

| PROPOSAL FORM FOR AGENDA ITEMS FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEES | | |
|---|---|---|
| NAME OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE | Partnerships Scrutiny Committee | |
| DATE OF MEETING / TIMESCALE FOR CONSIDERATION | 6 th February 2014 | |
| TITLE OF REPORT | North Wales Residual Waste Treatment Project – Approval of Preferred Bidder & Inter Authority Agreement 2 | |
| P U R P O S E | 1. Why is the report being proposed? (see also the checklist overleaf) | Necessary governance check in moving towards contract award (same scrutiny process being undertaken by the other 4 North Walian Councils involved in the project). Cost to DCC will be £1.7m / year (25 year contract) |
| | 2. What issues are to be scrutinised? | Process involved in awarding ‘preferred Bidder’ status. Issues surrounding approving Inter Authority Agreement 2. |
| | 3. Is it necessary/desirable for witnesses to attend e.g. lead members, officers/external experts? | Yes – Lead member / Project Team |
| | 4. What will the committee achieve by considering the report? | Will test project governance arrangements / contract value for money |
| | 5. Score the topic from 0 – 4 on aims & priorities and impact (see overleaf)* | Aims & Priorities |
| ADDITIONAL COMMENTS | | |
| REPORTING PATH – what is the next step? Are Scrutiny’s recommendations to be reported elsewhere? | Following scrutiny, recommendation to proceed to ‘Preferred Bidder’ will be taken to Cabinet and also Full Council. | |
| AUTHOR | Jim Espley (Report will be presented by NWRWTP Project Team). | |

Please complete the following checklist:

| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Is the topic already being addressed satisfactorily? | x | |
| Is Scrutiny likely to result in service improvements or other measurable benefits? | | x |
| Does the topic concern a poor performing service or a high budgetary commitment? | x | |
| Are there adequate resources / realistic possibility of adequate resources to achieve the objective(s)? | x | |
| Is the Scrutiny activity timely, i.e. will scrutiny be able to recommend changes to the service delivery, policy, strategy, etc? | x | |
| Is the topic linked to corporate or scrutiny aims and priorities? | x | |
| Has the topic been identified as a risk in the Corporate Risk Register or is it the subject of an adverse internal audit or external regulator report? | x | |

*The following table is to be used to guide the scores given:

| Score | Aims & Priorities | Impact |
|-------|--|--|
| 0 | No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities | No potential benefits |
| 1 | No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities but a subject of high public concern | Minor potential benefits affecting only one ward/customer/client group |
| 2 | Some evidence of links, but indirect | Minor benefits to two groups/moderate benefits to one |
| 3 | Good evidence linking the topic to both aims and priorities | Moderate benefits to more than one group/substantial benefits to one |
| 4 | Strong evidence linking both aims and priorities, and has a high level of public concern | Substantial community-wide benefits |

SCORING

Aims & Priorities

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 4 | Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately | Priority topic for Scrutiny – for urgent consideration |
| 3 | | |
| 2 | Reject topic for Scrutiny – topic to be circulated to members for information purposes | Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately |
| 1 | | |

0

1

2

3
Impact

4