

## **BARNSELY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD**

**Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate  
Street, Rotherham S60  
2TH**

**Date: Friday, 11th March, 2016**

**Time: 2.00 p.m.**

### **A G E N D A**

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Retirement of Councillors and Officers
4. Declarations of Interest
5. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 11th December 2015 (Pages 1 - 5)
6. Matters Arising (Page 6)  
To discuss matters arising from the previous minutes, which are not included elsewhere on the agenda.
7. Internal Audit Report (Pages 7 - 17)
8. BDR Manager's Report (Pages 18 - 25)
9. Risk Register (Pages 26 - 40)
10. Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Waste Strategy 2016 to 2021 (Pages 41 - 49)
11. Exclusion of the Press and Public  
  
The following item is likely to be considered in the absence of the press and public as being exempt under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended, March 2006 – information relates to finance and business affairs)
12. BDR PFI Budget Update 2015/16 (Page 50)

13. Date, time and venue for the next meeting  
: Friday 10th June, 2016 at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.
- : if necessary, a meeting shall be held during September, 2016, on a date to be arranged.
- : date to be arranged during December, 2016.

**BARNLEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD**  
**11th December, 2015**

Present:- Councillor K. Sims (Rotherham MBC) (in the Chair); Councillor R. Miller (Barnsley MBC) and Councillor C. McGuinness (Doncaster MBC), together with Mrs. L. Baxter and Mr. A. Gabriel (Rotherham MBC), Mr. P. Castle (Barnsley MBC) and Mr. L. Garrett (Doncaster MBC).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor E. Hoddinott (Rotherham MBC) and from Mr. D. Burton (Rotherham MBC) and Mr. J. Busby (DEFRA).

**10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

**11. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12TH JUNE 2015**

Consideration was given to minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 12th June, 2015.

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman, with the inclusion of the following corrections:-

(1) persons in attendance at the meeting - the correct spelling of the surname of Mr. L. Garrett (Doncaster MBC);

(2) Minute No. 4, BDR Manager's Report – the inclusion of wording that the fire strategy complied for insurance purposes.

**12. BDR JOINT WASTE BOARD - ANNUAL AUDIT - YEAR ENDED 31ST MARCH, 2015**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the report about the issues arising from the annual audit of the 2014/2015 accounts of the Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI). The report included the completed annual return for the Joint Waste PFI for the financial year ended 31st March, 2015 and the appropriate sections of that return were duly read out by the Chair of the meeting.

The issues report had been prepared by external auditors BDO LLP and highlighted that:-

- with regard to the annual return and accounts, the Joint Waste Board should include this matter as a formal agenda item at a Board meeting and minute their approval and adoption;

**BARNSLEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD – 11/12/15**

- the Joint Waste Board should ensure that, after approval, the minutes of the Board's meetings must be signed by the Chair; and
- with regard to the external auditor's report on the annual audit of the 2014/2015 accounts of the Joint Waste PFI, the Joint Waste Board should include this matter as a formal agenda item at a Board meeting and minute the consideration of and decision on such report.

Agreed:- (1) That the report about the issues arising from the annual audit of the 2014/2015 accounts of the Joint Waste PFI, as now submitted by external auditors BDO LLP, be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board shall ensure that the necessary action is taken in response to the issues now highlighted within the annual audit report 2014/15.

(3) That the completed annual return, including Section 1 (the Accounting Statements for 2014/15), Section 2 (the Annual Governance Statement for 2014/15) and Section 4 (the Annual Internal Audit Report for 2014/15), for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste PFI, for the financial year ended 31st March, 2015, as now submitted, be approved.

**13. BDR MANAGER'S REPORT**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager submitted a report which highlighted and updated the following issues relating to the Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI), for the period June to November 2015:-

- : changes at senior management level within Rotherham MBC;
- : issues reported as part of the external audit of the 2014/15 accounts of the Joint Waste PFI;
- : the internal audit of the Joint Waste PFI by Rotherham MBC internal auditors;
- : key milestones for the sites at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne, Grange Lane, Barnsley and at Ferrybridge, West Yorkshire;
- : the Independent Certifier had issued the acceptance test certificate and snagging list for the Bolton Road Waste Treatment Facility on 3rd July, 2015;
- : information about the number of tonnes of waste processed and the contract performance in respect of the recycling and diversion of waste materials;
- : waste compositional analysis; a further detailed report on this issue will be submitted to the next meeting of the Joint Waste Board;

**BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD – 11/12/15**

- : complaints received about the operation of the facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne, during the period 26th February to 31st October, 2015;
- : the health and safety audit of the facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne;
- : site compliance of the facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne, during the period 26th February to 31st October, 2015;
- : Ferrybridge facility – Ferrybridge MultiFuel 1 had become operational on 31st July, 2015;
- : Ferrybridge facility – fuel deliveries and electricity export; site compliance;
- : the handover of the transfer station at Grange Lane, Wath upon Dearne had taken place on 1st July, 2015;
- : communications, including : (i) the submission to the Local Government Chronicle awards about the partnership working between the three local authorities; (ii) the Waste Infrastructure Development Programme quarterly meeting held in June 2015 at the BDR visitors' centre; (iii) "It's a Rubbish Adventure", a joint yearlong project between the new waste treatment facility at Manvers in Rotherham and Magna Science Adventure Centre; and (iv) in November, 2015, the Waste Treatment Facility at Wath-Manvers played host to members of the Chartered Institute of Waste Management;
- : on 13th November, 2015, HM Lord-Lieutenant of South Yorkshire, Andrew Coombe, officially opened the waste treatment facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne;
- : finalising the lease for the waste treatment facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne;
- : review of the insurance for the Joint Waste PFI and level of premiums;
- : the Inter-Authority Agreement is being reviewed to provide more clarity and remove some historical information;
- : finance – payment of the capital contribution on 6th July 2015;
- : the BDR Partnership was the subject of an interview in October 2015, as part of the Rotherham MBC peer review of Waste Management.

- : glossary of terms relating to waste management and the Joint Waste PFI.

It was also noted that the terms of reference of the Steering Group were being reviewed.

Members of the Joint Waste Board suggested that there was a need for more education for young people about the need to reduce food waste.

Appropriate training is to be provided for new Members of the BDR Joint Waste Board.

Agreed:- (1) That the BDR Manager's report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the Joint Waste Board welcomes the positive comments about the BDR Partnership made as part of the Rotherham MBC peer review of Waste Management and will give consideration to the further development of partnership working between the constituent local authorities in respect of waste management.

