

# OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE

20 January 2012

## Performance Monitoring – Third quarter 2011/12

### 1 Purpose of Report

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

### 2 Background

- 2.1 This report provides an update on OWP's progress over the previous quarter (Oct 2011 – Dec 2011) against its agreed Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) Action Plan. A budget statement is included and any high level risks from the partnership's Risk Register are highlighted. A summary of performance against National Indicators (NI's) is also set out.

#### 2.2 JMWMS Action Plan

The 2011/12 Action Plan is attached at appendix 1. Each action has been assigned a "traffic light" score to indicate whether the project is:

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

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

#### Successes

- An online guide to reducing, reusing and recycling in Oxfordshire has been launched. It is hoped that the guide will increasingly become a "one-stop shop" for information and advice on waste management issues.
- A joint waste and energy management education service contract was awarded to the environmental charity, Groundwork Thames Valley.
- A five year review of the Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste management Strategy has commenced with the development of a draft consultation document. The document reports on successes over the last five years and seeks views on future plans.

#### Concerns

- No actions have been scored as "red" during the last quarter, meaning there are no specific concerns to report.

#### 2.3 Risks

A risk register that identifies risks associated with the delivery of the 2011/12 JMWMS Action Plan is reviewed quarterly by the Officer Strategy Group. Risks are scored according to their likelihood and the impact that they would have should they occur. Mitigation measures are set out to reduce the effects of these risks. The highest scoring risks (i.e. those that are either most likely or might have the most dramatic impact) are reported to the Joint Committee.

At quarter 2, two identified risks were scored as "high". These are set out in table 1, together with the mitigation measures proposed at the time. OWP agreed (on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2011) that no further action be taken on these and that the actions/projects, together with the accompanying risk register entries should be closed. With regards to action 4.2, work to

**OWP18**  
**OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE**

secure recycling outlets (rather than the reuse outlets originally intended) is progressing well. Whilst no further work is being undertaken on the development of Zero Waste Places (action 5.3), community groups continue to be supported through the ongoing Community Action Groups (CAG) programme, which is detailed elsewhere within the OWP action plan.

Table 1 – High level risks identified in quarter 2

<b>No.</b> (from JMWMS Action Plan)	<b>Action</b> (from JMWMS Action Plan)	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Possible Consequence</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Status at Oct 11</b>
4.2	Increase role of community reuse organisations in the collection and reuse of bulky household wastes.	Material quality is too low for reuse.	Community organisations unable to reuse collected material, increasing their waste disposal costs.	Develop waste sorting measures to allow community groups to segregate reusable items from unsuitable items.	Bulky re-use trial with Emmaus abandoned due to material quality issues. Currently assessing the operational requirements to enable metal and wood waste to be recycled from bulky collections from WODC and Ox City. Risk Likelihood has been increased.
5.3	Explore the application of Zero Waste Place (ZWP) Standards to Oxfordshire Communities	Lack of interest from local communities.	Host communities for Zero Waste Places cannot be found.	Good promotion through existing networks, such as Community Action Groups (CAGs) and low carbon communities.	ZWP Standard obtained by Dorchester on Thames. CAG project supporting other communities in achieving the Standard, but no further groups have yet applied. Risk likelihood increased.

The Officer Strategy Group considered the Risk Register again at its December 2011 meeting and no further risks were scored as high level for quarter 3. Copies of the updated risk register document are available from the OWP Coordinator.

#### 2.4 Budget statement

The current budget position is shown in appendix 2. No significant budget variances are anticipated. Income has been received from each of the six partner councils.

#### 2.5 New Initiatives fund

Table 2 provides a summary of the New Initiatives Fund (NIF) budget position. £3,007 of revenue and £6,894 of capital funding currently remains available. Remaining funds are ring-

**OWP18**  
**OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE**

fenced for South Oxfordshire, Vale of White Horse and West Oxfordshire District Councils.

Table 2 – NIF summary budget statement

	<u>Revenue</u>	<u>Capital</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total income	£ 615,594	£ 719,358	£ 1,334,952
Total commitments	£ 112,809	£ 287,944	£ 400,753
Total expenditure	£ 499,778	£ 424,520	£ 924,298
Remaining funds to be allocated	£ 3,007	£ 6,894	£ 9,901

The NIF Projects funded to date are listed in appendix 3. From this it can be seen that some projects have yet to draw down the full amount of funding allocated to them. An update on these projects will be provided to the March 2012 meeting of the committee.

## 2.6 NI Target performance

Local Authorities are no longer required to report performance against National Indicators to government. However, OWP agreed to retain local reporting against some of these indicators in order to measure progress against joint waste strategy objectives. Performance for the year to date is summarised in table 3 below.

The amount of residual waste per household has reduced compared to the equivalent period for last year (by around 61 kg per household). The recycling rate (NI 192) is 61.49% so far this year; an increase of 6.49% over the 2010/11 outturn figure. The amount of waste sent to landfill (NI 193) has also reduced by 13,052 tonnes compared to the same period last year. The increased recycling rate and reduced landfill tonnages reflects the “full year” effect of new collection systems introduced mid-way through 2010/11 in Oxford City, Vale of White Horse and West Oxfordshire District Councils.

The number of fly-tipping incidents has reduced by 144 incidents compared to the equivalent period last year. This reduction continues the trend of the last three years, which have seen a sharp drop in the number of fly-tipping incidents.

Monthly NI performance for each partner council is set out in appendix 4.

Table 3 National Indicator performance

<b>NI number</b>	<b>NI description</b>	<b>10/11 performance (Full year)</b>	<b>10/11 performance (equivalent period)</b>	<b>11/12 performance year to date (April – Oct)</b>
NI 191	Residual waste per household	469.56 kilograms per household	304.59 kg per household	242.92 kg per household
NI 192	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	55%	53%	61.49%
NI 193	Municipal waste landfilled	133,357 tonnes	86,486 tonnes	73,434 tonnes

**OWP18**  
**OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE**

NI 196	Improved street and environmental cleanliness – fly tipping	2806 incidents	1621 incidents	1477 incidents
--------	---	----------------	----------------	----------------

**3 Financial, Risk and Staff Implications**

3.1 There are no direct implications resulting from the report.

**4 Areas Affected**

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

**5 Effect on Strategic Policies**

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

**6 Options or Alternatives**

6.1 Not applicable.

**7 Recommendations**

7.1 That the report is noted and that an update on NIF funded projects be considered at the next OWP meeting.

**8 Reasons for Recommendations**

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

**9 Contact Officer**

9.1 Author: Wayne Lewis Tel: 01295 221903

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

Background Papers: