

TO:

Your Ref /
Eich Cyf

Our Ref / Ein NG
Cyf

Date / Dyddiad 05/03/2009

Ask for / Gofynner am Graham Connah

Direct Dial / Rhif Union 01352 702336

Fax / Ffacs

Councillor Nancy Matthews, Councillor Patrick Heesom, Councillor Graham Rees, Councillor Michael Priestly, Councillor Eryl Williams, Councillor Julian Thompson-Hill, Councillor Arwell Pierce, Councillor W. G. Roberts, Councillor R. G. Parry and Councillor Goronwy Parry

Dear Sir / Madam,

A meeting of the **NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE** will be held in the **COUNCIL OFFICES, LLANGFNI, ISLE OF ANGELSEY** on **WEDNESDAY, 11 MARCH 2009** at **10:30** to consider the following items.

Yours faithfully



Assistant Director (Democratic Services)

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**
3. **PROJECT TEAM RECRUITMENT AND INTERIM PROJECT SUPPORT ARRANGEMENTS - (VERBAL) CE**
4. **PROGRESS UPDATE - (REPORT) NT**
5. **MOU - TRANSACTOR SUPPORT - (VERBAL) NT**
6. **PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT - WAG PO FEEDBACK - (VERBAL) NT**
7. **OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE - (VERBAL) NT**

County Hall, Mold. CH7 6NA
Tel. 01352 702400 DX 708591 Mold 4
www.flintshire.gov.uk
Neuadd y Sir, Yr Wyddgrug. CH7 6NR
Ffôn 01352 702400 DX 708591 Mold 4
www.siryfflint.gov.uk

8. **RECRUITMENT OF EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS - (REPORT) BD**
9. **INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT - (SEE ITEM 8) BD**
10. **FINANCE UPDATE - (REPORT) NT**
11. **NATIONAL UPDATE - REVISED RECYCLING TARGETS & FINANCIAL SUPPORT (FUTURE DIRECTIONS) - (REPORT) NT**
12. **RIR - RISK STATUS - (DOCUMENT) NT**
13. **FUTURE MEETING DATES - (VERBAL)**
14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS - (REPORT)**
AGENDA (CYMRAEG) - ADRODDIADAU AR GAEL
2. **CYMERADWYO'R COFNODION BLAENOROL**
- 8 + 9. **RECRIWTIO YMGYNGHORWYR ALLANOL - (ADRODDIAD) - BD**
11. **BWLETIN CENEDLAETHOL - TARGEDAU AILGYLCHU DIWYGIEDIG A CHEFNOGAETH ARIANNOL (CYFEIRIADAU'R DYFODOL) - (ADRODDIAD) - NT**
14. **UNRHYW FUSNES ARALL**



NWWTP

North Wales Waste Treatment Partnership

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2

Shadow Joint Committee

Wednesday, 10 December 2008
Bodlondeb, Conwy

PRESENT:

Councillor Eryl Williams (Chair)	Denbigh County Council
Councillor Graham Rees (Vice-Chair)	Conwy County Borough Council
Councillor Mike Priestley	Conwy County Borough Council
Councillor Patrick Heesom	Flintshire County Council
Councillor Richard Jones	Flintshire County Council
Councillor Richard Llewelyn Jones	Isle of Anglesey County Council
Councillor Arwel Pierce	Gwynedd County Council
Councillor Gareth Roberts	Gwynedd County Council
Councillor Robert. G. Parry	Isle of Anglesey County Council
Councillor Julian Thompson-Hill	Denbigh County Council

In attendance

Enid Roberts	Conwy County Borough Council
Andrew Kirkham	Conwy County Borough Council
Alwyn Evans	Conwy County Borough Council
Kerry Feather	Flintshire County Council
Barry Davies	Flintshire County Council
Nigel Trueman	Flintshire Council Council
Colin Everett	Flintshire County Council
Carl Longland	Flintshire County Council
Dewi Rowlands	Gwynedd County Council
Arthur Owen	Isle of Anglesey County Council
Geraint Edwards	Conwy County Borough Council

Apologies

Iwan Prys-Jones	Denbigh County Council
-----------------	------------------------

1. Introductions

All those present introduced themselves and explained their role on the Committee.

2. Minutes

The Minutes of the North Wales Waste Treatment Partnership meeting held on 16 November 2008 were approved as a correct record.

It was clarified that the cost of the first stage of the project would be £4 million.

It was noted that Councillor R. G. Parry had been in attendance at the meeting.



NWWTP

North Wales Waste Treatment Partnership

2. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) – Transactor Support/Release of Funding from WAG

The five Local Authorities had given their consent for their Chief Executive to sign the MOU and were all in receipt of the document. The first stage payment was awaited and WAG had formerly confirmed funding for the project.

3. Partnership Agreement

The final draft of the Partnership Agreement was circulated to the Committee. Each Council would have two representatives, with one vote, sitting on the Committee and were able to appoint deputies to attend in their absence; deputies would have the power to vote. The Committee would only be quorate if there was one Member from each Authority in attendance. Translation would be provided for each Committee meeting and agendas together with written reports would be circulated five working days before each meeting.

Comments and responses were made as follows:-

- All documentation should be circulated before the meeting from one source to avoid confusion.
- It was understood that there were a few minor typing errors in the Partnership Agreement and these would be corrected.
- The word 'Residual' had been omitted and this would be corrected.
- Once the Outline Business Case was agreed by each Authority the final Partnership Agreement would be signed by each Local Authority.

4. Inter Authority Agreement

Work on preparing the Inter Authority Agreement has begun. A draft will be presented to a future meeting of the Committee.

5. Communication Strategy

Flintshire would take the lead on communication and all press enquiries should be signposted to Flintshire. A background paper would be produced together with a statement and outline plan, which each Local Authority would use when briefing potential contractors. Regular Member briefings are also required. All documentation produced by the Partnership would need to have a common brand and typeface.

6. Project Team – Procurement Methodology, Recruitment Costs, Recruitment Timescales

A paper was circulated giving information relating to salary, timeframe and recruitment costs.

The salary was in accordance with advice from Partnerships UK and in-line with similar posts in Flintshire.



NWWTP

North Wales Waste Treatment Partnership

It was hoped that, if the advertisements ran in the press in mid-January 2009 and after interviews were held by the Panel, an offer would be made verbally to a prospective candidate by 19 February 2009.

The cost of recruitment was high at £21,262.04 as the cost of advertising in large broadsheets ran at around £7,000; it was vital to advertise nationally to ensure the highest calibre of candidates were reached.

The advert would state that a candidate with an understanding of local government and the ability to speak Welsh would be highly desirable.

AGREED – That the Procurement Methodology, Recruitment Costs and Recruitment Timescales be approved.

7. External Consultants – Options Appraisal, Anticipated Costs, Procurement Timescales.

A paper relating to the appointment of external consultants had been circulated to the Committee.

Methods of Procurement

The options together with the strengths and weaknesses were:-

1. Office of Government Commerce (OGC) Framework Agreements
 - Had the potential to reduce timescale to appoint as advisers on the framework had already prequalified.
 - There were a smaller number of potential bidders.
 - Maybe seen to 'Cherry-Pick' if bidders were selected from different OGC framework agreements.
 - Potentially reduce competition.
 - Still the need to run a completion to evidence 'Best Value'.
2. Official Union of the European Union (OJEU) Procurement Process
 - Greater competition.
 - Opened the contract out to a larger number of potential advisers.
 - Potentially increase timescale to appointment.
 - Need to decide procurement route.

The Committee agreed that Option 2 would be better at delivering best value.

Before moving forward with the Method of Procurement it was agreed that the legal representatives from each Authority discuss any legal issues and present them at the next meeting.

AGREED – That Option 2 of the Method of Procurement be approved.

ACTION – That internal procurement and legal advice be taken on the procurement route and be presented at the next meeting of the Committee.

Methods of Engagement

The options together with the strengths and weaknesses were:-



NWWTP

North Wales Waste Treatment Partnership

1. Appoint a single lead adviser who appointed others on a sub-consultant basis.
 - Single point of contact for delivery of all aspects of the required services.
 - Responsibility for delivering lay with the lead consultant – less risk of silos emerging.
 - Consultants would have established working relationships with financial and legal partners.
 - Would reduce the number of tender documents to evaluate.
 - Would give the advisers the opportunity to look at synergies across the range of advice being requested to deliver Value for Money.
 - Tender price may reflect issues associated with sub-contracting.
 - Lead consultant may select partners which did not have prior experience of complex procurement – so less choice for the contracting Authority.
 - May not achieve 'best-value' for individual elements of the overall work package. However, it was the overall price which would matter.
 - Harder to address performance issues with collaborative partners.
 - Preferred method of Partnership UK.

2. Invite a consortium of advisers to bid who were engaged on a joint and several basis.
 - Consultants would have established working relationships with Financial and Legal partners.
 - Gave the advisers the opportunities to look at synergies across the range of advice being requested to deliver value for money.
 - Required additional management of consultants by the Project Team.
 - Tender process required greater resource given likelihood that legal would bid separately.
 - Likely that legal advisers would need to be procured separately.

3. Procure all 3 separately.
 - Able to demonstrate 'best value' for individual work streams.
 - Could readily address performance issues with adviser.
 - Consortia able to terminate individual adviser, if necessary.
 - Advisers would need greater management to ensure silo effect was avoided.
 - Successful tenderers may have no previous experience of working together leading to delay and variations.
 - Increased number of tender documents to evaluate.
 - Greater emphasis on project team to identify all workstreams.

It was felt that Option 1 would be preferential as it would be easier to manage, and would give a single point of accountability; however, it was essential that evaluation criteria would have to be put in place to ensure value for money.

The specifications of the contract would need to be as tight as possible to ensure that variations, incurring additional costs, would be minimal.

Updates on the progression of the contract would be given to the Partnership on a regular basis.

AGREED – That Option 1 of the Method of Engagement be approved.



NWWTP

North Wales Waste Treatment Partnership

AGREED - That work would be undertaken by the Project Team to define fixed-priced packages for achieving specific milestones such as the OBC and elements within the procurement stage as accurately as possible to mitigate additional costs, but a schedule or rates would be requested to deal with variations.

Scope of Engagement

The options together with the strengths and weaknesses were:-

1. Appoint advisers for the OBC stage only and on completion of the OBC stage re-tender for the advice required during the procurement stage.
 - Gave the opportunity to re-price at the procurement stage based on clearer understanding of what was required at that stage.
 - Delay in timetable due to re-tendering at procurement stage.
 - Lack of competition at procurement stage, giving the detailed knowledge, and established working relationship incumbent at the OBC stage would have established.
2. Appoint advisers for both the OBC stage and the procurement stage at the outset.
 - Continuity of support.
 - Long-term contract should be more attractive to the market of advisers and enable the consortia to derive extra value.
 - Limits the risks of delay as a result of having to re-tender at the procurement stage.
 - Not a clear picture of what advice would be required during the procurement stage.

It was agreed that Option 2 would give continuity to the project and would attract the widest range of consultants.

AGREED – That Option 2 for the Scope of Engagement be approved.

8. National Update – Financial Support, Clarification of Targets.

There had been no commitment from WAG on subsidising combined 'gate fees' of the facility.