#### **14. RISK REGISTER**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the updated Waste PFI risk status report (risk register), as at 26th November, 2015. Reference was made to:-

- : Insurance – insurance costs for waste management facilities have increased because of the number of fires at such facilities;
- : the reporting system for the Rotherham MBC risk register is changing and future risk status reports will be utilising that revised format; reports should clearly state the action to be taken to mitigate any 'red' risks shown in the risk register;
- : Inter-Authority Agreement between the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Councils in respect of Waste Management Services – there are proposed revisions to the Agreement, currently being considered by the constituent local authorities; it was anticipated that the revised Inter-Authority Agreement will be submitted for consideration at the next meeting of the Joint Waste Board.

Agreed:- That the updated information on the risk status report be received.

**15. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Agreed:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 as amended (information relating to the financial/business affairs of any person (including the Joint Waste Board)).

**16. BDR PFI BUDGET UPDATE 2015/16**

Consideration was given to the Budget Summary, as at November 2015, for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI). It was noted that current expenditure remained within the agreed budget. Further reference was made to the likelihood of insurance costs increasing.

Agreed:- That the report be received and its contents noted.

**17. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

Agreed:- (1) That the next meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday, 11th March, 2016, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.

(2) That the next following meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday 10th June, 2016 at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.

(3) That, if necessary, a meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held during September, 2016, on a date to be arranged.

(4) That a scheduled meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on a date to be arranged during December, 2016.

## Barnsley Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board Friday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2015 Actions

<b><i>Action Required</i></b>	<b><i>Timescale</i></b>	<b><i>Owner(s)</i></b>	<b><i>Completed</i></b>	<b><i>Comments</i></b>
Item 3 – 12 <sup>th</sup> June 2015 Create a training programme for new elected members on the BDR Joint Waste Board	No timescale set	Beth Baxter		Presentations have been prepared dates for training to be diarised.
Item 12 the Joint Waste Board should ensure that, after approval, the minutes of the Board's meetings must be signed by the Chair	Ongoing	Beth Baxter		December minutes to be signed at the March meeting.

**Executive Summary.****1. Introduction**

- 1.1 In April 2011, BDR (Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Councils) chose 3SE (a partnership between Shanks Group plc (a specialist waste contractor) and Scottish & Southern Energy plc) to become the preferred bidder for the contract to treat their residual waste for 25 years.
- 1.2 The BDR Partnership secured £77.4 million of Private Finance Initiative funding from central government towards the cost of the scheme and a new waste treatment facility was constructed at the Council's Bolton Road, Manvers site.
- 1.3 The site became fully operational in July 2015 and is used to treat the left over waste from the three authorities, Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham, using a mechanical and biological treatment process.
- 1.4 The site processes left over waste from circa 300,000 properties with an estimated annual throughput of 265,000 tonnes per year of residual household / council commercial waste.
- 1.5 A small team of officers, the BDR Client Team, act as the liaison between the site operators and the three Councils. The team has the responsibility of ensuring compliance with the terms of the contract between BDR and 3SE and the terms specified in the Inter-Authority Joint Working Agreement (IAA2).

**2. Scope and Objectives.**

- 2.1 To ensure proper financial management and governance of the Waste Treatment Facility, Manvers.

To address this objective the audit enquiries were focused on the following areas:

- Have risks to the Council been identified and managed in the Environment and Development Services (EDS) Risk Register
- Ensure that the BDR Client Team has robust arrangements in place for checking the payments to 3SE.
- Are the outputs from the transfer station accurately recorded to satisfy the Council's reporting obligation to central government (via WasteDataFlow)
- Are there adequate arrangements in place for the effective performance monitoring of the contractor against the contract terms and conditions.
- Is BDR recharging Barnsley and Doncaster as per the agreed contract terms (IAA2).

**3. Main Conclusions.**

- 3.1 The major risks to the Council have been identified in the EDS Risk Register; however, for a number of risks there appears to be a lack of progress being made towards full implementation of the individual mitigating actions that need to be taken to address the risks.

- 3.2 Payments to 3SE appear to be broadly accurate and calculated as per the terms and conditions of the contract. One minor error was noted in the application of the contract terms, this has been highlighted to the Client Team.
- 3.3 Based on a sample of tests carried out on the outputs from the transfer station during September 2015, the outputs from the transfer station are recorded accurately.
- 3.4 The Client Team has recently introduced a monthly performance monitoring programme which will assist with the monitoring of contractor performance throughout the year and also contribute to the year-end contractor performance reconciliation process.
- 3.5 Based on a sample of payments made to 3SE that relate to waste treatment charges for the months of June, July and August 2015, Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham have been recharged appropriately for the correct amounts and in a timely manner (see also point 3.2).

#### 4. Opinion

- 4.1 Internal Audit provides an 'opinion' based upon the work undertaken during our current review. This 'opinion' contributes to the production of the Council's Annual Governance Statement.
- 4.2 Based upon the results of our audit we consider that:-
  - a) The overall control environment is adequate and there are no fundamental concerns which would warrant consideration for inclusion in the Annual Governance Statement. However, implementation of our recommendations should enhance the control environment and provide an increased level of assurance to management.

#### 5. Appendices.

- 5.1 Appendix A – Assurance Objectives, Conclusions, Findings and Recommendations
- 5.2 Appendix B – Action Plan

**Assurance Objectives, Overall Conclusions, Key Findings and Recommendations**1. Assurance Objective

**Have risks to the Council been identified and managed in the EDS Risk Register?**

Overall Conclusion

**The major risks to the Council have been identified in the Council Risk Register; however, for a number of risks there appears to be a lack of progress being made towards full implementation of the actions that need to be taken to mitigate these.**

Key Findings

A total of 13 risks with 105 control measures are recorded on the EDS Risk Register. It is noted that a number of the control measures refer to the construction and commissioning of the plant. At the time of the audit the implementation of the control measures were:

- 32 = implemented (100% complete)
- 35 = in progress (various levels of completion)
- 7 = proposed (various levels of completion)
- 31 = withdrawn (100% complete (older risks))

Progress against the risks is monitored by the Client Team and reported at each meeting of the Joint Waste Board, however from a sample of control measures examined, it was evident that little progress had been made with control measure WPFIT0001/004 – Dispute Resolution (30% complete) and WPFIT0011/005 – Contract Manuals (25% complete).

**Recommendation 1**

The mitigating actions detailed in the Council Risk Register need to be progressed to full completion. There should be a reasonable timescale stated for each action and progress against this should be highlighted at the Joint Waste Board meetings. Any areas where there is no progress being made should be highlighted to the Board for their information and their consideration of whether to prioritise / allocate additional resource to aid completion.

