

## JOINT WASTE CONTRACT 2017: PRE-MARKET ENGAGEMENT JULY 2017

Six companies responded to the PME. Five are waste collection companies and one is a composting/bio-disposal company. Only the five collection company responses are provided in this summary.

Question	Company 1	Company 2	Company 3	Company 4	Company 5
What would be your general level of interest in bidding for a waste services contract? Have you delivered services of this nature across a partnership of authorities previously?					
What would be the ideal length of contract for delivery of these services? And your views on possible contract extension and how this is managed?	7-9 years (optimised for the life of the vehicles) - would be prepared to 'buy out' existing vehicles which could lengthen this time period. Extension to also align with vehicle life - suggested 4 year review and 'qualification' for next contract period.	Up to 10 years aligned with vehicle life, with extension of same period. Extension to involve consultation on both sides - suggestion that partners are able to extend independently.	10 years, mutually agreed option to extend.	10 years - aligned with vehicle life, with extension to match the initial term.	Minimum term of 8 years, with 2 potential extensions of 8 years.
What are your views on the ownership of With the contractor With the contractor the integrated IT system to support any Contract? Should this sit with the contractor, or with a designated Authority within the Partnership? What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of both approaches?	With the Contractor.	With the Contractor.	Use Whitespace, and this usually lies with Serco and appears to be preferred option.	With the Contractor (preferably able to use their own system).	With the Contractor.

Question	Company 1	Company 2	Company 3	Company 4	Company 5
What is your experience in delivery of a subscription Garden Waste Service? Some of the Authorities may levy a charge for this service. What would be your preference for managing this subscription/charging system – should this responsibility lie with the Contractor? Or individual Authorities? What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of both options.	Operate both, but preference is for the administration to sit solely with the contractor. (But would ideally want alignment of terms and conditions to deliver cost effectively).	Would like to run this <a href="http://www.greenwastecлуб.co.uk">www.greenwastecлуб.co.uk</a> , but Company 2 would like to price-set. However, would also be happy to deliver a GW service managed by the Councils.	No strong feelings either way, but if needed would typically establish a local customer services point for the purposes of local knowledge.	Authorities to handle calls and take payments, Company 4 to offer self-serve functionality.	Flexible either way, although if this is managed by contractor, and they do not also have responsibility for all Customer Service, then this will equate to additional cost.
What is your preferred approach to recycling ownership and risk within the contract? If responsibility for collection, transfer, bulking, haulage, MRF processing and final sale of recycling lay with the contractor, how would this affect contract pricing? Are you in favour of an income or profit share mechanism assigned to this aspect of the contract? Are there other approaches that could work? Please detail and explain the possible effects on contract pricing. What are your thoughts on separating out the ownership of recycling from the collection contract, with bulking, haulage and processing of recycling material handled through a separate contract?	Could possibly look at income and profit share, but would like it as a lot within the contract to allow access for specialist contractors.	Would prefer to see a separate contract for this. However, would be prepared to share risk on 50:50 if included with some other caveats.	Would like to see a separate contract for this. The materials ownership in the previous contract was the reason for withdrawal.	Will not bid if full risk is passed to the contractor. Preferred option would be a risk share 50:50.	Would like to manage the recyclable within the contract. Would want to share the risk.
In terms of roles and	Shared approach.	Shared approach.	Have a team of 8	Shared approach.	Would welcome the

Question	Company 1	Company 2	Company 3	Company 4	Company 5
responsibilities what are your views and experience regarding the Communications and Public Relations aspect of this Service and its management? At the commencement of a new contract there may be a service change requiring communication, advertising and promotion; what is your previous experience of how this has been handled?			marketing professionals so there is scope. Usually include a marketing budget in tender.		inclusion of this function within the contract.
What are your views regarding the Customer Service arrangements that support the Service, including the roles and responsibilities. Do you have any experience of delivery of this aspect of the Service in a similar contract? What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of this responsibility sitting with the contractor, or with individual Authorities?	Would like this to sit with the contractor, but other approaches can be accommodated.	Majority of contracts, stays with the districts, but they do operate a contact centre and consider that a contractor operated services brings advantages.	Should remain with the districts (although does operate a range of models).	Should remain with authorities.	Preferable to sit with contractor, particularly if contractor are managing GW service.
Should the contract be split into lots, how would your approach to tendering change? There are several options for different Council areas to be managed together or separately and for collection services and street cleansing services to be managed together or separately. We would welcome	As per Q5, not lots, exempt for recycling element.	Not in favour of lots.	Not in favour of lots.	Would like the split of lots to be main contract and a lot for processing and sale of materials and would be interested in bidding for both.	Not in favour of lots.

Question	Company 1	Company 2	Company 3	Company 4	Company 5
your thoughts on how this might affect pricing. How would costs be modelled where a partnership is made up of councils that are urban only and mixed urban/rural?					
What would be your minimum mobilisation period for a contract of this nature and size?	9 months.	Minimum 9 months.	Minimum 6 months.	Minimum 6 months.	6-9 months.
What would you see as the key challenges and risks in delivering on a contract of this nature and size?	Legal agreement at an early stage, People management and engagement, clear and accurate data, property matters, material management, finance of vehicle provision.	Recyclate price/income, service change and associated redundancy, indexation, property growth, container replacement, vehicle finance.	Clear baseline data, council to use tech experts in DD evaluation, TUPE, understanding of tourist economy, consistency and equality of service, practical and political obstacles, embracing financial and commercial opportunity.	Procurement of vehicles, contract award delay, Unsettled / dissatisfied employees, IT system not in place at service commencement, routes or schedules inaccurate or incomplete.	Productivity in rural areas, point of container collection in rural areas, household behaviour regarding container and recyclates presentation, availability of workforce, client interface: one point of contact for all authorities, robust data on households to be serviced, responsibility for materials collection and disposal, PMF, current workforce relationships and recognised TU relationships, availability and opening hours at waste/recyclable delivery points, uniform approach by authorities to

Question	Company 1	Company 2	Company 3	Company 4	Company 5
					specification and ICT and call centre integration, levels of training, capability, productivity.