There was an issue with regard to re-balancing local allowance scheme and no decision had yet been made.

It was agreed that a summary of waste as a background document be produced to feed into the waste targets.

It was understood that food waste was taken out of the waste figures and facilities for anaerobic digestion could not be owned or operated by any of the Local Authorities.

Certain timescales had to be met in order to access the larger element of 22 million by 2011/12.



NWWTP

North Wales Waste Treatment Partnership

9. Risk and Issue Register

The Risk and Issue Register was circulated to the Committee and would be updated at the next meeting to take account of the signing of the Partnership Agreement.

It was suggested that a traffic light system to identify the risks be introduced.

AGREED – That the most up-to-date Risk and Issue Register be presented to the Committee at future meetings.

AGREED – That a traffic light system to identify the risks quickly be added to the document.

10. Forward Work Programme

Members of the Appointment Panel for the Project Director were requested to keep the 16 and 19 February 2009 free in their diary.

The next meeting would be held after the Project Director had been appointed.



NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE TREATMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS REPORT

Joint Committee

Date: 11th March 2009

Period: April 1st – June 30th 2009

Project Summary

To procure a sustainable waste management solution for the 5 local authorities in north Wales (Flintshire, Denbighshire, Conwy, Gwynedd and Isle of Anglesey) that will assist with the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from landfill and will minimise the tonnage of waste residue sent to landfill thus ensuring that the authorities avoid Landfill Allowance Scheme (LAS) infraction penalties

Progress since last update

- Joint Committee now fully constituted
- PID approved by WAG PO
- Outline Business Case (OBC) commenced by officers
- External consultants brief prepared by PUK

Project Status

Project status	
☹	The recruitment of the project team has been subject to delay due to the late withdrawal of a candidate for the post of Project Director. Approval for a change in strategy in the recruitment process will be sought from the JC in March. The recruitment of external advisors has been subject to further review following the allocation of Hazel Nickless as PUK advisor. Project Plan to be evaluated by LA Project Managers and baselined.

Budget status	
☺	Funding for the project team and supporting administrative functions yet to be received. Recruitment costs for the Project Director remained roughly in line with budget with the exception of the advert in the MJ which was approximately £2,250.00 in excess of that reported due to an increase in size. Total spend to date to reported at future meetings against budget profile.

Symbol	Meaning
☺	There are no problems; all is progressing well and to plan.
☹	There are some minor/less significant problems. Action is needed in some areas but other parts are progressing satisfactorily.
☹	There are significant problems and urgent and decisive action is needed



NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE TREATMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS REPORT

Project Update - Activities due for Completion January 1st to March 31st 2009

ID	Activity	RAG Status	Comments	Forecast
	Stage 1 funds (£75,000) uploaded from WAG PO	☺	PL8 form required completion. WAG PO confirmed upload 26 th Jan	Mar
51	PID Approved by WAG PO	☺	PID issued to WAG on 16 th Dec. Approved with comments 26 th Jan	19 th Jan
52	Stage 2 funds (£195,000) uploaded from WAG PO	☺	PL8 form required completion. WAG PO confirmed upload 26 th Jan	Mar
	Remote Document Management systems evaluated	☹	FCC procurement team confirming procurement	Mar
	Member Training Organised	☺	Further consideration led to a decision to undertake Member Training later in the Procurement Schedule	Apr 2009
54	Write Advertisement	☺	Completed	2 nd Jan
55	Approve Ad	☺	Completed	5 th Jan
56	Advert Placed	☺	Completed. Advert placed in MJ, Guardian & Daily Post	15 th Jan
57	Replies Received	☺	Closing date extended to 2 nd Feb 12 replies received long listed to 5	23 rd Jan
58	Interview Stage 1 (Project Board)	☹	4 candidates interviewed. Candidate withdrew terminating process	6 th Feb
59	Interview Stage 2 (Joint Committee)	☹	See ID 56	13 th Feb
60	Final Assessment	☹	See ID 56	19 th Feb
61	Verbal Offer	☹	See ID 56	20 th Feb
62	Determine Job Description, Salary Scale – Project Manager	☺	Completed in draft form	26 th Jan
63	Write Advertisement	☹	Recruitment of project team process subject to approval by joint Committee	1 st Feb



NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE TREATMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS REPORT

64	Approve Ad	☹️	Awaiting decision on 61. To be re-scheduled	12 th Feb
65	Advert Placed	☹️	Awaiting decision on 61. To be re-scheduled	24 th Feb
66	Replies Received	☹️	Awaiting decision on 61. To be re-scheduled	4 th Mar
67	Interview Stage 1 (Project Board)	☹️	Awaiting decision on 61. To be re-scheduled	18 th Mar
68	Interview Stage 2 (Joint Committee)	☹️	Awaiting decision on 61. To be re-scheduled	25 th Mar
69	Verbal Offer	☹️	Awaiting decision on 61. To be re-scheduled	26 th Mar

Reason for Changes:

51. The submission of the PID over the Christmas period delayed the provision of feedback

57. Due to the late availability of the advertisement it was determined that the application date be extended

59-61. Candidate withdrawal resulted in recruitment process being terminated

Project Update - Activities due for Completion April 1st – June 30th 2009

	Activity	RAG Status	Comments	Forecast
	Project plan to be baselined	☺️	Project plan to be reviewed by participating authorities and agreed prior to baselining.	Apr
	Inter Authority Agreement Completed	☺️	Legal consultants required to develop and complete this element of work	Jun
73	Prepare brief (technical, legal, financial)	☹️	Change in recruitment process requires authorisation. Briefs available from PUK for further development	1 st Apr
74	Place OJEU Advert for External Advisors	☺️		2 nd April
75	PQQ's distributed	☺️		3 rd April
76	PQQ's Returned	☺️		14 th May
77	Evaluate Bids	☺️	Bid team to be assembled to evaluate	21 st May



**NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE TREATMENT PARTNERSHIP
PROGRESS REPORT**

			technical, legal & Financial bids	
	OBC Strategic Case Sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 & 3.6 completed by waste officers	☺	Officer meetings scheduled, workstreams identified	Jun

Key Risks

Risk/Issue	Action	Owner
WAG waste management targets change	Re-profiling and affordability following each alteration	LA

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 11 MARCH 2009

REPORT OF: HEAD OF LEGAL & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

SUBJECT: RECRUITMENT OF EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS

1.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.01 To give consideration to the appointment of legal consultants separately from other specialist consultants for the procurement project.

2.00 BACKGROUND

2.01 At a meeting of the Shadow Joint Committee at Bodlondob on the 10 December 2008 consideration was given to the various options for the appointment of consultants to advise on the residual waste project. A general view was that all advisors should be procured jointly as a consortia with joint and separate liability.

2.02 The lawyers representing each of the five authorities on the Joint Committee have subsequently met to consider how best to develop an inter-parties agreement which will extend from the acceptance or refusal of the outline business case until the award of contract to the successful tenderer for residual waste treatment project. The consensus of the meeting which was advised by Hazel Nickless of Partnerships UK was that it would be preferable for the inter-parties agreement to be developed by a firm of external solicitors with significant expertise in major residual waste treatment contracts.

2.03 Advice was also given that, for the sake of consistency and continuity, the same solicitors who advise on the development of an inter-authorities agreement should also be the main legal advisor for the procurement exercise. Ms Nickless felt that a direct relationship with its outsourced legal advisors would be more beneficial to the Joint Committee than the provision of advice through intermediaries.

3.00 CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.01 Information has been sought in relation to the appointment of legal advisors for project work involving five local authorities in South Wales. They have recently undertaken a procurement exercise for external legal advice through the OGC catalyst route. Their external legal advisors are now in the process of preparing two inter-authorities agreements. The first to last from the publication of the OJEU notice for the project and lasting until the engagement of the successful contractor. The second one will encompass the period of the contract with the successful tenderer. It was recognised that it might well be that no contractor is appointed following the procurement exercise.
- 3.02 If the Joint Committee agreed then a procurement exercise could be undertaken through the OGC catalyst route seeking tenders from those firms on the list able to demonstrate significant experience in public law procurement, the competitive dialogue process and major residual waste management contracts. Firms could be asked to price for advice during the whole process but the appointment could be in stages so that there would be an opportunity to terminate in certain eventualities, e.g. if the Joint Committee were to be unhappy with the advice provided prior to the outline business case.
- 3.03 If the Joint Committee agree to procure external legal advisors, ahead of the appointment of the consortium, it is suggested that the costs arising out of the appointment can be resourced from the funds earmarked for the recruitment of specialist advisors.

4.00 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.01 That legal advisors be appointed through the OGC catalyst route for the development of inter-authorities agreement and to advise throughout the procurement process.
- 4.02 That the project board be given delegated authority to make all necessary arrangements for the recruitment process, including the appointment of legal advisors.
- 4.03 That the costs arising from the appointment be paid from the funds set aside for external advisors.

5.00 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.01 None at this stage as the recruitment of external legal advisors can be undertaken internally among the five authorities. The cost of the external legal advice arising from the appointment will be sourced from existing funds to be drawn down.

6.00 ANTI-POVERTY IMPACT

6.01 None

7.00 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

7.01 None in respect of this part of the exercise.

8.00 EQUALITIES IMPACT

8.01 Not applicable

9.00 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

9.01 The project will involve significant involvement of in house legal teams to support and inform the external solicitors appointed.

10.00 CONSULTATION REQUIRED

10.01 None

11.00 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

11.01 Partnerships UK

12.00 APPENDICES

12.01 None

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Background Documents:

None

Contact Officer for Background Documents:

Barry Davies, Head of Legal & Democratic Services
01352 702344, barry.davies@flintshire.gov.uk

Item	Budgeted	Actual
<i>Project Director Recruitment</i>		
1 Job design & Evaluation	£800.00	£800.00
Total costs of job evaluation	£800.00	£800.00
<i>Proposed Recruitment in Jan 09</i>		
2 Advert in Society Guardian (based on Quarter Page colour Ad)	£7,125.00	£7,068.75
3 Advert in Municipal Journal (based on Quarter Page colour Ad)	£2,850.00	£5,032.00
4 Advert in Daily Post (colour/bilingual)	£5,258.00	£6,005.40
5 Estimated Internet Advertising	£875.00	£875.00
6 Estimated Creative Ad Design Costs (Tribal)	£500.00	£500.00
7 Estimated Longlist Interview/Shortlist Assessment Days HR Consultancy Support Jan	£1,000.00	£1,000.00
8 Estimated Candidate Travel Costs	£500.00	£9.04
9 Estimated Total Recruitment Costs for Project Director	£18,108.00	£20,490.19
10 Estimated Administration Fee - Flintshire Support	£2,354.04	£2,663.73
Total Estimated Budget Required	£21,262.04	£23,953.92

[REDACTED] Invoices for these activities have yet to be received

Notes

- 3 The Advert for the MJ was increased in size from Qtr page mono to Half page colour.
- 6 Invoice yet to be received
- 7 Internal support costs currently being calculated
- 8 Activity over estimated

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 11 MARCH 2009

REPORT OF: INTERIM PROJECT MANAGER

SUBJECT: NATIONAL WASTE TARGETS

1.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.01 To update members on the revised Future Directions 2 paper and to provide context in relation to the impact on the North Wales Residual Waste Treatment Partnership.

