

LEAP Project Meeting

Date: 14th –15th April 2005

Agenda Item	Discussion/Presentation	Comments/ To dos
<p>1. Welcome to Brighton Diane Smith gave a ‘Welcome to Brighton’ and a short introduction to the City.</p>		
<p>2. LEAP Green Procurement Tools Task 3 1st April 2004 – 1st December 2004 Task 6 1st November 2004 – 1st December 2005 Since October 2004 LEAP partners have been working on the refinement of the Procurement Tools. Each Tool had been amended from feedback received since the last meeting and is currently being tested and assessed in each partner city.</p>		
<p><i>Timetable</i></p>	<p>All partners are currently testing and assessing tools within their own organisation.</p> <p>All partners are completing questionnaires for each Tool. The questionnaire results will be feedback to each Tool lead partner who will use the feedback to amend the Tool.</p> <p><u>6th May –20th May 2005</u></p> <p>G2L will collate questionnaires for each tool and pass back amendments to be incorporated into tool</p> <p><u>20th May – 6th June 2005</u></p> <p>Tool leads will amend tools prior to testing in 10 non-LEAP organisations.</p> <p><u>8th June 2005</u></p> <p>Tools to go to 10 non-LEAP partners for testing-assessment</p> <p><u>10th June 2005</u></p> <p>Revised Tools will be put on website</p>	<p><u>All Tool Lead Partners to pass questionnaires to Diane Smith by 30th April</u></p> <p>(subsequently amended to Friday 6th May)</p> <p><u>G2L to co-ordinate feedback</u></p> <p><u>All Tool leads to amend tools and return to G2L</u></p> <p>ICLEI are recruiting 10 non-LEAP organisations for testing</p>
<p><i>Tool 1: Policy (Holargos)</i></p>	<p>Tool 1 has been amended and improved since presentation in October 2004.</p> <p>Feedback has resulted in the layout being improved</p> <p>Comments included: Green Procurement Policy needs to integrate into Procurement Strategies –UK authorities are being instructed by central government to meet demands within a National Procurement</p>	<p>Holargos to amend Tool 1 after feedback from questionnaires.</p>

	<p>Strategy.</p> <p>Barcelona commented that they would benefit from an explanation in the introduction to explain that authorities can pick out parts of the Green Procurement Policy rather than having to use the entire tool.</p> <p>A number of the points in Tool 1 to be moved into other tools especially Chapter 5 which needs to go into Tool 7.</p>	
<i>Tool 2:EMS Management Procedures (G2L)</i>	<p>Tool 2 is a set of Procedures to control the procurement process.</p> <p>Feedback: discussion around whether environmental risk i.e. high medium and low should determine whether procurement should follow proposed procedures rather than monetary value</p> <p>A risk assessment chart at the beginning of the Tool would help this process.</p>	G2L to amend based on feedback and questionnaire results
<i>Tool 3: Self assessment of barriers to green procurement (Southwark)</i>	<p>This tool was not presented in October 04</p> <p>The tool has now developed into a self assessment tool for authorities to use</p> <p>There is a strong link between 2 an 3 that needs to be addressed</p> <p>All partners are currently assessing and feedback from questionnaires expected.</p>	Southwark to amend based on feedback and questionnaire results.
<i>Tool 7 Specifications and award criteria (SEMCO)</i>	<p>Standard Specifications:</p> <p>Food Procurement: discussion around ‘seasonal’ produce, and information contained in the ‘Buying Green’ handbook.</p> <p>Variance: discussion about variance of contracts and rewarding ‘extra’ environmental considerations above the specification. It was thought that award criteria need to be very explicit about how contract will be awarded.</p> <p>New procurement directives state that award criteria weightings need to be transparent.</p> <p>The issue of Tools overlapping was discussed as it was felt other tools overlapped in particular with Tool 7.</p> <p>It was suggested that some information from Tool 1 (Chapter 5) could be transferred to Tool 7</p> <p>Some elements of Tool 8 could be transferred to Tool 7</p> <p>Some information contained in Tool 7 Appendices could be included in the main text</p>	SEMCO to amend after questionnaire feedback