**Recommendation 2**

The Client Team need to ensure that the current risks on the Council's Jcad system are transferred to the equivalent of Jcad (spreadsheet format) within the service and the progress against these is regularly monitored.

## 1.2 Assurance Objective

**Ensure that the BDR Client Team has robust arrangements in place for checking the payments to 3SE.**

### Overall Conclusion

**The BDR Client Team has adequate arrangements in place for the checking of payments to 3SE. Payments to 3SE appear to be broadly accurate and calculated as per the terms and conditions of the contract. One minor error was noted in the application of the contract terms, this has been highlighted to the Client Team.**

### Key Findings

Payments to 3SE for waste management services provided for the months of June, July and August 2015 were examined. All elements of the monthly net fee payable were confirmed to have been calculated and apportioned as per the payment mechanism detailed in the contract.

Testing revealed that the July payment calculation had used an incorrect figure for the calculation of the Transfer Loading Station Facility Payment – the contract states that the indexed figure used in this calculation should change to a different indexed figure in the year which service commencement occurs. This error has been pointed out to the BDR Contract Compliance Officer and is to be corrected for payments already made and payments going forward.

### **Recommendation 3**

The error highlighted in the calculation of the monthly Transfer Loading Station Facility Payment to 3SE should be corrected for payments already made to the contractor and in the calculation of future payments for waste management services to the contractor.

The base tonnage monthly payment to the contractor is based on tonnage forecasts supplied by the contractor at the commencement of the contract. These are monitored on a monthly basis against the actual throughputs at the plant. The contract agreement states that a reconciliation exercise should be performed at the end of each quarter and an adjustment made to the base tonnage forecasted figure where appropriate. It is noted that this reconciliation exercise has not been performed. The BDR manager has indicated that a reconciliation will be performed at the end of the third quarter.

### **Recommendation 4**

A base tonnage reconciliation exercise should be performed at the end of the third quarter and quarterly thereafter. Any revision to the base tonnage figure should be applied to payments to the contractor as per the contract payment mechanism.

With reference to the residual waste outputs from the plant, it is noted that the arrangements for applying the output data to the terms of the contract at the year-end have yet to be finalised (there is also a diversion and recycling target that is derived

from the waste ins and outs and an income share that is worked out at the end of the year from a basket of income once the base case income has been exceeded). The BDR Manager has indicated that the Client Team is looking at options of how to deal with any additional income / expenditure data at the year-end and the consequences to BDR as per the terms of the contract. It is understood that a preferred solution of buying in 'expert' assistance is being considered by the team.

#### **Recommendation 5**

The Client Team should ensure that resources are in place to address the year-end cost/profit or pain/gain process as specified in the contract. The process should be documented in order to produce a formal work instruction to identify each step of the process along with the roles and responsibilities of staff.

### 1.3 Assurance Objective

**Are the outputs from the transfer station adequately recorded and monitored?**

#### Overall Conclusion

**The outputs from the transfer station are recorded in sufficient detail to enable the Council to meet its obligations to provide accurate data to central government and to monitor the performance of the contractor, including the making of financial penalties in the event of underperformance. The Client Team is in the process of introducing a monthly output monitoring system to gain assurance that the municipal waste data provided by the contractor is accurate. Checks conducted on the output data for September 2015 has provided some assurance that the output weighbridge data provided by the contractor can be relied on.**

#### Key Finding

The site operator has a detailed recording arrangement in place to provide the information required to fulfil the Council's reporting obligations to government. A process of monitoring outputs from the transfer station has recently been introduced by the Client Team. The result from this initial exercise has revealed some discrepancies between the weights of the outputs recorded at the plant's weighbridge and the weights recorded by the recipients of the outputs from the plant, however this is most likely due to either moisture loss in transit or a difference between the weighbridges at both sites, or a combination of the two; the differences were minor and not a concern, however they have been identified by the Client Team for further investigation. The outputs from the site for September 2015 were checked against tonnage received data from the off-takers; this check has provided assurance that the output weighbridge data provided by the contractor is accurate. It was noted that due to poor information management on the part of the contractor, off-taker data was not available for inspection and reconciliation for the month of October 2015.

#### **Recommendation 6**

In order to gain assurance that the Council's municipal waste data reporting to government is accurate, the Client Team should have in place a routine monthly monitoring process where weighbridge weights of 100% of the outputs from the

transfer station are verified to the weight records of the respective off takers. Any verification discrepancies should be investigated, the findings recorded and the results reported to the Joint Waste Board.

#### **Recommendation 7**

The BDR Client Team should instruct the contractor (Shanks) to ensure that output data from the off-takers is filed and available for inspection without delay.

### 1.4 Assurance Objective

**Are there adequate performance monitoring arrangements in place?**

#### Overall Conclusion

**Sufficient performance monitoring arrangements are in place to enable the Council to fulfil its statutory reporting requirements to government through WasteDataFlow.**

**In addition the Client Team has introduced a series of performance monitoring arrangements in order to monitor the performance of the site operator against the performance standards stated in the contract.**

#### Key Findings

Certain performance standards, for example 'turnaround times', are embedded into the site operator's data recording and reporting mechanism and routinely monitored by the Client Team and any performance deductions applied to the monthly payments to the site operator; however other standards require a system of routine inspection to be undertaken by the Client Team. The Client Team has recently introduced a routine performance monitoring programme to assess performance of the site operator on a monthly basis. The programme is based on the performance standards as stated in the contract. The BDR Manager has risk assessed the indicators in order to identify those relevant to the operational aspect of the facility, and allocate each a red amber or green rating based on their potential risk to the organisation (financial, service, operational, safety, reputational). From an examination of the performance monitoring undertaken to date, it is not clear whether the examination frequency and intensity of the individual performance indicators has been based on structured methodology.

#### **Recommendation 8**

The BDR Manager should review the performance monitoring arrangements undertaken by the Client Team to ensure that the routine monitoring of all operational performance standards that have been classified as 'highly likelihood of impact on service or reputation' are included.

#### **Recommendation 9**

The performance monitoring programme should be structured to ensure that each performance standard is allocated a frequency and intensity for inspection – monthly, quarterly or annually.