2.00 BACKGROUND

2.01 On the 18th October 2007 the Welsh Assembly released the 'Future Directions' paper for consultation with both local and national government. The paper contained targets which outlined preferred targets for the management of municipal waste.

2.02 The initial consultation process has now concluded and this has resulted in a number of changes to the previously proposed municipal waste targets.

2.03 On 20th January 2009 the revised 'Future Directions 2' paper was issued to local and national government organisations for further consultation prior to a full public consultation later this year.

3.00 CONSIDERATIONS

3.01 Targets

For the purpose of clarity I have set out below the proposed targets in full, rather than identifying only those which have been subject to alteration. The original targets are shown in brackets.

Targets for each Local Authority	Targets for each target Year				
	2009/10	2012/13	2015/16	2019/20	2024/25
Dry Recycling	25%	52%	58%	64%	70%
Composting	15%				
Food & Kitchen Waste (Min %) as part of target above	-	(15%)	(15%)	(15%)	(15%)
		12%	14%	16%	18%
EfW (Maximum %) Net ¹ (Gross)	-	-	42%	36%	30%
Maximum amount of residual waste per inhabitant per annum	-	(-) 295 kg	(-) 258 kg	(-) 210 kg	150 kg
Maximum Level of Landfill	-	-	-	10%	5%
(A minimum efficiency target of between 60%-65% for EfW facilities).					
(A potential ban on land-spreading non-source separated treated municipal waste from 1st April 2016).					

It should be noted that the dry recycling and composting targets for the 2012/13 target year show no increase from the current 2009/10 target

(3.02 The minimum efficiency target for EfW type facilities effectively means the commissioning of Combined Heat Power (CHP) facilities in order to ensure the utilisation of the heat generated. CHP facilities need to be located within a maximum 2 mile radius of high pressure industry users and 7 miles from domestic properties. This places a further limitation on the suitability of sites.

3.03 The principal alterations are;

- A decrease in the percentage of food and kitchen waste collected from 15% to 12% (2012/13) and 14% (2015/16). Collection targets have increased to 16% (2019/20) and 18% (2024/25)
- From 1st April 2012 onwards it is proposed that incinerator / EfW bottom ash and beach cleansing wastes will be added as recyclates and will therefore have a positive impact on authorities' ability to attain recycling targets.
- The Energy from Waste (EfW) target has been modified on three counts :
 - i. the 'sharing' amongst the partnership of the percentage of waste permitted to be sent for treatment at EfW facilities.

¹ It has been assumed that approximately 20% of the total EfW input will be bottom ash.

- ii. the tapering of targets and
 - iii. the incorporation of 'bottom ash' as a recyclate enabling the percentage of waste to be sent for treatment to be increased, therefore reducing kerbside performance by the same percentage.
- The waste minimisation target (maximum amount of residual waste per inhabitant) has been expanded to include targets for 2012/13, 2015/16 and 2019/20. The target of 295kg per inhabitant per annum represents a reduction based upon 2006/07 population statistics of over 45%.
 - WAG has identified additional revenue funding from 2014/15 onwards which is specific to the contribution towards gate fee payment for EfW type facilities.
- 3.04 The revised food waste collection targets are based on assumptions of waste composition and not on robust data. Waste composition is an integral part of the work to be undertaken as part of the Outline Business Case (OBC) and can be used to assist waste recycling officers to identify those materials where participation or 'put-out' rates are lower.
- 3.05 WAG informed Authorities that consideration is being given to the re-profiling of LAS allowances for all 22 Authorities from 2010/11 onwards. The revised LAS targets had an overall benefit to the NWRWP though these targets are local and Conwy were adversely affected.
- 3.06 The Eumonia report, which informed the original Future Directions paper, identified that the proposed targets were only achievable with a number of economic and legislative powers in place. These included; statutory Pay As You Throw (PAYT) or Direct and Variable Chargeable (DVC), Producer responsibility and landfill charges in line with the Flanders region of Europe (approximately £130 per/tonne). These legislative powers have yet to be attained and the landfill tax escalator is not due for review until 2011. In the event that this supporting legislation is not obtained the recycling targets will require further consultation and may cause delays in the procurement program as further waste modeling is undertaken.

4.00 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.01 That Members approve the commissioning of localised waste composition analyses to inform WAG policy targets.
- 4.02 To continue to seek clarification on the Future Direction targets specifically in relation to food waste collection and re-base lining of local LAS targets.

- 4.03 To continue political dialogue with the Welsh Assembly in respect of issues associated with the introduction of mandatory PAYT, producer responsibility and landfill tax escalator and the impact on national targets in their absence.
- 4.04 To seek clarification on SWMG revenue allocations for non-EfW solutions and opportunities in relation to support where existing EfW facilities may be available to consortia prior to 2014/15.

5.00 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.01 None in direct relation to the revised targets. However, the Department for the Environment Sustainability & Housing (DESH) have secured revenue funding to assist the affordability of gate fees at EfW facilities. The funding has been made available from 2014/15 onwards.

6.00 ANTI-POVERTY IMPACT

- 6.01 None

7.00 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

- 7.01 Landfill waste produces landfill gases which contribute to global warming and have a significant negative impact upon the environment. The diversion of waste from landfill in line with WAG targets will have a positive impact on both the environment and CO2 emissions.

8.00 EQUALITIES IMPACT

- 8.01 Not applicable

9.00 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.01 None

10.00 CONSULTATION REQUIRED

- 10.01 None

11.00 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

- 11.01 None

12.00 APPENDICES

12.01 None

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Background Documents:

'Scoping New Municipal Waste Targets for Wales' (Eunomia Research & Consulting)

'Future Directions for Municipal Waste Management in Wales' (WAG)

Contact Officer for Background Documents:

Nigel Trueman
Interim Project Manager
01352 703120
Nigel_trueman@flintshire.gov.uk

Environmental Services: Bulky Collections Contract

Risk and Issues Register

A list of the threats to the success of the project and the action being taken to address these.

This document is only valid on the day it was produced and dated

Revisions etc.,

Revision Date	Version	Summary of Changes	Distributed
			Y/ N
17.02.09	V2.0	All risks scored. Removed (R5, P4) Revised (T2, T3)	

Approvals

This document requires the following approvals.

Name	Signature	Title	Date of Issue	Version

Distribution

This document has been distributed to:

Name	Title	Date of Issue	Version

Author: **N. Trueman**
E. Roberts
 Version: 2
 Revision No. 0
 Status **Draft**

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12
RIR

IDENTIFYING THE RISK or ISSUE						MANAGING THE RISK or ISSUE						
ID	Risk / Issue (i.e.: Threat to the Project)	Consequence	Current Assessment			How the risk will be managed and controlled				Impln Date	Review Date	Closure Date
			Impact	L'hood	Overall	Already in Place	Who is Managing	Not in Place (Proposed)	Who will Manage			
Resourcing - Staff / Advisors / Funding												
R1	Outstanding Team appointments	Project team under resourced leading to project slippage	3	2	6	Proposed team requirements		Authorities to nominate appropriate individuals and to backfill their posts				
R2	Unclear definition of responsibilities of the project team	Tasks not completed. Risks and issues not escalated.	3	1	3	Job Descriptions for key roles		Project structure with outline Job Descriptions included in PID				
R3	Lack of Budget profile leads to unexpected surplus	Surplus is absorbed and re-application required	3	2	6	PUK/WLGA investigating spend by discipline		Payments based on milestones. FO to be appointed to Project Team to specifically monitor the budget. Budget Profile to be established				
R4	Funding not Provided from Treasury	Project Delayed whilst costs are reduced or Project suspended	4	1	4							
R6	Consultants not appointed using correct procedures	Project delays whilst appointments challenged	4	1	4			Take advice from Procurement specialists and PUK				
					0							
Timescales												
T1	Multi-Authority Approach leads to protracted discussions to resolve issues	Consultancy costs increase. End date not met. LAS penalty risk increased.	3	3	9	Project Plan detailing timescales		Cabinet meeting dates to be obtained from participating Authorities for inclusion into the plan to assess impact. documentation distribution to be widened at discretion.				

T2	Planning Permission not granted at identified Sites	Project delayed whilst suitable sites are secured	5	3	15			Alternative Site(s) to be identified and prioritised in order of suitability. Planning Officer appointed to project team				
T3	Partner LA doesn't sign Inter Authority Agreement (IAA)	Project delayed whilst revisions are made to IAA document	3	2	6							
T4	Procurement delays lead to increased procurement costs	LA's seek additional funding or withdraw	3	3	9	Cabinet reports sought to extend finance as required beyond budget						
T5	Key Activities not identified in Project Plan	Potential for project to be delayed due to lack of resource or dependability issues	3	1	3	WAO and PUK experts to scrutinise Project documentation						
T6	WAG Policy changes affecting project (emissions/landfill diversion)	Project delayed whilst impact of change and mitigation measures determined	4	4	16							
T7	Environmental Activists seek to delay construction	Project/build potentially disrupted	3	3	9	Pro-Active Communication Plan & involvement of EA and HIA		Appointment of PR Consultants				
T8					0							
Procurement Process - Decision Making / Competition/Method Policy - National / Local Finance - Affordability/Budget												
P1	One of the Partner LA's withdraw during PQQ	New OJEU notice has to be placed	5	2	10	Procurement Agreement to be drafted to tie Authorities in to the PQQ procurement phase.		Comprehensive PID endorsed by all participating partners				
P2	Existing contracts and facilities prevent all participating authorities to utilise all elements of the proposed final solution	Payment made by authorities in duplication	2	2	4	Facilities paid for on a gate fee by use, not availability						

P3	LAS Risk for the contractor deters potential bidders	insufficient competition for contract	4	2	8			Authorities sign agreement guaranteeing landfill diversion targets, accepting penalty for failure to manage to targets.				
P5	Potential bidders do not bid due to the costs associated with Competitive Dialogue process	Reduced Competition on bid process	4	2	8			Contact companies expressing concern from the SMT to determine cost implications and review implications				
P6	Potential bidders do not bid due to the Risks being passed to the Contractor	Reduced Competition on bid process	4	2	8			Consideration given to removal of Risk to contractor as a variant bid				
P7	Potential bidders do not bid due to lack of cohesiveness of the Partnership	Reduced Competition on bid process	4	2	8	Partnership Agreement & Governance Arrangements drafted		All related documentation signed prior to PIN & OJEU				
P8	Potential bidders do not bid due to the prescriptive requirements	Reduced Competition on bid process	4	2	8	Procurement is 'Open' Technology						
P9	Cost of Contract too High	Project Re-tendered	4	4	16			Allow variants within the bid to remove elements to bring costs down				
P10	Variant bid and resultant funding arrangements are present in PQQ	PQQ evaluation period extended to accommodate variations and risks regarding funding	2	2	4	Financial assessment to be undertaken by consultancy						
P11	Decision of Contractor selection is not left solely with Lead Authority	Selection of Contractor is delayed due to multi-Authority Involvement (Cabinet Process)	4	3	12			Project Champions from participating Authorities shall evaluate the bid without disclosure to members/senior staff (GMWDA Model)				
P12	Solution offered is not technically viable	landfill diversion not obtained, LA's incur infraction penalties	5	2	10	LAS infraction fine passed to contractor. Technical viability scored within procurement documentation						
P13	Technological solutions offered are not commissionable within LAS infraction timescales	LA' s face infraction fines for additional landfill above allowance	4	4	16			Identification of intermediate solutions				