	to allow it to be more accessible	
Tool 8: Tender evaluation tool (Leicester)	<p>This Tool has changed considerably from what was presented in Almada.</p> <p>It now contains guidance on Tender Evaluation for Environmental staff and Procurement staff to use during the procurement process.</p> <p>The Guidance contains a Tender Evaluation model used by the UK's Environment Agency, where particular emphasis is placed on the Environmental weighting. It was commented that this might be appropriate for such an organisation like the EA but not necessarily for a local authority.</p>	Leicester to amend from feedback and questionnaire results.
Tool 9: Access to information tool	<p>Format:</p> <p>The tool has been amended to include a search facility to search by: language, label, and product and it was felt this was a big improvement and made the information more accessible.</p> <p>Keeping info up to date:</p> <p>The issue of keeping the data up to date as information changes was discussed. This was particularly important for both the lifetime of the project and beyond. It was suggested this was discussed with the Commission (possibly with the EMAS desk officer) and how it might link to the 'Buying Green Handbook'</p> <p>All partners are currently testing-using this tool, it was felt that this tool in particular was useful for environmental officers who might be asked to help select criteria for products to be included in tender documentation.</p> <p>General comments included queries on whether it would be possible to highlight 'recently visited sites'.</p> <p>Note needed reL criteria and whether they are all permissible under EU procurement regulations</p>	<p>Feedback about the format will be gained from questionnaires.</p> <p>Approach Commission re: links to Buying Green handbook</p> <p>Approach EMAS desk officer at commission to discuss</p> <p>Discuss with Commission attendance at next meeting (November 05)</p> <p>For the duration of the LEAP project G2L will update the tool on a 6 monthly cycle to improve its useability</p>
Tool 10: Supply Chain Management (Sutton)	<p>Since the last meeting feedback had been provided and the tool amended.</p> <p>Comments included: a concern that this tool needs to remain simple and not too complex if it is going to get used</p> <p>Post 2006, the tool will need to be kept up to date</p> <p>The issue around making sure all tools link</p>	<p>Sutton to amend tool from feedback and questionnaires</p> <p>Sutton to ask for examples and case studies from Spain, Portugal, Greece and include Barcelona, Almada, Holargos,</p>

	<p>Final version of letter, form and tool descriptions ready</p> <p>Letter of invitation sent to 300 Local Authorities</p> <p>Adapting instructions</p> <p>Adapting questionnaire</p> <p>Final list of cities</p> <p>Send out Tools, instructions and questionnaires</p> <p>Support for cities to complete questionnaires</p> <p>Receive feedback from testing cities</p> <p>Project Workshop</p> <p>Final Report</p> <p>Discussion: it was stressed that input was needed from northern central and southern European countries and that the choice of the 10 testing cities should reflect this.</p> <p>June-July is holiday period in Sweden</p> <p>An initial list of 340 municipalities has been gathered and all will be circulated so we can all assist in finalising the 10 testing cities.</p> <p>What is the process of testing?</p> <p>The testing process will consist of participants either reading or using the tools and completing a questionnaire (similar to the questionnaire used by LEAP partners)</p>	<p>19th April 2005</p> <p>22nd April 2005</p> <p>10th May 2005</p> <p>10th May 2005</p> <p>23rd May 2005</p> <p>6th June 2005</p> <p>31st July 2005</p> <p>1st August 2005</p> <p>November 2005</p> <p>1st December 2005</p> <p>ICLEI to circulate list to partners</p> <p>Testing period by 10 cities to take account of Summer holiday period ICLEI to revise timetable.</p> <p>All Partners to respond with any other contacts.</p>
<p>5. 1st Joint Procurement</p>		
<p>Task 5 1st November 2004 – 1st September 2005</p>		
<p><i>ICLEI</i> <i>Simon</i> <i>Clement</i></p>	<p>As reported at previous partner meeting the approach to Task 5 has changed from a ‘joint procurement’ with all partners buying from a single contract, to a ‘co-ordinated’ approach where each country represented in the LEAP project will go out to tender at the same time for the same products. There will be a notice in the Journal for Portugal, Spain, Greece, UK and an overall notice linking the 4.</p> <p>The two products selected for the 1st Joint procurement are:</p> <p><u>TFT computer monitors</u>: a specification has been developed in consultation with EKU, which asks for an improved energy</p>	<p>JH to look at Leicester’s existing IT contracts and how</p>

	<p>performance. Initial supplier research has suggested that suppliers will be able to meet the enhanced energy efficiency in the specification</p> <p><u>Cleaning products:</u> a specification has been developed in consultation with ECU, Initial supplier research has not been so successful, and there may be doubts that suppliers will be able/willing to meet the specification in all countries.</p> <p>For the cleaning products, the issue was also raised that it would be very difficult for procurers to check the compliance of the offered products with the criteria set. The approach proposed previously has been to ask suppliers to declare that the criteria are met, however several UK authorities felt that this would not be sufficient</p> <p>It is the intention to set up 3 year framework contracts and for the monitor contract in particular it will be necessary to include a variation clause that will allow the contract to supply monitors as technology and performance improves over the lifetime of the contract.</p> <p>In the UK ESPO have now confirmed they will co-ordinate the UK monitor contract and Lewisham will co-ordinate the cleaning product contract.</p> <p>Evaluation: discussion took place about the need for all Tender Evaluation to be the same for each country</p> <p>The notices need to be placed in the European Journal and ICLEI need a final decision on which partners are participating in each procurement.</p> <p>Target date for publication is end of May 05</p> <p><u>Barriers to participation:</u> a discussion took place about the barriers some partners were experiencing.</p> <p>The timing of letting the 2 contracts was not convenient for some partners, either because they did not anticipate buying the products in the foreseeable future (particularly monitors) and where their cleaning contract has been outsourced, some authorities were not able to direct their contractors towards particular products.</p>	<p>they are kept up to date with changing technology, pass to ICLEI.</p> <p>ICLEI to investigate alternative approaches to verifying compliance</p> <p>All partners to confirm whether or not they are participating by 22nd April 2005</p>
--	---	--