1.5 Assurance Objective

**Is BDR recharging Barnsley and Doncaster as per the agreed contract terms (IIA)?**

Overall Conclusion

**With reference to payments made to 3SE that relate to waste treatment charges for the months of June, July and August 2015, Barnsley and Doncaster appear to have been recharged appropriately for the correct amounts and in a timely manner. There were no findings or recommendations arising from our audit of this area.**

1.6 Assurance Objective

**Are there adequate reporting arrangements in place?**

Overall Conclusion

**Reporting arrangements for the site operator and the BDR Client Team are considered to be adequate. At the commencement of the audit the Council's Waste Management Team raised a concern with the availability of timely information for reporting to WasteDataFlow. It is understood that the Waste Management Team have been working with the Client Team and this is no longer a concern.**

Key Finding

There is no process documentation to record who routinely produces what data/information, when, why and for whom.

**Recommendation 10**

The BDR Client Team should ensure that the right people receive the right information at the right time. To assist in this process the BDR Client Team should create a master document to detail the data/information flow throughout the waste transfer process along with the data/information requirements of staff.

## Waste Treatment Facility – Action Plan

<b>Priority</b>	<b>***</b>	<b>Fundamental</b>	<b>(Action considered necessary to avoid exposure to high risk)</b>
	<b>**</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>(Action considered necessary to avoid exposure to a significant risk)</b>
	<b>*</b>	<b>Merits Attention</b>	<b>(Action desirable to enhance control or value for money)</b>

Rec.	Recommendations.	Priority.	Responsibility.	Agreed.	Comments.	Date.
1	The mitigating actions detailed in the Council Risk Register need to be progressed to full completion. There should be a reasonable timescale stated for each action and progress against this should be highlighted at the Joint Waste Board meetings. Any areas where there is no progress being made should be highlighted to the Board for their information and their consideration of whether to prioritise / allocate additional resource to aid completion.	*	BDR Manager BDR Administrator	Yes	The BDR Team have been notified that Jcad will no longer be used for the Risk Register.  Currently populating the new system per corporate instruction  Risk Register is considered as part of Steering Committee and Joint Waste Board meetings  Confirmation received that JCAD obsolete	5.2.16
2	The Client Team need to ensure that the current risks on the Council's Jcad system are transferred to the equivalent of Jcad (spreadsheet format) within the service and the progress against these is regularly monitored.	*	BDR Administrator	Yes	Draft is in place BDR Manager is to be Risk Register trained date to be confirmed.	5.2.20 16
3	The error highlighted in the calculation of the monthly Transfer Loading Station Facility Payment to 3SE should be corrected for payments already made to the contractor and in the calculation of future payments for	*	BDR Compliance Officer	Yes	This has been highlighted to contractor and rebate has been applied	10.1.1 6

## Waste Treatment Facility – Action Plan

Rec.	Recommendations.	Priority.	Responsibility.	Agreed.	Comments.	Date.
	waste management services to the contractor.					
4	A base tonnage reconciliation exercise should be performed at the end of the third quarter and quarterly thereafter. Any revision to the base tonnage figure should be applied to payments to the contractor as per the contract payment mechanism.	*	BDR Manager BDR Compliance Officer	Yes	Base tonnage reconciliations have already been completed. Forecasts are monitored against actuals each month with quarterly adjustments made when required.  One adjustment has been made in October and a further in February.  An annual reconciliation will be made, however the aim is for the forecast adjustments to be as close to the actuals reducing the year end reconciliation.	31.10.15  And 2/2/16  Year end reconciliation – 1.5.16
5	The Client Team should ensure that resources are in place to address the year-end cost/profit or pain/gain process as specified in the contract. The process should be documented in order to produce a formal work instruction to identify each step of the process along with the roles and responsibilities of staff.	*	BDR Manager	Yes	Financial advisor has been appointed to assist with the refinance and savings and will assist in the year end resolutions.  Work instructions are being currently being progressed but will not be finalised until post year reconciliation to ensure that any unforeseen items can be documented	5.2.16  1.5.16
6	In order to gain assurance that the Council's municipal waste data reporting to government is accurate, the Client Team	**	BDR Compliance Officer	Yes	BDR Compliance Officer is checking 100% of the tickets retrospectively. Ticket information	24.3.16

## Waste Treatment Facility – Action Plan

Rec.	Recommendations.	Priority.	Responsibility.	Agreed.	Comments.	Date.
	should have in place a routine monthly monitoring process where weighbridge weights of 100% of the outputs from the transfer station are verified to the weight records of the respective off takers. Any verification discrepancies should be investigated, the findings recorded and the results reported to the Joint Waste Board.				provided by the contractor is being checked against the invoices provided by the third party off takers. Significant discrepancies will be recorded and available for joint waste board. N.B there will be variance between one weighbridge and another.  This is now being completed on a monthly basis,	
7	The BDR Client Team should instruct the contractor (Shanks) to ensure that output data from the off-takers is filed and available for inspection without delay.	*	BDR Compliance Officer	Yes	BDR Compliance Officer has instructed the financial controller to ensure the output data is available and in a format that is easily accessible. This data is also cross referenced with the invoices prior to RFL inspection.	1.2.16
8	The BDR Manager should review the performance monitoring arrangements undertaken by the Client Team to ensure that the routine monitoring of all operational performance standards that have been classified as 'highly likelihood of impact on service or reputation' are included.	**	BDR Manager	Yes	Performance monitoring framework has be RAG rated.  Performance monitoring inspection sheet has been created to inspect all aspects of the performance framework	11.1.16
9	The performance monitoring programme should be structured to ensure that each performance standard is allocated a frequency and intensity for inspection – monthly, quarterly or annually.	**	BDR Compliance Officer	Yes	PFI contracts are self-monitoring Frequency is detailed in schedule 5 Table 3 of the Performance Framework  Inspection sheet to look at the	Complete  11.2.1

## Waste Treatment Facility – Action Plan

Rec.	Recommendations.	Priority.	Responsibility.	Agreed.	Comments.	Date.
					<p>performance framework is completed monthly.</p> <p>Where there are areas of concerns more frequent monitoring will occur.</p> <p>Contractor is aware of the monitoring but does not know the date or time monitoring to ensure no additional preparation can be conducted.</p> <p>Team are also based at site 2-3 times a week and will pick up on any issues as they arise.</p>	6
10	The BDR Client Team should ensure that the right people receive the right information at the right time. To assist in this process the BDR Client Team should create a master document to detail the data/information flow throughout the waste transfer process along with the data/information requirements of staff.	**	BDR Compliance Officer	Yes	<p>Process flowchart already available has names and posts of who requires what. Dates to be included in this diagram.</p> <p>A further meeting with relevant officers planned for March to ensure that for the next financial year the data provided is correct and in a usable format.</p>	11.2.16 31.3.16

**BDR WASTE PFI  
BDR MANAGER UPDATE REPORT**

**DECEMBER 2015 – FEBRUARY 2016**

## **1.0 Governance**

### **1.1 Resources**

David Burton, Assistant Director of Street pride will be retiring prior to the next Joint Waste Board. The BDR team would like to wish him well and thank him for his hard work over the years.

