

**Listing of Key Findings and Recommendations and Waste Authority response to
GHD's 'Report for Review of Zero Waste Plan Development Scheme and Regional Funding Program Pilot, June 2010'**

| GHD finding | | GHD recommendation | | Waste Authority response |
|-------------|---|--------------------|--|---|
| 1.1 | Lack of waste data available | a | <p>Assist local governments with obtaining and/or getting access to relevant waste-related data to guide decision making on strategic waste management options appropriate to their region. This is particularly important for regional governments. Potential opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ DEC to provide data collection service on a standard fee basis (e.g. through consultancy agreement) ▶ DEC to facilitate a co-ordinated and state wide waste data audit prior to on-line survey ▶ Develop standard methods for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Waste audits ○ Weight data to be reported ○ Volume estimation and conversion to weight ▶ On-line reporting of audit and waste data by local governments | <p>DEC conducts an annual survey of local governments on their waste and recycling services.</p> <p>The Waste Authority, through the Local Government Waste and Recycling Data Collection and Reporting Development program, will work with local government to improve the availability and quality of data collected and reported. The program includes a review of the annual survey, as well as extensive consultation with local government.</p> |
| 1.2 | Structure of survey | a | <p>Review relevant sections, categories and overall format of the on-line survey in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Align survey questions with priorities in draft WA Waste Strategy ▶ Relevance to implementation and maintenance of SWMPs ▶ Allow for differences between metropolitan and regional councils | <p>Funding to local governments will be conditional on their participation in the annual local government survey.</p> |
| | | b | <p>DEC to develop all stages of the on-line survey internally rather than through external consultants to ensure any problems or troubleshooting can be addressed easily and promptly by DEC staff.</p> | |
| 1.3 | Periodic undertaking of survey | a | <p>Undertake survey with local government on a periodic basis (e.g. every 2-4 years) to assist with development of set of consistent waste data for WA over time.</p> <p>Survey to facilitate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Distribution of detailed survey results comparing government performance anonymously ▶ Periodic review and updating of SWMPs ▶ Review progress and setting/adjustment of targets in WA Waste Strategy ▶ Specify standard methods for reporting to be eligible for funding | |
| 2.1 | Need for alignment of SWMPs with the draft Waste Strategy | a | <p>As part of ongoing maintenance and review, priorities outlined in SWMPs need to be aligned and updated according to priorities of the WA Waste Strategy.</p> | <p>A review of SWMP criteria is planned for 2010/11 to ensure alignment with Waste Strategy priorities and consistency of quality.</p> |
| | | b | <p>DEC and Waste Authority to provide clarity and directions to local governments regarding the implications of the Waste Strategy to their local situation and their SWMPs</p> | |
| 2.2 | Issues of time and human resources | a | <p>Review any future timeframes (e.g. review and updating of SWMPs) in consultation with local governments to take into account local government processes (e.g. council approval requirements) and available resources (staffing and financial).</p> | <p>The Waste Authority will consult with WALGA on the design of any new program that aims to encourage the upgrade and implementation of SWMPs.</p> |



| GHD finding | | GHD recommendation | | Waste Authority response |
|-------------|---|--------------------|--|---|
| 2.3 | Local government ownership | a | <p>Enhance local government ownership of SWMPs over time to ensure effective use, relevance and implementation of commitments outlined in SWMPs.</p> <p>Possible mechanisms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ DEC to provide assisting role to local government in implementation and maintenance of SWMPs, at least for next 2-3 years (e.g. Regional Co-ordinators, see point 4.3) ▶ DEC to enforce periodic review and auditing of SWMPs every 2 years (see point 2.5) ▶ Alignment of RFP funding timeframes to match local government budget cycles (see point 3.2) ▶ Form advisory group composed of local government representatives ▶ Develop a local government two-way consultation plan ▶ Consult local government in developing standard survey methods | <p>SWMPs may be reviewed by local governments at any time. Funding will only be available through any future Regional Funding Program for projects identified in a current SWMP and this will provide the impetus for local governments to ensure that SWMPs are up-to-date and relevant. Support may be provided to assist groups of local governments to upgrade their regional SWMPs. A mandatory review of SWMPs may be considered in the future.</p> |
| 2.4 | Additional or replacement sections in SWMP template | a | Consult with local government, consultants and other stakeholders regarding additional or replacement sections in the SWMP template. | |
| | | b | <p>Consider a two template approach to cater for regional and metropolitan differences.</p> <p>Sections to consider include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Future planning section where local government concerns can be documented (e.g. radioactive waste, local government dealing with impacts to agricultural market among others); ▶ Best practice guideline requirements; ▶ Basic SWMP examples for both metropolitan and regional councils; ▶ Question related to commitment for regional groupings. As the group was not formally constituted, it could be dissolved at any time; ▶ Waste education; ▶ Greater emphasis on budgeting and action planning. | |
| 2.5 | Lack of review or monitoring process of SWMPs | a | DEC to enforce periodic review and auditing of SWMPs every 2 years | |
| | | b | Emphasise monitoring and review processes in SWMP template to ensure there are adequate processes for this within local government | |
| 2.6 | Lack of targets for waste management in SWMPs | a | Incorporate target setting section within SWMP template | |
| | | b | <p>Future updated SWMPs to include targets for prioritised areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Aligned with Waste Strategy (see point 2.1) ▶ Recognise that lack of waste data may restrict use of quantitative targets (e.g. use qualitative targets instead) | |
| 2.7 | Use of selected SWMPs as case-studies | a | Use of high quality and effective SWMPs (both the quality of the document and SWMPs as good demonstrations of regional collaboration) as case studies and examples for other local governments | |



