

Proposals – Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

THEME – Proposed KPI <i>{Source}</i>	Relationship to JMWMS Objectives
<b>WASTE HIERARCHY – Recycling rate of “waste from households”</b> <i>{National/EU measure}</i>	2 – Common recycling mix will hopefully increase this 3 – Food waste recycling would increase this rate 5 – Measures our contribution to the national rate
<b>WASTE HIERARCHY – Percentage of Municipal Waste Sent To Landfill</b> <i>{Former NI193}</i>	1, 2, 3, 5 – Increased recycling will reduce landfill 4 – Waste hierarchy places landfill as worst option 8, 10 – Providing capacity for better solutions
<b>WASTE HIERARCHY – Household Waste Collection (kilograms per head)</b> <i>{National R&amp;W Strategy; Former BV84a; SEA}</i>	4 – Measures waste minimisation
<b>WASTE HIERARCHY – Residual waste per person per year</b> <i>{National R&amp;W Strategy; ESA report }</i>	4 – Measures waste minimisation 5 – Measures effect of recycling on residual waste
<b>CONTAMINATION – Recycling contamination rate</b> <i>{ESA report}</i>	1 – Reducing contamination improves quality 2 – Common recycling mix will hopefully reduce this 3 – Food waste recycling could decrease this
<b>CARBON – Overall LWP waste management carbon footprint (per head)</b> <i>{National R&amp;W Strategy; SEA; ESA report}</i>	6 – A new way to measure overall performance 7 – Need to measure to know we're reducing it 10 – An innovative way to measure performance
<b>VALUE FOR MONEY – Cost of household waste collection per household</b> <i>{Former BV86}</i>	2 – Synergies could reduce collection costs 3 – Food collections where economically practicable
<b>VALUE FOR MONEY – Cost of municipal waste disposal per tonne</b> <i>{Former BV87}</i>	1 – Improved commercial value reduces overall costs 3 – Food collections where economically practicable
<b>CUSTOMER FRIENDLY – Percentage of people expressing satisfaction with waste collection</b> <i>{Former BV90a; ESA report}</i>	2 – Common recycling mix will hopefully improve this Vision – "Customer friendly" services
<b>CUSTOMER FRIENDLY – Percentage of people expressing satisfaction with waste disposal (local tips)</b> <i>{Former BV90c; ESA report}</i>	Vision – "Customer friendly" services

## Supporting measures

<b>WASTE HIERARCHY</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Recycling rate of “waste from households”</li> <li>– Percentage of Municipal Waste Sent To Landfill</li> <li>– Household Waste Collection (kilograms per head)</li> <li>– Residual waste per person per year</li> </ul>	
Percentage HH waste sent for Reuse, Recycling or Composting (whole county)	{Source = LWP charts; LCC CBP; Former NI192; SEA} Allows comparison with historical performance
Percentage HH waste sent for Reuse, Recycling or Composting (each WCA)	{Source = LWP charts; Former NI192} Contribution of each WCA to overall rate
Percentage HWRC waste sent for Reuse, Recycling or Composting	{Source = LWP charts; LCC CBP} Contribution of WDA-collected waste to overall rate
Tonnage of household waste sent for composting or anaerobic digestion	{Source = LCC CBP; Former BV82b(ii); SEA} Reflects impact of weather conditions
EfW facility(s) ash disposal use as a sub-base for construction material.	{Source = SEA} Doesn't currently count towards overall rate, but is preferable to disposal
Percentage of household waste sent for energy recovery	{Source = Former BV82c(i); SEA} Reducing "disposal (landfill) by diverting to recovery
Residual waste tonnage (by destination)	{Source = LWP charts} Contribution of each WCA to overall rate
Fly tipping tonnage per annum	{Source = SEA} Reducing waste means greater legitimate capacity and thus could reduce fly tipping
<b>CONTAMINATION – Recycling contamination rate</b>	
Percentage of recyclables in residual waste per quarter (as an indicator of resources lost to less sustainable management)	{Source = SEA} Missed recyclables could be seen as contaminating residual waste

<b>CARBON – Overall LWP waste management carbon footprint</b>	
Amount of fuel used in waste management collections per annum.	{Source = SEA} A significant source of carbon emissions
Monitoring carbon emissions throughout the treatment of waste (recycling, composting, incineration, landfill)	{Source = SEA} The largest source of the LWP's waste-related carbon emissions
Striving to meet Industrial Emissions Directive Emission Limit Values.	{Source = SEA} Could reduce our carbon footprint
Amount of energy generated by the EfW (as a measure of noncombustible diversion rates) per annum	{Source = SEA} Reducing carbon emissions resulting from EfW
Amount of heat exported from the EfW.	{Source = SEA} Reducing carbon emissions resulting from EfW
<b>VALUE FOR MONEY</b>	
– Cost of household waste collection per household	
– Cost of municipal waste disposal per tonne	
<i>No supporting measures proposed</i>	
<b>CUSTOMER FRIENDLY</b>	
– Percentage of people expressing satisfaction with waste collection	
– Percentage of people expressing satisfaction with waste disposal (local tips)	
Proportion of housing scheme planning approvals where dedicated waste management storage considerations are included in the application per annum	{Source = SEA} Makes the service easier for new customers
Fly tipping actions taken	{Source = National R&W Strategy } Helping to improve customer satisfaction?

### Project-specific measures

Number of surface water discharge applications for new waste management infrastructure agreed by the Environment Agency.
Monetary value of new waste management infrastructure developed per annum
Number of planning applications for new waste management infrastructure that consider the appropriateness of access through NIAs
Area of agricultural land lost to new waste management infrastructure.
Number of archaeological investigations and cultural heritage setting assessments undertaken for new waste management infrastructure.
Area of AONB land lost to new waste management infrastructure
Area of landscape character area, green belt or AONB designation lost to waste management uses per annum
Area of greenfield land lost to new waste management uses per annum
Uptake of biodiversity net positive initiatives at new and existing waste management sites
Significant effects upon biodiversity identified during the planning consenting process for new waste management infrastructure.
Replacement bins that are recycled at the end of their useful life
Percentage of Euro VI engines, electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, biogas or hydrogen fuelled vehicles operating on behalf of the local authorities in a waste management related capacity per annum

## Backup measures

Measure	Reason not included in proposed measures
Recycling rate (Municipal Waste)	Although proposed in the National R&W Strategy, this is similar to “waste from households”
Percentage of household waste arisings which have been sent for recycling	Included in NI192
Percentage of household waste sent for composting or anaerobic digestion	Included in NI192
Percentage of household waste landfilled	Similar to NI193
Total waste per household (kg)	Similar to BV84a
Household Waste Collection % Change on Previous Year	Similar to BV84a
Total HH Waste Collected	Similar to BV84a
Total Municipal Waste Collected	Similar to BV84a
HH waste sent for recycling, reuse or composting	Better as percentage
Tonnage of household waste arisings which have been sent for recycling	Better as percentage
Tonnage of household waste sent for energy recovery	Better as percentage
Residual Household Waste per Household	Similar to LWP chart measure
HH waste not sent for recycling, reuse or composting	Similar to LWP chart measure
Tonnage of household waste landfilled	Better as percentage
Municipal Waste Landfilled	Better as percentage
Landfilling of biodegradable waste	Although proposed in the National R&W Strategy, this is covered by carbon footprint and overall landfill tonnes
Material capture rates at point of collection	Complex and confusing
Estimated rejected household recycling (as reported by Defra)	Other measures better show contamination levels
Tonnage of MDR recycled	Other measures better show contamination levels
Avoided energy & water use	Part of overall carbon footprint?
Cost of Waste Collection	Better measured per household
Cost of Waste Disposal	Better measured per tonne
Minimum standards - consistent collections	Not quantifiable
Percentage satisfaction with keeping the local area clear of litter and refuse	Lower priority than overall satisfaction?
Percentage of people expressing satisfaction with local recycling facilities	Lower priority than overall satisfaction?

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Reason not included in proposed measures</b>
Number of Households satisfied with keeping the local area clear of litter and refuse	Better as percentage
Number of Households satisfied with waste collection	Better as percentage
Number of Households satisfied with local recycling facilities	Better as percentage
Number of Households satisfied with waste disposal (local tips)	Better as percentage
Percentage receiving kerbside collection of recyclables (one recyclable)	No longer relevant (TEEP)
Percentage receiving kerbside collection of recyclables (two recyclables)	No longer relevant (TEEP)
Number of Households receiving collection (one recyclable)	No longer relevant (TEEP)
Number of Households receiving collection (two recyclables)	No longer relevant (TEEP)
Fly tipping incidents per annum	Better as tonnage
"Litter"	Although proposed in the National R&W Strategy, no specific measures listed
Illegal waste activity using a proxy of illegal waste sites active	Not an LWP function
Total number of households	Used in calculating others
Total population	Used in calculating others