Damien Wilson will commence work in RMBC as the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment Services and Karen Hanson will commence as Assistant Director Community Safety and Street Scene we look forward to working with them in the future.

### **1.2. Rotation of Chair**

In June 2016 the Chair of Joint Waste Board will rotate to Barnsley and the Chair of Steering Committee will rotate to Rotherham.

## **2.0 Project Performance**

### **2.1 Bolton Road**

#### **2.1.1 Contractors Representative**

The Contractors Representative attended the Steering Committee meeting on the 22nd of December 2015 and gave a presentation on the plant performance and challenges. An update on the matters discussed is to be provided by the Contractors Representative at the May Steering Committee.

#### **2.1.2 Recycling and Diversion**

Table 1 contains information on the number of tonnes processed and the contract performance. There have been some issues, which have impacted on the recycling performance of the facility:-

- The market for recycling plastics from an MBT is poor at the moment as the price of oil is low
- Grounds maintenance waste is not being delivered to the facility

- Blockages in refinement have impacted on the tonnage throughput
- The SRF Offtake facility has had some downtime due to boiler and crane issues
- Throughput rate of the refinement section

The Contractor has mitigated the impact of these issues by;-

- Paying to get plastics reprocessed
- Pre-shredded Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) waste to minimise the blockages
- Sourced alternative SRF Offtake facilities
- Determined the optimum throughput to achieve maximum recycling
- Assigned a project team to further optimise performance and quality

**Table 2 - Tonnes Processed 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015 to 28<sup>th</sup> February 2016**

<b>Process</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Tonnes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Target (contract estimate)</b>	<b>Variance</b>
Landfill		6788	4.7%	n/a	
Recovery	Ferrybridge	72628			
	Other	9797			
	Total	82425		n/a	
Recycling	Ferrous	2002			
	Non-ferrous	173			
	Compost like output (CLO)	7491			
	Glass and Stone	1648			
	Plastic	5112			
	Total	16426	12.63%	19.00%	-6.37%
Total Waste delivered		143,688.			
Moisture Loss		39,829	27.72%	29.14%	-1.42%
Total Waste Diverted		136,935	95.34%	96.50%	-1.16%

n.b. above figures are unaudited and subject to change.

### 2.2.4 – Complaints

**Table 4 – Complaints received from 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2016**

Type	Received this month	Year To date	Comment
Noise	9	34	45% of these are complaints from one particular area of Bolton upon Dearne
Litter	0	3	Litter picks undertaken
Odour	0	1	Complainant contacted and processed explained
Mud on road	0	1	Road cleaned
Flies	0	5	Fly control measures increased, Environmental Health Officers from RMBC taken around plant and process explained.
Traffic Management	0	2	Sub-contractor notified of the issue and approved route information re-issued

The Environment Agency are undertaking independent noise investigations and liaising with residents on Bolton upon Dearne

### 2.2.5 Health and Safety

**Table 5 - Compliance from 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2016**

	Close Call (Observation)	Accident less than 3 days	Accident more than 3 days	Non RIDDOR dangerous occurrence	RIDDOR dangerous occurrence	RIDDOR more than 7 day injury	Major RIDDOR	Environmental
YTD Total	97	4	0	20	4	0	0	6

### 2.3 Ferrybridge

**Table 6 – Ferrybridge BDR Fuel Deliveries and Electricity Export**

<b>Fuel Deliveries &amp; Electricity Export</b>	<b>JULY</b>	<b>AUGUST</b>	<b>SEPTEMBER</b>	<b>OCTOBER</b>	<b>NOVEMBER</b>	<b>DECEMBER</b>	<b>JANUARY</b>	<b>YTD Totals</b>
BDR Fuel Delivered (tonnes)	6,377	9,109	11240	9763	8638	9807	10767	65701
BDR Average Fuel NCV (MJ/kg)	16.00	15.50	16.15	15.6	15.0	15.40	15.38	15.6
BDR Proportion of Electricity (MWhe)	9117	10655	11763	9780	9381	10685	10837	71870
BDR Electricity (MWh/tonne)	1.43	1.17	1.05	1.00	1.09	1.09	1.01	1.11
<b>RESIDUES (tonnes)</b>								
BDR Proportion of IBA	2021	1710	2509	1737	1553	1931	2504	13966
BDR Proportion of APCr	386	386	399	309	373	358	375	2587
BDR Proportion of Fe	5	44	34	20	16	4	0	123

Table 7 - Compliance

	<b>Lost Time</b>	<b>Medical Incident</b>	<b>First Aid</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>RIDDOR</b>
<b>YTD Total</b>	0	0	0	105	1

RIDDOR Incident, Operator received burns to his lower leg attempting to clear an ash blockage from a bunker.

## 2.4 Grange Lane

Non-contract waste streams are now being accepted at Barnsley Transfer station. Barnsley Waste Management Officers have access to BOXI and are no longer duplicating the ticket checking process. Further work is underway on the output information to ensure consistency.

### **3.0 Communications**

In January the Community Education and Liaison Officer from Shanks has attended a series of Meetings with Friends of Wath Town Hall, Barnsley Foster Carers, Swinton Sports and Health and Dearne Allotment along with several Scout groups and a meeting of the Community Liaison Group.

Through the Shanks Corporate Social Responsibility Fund partnerships are being made with several hard-to-reach groups including children in care and adults with learning disabilities and mental health issues.

In February 2016, a reporter and photographer from Rotherham Advertiser visited the site and a two-page article about the facility, which was printed on Friday 5<sup>th</sup> February 2016 (appendix 1).

### **4.0 Legal**

#### **4.1 Insurance**

Insurance costs have increased significantly; the Contractor is working with his insurance providers to widen the market provision and attempt to lower the premiums. BDR are in discussions with the Contractor regarding the insurance provision.

#### **4.2 Inter-Authority Agreement**

The Inter-Authority Agreement has been reviewed to provide more clarity and remove some historical information. It is expected to have this finalised and signed by the middle of March.

### **5.0 Financial**

#### **5.1 Financial advisors**

Following a tender exercise Romaine have been appointed as financial advisors to the BDR PFI.

### **6.0 Other**

The Contractor is assisting Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield with their Waste Strategy Consultation.