P14	Bids scored by inexperienced internal team	Solution selected is not the most advantageous tender and is open to challenge by unsuccessful bidders	4	3	12			Bid team selected by Project manager and PUK				
P15	Bids scored by external consultants	Solution selected does not meet local requirements and is not accepted by LAs	4	2	8			Bid team selected by Project manager and PUK				
P16	Officer(s) are perceived to have preconceived ideas of the 'best' solution	Lack of trust of bidder selection and solution selected	4	2	8			Bid team selected by Project manager and PUK. Agreed scoring criteria				
Specification - Ambiguity/Scope Creep Planning - Sites/Availability Communication Approvals												
S1	Mis-information to Members caused by differences in reports and documentation	Authorities working to different agendas/outcomes leading to a breakdown in the consortia	3	2	6			Communication protocol established to ensure consistency of message	PMO			
S2	RDF produced Cannot be sold	RDF is landfilled	4	2	8			Total solution to be added as a variant bid to ensure market. Consideration to producing PIN and OJEU notice for the procurement of RDF from FCC	AM			
S3	RDF quality not consistent due to inflow of residual	Purchaser of RDF rejects loads	4	2	8			Contractor to guarantee calorific value within tolerance limits. Scoring off PQQ to favour total solution				

S4	LA fails to supply required volumes of waste for treatment	Contractor invokes penalty clause to meet targets	4	3	12			Waste volumes set at minimum levels and monthly monitoring of waste arisings until contract sign to provide clarity.				
S5	Waste composition analysis not as Eunomia / AEA	Contractor unable to determine appropriate technology for treatment / EfW	2	3	6			Waste composition to be monitored during procurement and data shared at Competitive Dialogue to inform solution.				
S6	LA collection methodology leads to peaks and troughs of supply	treatment plant unable to cope with wide variance in volumes / composition	3	3	9			LA's sign LAA to ensure even flow of material to facilities as determined by the contract.				
S7	Potential bidders do not bid as volumes of waste are too small	Reduced Competition on bid process	4	2	8			Consider adding Commercial and Industrial waste to scope of project. Consider allowing bidders to be open to other contracts				
S8	WAG waste management targets change	Local Authorities will incur penalties regardless of this project	4	4	16			Consider delaying project until there is more certainty of targets. Consider medium term solution only. Consider maximising outcomes regardless of targets. Communicate the issue to WAG				
S9	Regional Waste Plan is in conflict with potential solutions	Reduced Competition on bid process	4	2	8			Ensure the Regional Waste Plan is endorsed as guidance only. Communicate the issue to WAG				

Definition of Risk

Likelihood	High	5 (W)	10 (W)	15 (M)	20 (M)	25 (M)	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center; gap: 10px;"> <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;">M Mitigate</div> <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;">W Watch</div> <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;">A Accept</div> </div>
	Medium / High	4 (W)	8 (W)	12 (M)	16 (M)	20 (M)	
	Medium	3 (A)	6 (W)	9 (W)	12 (M)	15 (M)	
	Low / Medium	2 (A)	4 (A)	6 (W)	8 (W)	10 (M)	
	Low	1 (A)	2 (A)	3 (A)	4 (W)	5 (W)	
		Low	Low / Medium	Medium	Medium / High	High	
		Impact					

Likelihood (probability of occurrence)

5	High	75% to 100%
4	Medium / High	50% to 75%
3	Medium	26% to 49%
2	Low / Medium	11% to 25%
1	Low	< 10%

Impact (affect on outcome)

5	High	Catastrophic
4	Medium / High	Critical
3	Medium	Concerning
2	Low / Medium	Marginal
1	Low	Negligible

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 11 MARCH 2009

REPORT OF: PROJECT MANAGEMENT LEAD

SUBJECT: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

1.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.01 To identify, and gain support for measures aimed at improving community engagement in the process being undertaken by the North Wales Residual Waste Partnership (NWRWP).

2.00 BACKGROUND

2.01 Historically, the development of new waste treatment facilities has been a contentious subject with local residents and other stakeholder groups. With the added pressure of limited time and mounting costs, local authorities cannot afford to go through lengthy planning appeals and must get the public engaged and involved as soon as possible. In the waste management industry, public engagement is now becoming standard practice and service delivery is more focused on the public as 'customers'. What can be done to make public engagement better and to ensure people understand the serious issues facing us in terms of waste treatment and disposal?

2.02 In order to overcome potential confrontation and develop productive dialogue and cooperation there is a need to ensure that the community has access to up to date, accurate information. Public involvement is an important element in any waste project from the very beginning and should continue up to and including the statutory process and throughout the duration of any facilities operating life.

2.03 The Community Engagement toolkit was produced for WAW in 2007. The toolkit provides full factual guidance document on how and when to consult key stakeholders in the planning and delivery of new waste management facilities. This guidance was produced as a result of a partnership between the Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA), Welsh Assembly Government (WAG), Environment Agency Wales (EAW) and Waste Awareness Wales (WAW).

- 2.04 However production of a toolkit alone is not enough and for LAs and other agencies to make the most of the wealth of material and information that has been produced it is essential that training is delivered. Training on the toolkit and the best ways to approach difficult and controversial service changes and planning applications will assist LAs, WAG and others through the difficult and challenging procurement and planning processes. The training on best practice will also reassure our communities that LAs are aware of their responsibilities on consultation and will engage appropriately and take account of local views and needs through the process.
- 2.05 In addition to the Community Engagement training, it is proposed NWRWP invites the Project Manager, and other key individuals, of the consortia in the South East ('Prosiect Gwyrdd') to present a briefing session of their experience and lessons learnt to date. Prosiect Gwyrdd is a similar project to the NWRWP based on a partnership of Caerphilly, Cardiff, Monmouthshire, Newport, and Vale of Glamorgan. This project is currently finalising their Outline Business Case (OBC). Creating an Outline Business Case is one of the next important steps of the NWRWP project.
- 2.06 Work is required to arrange this briefing session including selecting a date, booking a venue, preparing an agenda and identifying the attendance list.

3.00 CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.01 Waste Awareness Wales in partnership with Welsh Assembly Government (WAG), Environment Agency Wales (EAW) and the Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) wish to commission training to ensure Local Authorities and other agencies are appropriately skilled in consultation and communication through the procurement and commissioning of contentious waste facilities.
- 3.02 The primary aim is to provide a series of training days to a range of stakeholders so all understand their role in communications/consultation, understand best practice and are equipped to plan their communications strategy alongside their procurement programmes:
- To ensure that Local Authorities and relevant agencies understand and appreciate the need for best practice community engagement and consultation through the procurement, planning and commissioning of waste facilities – particularly food waste treatment and residual waste treatment.
 - To ensure that LAs and relevant agencies fully appreciate the different tools and techniques open to them for community engagement and consultation.
 - To enable LAs and relevant agencies to understand the different communication requirements through the various procurement stages e.g. project preparation, OJEU notice, planning etc.

- To ensure the training dovetails with training and advice being provided by the WAG Procurement Office on the procurement and quality assurance process.
- 3.03 Format & Delivery Model:
- introductory session for all target audiences.
 - separate session with waste cabinet members for them to appreciate their community leadership role and what consultation means through the procurement process
 - 2-3 day training for officers heavily involved in the AD and residual procurement programmes. This could either be in blocks or over a period of weeks.
- 3.04 It is proposed that the detailed training would be held on a regional basis – North, South West - Mid and South East.
- 3.05 The programme is intended to run across 2009 -10 with a possible extension for a further year should demand and success of the programme necessitate it.
- 3.06 It is essential that training is tailored to the needs of the audience. Particular groups are:
- Local Authority: Waste cabinet members; Planning cabinet members; Planning committee members; Waste procurement lead officers; Waste procurement project directors/project managers; Waste officers; Planning officers; Procurement officers; Consultation/engagement officers; Media/PR officers
 - Other relevant bodies: EA strategy and regulatory staff; CCW staff who would be involved in planning issues; WAG waste, procurement and DET (finding appropriate site) officials; WAW officers; PUK officers (working with WAG in Procurement Office)

4.00 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.01 That Members agree to stakeholders attending the Community Engagement training when it becomes available.
- 4.02 That Members agree to a briefing session by Prosiect Gwyrdd's Project Manager aimed for Members and Officers involved in the NWRWP, and other identified key stakeholders.
- 4.03 That Members support attendance at future training and briefing events that are relevant and appropriate to the NWRWP project.

5.00 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.01 Waste Awareness Wales: Cost of travel by attendees to a venue in north Wales

5.02 Prosiect Gwyrdd briefing: Travel, and potential accommodation cost of presenters travelling from Cardiff; cost of venue; cost of travel by attendees to a venue in north Wales. It is proposed that these costs be met from the RCAF monies assigned to the project management function.

6.00 ANTI-POVERTY IMPACT

6.01 None

7.00 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

7.01 Not applicable

8.00 EQUALITIES IMPACT

8.01 Not applicable

9.00 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

9.01 Member and Officer time to attend training and briefing events as appropriate.

10.00 CONSULTATION REQUIRED

10.01 NWRW Project Board

11.00 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

11.01 NWRW Project Board

12.00 APPENDICES

12.01 None

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Background Documents:

None

Contact Officer for Background Documents:

Not applicable

Barry Davies LL.B (Hons)
Solicitor/Cyfreithiwr
Head of Legal and Democratic Services
Pennaeth Gwasanaethau Cyfreithiol a
Democrataidd



At:

Councillor Nancy Matthews, Councillor Patrick Heesom, Councillor Graham Rees, Councillor Michael Priestly, Councillor Eryl Williams, Councillor Julian Thompson-Hill, Councillor Arwell Pierce, Councillor W. G. Roberts, Councillor R. G. Parry and Councillor Goronwy Parry

Your Ref / Eich
Cyf
Our Ref / Ein NG
Cyf
Date / Dyddiad 05/03/2009
Ask for / Graham Connah
Gofynner am
Direct Dial / 01352 702336
Rhif Union
Fax / Ffacs

Annwyl Syr / Fadam,

Cynhelir cyfarfod **PARTNERIAETH TRIN GWASTRAFF GOGLEDD CYMRU yn SIAMBR Y CYNGOR, LLANGEFNI, YNYS MON, DYDD MERCHER, 11 MAWRTH 2009 am 10:30 am** i drafod y materion canlynol.

