

## Decisions taken prior to roll out

Decision Taken	Analysis	Conclusion
<p>Decision to optimise the routes/working arrangements “in one-go”.</p> <p>It was felt that; doing things in one go would enable the Council to deliver the most efficient system more quickly.</p>	<p>The potential benefits of a fully optimised (zoned) system had been identified through the experiences in the north of the county, where systems had been changed piecemeal, and then been revisited and amended again (in order to optimise /zone them).</p> <p>However, a piecemeal roll out was not really feasible in the south due to the scarcity of population and the (existing) complex routing arrangements.</p>	<p>The decision to roll out in one go is therefore still considered to have been the right one.</p>
<p>Decision to utilise a computer software system to optimise routes.</p>	<p>This decision was taken because route planning is more complex in the south of the county (due to its rural nature), and because most other progressive councils already use computerised systems of this type.</p>	<p>There were difficulties with the implementation of this system, however, the decision to use it is still considered to have been the right one.</p>
<p>The roll out was planned for October, before the hour went back. The timescale was effectively fixed in July 2012 when the Council committed to the wheelie bin production schedules.</p>	<p>The decision to go for an autumn roll out was taken in order to satisfy the expectations that had been generated within communities when consultation had taken place about the planned changes. In hindsight officers should have consulted later, and not given any indication of timescale. This would have lessened the pressure for an early roll-out.</p>	<p>The roll out would have been better executed if it had been undertaken in the following spring. The choice of an autumn roll out effectively eliminated the possibility of evening working to rectify defects/omissions.</p>

**A. Extra costs incurred**

The cost of the extra resources that had to be utilised in order to recover the situation

Source	Extra costs incurred	Comments
Retention of delivery contractor for extra 3 weeks	£9,000	The contractor worked for 6 weeks. The original programme was 3 weeks
Use of Local contractor to assist with collections	£1,100	The contractor worked picking up refuse from properties that had reported missed collections
Collections crew overtime costs	£4,800	Overtime was worked on 4 consecutive Saturdays in the run up to Christmas. The figure includes an allowance for employer NI contributions etc.
Additional equipment delivery team employed	£6,000	External Contractor with local knowledge was used to assist with deliveries
Back office staff overtime	£120	Two admin officers worked a Saturday morning processing CRMs
<b>TOTAL COST:</b>	<b>£21,020</b>	

The majority of the extra costs shown above could have been avoided if the roll out had been delayed by 6 months. However; the extra costs should be viewed in the context of the overall cost effectiveness of the recycling system that was being deployed. The latest WLGAs benchmarking data shows Denbighshire's dry recycling scheme to be the most cost effective in Wales.

As an illustration; the roll out has resulted in a significant reduction in landfill costs, that will continue into the future (*figures available to date are shown below*)

**B. Disposal cost savings due to new system (Dec.12 & Jan.13 only):**

Type of recycling	Quantity of <u>extra</u> material recovered (due to new system)	Disposal Cost saving (over 2 month period)	Detail
Food waste recycling	166 tonnes	£3,152	Difference between recycling cost (AD plant) and landfill cost.
Kerbside Dry recycling	148 tonnes	£15,262	Difference between selling the extra material recovered (to UPM Shotton) and the previous land-filling cost
	<b>Total reduction:</b>	<b>£18,414</b>	

**Customer Enquiries generated & resolved**

In cases where customers required more equipment, or had service issues that needed to be resolved, a CRM enquiry was created by the call centre, and forwarded to the service. The graph below shows the daily number of CRMs that were created / resolved.

The peak “incoming” number, of 120+ per day, is roughly three times higher than the number that had been expected. Resources were consequently significantly over-stretched, By the time that additional resources had been mobilised, there was already a backlog of enquiries waiting to be cleared. This is illustrated by the duration of “time lag” between the solid and dotted lines. Two or three days of the time lag was administrative (completions were not entered into the computer on the day the work was done), but the remainder was a genuine service delay. The fact that hundreds of calls were not resolved straight away meant that a lot of repeat calls were generated. This added to the overall level of incoming calls, and the “high level period” lasted longer than it needed to.