## 7.0 Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition
<b>3SE</b>	The name for the partnership between Shanks Group plc and Scottish & Southern Energy plc.
<b>Anaerobic Digestion (AD)</b>	A series of biological processes in which micro-organisms break down biodegradable material in the absence of oxygen. One of the end products is biogas, which is combusted to generate electricity and heat.
<b>Chartered Institute of Waste Management CIWM)</b>	The leading waste management organisation in the UK.
<b>Community Liaison Group (CLG)</b>	This is group of 15 of residents and ward councillors with an active interest in ensuring the facility at Bolton Road is properly managed.
<b>Environment Agency (EA)</b>	An executive non-departmental public Body responsible to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for issues affecting the environment.
<b>Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC)</b>	Is a place to recycle and dispose of household waste.
<b>Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA)</b>	Is a form of ash produced in incineration facilities
<b>Independent Certifier (IC)</b>	Provides the specialist service of checking the compliance of buildings and infrastructure projects against client requirements, detailed design and construction standards.
<b>Joint Waste Board (JWB)</b>	The Statutory Committee comprising Portfolio Holders and Senior Officers with responsibility for waste.

## 7.0 Glossary of Terms

<b>Jones Celtic Bio Energy (JCBE)</b>	Provides a complete solution for the generation of renewable energy from biodegradable sources, such as municipal waste, food waste.
<b>Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)</b>	A type of waste processing facility that combines a sorting facility with a form of biological treatment such as composting or anaerobic digestion.
<b>Megawatt Hour (MWh)</b>	Is a measure of energy that is often used to describe an amount of electricity.
<b>Private Finance Initiative (PFI)</b>	Mechanism for creating "public-private partnerships" (PPPs) by funding public infrastructure projects with private capital.
<b>Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR)</b>	RIDDOR which puts duties on employers, the self-employed and people in control of work premises (the Responsible Person) to report certain serious workplace accidents, occupational diseases and specified dangerous occurrences (near misses).
<b>Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF)</b>	A fuel produced by shredding and dehydrating solid waste (MSW) with a waste converter technology.
<b>SSE plc (formerly Scottish and Southern Energy plc)</b>	A British energy company headquartered in Perth, Scotland.
<b>Shanks Waste Management (SWM)</b>	The UK arm of Shanks Group plc, a leading international sustainable waste management business.
<b>Waste Infrastructure Delivery Programme (WIDP)</b>	The delivery unit in England to make available programme management resources to Defra.
<b>Waste Electrical &amp; Electronic Equipment (WEEE)</b>	Is the European Community directive 2012/19/EU on waste electrical and

	electronic equipment (WEEE) which, together with the RoHS Directive 2002/95/EC, became European Law in February 2003.
--	---

**Contact Name:-** Lisbeth Baxter, BDR Manager, Tel. Ext 55989  
e.mail: [Lisbeth.Baxter@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Lisbeth.Baxter@rotherham.gov.uk)

BDR Joint Waste Board Risk Status Report March 2016

RMBC have changed the Corporate Risk Register and the JCAD system previously used is no longer supported. A spreadsheet is now maintained and reported on corporately. The open risks from JCAD have been transferred across to the new format and new risks added. The method of scoring the benchmark effects is different from the method used on JCAD (see Risk Assessment Form for the current scoring matrix) .

Old Risk Reference	Risk	Comments and outstanding actions	Date for completion
WPFIT001	Waste Volumes Change – Facility too small or too large NEW RISK DESCRIPTION Changes to Collection services to support budget savings that impact on the PFI Contract	Waste managers and the BDR team to continue liaison to ensure waste projections are accurate and that all streams that can be processed at the facility are sent there. Inter-Authority Agreement is being reviewed.	Monitoring of waste volumes will be on-going. The proposed revisions to the Inter Authority Agreement have been considered across the 3 Councils.
WPFIT007	Legislative Change - BDR have no direct control over Legislative change NEW RISK DESCRIPTION Changes in Government Law/Regulations	Legislative change can impact on costs and operations at the facility so BDR will Monitor the legislation on an ongoing basis and Lobby Central Government on any item which may impact on the Contract Close liaison with waste managers – IAA3 providing more clarity No further movement on the Circular Economy – further information from Europe was published on 2 <sup>nd</sup> December 2015	Lobbying on Recycling – draft letter December 2015. On-going
WPFIT008	Compliance with contract  TWO NEW RISK DESCRIPTIONS Environmental Impact to Local Area from Noise/Odour/Flies/Vermin	Failure of the Contractor to comply with the operational terms of the contract could result in complaints from residents. Measures are in place to monitor the Contractors maintenance of the biofilters to prevent odours. The routes the vehicles take are monitored and the number of vehicles in and out of the facility, are reported as part of the monthly report. Noise mitigation measures have been installed BDR and the Contractor continue to monitor the area and control the activities to minimise night time noise.	On-going

	<p>etc</p> <p>There is a risk that the contractor will not comply with the terms and conditions and the performance will be less than the Councils are paying for</p>		
WPFIT009	<p>Major Incident at ITS/AD</p> <p>NEW RISK DESCRIPTION</p> <p>Serious injury/death of a member of staff or public through service operation</p> <p>Closure of facility or inability to provide the service due to a force majeure event</p>	<p>An Emergency plan is in place, Health and Safety meetings with H&amp;S representatives of all three Councils are held quarterly. The actions necessary from a contractual view point should this occur need to be documented in the Contract Manuals.</p>	On-going
WPFIT011	<p>Business Continuity – BDR</p>	<p>Procedures that are in place to monitor the contract need to be fully documented in the Contract Manuals. This is a work in progress as the procedures are being refined. Training material needs to be developed for Members, Senior Officers and the wider team to ensure resilience.</p>	January 2016
WPFIT015	<p>Review of Waste Infrastructure PFI Credits</p> <p>NEW RISK DESCRIPTION</p> <p>Failure of plant equipment results in withdrawal of credits</p>	<p>There is a Risk that if BDR fail to comply with the Terms and Conditions of the Waste Infrastructure letter the credits could be removed or reduced. The BDR Joint Waste Team liaises with the Operational Managers and the WIDP Transactor to ensure compliance with these Terms</p>	On-going
WPFIT016	<p>Insurance Costs Increase</p> <p>NEW RISK DESCRIPTION</p> <p>Obtaining required terms for Insurance is difficult or impossible due to market conditions</p>	<p>Insurance costs for waste management facilities have increased due to the number of fires in the sector. BDR have engaged AON to provide advice and the Contractor has a robust fire strategy in place and is working with insurance companies to confidence to bring down the costs.</p>	On-going