| GHD finding | | GHD recommendation | | Waste Authority response |
|-------------|--|--|---|--|
| 3.1 | Alignment with draft Waste Strategy for WA | a | Align criteria for assessment of Regional Investment Plan (RIPs) with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Priorities outlined in the Waste Strategy ▶ Differences in needs from regional versus metropolitan councils ▶ Length of the program post the pilot | <p>The Waste Authority will consider the recommendations of the GHD report in determining the most appropriate funding mechanism for improving waste management and recycling services provided by local government.</p> <p>Any future funding program will require alignment with the Waste Strategy.</p> <p>The Waste Authority will consult with and seek comment from WALGA on the design of any future funding program for implementation of local government SWMPs.</p> |
| 3.2 | Timeframe | a | DEC to ensure and communicate a long term commitment to RFP funding to provide confidence to local governments. This is required for local government to prioritise waste management and set up the necessary structures and processes to implement their SWMPs (see also point 4.2). | |
| b | | Review timeframe for spending funding for RIP projects in consultation with local government and other stakeholders (e.g. equipment suppliers) to ensure timeframe is realistic and achievable particularly for infrastructure investment projects. | | |
| c | | Align funding timeframe to match local government budget cycles and if funding falls outside of budget cycles, it is recommended that funding is provided for at least 12 months to allow sufficient time for local governments to develop projects and gain approval from council. | | |
| 3.3 | Funding model | a | <p>RFP Pilot Funds have been allocated to government groupings based on the number of regional groups that exist, the number of local governments within the group and the total population the group represents.</p> <p>Recommended alternative funding allocation models for future RFP (next 3-4 years):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Allocate a proportion (e.g. 50%) of the funds based on group size and the population it represents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support regular programs to achieve and maintain minimal waste management standards (e.g. waste education officer, monitoring, education and awareness) ○ Support ad-hoc waste management initiatives on a small scale ○ Funding aims to align with SWMP and the Waste Strategy ▶ Offer a proportion of funding (e.g. 50%) as competitive grant based on estimated waste saving quantities compared to funding amounts ('best value for money spent') and/or selected key priorities of the State Strategy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include an upper funding limit per project and/or local government grouping ○ Include specific deadline(s) for submission of RIPs for competitive grants ○ Favour applications which include co-contributions and those councils who have proven to be able to effectively manage their projects | <p>The level of funding allocated to any funding program will depend on the availability of funds and relative priorities within the Waste Strategy and annual Business Plan.</p> <p>The Waste Authority considers that the improvement and development of waste management services, infrastructure and technologies in Western Australia is a joint responsibility of State and local governments. The contribution made by the Waste Authority to any future funding program will not cover the the cost of all waste management priorities identified by regional groups of councils in their SWMPs, but serve as a contribution toward the cost of developing and improving waste management services, infrastructure and technologies over the</p> |
| b | | When waste management processes within local governments across WA have matured and the Waste Strategy has been well developed and implemented, it is worthwhile to consider a compliance- or standards-driven approach. However, this is not yet the case in WA. Therefore, it is recommended to continue with the current SWMP approach at least for the next 3-4 years. It is recommended to undertake another review of the ZWPDS and RFP in 2 years time. | | |



