	35.05%
Peterborough City Council	44.00%	46.60%	50.83%
Rochford District Council	66.00%	65.20%	65.47%
South Cambridgeshire District Council	57.50%	58.10%	57.05%
South Norfolk Council	43.60%	40.40%	39.22%
Southend-on-Sea Borough Council	45.70%	51.40%	52.31%
St Albans City and District Council	52.20%	50.40%	47.67%
St Edmundsbury Borough Council	51.20%	51.70%	52.61%
Stevenage Borough Council	39.40%	38.20%	37.40%
Suffolk Coastal District Council	57.90%	56.50%	57.44%
Suffolk County Council	53.00%	53.10%	52.97%
Tendring District Council	26.20%	26.30%	27.02%
Three Rivers District Council	59.40%	63.20%	62.44%
Thurrock Council	37.90%	40.40%	40.93%
Uttlesford District Council	50.20%	50.30%	53.69%
Watford Borough Council	40.10%	41.70%	40.60%
Waveney District Council	49.60%	51.80%	50.94%
Welwyn Hatfield Council	48.50%	48.00%	46.63%



**LOCAL
PARTNERSHIPS**

Local Partnerships is jointly owned by



HM Treasury

Local Partnerships: the public sector delivery specialists

Local Partnerships, Local Government House, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ
020 7187 7379 | LPenquiries@local.gov.uk | @LP_localgov | localpartnerships.org.uk