NEW RISK			
	Contractor default needing emergency action and/or leading to contract termination. <b>NEW RISK</b>	A series of performance bond and Parent Company Guarantees exist to provide and/or pay for interim/alternative arrangements to be made. Funders step-in. Robust Contract monitoring procedures.	Ongoing
	Failure to pay the Contractor or deliver waste could result in the Councils being in breach. Failure to correctly apportion the costs could result in one Council paying more than is necessary. <b>NEW RISK</b>	Process for checking Tickets from each Council is in place. Direct debit mandate is in place for Barnsley and Doncaster to pay Rotherham. All deductions are accounted for in line with the IAA3. Guaranteed minimum tonnage requirement for the Councils. Regular reports to Steering Group/Joint Waste Board. Systems in place to pay the Contractor Internal and External Audits undertaken	Ongoing
	Fraud <b>NEW CORPORATE RISK</b>	Process for checking Tickets from each Council is in place. Financial and Legal Officers form part of team. Information shared across all 3 Councils Direct debit mandate is in place for Barnsley and Doncaster to pay Rotherham. All deductions are accounted for in line with the IAA3. Guaranteed minimum tonnage requirement for the Councils. Regular reports to Steering Group/Joint Waste Board. Systems in place to pay the Contractor Internal and External Audits undertaken	Ongoing
	Ensure the balance of risk between Contractor and BDR is maintained. <b>NEW RISK</b>	Change protocol in place, consideration needs to be given to level of risk as changes are negotiated.	Ongoing

Business Objective	Risk Title	Consequence /effect: - <i>What would actually happen as a result? How much of a problem would it be? To whom and why?</i>
	There is a risk that the contractor will not comply with the terms and conditions and the performance will be less than the Councils are paying for. <b>(Compliance)</b>	Service disruption. Temporary full or partial closure of facilities.
	Contractor default needing emergency action and/or leading to contract termination. <b>NEW RISK</b>	Service disruption. Temporary full or partial closure of facilities.
	Failure to pay the Contractor or deliver waste could result in the Councils being in breach. Failure to correctly apportion the costs could result in one Council paying more than is necessary. <b>NEW RISK</b>	Contractor could terminate contract and seek damages
	Fraud <b>NEW CORPORATE RISK</b>	Contractor could attempt to charge for more than they are entitled to/Client team could collude with Contractor

To meet our statutory obligation under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 for “places to be provided at which persons resident in its area may deposit their household waste and for the disposal of the waste so deposited”. To contribute towards achieving the European Union Recycling Target for England of reaching 50% recycling overall by 2020

Ensure the balance of risk between Contractor and BDR is maintained. <b>NEW RISK</b>	Councils could take more risk than anticipated
Serious injury/death of a member of staff or public through service operation ( <b>MAJOR INCIDENT AT ITS/AD</b> )	Personal tragedy. Health and Safety Executive intervention. Possible service disruption. Possible corporate liability offence
Obtaining required terms for Insurance is difficult or impossible due to market conditions ( <b>Insurance costs increase</b> )	There is a lack of Markets for Insuring waste plants
Changes to Collection services to support budget savings that impact on the PFI Contract ( <b>waste volumes change</b> )	Potential to impact on the performance of the plant. Potential to impact on the Third Party Revenue Share due to the Councils. Implications on PFI Credits. Implications on Inter Authority Agreement.
Changes in Government Law/Regulations ( <b>Legislative Change</b> )	Potential financial implications to cover the cost of required service change
Environmental Impact to Local Area from Noise/Odour/Flies/Vermin etc ( <b>Compliance</b> )	Reputational damage and adverse publicity from pollution emanating from State of the Art Facility. Potential for Local/National interest

<p>Failure of plant equipment results in withdrawal of credits <b>(Review of WICS)</b></p>	<p>Reputational damage and adverse publicity emanating from poor performance of state of the art facility. Potential for Local/National interest. Budget impact</p>
<p>Lack of resources due to restructures, and staff resignations failure to have a knowledge management plan <b>(Business Continuity - BDR)</b></p>	<p>Failure to monitor the contract effectively/make payments resulting in Breach</p>
<p>Closure of facility or inability to provide the service due to a force majeure event (major incident at ITSAD Facility)</p>	<p>Service disruption. Temporary full or partial closure of facilities.</p>

Existing actions/controls - What are you doing to manage this now?	Number of Control Measures Implemented	Risk Score with existing measures (See scoring table)		
Regular contract meetings/Monitoring and review procedures/Emergency plan/Contingency facilities in place/Performance deduction , Step in provisions exist. It is likely that the Funders would step in an appoint another Contractor if performance is poor. Alternately the Councils could step in until the Contract could be retenderd	6	2	4	10
A series of performance bond and Parent Company Guarentees exist to provide and/or pay for interm/alternative arrangements to be made. Funders step-in. Robust contract monitoring procedures	2	4	2	8
Process for checking Tickets from each Council is in place. Direct debit mandate is in place for Barnsley and Doncaster to pay Rotherham. All deductions are accounted for in line with the IAA3. Guarenteed minimum tonnage requirement for the Coincils. Regular reports to Steering Group/Joint Waste Board. Systems inplace to pay the Contractor Internal and External Audits undertaken	9	1	1	1
Process for checking Tickets from each Council is in place. Financial and Legal Officers form part of team. Information shared across all 3 Councils Direct debit mandate is in place for Barnsley and Doncaster to pay Rotherham. All deductions are accounted for in line with the IAA3. Guarenteed minimum tonnage requirement for the Coincils. Regular reports to Steering Group/Joint Waste Board. Systems inplace to pay the Contractor Internal and External Audits undertaken	9	3	2	6

Change protocol in place, consideration needs to be given to level of risk as changes are negotiated.	2	3	2	6
Contractor has completed and regularly reviews full Risk Assessments. Staff training, H&S Inspections, Contract Monitoring and performance deductions for non compliance. External Audit has been undertaken by Consultants and RMBC Health and Safety Team Regular monitoring of the Contractual requirements in relation to Health and Safety Consistent application of the Payment Mechanism	7	3	3	9
Robust fire strategy, latest technology for fire suppression . Fire plan signed off by insurers BDR Technical advisors and Independent Certifier. Regular fire drills. Contractor liaison and education of insurance markets	4	2	5	10
Inter Authority Agreement measures. Significant collection change clause in the PFI Contract. Current WIDP/DEFRA position in terms of Credit Allocation position requires BDR to abide by the terms and conditions in the Promissary letter and the Final Business Case.	2	3	4	12
Procedure incorporated in the Contract Conditions. Impact and actions to be jointly agreed with the Contractor to mitigate costs as far as possible. Application of the Change in Law Clauses within the contract	3	3	4	12
Contractual controls and performance measures. Monitoring the contract. Pro-ative engagement with the local community . Sharing data Regular monitoring outside the perimeter of the plant	5	4	5	20