	<p>It was stressed that the contracts would be framework contracts and that by being mentioned in the notice did not commit a partner to actually buy anything, but it did allow them the opportunity to do so over the next 3 years.</p>	
<p>2nd Joint Procurement Task 7 1st August 2005-1st May 2006</p>		
<p>New Procurement Directives</p>	<p>The project envisages a 2nd Joint Procurement and a discussion took place about the options available to us.</p> <p>Three issues/options were discussed:</p> <p>1) It may be worth re-examining whether there is a way to set up joint procurement in the way originally intended, despite the advice received so far. It is principally contract law rather than procurement legislation hindering this, and it may be that legal experts would give a different opinion than the Commission sources.</p> <p>2) The new Procurement Directives may provide for Central Purchasing Bodies (CPBs) to be set up, which could in turn be used for cross-border joint-procurement. This will depend how and when the Directives are transposed into national law. Even if this doesn't happen within the project timeframe this would be useful information</p> <p>3) If it is not possible to carry out cross-border joint procurement in the second round, then national joint procurement activities would certainly be a good alternative - especially in countries where this is new - Greece, Portugal and Spain. These could focus on different products, or again be co-ordinated between all countries.</p> <p>Discussion: re impact of new directives, UK intends law to be adopted by Jan 06, Goteborg felt law would be adopted too late for LEAP project to utilize.</p>	<p>ICLEI to investigate employing a legal sub-contractor to provide a new model</p> <p>ICLEI, with the help of partners, to investigate the current status of transcribing in the LEAP countries, re. CPBs</p> <p>ICLEI to look into the legality of joint procurement in each country, and at possible product groups for national and cross-border joint procurement</p>
<p>Products for 2nd Procurement</p>	<p><u>Paper</u>: UK partners felt paper would not be a suitable product as many authorities are already buying recycled paper at a competitive price. This was not the case for Greece Spain and Portugal and paper might be a product these 3 countries could consider.</p> <p><u>Green Electricity</u>: Southwark were currently looking at their electricity contract, Leicester will investigate as well</p>	<p>Leicester to investigate how they are procuring green</p>

	<p><u>PC's</u>: could be considered</p> <p><u>Cars</u>: perhaps consideration could be given to purchasing 'mobility' rather than specifying vehicles</p>	<p>electricity</p> <p>Telephone conference to be organised to brainstorm products for 2nd Joint procurement</p>
<p>6. Project Management</p> <p>Task 10 1st November 2003 –31st October 2006</p>		
<p><i>Leicester</i></p> <p><i>Amin Girach</i></p> <p><i>Alison Lea</i></p>	<p><u>Interim Report:</u></p> <p>The project is at a stage where the Interim Report is due to be prepared and sent to the Commission.</p> <p>The Interim Report will cover the first 18 months of the project (i.e. 1st November 2003 – 30th April 2005).</p> <p>The Interim Report consists of 2 elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A progress report on the work programme and progress with the Tasks. This is the same format as for 6-monthly reports. All partners have been sent a template to complete and return to Leicester. 2. Completion of detailed financial forms far more detailed than previously submitted with the 6-monthly reports. <p><u>The Interim Report must be submitted and approved by the Commission before they will release the next payment. It is vital that all partners submit both elements of the Interim Report to Leicester by the deadline.</u></p> <p>Amin Girach from Leicester City Council's financial strategy team gave a presentation detailing how the financial forms should be completed. Partners raised the following issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All financial reports need to be supported by evidence of expenditure i.e. timesheets and invoices and receipts. 2. External Assistance: money contained in this budget is to be spent on paying the LEAP project sub-contractors. It was agreed at the 1st project meeting that Leicester would let this contract on behalf of the partners. ICLEI would then invoice partners for the pieces of work outlined on pages 75 and 76 of the project contract. 	<p>All partners to submit Progress report on work programme and completion of tasks to AL at Leicester by Friday 13th May 2005.</p> <p>All partners to submit completed financial forms and evidence to AL at Leicester by Friday 13th May 2005</p> <p>AL to write Holargos and Amarousson re-affirming what money in the External Assistance budget can be used for.</p>