| GHD finding | | GHD recommendation | | Waste Authority response |
|-------------|---|--------------------|--|---|
| 3.4 | Level of funding | a | <p>Required levels of funding for continuation of the ZWPDS and RFP is subject to decisions on the way forward of the programs. Indicative funding to extend ZWPDS with recommended 4 years includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Periodic undertaking of ZWPDS waste surveys = \$810,000 ▶ Maintenance and periodic review of SWMPs = \$1,080,000 ▶ 3 DEC Program Co-ordinators = \$1,050,000 ▶ Total = \$2,940,000 <p>Indicative funding to meet quantitative targets in Draft Waste Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Resource recovery = \$13.6 to \$23.1 million ▶ Waste disposal = \$4.6 to \$6.9 million ▶ Total = \$18.2 to \$29.9 million ▶ Potential RFP funding = \$17.7 to \$26.7 million | <p>next five years in line with the Waste Strategy.</p> <p>Any future funding program will include clear reporting requirements that allow comparisons between regional groups. Reporting by local government will form the basis for a review of any funding program within 5 years of its commencement.</p> |
| 3.5 | Progress reporting | a | In consultation with local government, develop a standard template for milestone reporting of approved RIP projects to ensure milestone reporting is completed as efficient and effective as possible on a consistent basis. | |
| 4.1 | Extension of ZWPDS and RFP | a | Recommended extension of ZWPDS and RFP approach with 3-4 years, incorporating the findings and subsequent recommendations formulated in this report. Over the past two years significant efforts and resources have been dedicated to build the solid basis of the programs. Continued efforts are required to capitalise on these foundations and government partnerships for achieving significant waste reduction and sustainable waste management practices in WA. From this review, it is most likely that the most of the SWMPs and government partnerships created will not continue or maintained without extension of the ZWPDS, RFP, and DEC support. | The Waste Authority will consider the recommendations of the GHD report in determining the most appropriate funding mechanism for improving waste management and recycling services provided by local government. |
| 4.2 | Confidence in continuity of ZWPDS and RFP | a | DEC to ensure and communicate a long term commitment to ZWPDS and RFP) to provide confidence to local governments. This is required for local government to prioritise waste management and set up the necessary structures and processes to implement their SWMPs. | The terms of any future funding program will be clearly communicated to local governments. |
| 4.3 | Review of role of Regional Co-ordinators | a | <p>Maintain support to regional local governments through Regional Co-ordinators.</p> <p>Recommendations for DEC Regional Co-ordinators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Three full-time DEC program co-ordinators over entire program period ▶ Covering metropolitan, northern and southern regional WA ▶ Based in Perth, with travel to specific regions on a periodic basis <p>Proposed functions of Regional DEC Co-ordinators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Provide direct and personal link between state and local government | The delivery of funding programs on behalf of the Waste Authority is conducted by DEC, which will determine appropriate staff resources allocated to any program in the context of the need to deliver the Waste Authority's Business Plan. |



| GHD finding | | GHD recommendation | | Waste Authority response |
|-------------|---|--------------------|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Designated DEC contact for local government to assist with periodic review of SWMPs and developing RIPs prior to submission ▶ Provide ongoing support, advice and training to local government Required skills and experience of Regional Co-ordinators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Induction to familiarise with regional waste management issues ▶ Local government experience ▶ Waste management knowledge and experience ▶ Available and willing to travel regionally | |
| 4.4 | Insufficient active engagement during consultation workshops. | a | Provide consultation prior to commencement of any processes and communicate scheduled consultation workshops with sufficient notice. | Noted. |
| | | b | Structure future workshops with local governments to be fully engaging rather than informational. | |
| 4.5 | Waste education was not an emphasis of ZWPDS and RFP. | a | Incorporate waste education into ZWPDS and RFP from the planning stage by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Emphasising waste education in the budgeting and action planning section to raise awareness of the importance of it as part of the planning stage ▶ Including an appropriate section in the SWMP template to focus on waste education ▶ Including waste education questions in the Phase 1 on-line survey covering topic such as whether local governments have a waste officer, inclusion of waste education in the planning process, what education programs are currently running, among others It is recommended that DEC consult with relevant stakeholders (e.g. Waste Educators Working Group) to determine other mechanism to incorporate waste education in the ZWPDS and RFP process overall. | Waste education was eligible for funding under the previous RFP and will continue to be promoted as an important component of improved waste management. |