

APPENDIX D

Brief Summary of Discussions and Outcomes from the Phase 3 Evaluation Workshop

The focus of the workshop was to confirm the Service Delivery & Technical criteria and to determine their relative weightings.

Points made from the floor during the presentations.

- It is essential the 'sustainability' is high on the agenda for the evaluation process. The weightings must reflect this.
- Clarification was called for in respect of the legal responsibilities of the Council in discharging its functions under UK law, and those in terms of the relationship between the contracting authority and the contractor.
- It is important to ensure that the key service objectives of the contract align themselves with the Authorities sustainability objectives and policies.
- We must make the deliverability of legal requirements under UK law a key service objective.

Discussions/outcomes on the Level 1 Criteria

One group out of the 7 groups were unable to reach a consensus view on their relative weightings and therefore wanted the range of weightings noted and reported onwards.

Service Delivery and Technical Level 1 Criterion

Many groups felt that this was the most important aspect of the evaluation as this would be the area in which environmental issues are included. The range of weightings offered by the groups ranged from 62% to 90% for this criterion.

The average weighting was 73.9%.

Commercial & Financial, Legal & Contractual and Overall Project Integrity Level 1 Criteria

The remaining Level 1 criteria average weightings were as follows;

| | | |
|----------------------------|-------|---------------|
| Commercial and Financial: | 12.1% | Range 5 – 20% |
| Legal and Contractual: | 11.0% | Range 4 - 20% |
| Overall Project Integrity: | 3.0% | Range 0 - 5% |

Discussions/outcomes on the Level 2 Criteria for Service Delivery and Technical

In the afternoon session the focus was on establishing weightings for Level 2 criteria for the Service Delivery and Technical area.

The recommended Level 2 criteria were Environment and Sustainability, Targets, Management and Deliverability. Most groups considered that the Environment and Sustainability Level 2 criterion was the most important one, and as this had synergies with delivering Targets it was agreed amongst the stakeholders that these criteria should be combined.

Many groups felt that good management ought to be a 'given', within a Local Authority contract, anticipating that it would be demonstrated and delivered through appropriate management standards eg: ISO 14001.

The outcome of detailed discussions and analysis on these Level 2 criteria resulted in the following averages:

| | | |
|--|-------|----------------|
| Environment, Sustainability and Targets: | 65.1% | Range 50 - 80% |
| Deliverability & Flexibility: | 29.9% | Range 20 - 45% |
| Management: | 5.0% | Range 0 -10% |

At the close of the workshop participants were provided by email correspondence with suggested Level 2 sub-criteria ie: at level 3; and have been asked to review a list of recommended weightings at this level. It was emphasised that with any criteria, it was important to ensure that there is a means by which they can be measured.

The final outcomes of the stakeholder workshop will be incorporated into an Evaluation Criteria Framework. This is to be considered initially by the West of England Joint Scrutiny Committee on 23rd January 2009. Its views will then be relayed to the Joint Waste Management Committee on 12th February 2009 at which the JWMC will be asked to approve the Evaluation Criteria and draft OJEU Notice.

DW/SVG
14th January 2009