	<p>3. ICLEI to provide detailed invoices to partners.</p> <p>4. Personnel Costs: the project contract sets out for each partner which staff they anticipated working on the project, their grade and day rates. Partners should base their claims on these figures any changes must be reasonable and justified.</p> <p>5. Consumables: where partners do not buy consumables specifically for the LEAP project it is possible to charge a % of your total consumable budget based on the % of your time spent on LEAP i.e. If your team spends 20% of its time working on LEAP charge LEAP 20% of your consumable budget.</p> <p>6. Overheads: LIFE limits overheads to 7% of total budget. Most organisations have a methodology for calculating overheads. Include details of this calculation and how you have arrived at your overhead figure. If your Overheads are in excess of 7% of total LEAP budget you must cap it at 7%.</p>	
<p>Partner Performance</p>	<p>Concerns were raised about the level of input some partners were putting into the project. The project is currently working on tasks 3, 4, 5 and 6. All partners have been allocated funding to work on these tasks based on an agreed amount of time they are to devote to each task.</p> <p>For the project to be a success and for the Commission to release the next payment, all partners need to demonstrate that they are spending the required amount of staff time on the project.</p> <p>Goteborg felt that because the tools were written in English it would be difficult for their procurement staff to use them.</p> <p>Barcelona have experienced problems allocating staff time to the project.</p> <p>Discussion took place about the consequences for partners who were not allocating enough staff time to the project and were not delivering the expected project outputs.</p>	<p>AL will circulate breakdown of time each partner is to spend on each task</p> <p>Goteborg to use some of their time allocation to translate tools into Swedish to facilitate their testing</p> <p>AL to write to Domenec Cucuruell to confirm time allocation Barcelona have committed to project and confirm staff time will be made available to meet the project outputs</p>

	<p>Leicester is the project lead and is responsible to the commission for achieving the deliverables and outputs in the project contract.</p> <p>The Partnership agreement signed by partners contains a clause about partner performance and Leicester has the opportunity to withhold payment from partners who having been given notice that their performance needs improving, still fail to improve.</p>	
<p>7. Dissemination</p> <p>8. Task 9 1st November 2003 –31st October 2006</p>		
<p><i>Final Conference</i></p>	<p>A proportion of the External Assistance (102,490 euro) budget is allocated to organising a final dissemination event.</p> <p>At the 1st LEAP project meeting it was decided that this event should be held in conjunction with the Eco-Procura event planned for 2006.</p> <p>To ease administration and to avoid delay in ICLEI receiving this money it was agreed that Leicester will forward the 102,490 allocated in the External Assistance budget direct to ICLEI. Leicester will provide partners with paperwork and an audit trail to ensure their accounts are correct.</p> <p>Leicester to agree with ICLEI schedule of payments.</p> <p>At the 2nd Project meeting in Amaroussion it was agreed that Barcelona Provincial council will host the Eco-Procura-LEAP final conference.</p> <p>Subsequently Barcelona City Council have agreed to jointly host the event.</p> <p>ICLEI, Leicester and Barcelona need to start planning this event and will be meeting after the Brighton meeting to discuss a timetable and way forward.</p> <p>It was agreed that the LEAP partners needed to ensure that event will meet the dissemination outputs and deliverables contained within the LEAP contract.</p> <p>ICLEI have prepared a draft agreement outlining the roles and responsibilities of:</p> <p>ICLEI, Leicester City Council, Barcelona Provincial Council and Barcelona City Council</p> <p>Project information leaflet/newsletter The information leaflet produced at the</p>	<p>Leicester to forward this element of the External Assistance direct to ICLEI and provide paperwork to partners to ensure accounts are correct.</p> <p>Leicester as beneficiary to ensure all LEAP outputs and deliverables are met by proposed Eco-Procura-LEAP event.</p> <p>Leicester to ensure agreement covers all LEAP's requirements and circulate to partners before signing</p> <p>Agreed that Leicester will co-ordinate production of a</p>

	<p>beginning of the project is now out of date and almost out of stock.</p> <p>Newsletter to produced in electronic format (pdf)</p> <p>Website: DStarling asked whether website can be used to hold tender documents</p>	<p>newsletter giving an update at 18 months onto the project and another towards the end of 2005</p> <p>ICLEI confirmed extra pages on website can be provided</p>
<i>Project Meetings</i>	<p>The next LEAP project meeting will be in November in Goteborg. It will be held to coincide with an Environmental Awards event in Goteborg.</p> <p>The April 06 meeting might be held in Freiburg, Germany - this to be confirmed..</p>	<p>Goteborg to inform Leicester as soon as date is set for awards event.</p> <p>ICLEI to see whether possible to host April meeting</p>
	<p>The meeting concluded at 13:30 on Friday 15th April 2005.</p>	