Yr eiddoch yn gywir

Cyfarwyddwr Cynorthwyol (Gwasanaethau Democrataidd)

AGENDA

1. YMDDIHEURIADAU
2. CYMERADWYO'R COFNODION BLAENOROL
3. RECRIWTIO TIM Y PROSIECT A THREFNIADAU I GEFONOG'R PROSIECT DROS DRO - (LLAFAR) - CE
4. BWLETIN AR GYNNYDD - (ADRODDIAD) - NT
5. MOU - CEFNOGAETH I DRASWEITHREDU - (LLAFAR) - NT
6. DOGFEN GYCHWYNNOL Y PROSIECT - ADBORTH LICC (LLAFAR) - NT
7. ACHOS BUSNES BRAS - (LLAFAR) - NT
8. RECRIWTIO YMGYNGHORWYR ALLANOL - (ADRODDIAD) - BD
9. CYTUNDEB RHWNG AWDURDODAU - BD
10. BWLETIN ARIANNOL - (ADRODDIAD) - NT

11. **BWLETIN CENEDLAETHOL – TARGEDAU AILGYLCHU
DIWYGIEDIG A CHEFNOGAETH ARIANNOL (CYFEIRIADAU’R
DYFODOL) – (ADRODDIAD) - NT**
12. **RIR – STATWS RISG – (DOGFEN) – NT**
13. **DYDDIADAU CYFARFODYDD Y DYFODOL – (LLAFAR)**
14. **UNRHYW FUSNES ARALL**



PTGGC

Partneriaeth Trin Gwastraff Gogledd Cymru

EITEM AGENDA RHIF 2

Cydbwyllgor Cysgodol

Mercher, 10 Rhagfyr 2008
Bodlondeb, Conwy

PRESENNOL:

Cyng Eryl Williams (Cadeirydd)	Cyngor Sir Ddinbych
Cyng Graham Rees (Is-gadeirydd)	Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sir Conwy
Cyng Mike Priestley	Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sir Conwy
Cyng Patrick Heesom	Cyngor Sir y Fflint
Cyng Richard Jones	Cyngor Sir y Fflint
Cyng Richard Llewelyn Ll Jones	Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn
Cyng Arwel Pierce	Cyngor Sir Gwynedd
Cyng Gareth Roberts	Cyngor Sir Gwynedd
Cyng Robert. G. Parry	Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn
Cyng Julian Thompson-Hill	Cyngor Sir Ddinbych

Yn mynychu	
Enid Roberts	Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sir Conwy
Andrew Kirkham	Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sir Conwy
Alwyn Evans	Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sir Conwy
Kerry Feather	Cyngor Sir y Fflint
Barry Davies	Cyngor Sir y Fflint
Nigel Trueman	Cyngor Sir y Fflint
Colin Everett	Cyngor Sir y Fflint
Carl Longland	Cyngor Sir y Fflint
Dewi Rowlands	Cyngor Sir Gwynedd
Arthur Owen	Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn
Geraint Edwards	Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sir Conwy

Ymddiheuriadau	
Iwan Prys-Jones	Cyngor Sir Ddinbych

1. Cyflwyniadau

Cafwyd cyflwyniad personol gan bawb a oedd yn bresennol ac esboniwyd rôl pob un ar y Pwyllgor.

2. Cofnodion

Cymeradwywyd cofnodion Partneriaeth Trin Gwastraff Gogledd Cymru a gynhaliwyd ar 16 Tachwedd 2008 fel cofnod cywir.

Eglurwyd mai cost cymal cyntaf y prosiect fyddai £4 miliwn.

Nodwyd bod y Cyng R. G. Parry wedi mynychu'r cyfarfod.



2. Memorandwm Cyd-ddealltwriaeth (MC) - Cymorth/Rhyddhau Cyllid gan LICC

Roedd y pum Awdurdod Lleol wedi cydsynio i'w Prif Weithredwr Iofnodi'r MC ac roedd pob un wedi derbyn y ddogfen. Disgwylid y taliad cyntaf ac roedd LICC wedi cadarnhau cyllid i'r prosiect yn ffurfiol.

3. Cytundeb Partneriaeth

Dosbarthwyd drafft terfynol y Cytundeb Partneriaeth i'r Pwyllgor. Byddai gan bob Cyngor ddau gynrychiolydd, ag un bleidlais, yn sefyll ar y Pwyllgor a gallent benodi dirprwyon yn eu lle pe na baent yn bresennol, a allai fwrw pleidlais yn eu lle. Ni fyddai'r Pwyllgor ond yn gworwm petai un Aelod o bob Awdurdod yn mynychu. Byddai cyfieithu ar y pryd ym mhob cyfarfod o'r Pwyllgor a byddai'r agenda ac adroddiadau ysgrifenedig yn cael eu cylchredeg bum niwrnod cyn pob cyfarfod.

Cafwyd sylwadau ac ymatebion fel a ganlyn:-

- Dylid cylchredeg pob dogfen cyn y cyfarfod o un ffynhonnell er mwyn osgoi dryswch.
- Deallid bod rhai mân wallau teipio yn y Cytundeb Partneriaeth ac fe gâi'r rhain eu cywiro.
- Hepgorwyd y gair 'Gweddill' a byddai hyn yn cael ei gywiro.
- Unwaith bod cytundeb ar Achos Busnes Bras gan bob Awdurdod byddai pob Awdurdod Lleol yn arwyddo'r Cytundeb Partneriaeth terfynol.

4. Cytundeb Rhwng Awdurdodau

Cychwynwyd y gwaith o baratoi'r Cytundeb Rhwng Awdurdodau. Bydd drafft yn cael ei gyflwyno i gyfarfod o'r Pwyllgor yn y dyfodol.

5. Strategaeth Gyfathrebu

Byddai Sir y Fflint yn arwain ar gyfathrebu a dylid cyfeirio pob ymholiad gan y wasg at Sir y Fflint. Byddai papur cefndir yn cael ei gyhoeddi ynghyd â datganiad ac amlinelliad y byddai pob Awdurdod Lleol yn eu defnyddio wrth friffio darpar gontractwyr. Roedd angen sesiynau briffio rheolaidd i Aelodau hefyd. Byddai angen i bob dogfen a gynhyrchir gan y Bartneriaeth fod ar yr un diwyg a defnyddio'r un teip.

6. Tîm y Prosiect - Methodoleg Caffael, Costau Recriwtio, Amserlenni Recriwtio

Dosbarthwyd papur yn rhoi gwybodaeth am gyflog, amserlen a chostau recriwtio.

Roedd y cyflog yn unol â chynngor gan Partnerships UK ac yn gyson â swyddi eraill yn Sir y Fflint.

Petai'r swyddi'n ymddangos yn y wasg yng nghanol Ionawr 2009 ac yn sgil cynnal cyfweiliadau gan y Panel, y gobaith oedd y gellid gwneud cynnig llafar ar unwaith i ddarpar ymgeisydd erbyn 19 Chwefror 2009.



PTGGC

Partneriaeth Trin Gwastraff Gogledd Cymru

Roedd cost recriwtio'n uchel, ar £21,262.04 am fod cost hysbysebu yn y papurau mawr tua £7,000; roedd yn hollbwysig hysbysebu'n genedlaethol er mwyn sicrhau cyrraedd ymgeiswyr o'r ansawdd uchaf.

Byddai'r hysbyseb yn dweud y byddai ymgeisydd sydd â dealltwriaeth o lywodraeth leol a'r gallu i siarad Cymraeg yn ddymunol iawn.

CYTUNWYD - Cymeradwyo'r Fethodoleg Caffael, Costau Recriwtio, Amserlenni Recriwtio.

7. Ymgynghorwyr Allanol - Gwerthuso Opsiynau, Costau a Ragwelir, Amserlenni Caffael

Dosbarthwyd papur am benodi cynghorwyr allanol i'r Pwyllgor.

Dulliau Caffael

Yr opsiynau ynghyd â'r cryfderau a'r gwendidau oedd:-

1. Cytundebau Fframwaith Swyddfa Fasnach y Llywodraeth (OGC)
 - Yn meddu ar y potensial i leihau'r amserlen ar gyfer penodi cynghorwyr ar y fframwaith.
 - Roedd nifer llai o ddarpar gynigwyr.
 - Efallai y creir argraff o 'ddewis a dethol' petai cynigwyr yn cael eu dewis o wahanol gytundebau fframwaith.
 - Potensial i leihau cystadleuaeth.
 - Angen o hyd i ddangos tystiolaeth o 'Werth Gorau'.
2. Undeb Swyddogol o Broses Gaffael yr Undeb Ewropeaidd (OJEU)
 - Rhagor o gystadleuaeth.
 - Yn agor y contract i nifer uwch o ymgynghorwyr potensial.
 - Potensial i estyn yr amserlen cyn penodi.
 - Angen i benderfynu ar y dull caffael.

Cytunodd y Pwyllgor y byddai Opsiwn 2 yn well o ran rhoi'r gwerth gorau.

Cyn symud ymlaen gyda'r Dull Caffael cytunwyd y byddai'r cynrychiolwyr cyfreithiol o bob Awdurdod yn trafod unrhyw faterion cyfreithiol a'u cyflwyno yn y cyfarfod nesaf

CYTUNWYD – Cymeradwyo Opsiwn 2 o'r Dull Caffael.

GWEITHRED – Derbyn caffael mewnol a cheisio cyngor cyfreithiol ar y dull caffael i'w gyflwyno yng nghyfarfod nesaf y Pwyllgor.

Dulliau Cyswllt

Yr opsiynau ynghyd â'r cryfderau a'r gwendidau oedd:-

1. Penodi un prif ymgynghorydd sy'n penodi eraill ar gontractau.
 - Un man cyswllt ar gyfer darparu pob agwedd ar y gwasanaethau gofynnol.
 - Eiddo'r prif gynghorydd fyddai'r cyfrifoldeb – llai o risg creu 'silo'.
 - Byddai gan ymgynghorwyr berthynas broffesiynol sefydlog gyda phartneriaid cyfreithiol ac ariannol.
 - Byddai'n lleihau nifer y dogfennau tendro sydd i gael eu gwerthuso.



PTGGC

Partneriaeth Trin Gwastraff Gogledd Cymru

- Byddai'n rhoi cyfleoedd i'r cynghorwyr ystyried synergedd ar draws ystod o gyngor er mwyn rhoi gwerth am arian.
 - Gall pris y tendr adlewyrchu materion yn ymwneud ag is-gontractio.
 - Gall y prif ymgynghorydd ddewis partneriaid sydd heb brofiad blaenorol o gaffael cymhleth - felly llai o ddewis i'r Awdurdod sy'n contractio.
 - Efallai na chweir 'gwerth gorau' am yr elfennau unigol yn y pecyn gwaith. Fodd bynnag, y pris terfynol fyddai'r peth pwysig.
 - Anos trafod materion perfformiad gyda phartneriaid sy'n cydweithio.
 - Hoff ddull Partnership UK.
2. Gwahodd consortiwm o ymgynghorwyr a oedd yn cael eu defnyddio ar y cyd ac ar wahân.
- Byddai gan gynghorwyr berthynas broffesiynol sefydledig gyda phartneriaid Cyllidol a Chyfreithiol.
 - Yn rhoi cyfleoedd i'r cynghorwyr ystyried synergedd ar draws ystod o gyngor er mwyn rhoi gwerth am arian.
 - Yn gofyn rheoli ychwanegol ar ymgynghorwyr gan Dîm y Prosiect.
 - Roedd tendro'n gofyn am ragor o adnoddau o gofio'r tebygolrwydd y byddai'r cynnig cyfreithiol yn gynnig ar wahân.
 - Yn debygol y byddai angen eisio cynigwyr cyfreithiol ar wahân.
3. Caffael y 3 ar wahân.
- Gallai ddangos 'gwerth gorau' y llifoedd gwaith unigol.
 - Gallai drafod materion perfformiad yn rhwydd gyda'r ymgynghorydd.
 - Gallai consortia derfynu contract ymgynghorydd unigol, petai angen.
 - Byddai angen rheoli helaethach ar ymgynghorwyr er mwyn osgoi effaith y 'silo'.
 - Mae'n bosibl na fydd gan y rhai sy'n llwyddo gyda'r tendr brofiad blaenorol o gydweithio, gan olygu oedi ac amrywiadau.
 - Cynnydd yn nifer y dogfennau tendr i'w gwerthuso.
 - Mwy o bwyslais ar dîm y prosiect i adnabod yr holl lifoedd gwaith.