Regular contract meetings/Monitoring and review procedures/Contingency facilities in place/Performance deduction , Step in provisions exist. It is likely that the Funders would step in an appoint another Contractor if performance is poor. Alternately the Councils could step in until the Contract could be retenderd	5	5	3	15
Contract manual to document the processes and procedures. To be maintained and updated when changes occur. Contrcat information held on CIPFA site and on a Sharepoint portal.	2	3		6
Contractual conditions provide a shared responsibility to agree measures to mitigate the effects and facilitate the continuation of the service. There are contingencies within the contract to divert waste to other waste facilities	2	4	3	12

Further management actions/controls required - What would you like to do in addition to your controls?	Further Control Measure	Target Score with further management actions/controls required (See Scoring Table)		
Ensure succession planning is adequate. Invest in training for the current team Project Management and COTC.	2	2	3	6
Ensure monitoring staff are sufficiently skilled to manage this situation. Liaison with other PFI Contract Managers, knowledge transfer	3	3	2	6
Ensure regular reports to Joint Waste Board/Steering Committee/Joint Waste Team	1	1	1	1
Make an agenda item at meetings	1	2	2	4

Councils may consider taking on more risk as long (as this is properly assessed) to deliver savings. Currently being investigated as part of the Operational Savings review	1	2	2	4
Regular visits by Health and Safety officers	1	3	2	6
Consider reviewing the insurance requirements regarding the business interruption.	1	2	5	10
Dialogue with WIDP/DEFRA and between BDR Councils. Test potential impacts to the contract/Councils against the IAA2. Lobby Government on recycling definitions.	2	3	3	9
Consider the need for the Change in Law retention fund.	1	3	4	12
Further plant investment in Acoustic measures	1	4	4	16

Ensure monitoring staff are sufficiently skilled to manage this situation. Liaison with other PFI Contract Managers, knowledge transfer close liaison with DEFRA	2	5	2	10
		2	2	4
Undertake a Communications campaign. Use contingency sites/ other Contracts where possible e.g. Veolia Landfill. Use emergency procurement if absolutely necessary.	3	3	3	9

Cost (of impact; of current controls; of further controls) £	Risk Owner (Officer responsible for managing risk and controls)	Risk Review Date	% Control measures implemented
Approximate costs for training in Project Management and COTC £4,000	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	75.00%
	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	40.00%
	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	90.00%
			90.00%

Approximate costs for financial advice £30,000 Legal advice would also be needed approximately £30,000 money already allocated in Operational Management Budget for this.	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	66.67%
	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	87.50%
	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	80.00%
	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	50.00%
	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	75.00%
	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	83.33%

Fine tuning of facility potential investment in redesign of refinement by Contractor.	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	71.43%
	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	
	Beth Baxter	01/05/16	40.00%

# Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham & Sheffield Waste Strategy

2016 - 2021



**BARNSLEY**  
Metropolitan Borough Council



**Doncaster**  
Metropolitan Borough Council



# What is a waste strategy?

- How we will manage your waste
- All of the four Councils have individual waste strategies
- It is best practice to review these strategies every 5 years
- It will outline the priorities that are most important to our residents



**BARNSLEY**  
Metropolitan Borough Council



**Doncaster**  
Metropolitan Borough Council

**Rotherham**  
Metropolitan  
Borough Council

The logo for Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council is a stylized letter 'R' composed of two overlapping shapes: a purple one on the left and an orange one on the right.

# What shapes a strategy?

- Our priorities are influenced by external factors
  - Political (e.g. new legislation)
  - Financial (e.g. budget restraints)
  - Consultation with residents
  - Consultation with local businesses
  - Consultation with statutory bodies (e.g. Environment Agency)
  - Consultation with other stakeholders



**BARNSLEY**  
Metropolitan Borough Council



**Doncaster**  
Metropolitan Borough Council

**Rotherham**  
Metropolitan  
Borough Council

The logo for Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council is a stylized letter 'R' composed of two overlapping shapes: a purple one on the left and an orange one on the right.

# Why do we need a waste strategy?

- Provides a clear direction
- Contributes to the aims and objectives of the Waste Management Plan for England 2013
- Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield City Council's current waste strategies would benefit from being reviewed



**BARNSLEY**  
Metropolitan Borough Council



**Doncaster**  
Metropolitan Borough Council

**Rotherham**  
Metropolitan  
Borough Council



# Why work together?

- All working towards the same overarching strategy
- Will allow efficiencies and savings to be made
- Best practice to work towards common goals going forward
- Waste is a cross-boundary strategic planning matter
- Co-ordinated development and use of infrastructure



**BARNSLEY**  
Metropolitan Borough Council



**Doncaster**  
Metropolitan Borough Council

**Rotherham**  
Metropolitan  
Borough Council

A stylized graphic element for the Rotherham logo, consisting of a purple 'R' shape with an orange and yellow crescent-like shape on its right side.

# Why now?

- Previous strategies need to be reviewed
  - Barnsley 2007 - 2030
  - Doncaster 2009 - 2014
  - Rotherham 2005 - 2020
  - Sheffield 2009 - 2020
- Devolution and Sheffield City Region



**BARNSLEY**  
Metropolitan Borough Council



**Doncaster**  
Metropolitan Borough Council

**Rotherham**  
Metropolitan  
Borough Council



# What are the priorities we are consulting on?

- KSP A – We aim to encourage and inspire children and adults across Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield to make less waste by reducing, reusing and recycling more.
- KSP B – The four Councils will work together more closely to deliver value for money services.
- KSP C – We will work hard to deliver and maintain a dependable and reliable service to all our customers.
- KSP D – We will continue to explore how technology can be used to improve recycling and waste services.
- KSP E – We will be pro-active to influence decision-making on waste at European, National and local level, to drive investment into infrastructure within the Sheffield City Region economy.

# Provisional consultation timeline

- January 2016
  - Formation of working group
  - Scoping document and consultation
- February – April 2016
  - Drafting of background documents
  - Approval of consultation programme and materials
- May 2016
  - New member briefings
  - Consultation begins
- June – July 2016
  - Consultation
- August 2016
  - Data analysis
- September 2016
  - Adoption

# Questions?

- Do you have any questions?



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted