

Options Appraisal – Summary of SWOT Analysis

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
Methodology	Commingled	Commingled	Dual Stream	Dual Stream	Dual Stream	Dual Stream
Container	Single Bin	Single Bin	Two Bins	Two Bins	Bin and Bag	Bin and Bag
Vehicle	Single body	Single body	Single body	Single body	Split body	Split body
Frequency	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Alternate Four Weekly	Alternate Four Weekly	Fortnightly	Fortnightly
Disposal Responsibility	District	County Council	District	County Council	District	County Council
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple methodology Popular with residents High collection productivity No extra crews required Lower vehicle costs Recycling credit and income from materials No additional containers Communication campaign not required Less manual handling implications Bin only- less litter and keeps materials dry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple methodology Popular with residents High collection productivity No extra crew required Lower vehicle costs No gate fees No additional containers Less manual handling implications Bin only- less litter and keeps materials dry Monitoring and contact issues dealt by County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher material quality as card/paper separate More income High collection productivity No extra crews required Lower gate fees Recycling credit and income from materials Lower vehicle costs Service refresh to boost recycling Less rejections Less manual handling implications Bin only- less litter and keeps materials dry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher material quality as paper/card separate More income High collection productivity No extra crews required No gate fees Lower vehicle costs Service refresh to boost recycling Less rejections Less manual handling implications Bin only- less litter and keeps materials dry Monitoring and contact issues dealt by County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher material quality as card/paper separate More income Lower gate fees Recycling credit and income from materials Bags cheaper and extra recycling capacity Less storage issues Service refresh to boost recycling Less rejections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher material quality as card/paper separate More income No gate fees Bags cheaper and extra recycling capacity Less storage issues Service refresh to boost recycling Less rejections Monitoring and contact issues dealt by County
Weakness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very high gate fees Lower material quality and less income Cost of rejected loads Time and expense of monitoring contract No additional capacity No service refresh 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No income from Recycling Credit and materials. Lower material quality No additional capacity No service refresh 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of second bin Storage of second bin Public dissatisfaction with change. No additional capacity as four week gap. Time and expense of monitoring contract. Communication campaign required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No income from Recycling Credit and materials Cost of second bin Storage of second bin Public dissatisfaction with change. No additional capacity as four week gap Communication campaign required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower collection productivity Extra crews required Higher vehicle costs Public dissatisfaction with change. Cost of bag/short life Litter issues with bag Manual handling issues Time and expense of monitoring contract. Communication campaign required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No income from Recycling Credit and materials Extra crews required Lower collection productivity Higher vehicle costs Public dissatisfaction with change. Cost of bag/short life Litter issues with bag Manual handling issues Communication campaign required.
Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPR may incentivise retaining disposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County should take on responsibility for rejected loads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPR incentive for better quality as no commingling EPR may incentivise retaining disposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPR incentive for better quality as no commingling County should take on responsibility for rejected loads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPR incentive for better quality as no commingling EPR may incentivise retaining disposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPR incentive for better quality as no commingling County should take on responsibility for rejected loads.
Threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased distance to tipping locations. Market volatility affecting income Increase in rejections Deposit return scheme Contractual disputes EPR payments may be lower for commingling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased distance to tipping locations. Increase in rejections Deposit return scheme EPR payments may be lower for commingling and transferring disposal responsibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased distance to tipping locations. Market volatility affecting income Deposit return scheme Contractual disputes National Policy may limit gap between collections to two weeks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased distance to tipping locations. Deposit return scheme EPR payments may be lower for transferring disposal responsibility National Policy may limit gap between collections to two weeks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased distance to tipping locations. Market volatility affecting income Deposit return scheme Contractual disputes Risk of rejection if paper/card gets wet in bag 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased distance to tipping locations. Deposit return scheme EPR payments may be lower for transferring disposal responsibility Risk of rejection if paper/card gets wet in bag

EPR – Extended Producer Responsibility which is a proposal included with the Draft National Waste Strategy