Teimlid y byddai Opsiwn 1 yn well am y byddai'n haws ei reoli, ac am y byddai'n cynnig un ffynhonnell o atebolrwydd; fodd bynnag, roedd yn hanfodol bod meini prawf gwerthuso yn eu lle er mwyn sicrhau gwerth am arian.

Byddai angen i fanylebau'r contract fod mor dynn â phosibl er mwyn sicrhau lleihau amrywiadau - a chostau ychwanegol yn eu sgil - i'r eithaf.

Byddai'r Bartneriaeth yn derbyn bwletinâu ar gynydd y contract yn rheolaidd.

CYTUNWYD – Cymeradwyo Opsiwn 1 o'r Dull Cyswllt.

CYTUNWYD - y byddai gwaith yn cael ei wneud gan Dîm y Prosiect i adnabod pecynnau pris gosod ar gyfer cyrraedd cerrig milltir penodol megis yr ABB ac elfennau yn y cymal caffael mor gywir ag y bo modd er mwyn osgoi costau ychwanegol, ond gofyn am atodlen neu gyfraddau i gymryd amrywiadau i ystyriaeth.

Cwmpas yr Ymwneud

Yr opsiynau ynghyd â'u cryfderau a'u gwendidau oedd:-

1. Penodi cynghorwyr ar gyfer yr ABB yn unig ac yn sgil yr ABB gwneud tendr newydd am y cyngor gofynnol yn ystod y cymal caffael.



PTGGC

Partneriaeth Trin Gwastraff Gogledd Cymru

- Yn creu cyfle i ailbrasio yn ystod y cymal caffael yn seiliedig ar ddealltwriaeth gliriach o'r hyn sy'n ofynnol yn ystod y cymal hwnnw.
 - Oedi yn yr amserlen oherwydd ail-dendro yn ystod y cymal caffael.
 - Diffyg cystadleuaeth yn ystod y cymal caffael, yn rhoi gwybodaeth fanwl, a fyddai wedi sefydlu'r berthynas sy'n ofynnol yn y cymal ABB.
2. Penodi ymgynghorwyr ar gyfer y cymal ABB a'r cymal caffael o'r cychwyn.
- Dilyniant cefnogaeth.
 - Dylai contract hirdymor fod yn fwy atyniadol i'r ymgynghorwyr gan alluogi'r consortia i gael gwerth ychwanegol.
 - Yn lleihau risg oedi oherwydd gorfod gwneud tendr arall yn ystod y cymal caffael.
 - Nid yw'n rhoi darlun clir o'r cyngor a fyddai'n ofynnol yn ystod y cymal caffael.

Cytunwyd y byddai Opsiwn 2 yn gwneud y prosiect yn fwy cydlynol ac y byddai'n denu'r nifer mwyaf o ymgynghorwyr.

CYTUNWYD – Cymeradwyo Opsiwn 2 ar Gwmpas yr Ymwneud.

8. Bwletin Cenedlaethol - Cefnogaeth Ariannol, Egluro Targedau

Nid oedd ymrwymiad wedi bod gan LICC o ran rhoi cymhorthdal ar gyfer 'ffioedd mynediad' i'r cyfleustra.

Roedd anhawster o ran ail-gydbwysu cynlluniau lwfansau lleol ac nid oedd penderfyniad wedi bod eto.

Cytunwyd y dylid cyflwyno crynodeb o wastraff fel dogfen gefndir i ategu'r targedau ar wastraff.

Deallid bod gwastraff bwyd wedi cael ei ddileu o'r ffigurau gwastraff ac na allai'r un o'r Awdurdodau Lleol fod yn berchen ar y cyfleusterau treulio anerobig na'u rhedeg.

Roedd rai cyrraedd rhai terfynau amser er mwyn cael derbyn yr elfen fwyaf o 22 miliwn erbyn 2011/12.

9. Cofrestr Risgiau a Materion

Dosbarthwyd y Gofrestr Risgiau a Materion i'r Pwyllgor ac fe gâi ei diweddarau yn y cyfarfod nesaf i ymgymryd i ystyriaeth arwyddo'r Cytundeb Partneriaeth.

Awgrymwyd y dylid cyflwyno system goleuadau traffig i adnabod y risgiau.

CYTUNWYD – Y dylid cyflwyno'r Gofrestr Risg a Materion fwyaf diweddar i'r Pwyllgor mewn cyfarfodydd yn y dyfodol.

CYTUNWYD – Y dylid ychwanegu system goleuadau traffig i adnabod y risgiau at y ddogfen yn fuan.



10. Rhaglen Waith y Dyfodol

Gofynnwyd i aelodau'r Panel Penodiadau gadw 16 a 19 Chwefror yn rhydd yn eu dyddiaduron.

Cynhelir y cyfarfod nesaf wedi i'r Cyfarwyddwr Prosiectau gael ei benodi.

CYNGOR SIR Y FFLINT

ADRODDIAD I: **GYD-BWYLLGOR GWASTRAFF GWEDDILLOL GOGLEDD CYMRU**

DYDDIAD: **11 MAWRTH 2009**

ADRODDIAD: **PENNAETH GWASANAETHAU CYFREITHIOL A DEMOCRATAIDD**

PWNC: **RECRIWTIO YMGYNGHORWYR ALLANOL**

1.00 PWRPAS YR ADRODDIAD

1.01 Rhoi ystyriaeth i benodiad ymgynghorwyr cyfreithiol ar wahân i ymgynghorwyr arbenigol eraill ar gyfer y prosiect caffael.

2.00 CEFNDIR

2.01 Mewn cyfarfod o'r Cyd-Bwyllgor Cysgodol ym Modlondeb ar y 10 Rhagfyr 2008 rhoddwyd ystyriaeth i'r amrywiol opsiynau ar gyfer penodi ymgynghorwyr i gynghori ar y prosiect gwastraff gweddillol. Y farn gyffredinol oedd y dylid caffael pob ymgynghorydd ar y cyd fel consortia gydag atebolwydd ar y cyd ac ar wahân.

2.02 Mae'r cyfreithwyr sy'n cynrychioli pob un o'r pum awdurdod ar y Cyd-Bwyllgor wedi cyfarfod ar ôl hynny i ystyried sut orau i ddatblygu cytundeb rhwng y partïon a fydd yn ymestyn o dderbyn neu wrthod yr achos busnes amlinellol hyd nes caiff y contract ei ddyfarnu i'r tendrwr llwyddiannus ar gyfer y prosiect trin gwastraff gweddillol. Consensws y cyfarfod, a gynghorwyd gan Hazel Nickless o Partnerships UK, oedd y byddai'n well i'r cytundeb rhwng y partïon gael ei ddatblygu gan gwmni o gyfreithwyr allanol gydag arbenigedd sylweddol mewn contractau trin gwastraff gweddillol mawr.

2.03 Rhoddwyd cyngor hefyd, er mwyn cysondeb a pharhad, y dylai'r un cyfreithwyr sy'n cynghori ar ddatblygu cytundeb rhwng yr awdurdodau fod yn brif ymgynghorydd cyfreithiol ar gyfer yr ymarferiad caffael hefyd. Teimlai Ms Nickless y byddai perthynas uniongyrchol â'i ymgynghorwyr cyfreithiol ar gontract allanol yn fwy buddiol i'r Cyd-Bwyllgor na darparu cyngor drwy gyfryngwyr.

3.00 YSTYRIAETHAU

- 3.01 Gofynnwyd am wybodaeth mewn perthynas â phenodi ymgynghorwyr cyfreithiol ar gyfer gwaith prosiect sydd a wnelo â phum awdurdod lleol yn Ne Cymru. Maent wedi ymgymryd ag ymarferiad caffael yn ddiweddar ar gyfer cyngor cyfreithiol allanol drwy lwybr catalydd Swyddfa Masnach y Llywodraeth (OGC). Mae'u hymgyngorwyr cyfreithiol allanol wrthi'n awr yn paratoi dau gytundeb rhwng yr awdurdodau. Bydd yr un cyntaf ar gyfer y cyfnod o gyhoeddi hysbysiad yr OJEU ar gyfer y prosiect hyd nes y cyflogir y contractwr llwyddiannus. Bydd yr ail un yn cwmpasu cyfnod y contract gyda'r tendrwr llwyddiannus. Cydnabuwyd y gallai'n hawdd fod na chaiff contractwr ei benodi yn dilyn yr ymarferiad caffael.
- 3.02 Os yw'r Cyd-Bwyllgor yn cytuno yna gellid ymgymryd ag ymarferiad caffael drwy lwybr catalydd yr OGC yn gofyn am dendrau gan y cwmnïau hynny ar y rhestr sy'n gallu dangos profiad sylweddol mewn caffael y gyfraith gyhoeddus, y broses ddialog cystadleuol a chontractau rheoli gwastraff gweddillol mawr. Gellid gofyn i gwmnïau roi pris am gyngor yn ystod y broses gyfan ond gallai'r penodiad fod fesul cam fel y byddai cyfle i derfynu os digwydd rhai pethau, e.e. petai'r Cyd-Bwyllgor yn anfodlon gyda'r cyngor a ddarparwyd cyn yr achos busnes amlinellol.
- 3.03 Os yw'r Cyd-Bwyllgor yn cytuno i gaffael ymgynghorwyr cyfreithiol allanol, o flaen llaw i benodi'r consortiwm, awgrymir y gellir darparu'r adnoddau ar gyfer y costau sy'n codi o'r penodiad o'r arian a glustnodwyd ar gyfer recriwtio ymgynghorwyr arbenigol.

4.00 ARGYMHELLION

- 4.01 Bod ymgynghorwyr cyfreithiol i'w penodi drwy lwybr catalydd yr OGC ar gyfer datblygu cytundeb rhwng yr awdurdodau ac i gynghori trwy gydol y broses gaffael.
- 4.02 Bod bwrdd y prosiect i dderbyn awdurdod dirprwyedig i wneud yr holl drefniadau angenrheidiol ar gyfer y broses recriwtio, yn cynnwys penodi ymgynghorwyr cyfreithiol.
- 4.03 Bod y costau sy'n codi o'r penodiad i'w talu o'r arian a neilltuwyd ar gyfer ymgynghorwyr allanol.

