

Somerset Waste Board meeting
15 December 2017
Report for information



Performance Report - April 2017 to September 2017

Lead Officer: David Oaten, Contracts Manager – Treatment & Infrastructure

Author: John Helps, Performance Monitoring Officer

Contact Details: 01823 625705

Forward Plan Reference:	SWB/17/09/05
Summary:	<p>This report summarises the key performance indicators for the period from April 2017 to September 2017 and compares these to the same period in the last two years. Key headlines are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less waste (both residual & recycling) has been produced which has resulted in a slightly enhanced recycling performance • Recycling sites continue the trend of lower tonnages following the introduction of the permit scheme • Missed collections for recycling, food and garden waste are down around 5% • Missed collections have increased for refuse and repeat missed collections (actions to address this are summarised in section 2.5) • Flytipping is down overall but up in Mendip
Recommendations:	That the Board notes the performance findings in paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2, together with the tonnage and performance results within Appendices A & B.
Reasons for recommendations:	Report for information only. Whilst this report sets out specific actions being taken to address areas of concern, the business plan sets out how we focus on improving performance.
Links to Priorities and Impact on Annual Business Plan:	Transparency – Publishing Key Performance Indicators
Financial, Legal and HR Implications:	No direct financial, legal or HR implications.
Equalities Implications:	No equalities implications
Risk Assessment:	Areas of poor performance inform our overall risk assessment

1. Background

- 1.1. Reports with a full range of key performance indicators for services managed by Somerset Waste Partnership are presented to the Board in December (Quarter 2 performance) and June (Outturn performance).

As part of SWP's drive for continuous improvement, Members will note that a start has been made to rationalise the format and the amount of data provided as part of this performance report, and to provide a richer analysis of the reasons for good or poor performance, and the actions being taken as a result. Specific changes to the performance report for December 2017 are:

- A number of the former appendices have either been amalgamated, reordered or removed.
- The report structure has been changed to provide a focussed commentary on key areas of performance.
- A verbal update on more recent performance (i.e. where confirmed data is not yet available) will be provided at the meeting to highlight key trends.

Subject to, and informed by, the views of board members it is proposed to continue to make changes to the way we report performance. Proposed changes include:

- Future performance reports will also include a degree of additional analysis, focusing on discreet service areas, in order to keep Members informed of the actions taken to achieve performance improvement or indeed the reasons behind a deterioration in performance. The first area of focus for the February 2018 Board meeting is likely to be around our missed collection performance and the actions being taken to improve it.
- Giving an update on the business plan, which sets out the actions we are taking to improve performance, in particular highlighting areas of concern and areas of success.
- Bringing performance reporting together so that it represents a more rounded picture of performance, finance and risk, workforce and partnerships, customers and communications.

2. Performance Findings

2.1. Headline performance figures

Headline figures to note for April to September 2017 compared to the same period in 2016 are shown in the table below. The RAG ratings indicate where trends are on track (green), not as desired (amber) or a cause for concern (red). A verbal update for any significant changes to these trends will be given at the Board.

National Indicators	Result	+ / -	Appendix	Lines
Residual waste per household (NI 191) - kg/hh	245.20	-2.43%	A1	(38)
Recycling & reuse rate (NI 192) - %	55.07%	0.33%		(39)
Waste landfilled (NI 193) - %	43.44%	-0.60%		(40)
Waste Streams	Tonnes	% Change		
Total Reused, Recycled & Composted	75,963	-1.00%		(25)
Residual Landfilled	58,937	-2.71%		(26, 29, 30)
Recovery	2,692	2.00%		(27, 28, 31)
Total Household Arisings	136,879	-1.72%		(32)
Total Commercial Arisings	3,084	2.15%		(24, 34)

Recycling Sites	Tonnes/ Number	+ / -	A3
Tonnages	41,480	-2,283	
Recycling/Recovery Rate	79.73%	1.86%	
Visitor Numbers	956,413	-0.89%	

Missed Collections	Number	% Change	B1
Recycling & Food	6,610	-4.88%	
Garden Waste	3,148	-5.24%	
Refuse	3,742	13.22%	
Repeat Missed Collections	2,820	2.58%	

Fly Tipping	Number	+ / -	B2
Number of Incidents	2,279	-34	

2.2. Analysis of performance drivers

2.2.1. Overall tonnages

Appendix A1 shows tonnage by material type as well as the former key national performance indicators arranged in alphabetical commodity order and showing 3 comparative years. It shows data for the whole partnership (i.e. kerbside and recycling sites). The headline tonnage figures show that tonnages have declined. Key points are:

- A 1.13% (-862 tonnes) decrease in household waste reused, recycled and composted (line 23),
- A 1.72% (-2,395 tonnes) decrease in overall household waste arisings (line 32),
- A 2.61% (-1,575 tonnes) decrease in household waste landfilled (line 33).

Appendix A2 shows that Somerset households produced less waste, when compared to the first six months of 2016, with a reduction of 9.32 kg/hh, bringing the total waste arisings to 555.96 kg/hh, the majority of this reduction being achieved at the recycling sites.

2.2.2. Recycling and reuse

Appendix A1 shows materials recycled overall (both kerbside and recycling sites) and A2 shows headline kg per household performance for kerbside collection services and recycling sites.

Changes worthy of note include:

- A continued drop in the amount of paper collected, with a decrease of 10.60% (-609 tonnes - line 18),
- A 0.84% (-432 tonnes) reduction of residual waste sent to landfill collected from the kerbside (line 29), suggesting that the majority of material displaced from the recycling sites has not been presented for collection.
- It should be noted some of these changes may be as a result of improvements in manufacturing processes such as lighter glass and other external factors and not necessarily associated with service changes or provision. The Business Plan commitment to regular waste composition analysis will help better understand people's behaviour.

