

CONSULTATION PAPER ON THE DESIGN OF THE WASTE PERFORMANCE REWARD GRANT: SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS

1. Is recycling and composting the right measure on which to base performance rewards? If not, which qualitatively different measures should be used to gauge waste management performance?

Suggested Response – Recycling and composting is the right measure on which to base performance rewards.

(The Government prefers this measure).

2. Is it right to reward each of these two aspects of recycling and composting performance? Should one or other not be rewarded? If these two aspects of recycling and composting performance are not the right ones, which others constitute a better basis for rewarding good performance? Is it right to allocate funds on the basis of reaching a particular performance threshold, or should rewards be increased in proportion to the extent by which the threshold is beaten?

Suggested Response – Rewards should be made on a combined recycling/composting performance measure. Funds should be allocated on the basis of reaching a particular performance threshold. If rewards are increased for Authorities that exceed thresholds, fewer funds will be available for others.

3. Is it right to cap the size of awards under the Performance Reward Grant? If so, is lowering the threshold for reward the best mechanism for imposing a cap? Is twice the minimum reward a suitable level for capping the rewards?

Suggested Response – Yes to all three questions. The measure will help to spread the funding over more Authorities.

(The Government prefers this measure).

4. Is it right to weight the grants distributed for meeting the performance criteria? Is population the right factor to use?

Suggested Response – Yes to both questions.

(The Government prefers this option).

5. Is it right to split the funds available amongst the three types of waste authority? If so, is an equal split the right basis for allocation of the Performance Review Grant among the three types of authority?

Suggested Response – Yes to both questions.

6. Do you have any views on the interaction between the Performance Reward Grant and Local Public Service Agreements?

Suggested Response – Authorities should not be rewarded for the same extra performance under more than one regime.

LOCAL AUTHORITY PERFORMANCE AND REWARD GRANTS – CONSULTATION 2
PART 2: THE REWARD GRANTS – REVENUE COSTS AND REVENUE BENEFITS

7. Is it right to restrict the eligibility of authorities with PFI waste management contracts in the way suggested in the consultation paper?

Suggested Response – Yes

8. Is it right to use part of the funds available as pump-priming grants? Is one third of the funds (£30 million) the right proportion? Should all the first year funds (£45 million) be allocated as pump-priming grants in this way?

Suggested Response – Yes to all three questions.

9. Is there a need to spread rewards for a particular performance over a number of years to allow time for local authorities to mainstream additional revenue costs? If so, does a two year period allow sufficient time for the mainstreaming of revenue costs?

Suggested Response – Yes to the first question. A three year period may be more helpful to Authorities in allowing sufficient time for the mainstreaming of revenue costs.

10. Does the detailed design of the Performance Reward Grant set out in the above paper, including the specific proposals for 2005/06 and 2006/07, constitute a fair basis upon which to provide incentives to local authorities to improve their recycling and composting performance? Do the individual criteria strike the right balance between being achievable and challenging?

Suggested Response – Yes to both questions. However, given the large extent by which funding bids have exceeded the funding available so far, the total amount of money available (£90 million per year for 2006/07 onwards and £45 million in 2005/06) is insufficient to deliver the recycling performances we are all seeking across the country.