5.00 GOBLYGIADAU ARIANNOL

- 5.01 Dim ar hyn o bryd gan fod modd ymgymryd â recriwtio ymgynghorwyr cyfreithiol allanol yn fewnol ymhlith y pum awdurdod. Byddir yn darparu'r adnoddau ar gyfer cost y cyngor cyfreithiol allanol sy'n codi o'r penodiad o'r arian sydd mewn bod i'w dynnu i lawr.

6.00 EFFAITH GWRTHDLODI

6.01 Dim

7.00 EFFAITH AMGYLCHEDDOL

7.01 Dim mewn perthynas â'r rhan yma o'r ymarferiad.

8.00 EFFAITH CYDRADDOLDEB

8.01 Ddim yn berthnasol

9.00 GOBLYGIADAU PERSONÉL

9.01 Bydd y prosiect yn golygu cyfranogiad sylweddol timau cyfreithiol mewnol i gefnogi a chyfarwyddo'r cyfreithwyr allanol a benodir.

10.00 YMGYNGHORI SYDD EI ANGEN

10.01 Dim

11.00 YMGYNGHORI A WNAED

11.01 Partnerships UK

12.00 ATODIADAU

12.01 Dim

DEDDF LLYWODRAETH LEOL (MYNEDIAD AT WYBODAETH) 1985

Dogfennau Cefndir:

Dim

Swyddog Cyswllt ar gyfer Dogfennau Cefndir:

Barry Davies, Pennaeth Gwasanaethau Cyfreithiol a Democraidaidd
01352 702344, barry.davies@flintshire.gov.uk

CYNGOR SIR Y FFLINT

ADRODDIAD I: CYDBWYLLGOR GWASTRAFF DROS BEN GOGLEDD CYMRU

DYDDIAD: 11 MAWRTH 2009

ADRODDIAD GAN:RHEOLWR DROS DRO'R PROSIECT

PWNC: TARGEDAU GWASTRAFF CENEDLAETHOL

1.00 PWRPAS YR ADRODDIAD

1.01 Hysbysu aelodau am bapur diwygiedig Cyfeiriadau'r Dyfodol 2 a chreu cyd-destun i'r effaith ar Bartneriaeth Trin Gwastraff Dros Ben Gogledd Cymru.

2.00 CEFNDIR

2.01 AR 18 Hydref 2007 rhyddhaodd Cynulliad Cymru'r papur 'Cyfeiriadau'r Dyfodol' i ymgynghori arno gyda llywodraeth leol a chenedlaethol. Cynhwysai'r papur dargedau yn amlinellu'r targedau dymunol o ran rheoli gwastraff y bwrdeistrefi.

2.02 Daeth yr ymgynghoriad i ben erbyn hyn ac mae hyn wedi arwain at sawl newid i'r targedau o ran rheoli gwastraff y bwrdeistrefi a gynigiwyd yn wreiddiol.

2.03 Ar 20 Ionawr 2009 rhyddhawyd y papur diwygiedig 'Cyfeiriadau'r Dyfodol 2' i sefydliadau llywodraeth leol a chenedlaethol i ymgynghori ymhellach arno cyn cynnal ymgynghoriad cyhoeddus llawn yn ddiweddarach eleni.

3.00 YSTYRIAETHAU

3.01 Targedau

Yn enw eglurder rwyg yn amlinellu'r targedau a gynigir yn llawn isod, yn hytrach na nodi dim ond y rhai sydd wedi cael eu newid. Dangosir y targedau gwreiddiol mewn cromfachau.

Targedau i bob Awdurdod Lleol	Targedau bob Blwyddyn				
	2009/10	2012/13	2015/16	2019/20	2024/25
Ailgylchu Sych	25%	52%	58%	64%	70%
Compostio	15%				
Gwastraff Bwyd a Cheginau (Lleiafswm %) fel rhan o'r targed uchod	-	(15%)	(15%)	(15%)	(15%)
		12%	14%	16%	18%
YoW (Uchafswm %) Net ¹ (Gros)	-	-	42%	36%	30%
Uchafswm maint y gwastraff dros ben am bob preswlydd bob blwyddyn	-	(-) 295 kg	(-) 258 kg	(-) 210 kg	150 kg
Lefel Uchaf Tirlenwi	-	-	-	10%	5%
(Targed lleiafswm effeithlonrwydd o 60%-65% ar gyfer cyfleusterau YoW).					
(Gwaharddiad potensial ar wastraff gan fwrdeistrefi a drinnir, a wahenir ac ar daenir ar dir o 1 Ebrill 2016).					

Dylid nodi nad yw'r targedau ailgylchu sych a chompostio ar gyfer y flwyddyn darged 2012/13 yn uwch na'r targed ar gyfer 2009/10

(3.02 Mae'r targed effeithlonrwydd lleiaf ar gyfer cyfleusterau YoW yn golygu'n ymarferol fod gofyn comisiynu cyfleusterau Gwres Pŵer Cyfun (GPC) er mwyn defnyddio'r gwres a gynhyrchir. Rhaid lleoli cyfleusterau GPC ddwy filltir ar y mwyaf i ddefnyddwyr diwydiannol pwysedd uchel a 7 i eiddo domestig. Mae hyn yn cyfyngu ymhellach ar safleoedd addas.

3.03 Y prif newidiadau yw:

- Lleihad yng nghanran y gwastraff bwyd a chegin a gesglir gan 15% i 12% (2012/13) a 14% (2015/16). Mae targedau casglu wedi codi i 16% (2019/20) a 18% (2024/25)
- O 1 Ebrill 2012 ymlaen cynigir ychwanegu gwastraff llosgyddion / lludw gwastraff a charthion glanhau traethau YoW fel deunydd a ailgylchir a bydd hyn felly'n cael effaith gadarnhaol ar allu awdurdodau i gyrraedd targedau ailgylchu.
- Addaswyd y targed Ynni o Wastraff (YoW) dan dri phen:

¹ Cymerswyd y bydd tua 20% o gyfanswm y mewnbwn YoW yn lludw gwaelod.

- i. rhannu ymhlith y bartneriaeth gyfran o'r gwastraff y caniateir iddo gael ei anfon i'w drin at gyfleusterau YoW
 - ii. blaenllymu targedau ac
 - iii. ymgorffori 'lludw gwaelod' fel deunydd ailgylchir gan gynyddu canran y gwastraff y gellir ei anfon i'w drin gan leihau casglu gwastraff o fin y ffordd i'r un graddau.
- Ehangwyd y targed lleihau gwastraff (sef uchafswm y gwastraff dros ben i bob preswlydd) i gynnwys targedau ar gyfer 2012/13, 2015/16 a 2019/20. Mae'r targed o 295kg am bob preswlydd bob blwyddyn yn golygu lleihad o dros 45% yn seiliedig ar ystadegau poblogaeth yn 2006/07
 - Mae CLIC wedi clustnodi gwariant refeniw ychwanegol o 2014/15 ymlaen sy'n gyfraniad penodol at ffioedd mynediad i gyfleusterau YoW.
- 3.04 Mae'r targedau diwygiedig o ran casglu gwastraff bwyd yn seiliedig ar dybiau am gyfansoddiad y gwastraff ac nid ar ddata cadarn. Mae cyfansoddiad y gwastraff yn rhan annatod o'r gwaith sydd i gael ei wneud fel rhan o'r Achos Busnes Bras (ABB) a gellir ei ddefnyddio i gynorthwyo swyddogion ailgylchu gwastraff i adnabod y defnyddiau hynny lle mae cyfraddau cyfranogi neu 'adael' yn is.
- 3.05 Hysbysodd LICC Awdurdodau Lleol ei bod yn ystyried creu proffil newydd i lwfansau LAS i bob un o'r 22 o Awdurdodau Lleol o 2010/11 ymlaen. Roedd y targedau diwygiedig o fudd cyffredin i'r NWRWP er mai targedau lleol yw'r rhain a gafodd effaith andwyol ar Gonwy.
- 3.06 Nododd adroddiad Eumonia, a ategai'r papur Cyfeiriadau Newydd gwreiddiol, nad oedd modd cyrraedd y targedau a argymhellir ond trwy roi nifer o bwerau economaidd a deddfwriaethol yn eu lle. Yn eu plith caed: Talu Wrth Daflu (TWD) neu Daliadau Uniongyrchol ac Amrywiol (TUA), Cyfrifoldeb cynhyrchwyr a thaliadau am dirlenwi yn unol â rhanbarth Fflandrys yn Ewrop (tua £130 am bob tunnell fetrig). Ni lwyddwyd i sefydlu'r pwerau deddfwriaethol hyn eto ac nid yw'r escaladur trethi tirlenwi i gael ei arolygu tan 2011. Os nad yw'r ddeddfwriaeth hon yn dod i rym bydd angen ymgynghori pellach a all oedi'r rhaglen gaffael wrth i foddelu gwastraff pellach ddigwydd.

4.00 ARGYMHELLION

- 4.01 Bod Aelodau'n cymeradwyo comisiynu dadansoddiadau cyfansoddiad gwastraff lleol i ategu targedau LICC.

- 4.02 Parhau i geisio eglurhad ar dargedau Cyfeiriadau'r Dyfodol yn benodol mewn perthynas â chasglu gwastraff bwyd a diwygio targedau gwaelodlin Awdurdodau Lleol.
- 4.03 Parhau'r deialog gwleidyddol gyda Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru ar faterion yn ymwneud â chyflwyno TWD gorfodol, cyfrifoldeb cynhyrchwyr a threthi tirlenwi cynyddol a'r effaith ar dargedau cenedlaethol hebdynt.
- 4.04 Ceisio eglurhad ar ddyraniadau referniw SWMG yn achos atebion heb fod yn YoW a chyfleoedd mewn perthynas â chefnogaeth lle mae'n bosibl y bydd cyfleusterau YoW ar gael i gonsortia cyn 2014/15.

5.00 GOBLYGIADAU ARIANNOL

- 5.01 Dim o ran perthynas uniongyrchol â'r targedau diwygiedig. Fodd bynnag, mae Adran yr Amgylchedd, Cynladwyedd a Thai (DESH) wedi sicrhau cyllid referniw i dalu ffioedd mynediad i gyfleusterau YoW. Darperir y cyllid o 2014/15 ymlaen.

6.00 EFFAITH AR DLODI

- 6.01 Dim

7.00 EFFAITH AMGYLCHEDDOL

- 7.01 Mae gwastraff tirlenwi'n creu nwyon sy'n cyfrannu at gynhesu byd-eang ac sy'n cael effaith niweidiol sylweddol ar yr amgylchedd. Bydd ailgyfeirio gwastraff o safleoedd tirlenwi yn unol â thargedau LICC yn cael effaith gadarnhaol ar yr amgylchedd ac ar allyriant CO2.