Whilst it relates to an earlier period, the board may wish to note that the '*Local Authority Recycling Carbon Index*', recently published by Eunomia and reported in the trade press, shows SWP to be a 'high flyer' in saving carbon. SWP was the 4th best performing area in England, saving 103 kilogrammes of carbon equivalents (CO₂e) per person – the top performing authority in England saved 111kg CO₂e and the worst performing authority saved 29kg CO₂e.

2.3. Garden Waste

The amount of garden waste treated during this period at both the recycling sites and at kerbside increased by 2.34% (682 tonnes - line 10). Increases in garden waste per household were 2.72 kg/hh, with a continued increase seen in kerbside collections of 3.68kg/hh to 51.48 kg/hh, offset by a slight decrease at recycling sites of 0.96 kg/hh bringing the total through the sites down to 67.35 kg/hh. The biggest driver for changes in garden waste remains the weather.

2.4. Recycling Centres

Appendix A2 shows headline Recycling Centre performance figures and Appendix A3 shows, for different materials, the weight and variation from 2016 of waste and recycling through the recycling sites, as well as the site recycling/recovery rates and visitor numbers.

It shows a total reduction of material through the recycling sites of 2,283 tonnes. There was a loss of 484 tonnes of dry recycling and 241 tonnes of garden waste, as well as decreases of 1,211 tonnes (including asbestos) of residual waste, 169 tonnes of hardcore & soil and a reduction of 178 tonnes of wood sent for recovery. The majority of these reductions are thought to be related to the successful implementation and operation of the permit scheme.

This appendix also shows that the average recycling rate across the network is nearly 80%, with all sites showing improvement compared to the same period in 2016 and now all exceeding a rate of 71%. The lowest performing site at 71.73% being Frome and the highest performing at 86.90% being Minehead. Visitor numbers decreased by 8,544 (-0.89%), with 956,413 visits in the period April to September 2017. Again this is thought to be as a result of the permit scheme.

2.5. Missed Collections

Appendix B1 shows the level of missed collections (for refuse, dry recycling/food and garden waste) compared to all periods in 2016-17, as well as the level of repeated missed collections. Performance is measured by reported 'misses per 1,000 collections' as indicated on the charts.

Monitoring of contractor performance for missed collections continues as a priority to ensure levels do not return to those seen in previous years. It is proposed that this service area will be subject to more detailed scrutiny at a future Board meeting. Performance highlights, and the action being taken in response are:

- For most service areas the level of missed collections appears to be fairly similar in the first half of 2017, compared to the same period in 2016. The exceptions to this are refuse collections for Mendip, Sedgemoor and Taunton Deane, garden waste collections in Sedgemoor and recycling collections in Mendip and Taunton Deane.
- The number of repeat missed collections has increased in Q2 compared to Q1. This situation is being monitored by SWP operational staff and action will be taken to address the downturn in performance in due course. The repeat missed collections are largely focussed on the same geographical areas as the missed collections.
- SWP is undertaking further analysis of the causes of these issues and the additional actions we may need to take in order to ensure that these issues are rectified. Initial analysis suggests:
 - Issues in Mendip appear to have been driven by Kier's rectification of resource imbalances across the services it provides in Mendip which resulted in a large proportion of the District seeing changes to the configuration of its rounds. This has led to an increase in missed collections as crews got used to the new rounds but also through reports from residents who had been caught out by changes in collection times. As rounds settle down in Mendip performance is now improving and we are monitoring closely to ensure that this trend continues.
 - Across the contract Kier continue to experience difficulties in sourcing enough agency staff to support the service and at its worst Taunton alone had seven rounds which were unable to start the day. Kier have

reviewed and changed the way they recruit agency staff and although some days we still do not see full allocation of staff we are seeing an improving picture.

- Problems with certain garden waste rounds were identified as crew issues. The issues with some garden waste collections has ultimately led to staff changes which although unfortunate we hope this will ultimately result in an improved service.

2.6. Flytipping

Appendix B2 shows the level of reported flytips, broken down by waste type and District across Somerset. It shows that the numbers of reported flytips across Somerset continue to decrease slightly compared to 2016-17. In Quarters 1 – 2, the total number of flytips has reduced by 34 (-1.47%). There were decreases in the numbers reported in both Taunton Deane and West Somerset, with Sedgemoor and South Somerset remaining fairly static. The one exception being in Mendip where there was an unexpected increase in the number reported. Whilst we include fly tipping numbers as part of this Board report as the actions of the SWP can have an influence on flytipping, SWP has little control or influence over the numbers being shown as the statutory function to manage fly tipping events still rests with the partner District authorities.

3. Consultations Undertaken

- 3.1.** Consultation on findings in this report have been undertaken with SWP's Senior Management Group (officer representatives from partner authorities) and with SWP's Senior Management Team.

4. Implications

- 4.1.** Implications of the performance data are:
- A focussed review of missed collection performance is being undertaken by SWP and will inform the way we manage our contract with Kier.
 - Implementation of the permit scheme at HWRCs continues to be monitored closely but appears to be having the desired impact
 - Further dialogue with Mendip District Council is required to understand why their flytipping performance is bucking the overall positive trend, but there is no evidence to suggest that this is a result of SWP's actions.

5. Background papers

- 5.1.** No background papers referenced for this report.