8.00 EFFAITH AR GYDRADDOLDEB

- 8.01 Amherthnasol

9.00 GOBLYGIADAU O RAN PERSONÉL

- 9.01 Dim

10.00 YMGYNGHORI GOFYNNOL

- 10.01 Dim

11.00 YMGYNGHORI A WNEIR

11.01 Dim

12.00 ATODIADAU

12.01 Dim

DEDDF LLYWODRAETH LEOL (MYNEDIAD I WYBODAETH) 1985

Dogfennau Cefndir:

'Cwmpasu Targedau Gwastraff Bwrdeistrefi i Gymru' (cwmni Eunomia Research & Consulting)

'Cyfeiriadau Newydd mewn Rheoli Gwastraff Bwrdeistrefi yng Nghymru' (LICC)

Swyddog Cyswllt i'r Dogfennau Cefndir:

Nigel Trueman
Rheolwr Prosiect Dros Dro
01352 703120
Nigel_trueman@flintshire.gov.uk

CYNGOR SIR Y FFLINT

ADRODDIAD I: CYDBWYLLGOR GWASTRAFF DROS BEN GOGLEDD CYMRU

DYDDIAD: 11 MAWRTH 2009

ADRODDIAD GAN: ARWEINYDD RHEOLI'R PROSIECT

PWNC: CYSWLLT Â'R GYMUNED

1.00 PWRPAS YR ADRODDIAD

1.01 Adnabod mesurau, ac ennill cefnogaeth iddynt, gyda'r nod o wella cysylltiad y gymuned â'r broses a ddilynir gan Bartneriaeth Gwastraff Dros Ben Gogledd Cymru (NWRWP).

2.00 CEFNDIR

2.01 Yn y gorffennol, bu datblygiad cyfleusterau newydd i drin gwastraff yn bwnc llosg gyda thrigolion lleol a grwpiau o fudd-ddeiliaid. Oherwydd pwysau amser cyfyngedig a chostau cynyddol, ni all awdurdodau lleol fforddio wynebu apelïadau cynllunio maith a rhaid iddynt gysylltu â'r cyhoedd cyn gynted ag y bo modd. Yn y diwydiant rheoli gwastraff, mae cysylltu â'r cyhoedd bellach yn gwbl arferol a safonol ac mae'r gwasanaeth yn ffocysu fwy ar y cyhoedd fel 'cwsmerïaid'. Beth a ellir ei wneud i wneud cyswllt â'r cyhoedd yn well a sicrhau bod pobl yn deall y materion o bwys sy'n ein hwynebu o ran trin gwastraff a chael gwared arno?

2.02 Er mwyn osgoi gwrthdaro posibl a datblygu deialog a chydweithrediad cadarnhaol mae angen sicrhau bod y cyhoedd yn cael mynediad i wybodaeth ddiweddar a chywir. Mae cysylltu â'r cyhoedd yn elfen o bwys mewn unrhyw brosiect gwastraff o'r dechrau un a dylai barhau hyd at y broses statudol a thrwy gydol oes unrhyw gyfleusterau a ddefnyddir.

2.03 Crëwyd y pecyn Cyswllt Cymunedol gan CaW yn 2007. Mae'r pecyn yn cynnig canllaw lawn a ffeithiol ar sut a phryd i gysylltu â'r budd-ddeiliaid allweddol wrth gynllunio a darparu cyfleusterau rheoli gwastraff newydd. Cynhyrchwyd y ganllaw hon o ganlyniad i bartneriaeth rhwng Cymdeithas Llywodraeth Leol Cymru (CLILC), Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru (LICC), Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd Cymru (AAC) a Chraff am Wastraff (CaW).

2.04 Fodd bynnag, nid yw creu pecyn ar ei ben ei hun yn ddigon ac er mwyn i ALLau ac asiantaethau eraill wneud yn fawr o'r cyfoeth o ddeunydd a gwybodaeth a

gynhyrchwyd mae'n hanfodol darparu hyfforddiant. Bydd hyfforddiant ar y pecyn a'r ffyrdd gorau o ddelio â newidiadau anodd a dadleuol i wasanaethau ac ar geisiadau cynllunio'n cynorthwyo ALLau, LICC ac eraill trwy'r prosesau caffael a chynllunio anodd a heriol. Bydd yr hyfforddiant ar arfer gorau hefyd yn fodd i sicrhau ein cymunedau bod ALLau'n ymwybodol o'u cyfrifoldebau o ran cyfathrebu ac y byddant yn cysylltu'n briodol gan gymryd i ystyriaeth barn ac anghenion lleol trwy'r broses.

- 2.05 Yn ogystal â'r hyfforddiant mewn Cyswllt â'r Gymuned, cynigir y dylai NWRWP wahodd Rheolwr y Prosiect, ac unigolion allweddol eraill, o'r consortia yn y De Ddwyrain ('Prosiect Gwyrdd') i gyflwyno sesiwn briffio am eu profiad a'r gwersi a ddysgwyd hyd yn hyn. Prosiect tebyg yw Prosiect Gwyrdd i'r NWRWP yn seiliedig ar bartneriaeth rhwng Caerffili, Caerdydd, Sir Fynwy, Casnewydd a Bro Morgannwg. Mae'r prosiect hwn wrthi'n llunio'r Achos Busnes Bras (ABB) terfynol. Creu Achos Busnes Bras yw un o'r camau pwysig yn y prosiect.
- 2.06 Mae angen gwneud gwaith i drefnu'r sesiwn briffio hwn gan gynnwys pennu dyddiad, trefnu lleoliad a pharatoi agenda a llunio rhestr o'r rhai a fydd yn mynychu.

3.00 YSTYRIAETHAU

- 3.01 Mae Craff am Wastraff mewn partneriaeth â Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru (LICC), Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd Cymru (AAC) a Chymdeithas Llywodraeth Leol Cymru (CLILC) yn dymuno comisiynu hyfforddiant er mwyn sicrhau bod gan Awdurdodau Lleol ac asiantaethau eraill sgiliau priodol mewn ymgynghori a chyfathrebu wrth gaffael a chomisiynu cyfleusterau gwastraff dadleuol.
- 3.02 Y prif nod yw darparu cyfres o ddiwrnodau hyfforddi i ystod o fudd-ddeiliaid fel bod pawb yn deall eu rôl o ran cyfathrebu/ymgynghori, yn deall arfer gorau ac ar dir i gynllunio'u strategaeth gyfathrebu ochr yn ochr â'u rhaglenni caffael:
 - Sicrhau bod Awdurdodau Lleol ac asiantaethau perthnasol yn deall ac yn gwerthfawrogi'r angen am gysylltu ac ymgynghori â'r gymuned gan ddefnyddio arfer gorau wrth gaffael, cynllunio a chomisiynu cyfleusterau gwastraff – yn enwedig wrth drin gwastraff bwyd a gwastraff dros ben.
 - Sicrhau bod ALLau ac asiantaethau perthnasol yn gwerthfawrogi'r gwahanol ddulliau a thechnegau sydd ar gael iddynt wrth gysylltu ac ymgynghori â'r gymuned.
 - Galluogi ALLau ac asiantaethau perthnasol i ddeall y gwahanol ofynion o ran cyfathrebu trwy'r gwahanol gamau yn y broses gaffael e.e. paratoi'r prosiect, hysbysiadau OJEU, cynllunio ayb.
 - Sicrhau bod yr hyfforddiant yn cydio wrth yr hyfforddiant a'r cyngor a ddarperir gan swyddfa Gaffael LICC ar y broses gaffael a sicrwydd ansawdd.
- 3.03 Fformat a Model Darpariaeth:

- sesiwn rhagarweiniol i bob cynulleidfa darged.
 - sesiwn ar wahân gydag aelodau'r cabinet gwastraff iddynt werthfawrogi eu rôl fel arweinwyr yn y gymuned ac ystyr ymgynghori fel rhan o'r broses gaffael
 - 2-3 diwrnod o hyfforddiant i swyddogion sy'n chwarae than flaenllaw yn yr AD a'r rhaglenni caffael dros ben. Gallai'r rhain fod ar ffurf blociau neu dros gyfnod o wythnosau.
- 3.04 Cynigir y byddai'r hyfforddiant manwl yn digwydd mewn rhanbarthau - Gogledd, De Orllewin, Canolbarth a De Ddwyrain.
- 3.05 Bwriedir i'r rhaglen redeg trwy 2009 -10 gydag estyniad posibl o flwyddyn os bydd galw a llwyddiant y rhaglen yn gwneud hynny'n angenrheidiol.
- 3.06 Mae'n hanfodol bod hyfforddiant yn berthnasol i anghenion y gynulleidfa. Y grwpiau neilltuol yw:
- Awdurdod Lleol: Aelodau'r cabinet gwastraff; Aelodau'r cabinet cynllunio; Aelodau'r pwyllgor cynllunio; Prif swyddogion y prosiect caffael gwastraff; Cyfarwyddwyr rheolwyr y prosiect caffael gwastraff; Swyddogion gwastraff; Swyddogion cynllunio; swyddogion caffael; Swyddogion ymgynghorol/cyswllt; Swyddogion y cyfryngau/Cysylltiadau Cyhoeddus
 - Cyrff perthnasol eraill: Staff strategaeth a rheoleiddio EA; Staff CCW a fyddai'n cymryd rhan mewn materion cynllunio; Swyddogion gwastraff, caffael a safleoedd priodol LICC; Swyddogion PUK (yn gweithio gyda LICC yn y Swyddfa Gaffael)

4.00 ARGYMHELLION

- 4.01 Bod yr Aelodau'n cytuno i fudd-ddeiliaid fynychu hyfforddiant mewn Cysylltiad â'r Gymuned pan fydd ar gael.
- 4.02 Bod yr Aelodau'n cytuno i sesiwn briffio gan Reolwr y Prosiect Gwyrdd ar gyfer Aelodau a Swyddogion sy'n cymryd rhan yn y NWRWP, a budd-ddeiliaid allweddol eraill a enwir.
- 4.03 Bod yr Aelodau'n mynychu sesiynau hyfforddi a briffio yn y dyfodol sy'n berthnasol i'r prosiect NWRWP.

5.00 GOBLYGIADAU ARIANNOL

- 5.01 Craff am Wastraff: Cost teithio gan rai sy'n mynychu canolfan yng ngogledd Cymru
- 5.02 Papur briffio'r Prosiect Gwyrdd: Costau teithio a llety potensial i gyflwynwyr sy'n teithio o Gaerdydd, cost y ganolfan; cost teithio gan rai sy'n mynychu canolfan yng ngogledd Cymru. Cynigir y dylid talu'r costau hyn gydag arian RCAF a glustnodir ar gyfer rheoli'r prosiect.

6.00 EFFAITH AR DLODI

6.01 Dim

7.00 EFFAITH AR YR AMGYLCHEDD

7.01 Amherthnasol

8.00 EFFAITH AR GYDRADDOLDEB

8.01 Amherthnasol

9.00 GOBLYGIADAU O RAN PERSONÉL

9.01 Amser i Aelodau a Swyddogion dderbyn hyfforddiant a mynychu sesiynau briffio yn ôl y galw.

10.00 YMGYNGHORI GOFYNNOL

10.01 Bwrdd Prosiect NWRW

11.00 YMGYNGHORI A WNEIR

11.01 Bwrdd Prosiect NWRW

12.00 ATODIADAU

12.01 Dim

DEDDF LLYWODRAETH LEOL (MYNEDIAD I WYBODAETH) 1985

Dogfennau Cefndirol:

Dim

Swyddog Cyswllt ar gyfer Dogfennau Cefndir:

Amherthnasol