

Almada LEAP meeting 21/22 October

Welcome to Almada by Caterina Freitas

Agenda Item	Discussion/Presentation	Comments/ To dos
<p>1. LEAP Green Procurement Tools</p> <p>Tools will have to be tested between 12 November and 12 January. By 12 February tools will have to be amended according to feedback from testing authorities. By June 2005 tools will have to be tested with additional cities (10 additional cities in total?).</p>		
<p><i>Tool 1: Policy (Holargos)</i></p>	<p>Aspasia from EPTA: Collecting and assessing good practice, development of a standard procedure. Questionnaire was sent to a number of local authorities. 8 responses received so far. 4 Policies to work on have also been received. Extending the deadline to have some more answers? Now have to decide on how the standard procedure should look like. Have to clarify who is going to test the procedure, only support partners or all LEAP partners. Have support partners sent out the questionnaires (Southwark)?</p> <p>Procedure will help local authorities to adopt a policy.</p>	<p>Approach Kirk Lees to see if he has sent out the questionnaires (G2L).</p> <p>ICLEI to contact local authorities that have not responded.</p> <p>G2L to provide template for standard policy to Holargos.</p> <p>Barcelona to contact additional cities to receive more information.</p>
<p><i>Tool 2:EMS Management Procedures (G2L)</i></p>	<p>Integrate EMS into each step of the public procurement. Pre-procurement phase: List of existing contracts including dates for renewal have to be identified.</p> <p>Procedures will be different depending on the environmental impact. Goes through the different steps of the procurement and describes how to link it to EMS.</p> <p>Lewisham: procedure seems to be very resource intensive, which is a problem. Process can be split and just some stages can be implemented if there are not enough resources to carry out the whole procedure. And just for some</p>	<p>All and especially Lewisham to comment on the procedure asap and the latest by the 12 November.</p> <p>Local authority to give indication on which parts of the procedure are on the agenda/important for the local authority.</p>

	contracts, not for all.	
<i>Tool 3: Self assessment of barriers to green procurement (Southwark)</i>	No representative of Southwark. Supporting authorities sent questionnaires.	Alison to find out where the tool stands.
<i>Tool 9: Access to information tool</i>	<p>Purpose: find our sources of information to help for green procurement, will be put on the website. Sides according to national sites, languages, type of site (Ecolabel, private), according to products. Database containing criteria on a number of products. There is a site description for each site, assessment of how relevant for procurement and for EMAS.</p> <p>It has to be checked if there is the possibility to have improved search functions for the database.</p>	<p>All to send national consortia to Tanya, information on websites, comments on the database, links to project partner websites.</p> <p>All to comment on the usability of the database. Tanya to send the draft around.</p> <p>ICLEI to check possibilities for integrating search functions in the online database.</p>
<i>Tool 8: Tender evaluation tool (Leicester)</i>	<p>Identify good practice, EU regulations, draft model, test model. Very few examples of good practice found. Newcastle, Goteborg. Outlines the evaluation criteria.</p> <p>Lewisham: mixed up evaluation and specifications, which is dangerous. Difficult to have a model or scoring because depends very much on the quality criteria of the actual contract.</p> <p>Göteborg evaluates also according to environmental criteria, score depends on the actual context.</p> <p>Rather general guidance than concrete evaluation scores, because this would just be too difficult. Develop some sort of generic model and test this down on the product.</p>	All, especially Dave Starling to send feedback to Alison on the draft until first week of November.
<i>Tool 7 Specifications and award criteria</i>	Renewable electricity. Having criteria that can be verified by third parties. Also think about how the product is going to be used. Influence behaviour. Third party financing	All to send comments to Diane

Tool 10: Supply Chain Management (Sutton)	Questionnaire was sent out. Coordination of different departments difficult.	
Tool 11: Market promotion (Lewisham)	No response to the questionnaire that was sent out at all.	
Testing the Tools (ICLEI)	<p>Helmut asks local authorities to give give tools to their procurers to test the package of tools. The team will then pull all the comments together and revise the tools before they go into the second testing phase with outside local authorities. ICLEI suggested to test the tools with BIG-Net or Procura+ participants. ICLEI to take the lead on this consultation. The second testing round should take place between February and June 2005.</p> <p>Suggested to test them also on the local authorities that responded to the survey we sent out in the beginning of the project, since they already have some experience in green procurement. ICLEI to care for this.</p>	<p>All participating authorities to have the tools tested by their procurement department.</p> <p>ICLEI to coordinate the consultation with procurement networks and other local authorities to test the tools.</p>
2. EMS and Green Procurement		
Göteborg	<p>Put knowledge on green procurement into the EMS. One aspect of the project. Would be useful to know who has an EMS. Sutton has EMAS registration. Almada is going for it and will have it in two years time. Göteborg has their own system, is working on other authorities to get some kind of system. Barcelona has a programme but not an EMAS. Lewisham is in the course of having EMS. Sandwell not, Amaroussian no proper EMS but an own system. Holargos not but has just started a project that has the introduction of an EMAS as one objective.</p> <p>Henrik warns that not so much attention and energy should be spent on integrating the two aspects.</p> <p>How can people be motivated to participate in the activities, how can</p>	<p>Assess progress on this in 6 months time.</p> <p>Next project meeting discuss how to concretely implement.</p>

	<p>municipal employees be motivated?</p> <p>Aspasia mentions that in Greece the most important hurdle is still the legal situation because for some products it is difficult to use environmental criteria if the price is higher than for standard products.</p> <p>Political support and individual motivation of the procurer are the most important things to work on.</p> <p>Role of LEAP within the municipalities: in most municipalities, it is really only the department taking the lead that is involved and interested/motivated. Concrete benefits are needed to get a real involvement.</p>	
3. Dissemination		
<i>Göteborg</i>	<p>Networks of procurement officers can be used as means of dissemination, national networks. Information on LEAP in Swedish on the website of Göteborg, 1000 leaflets were produced and will be distributed to the target audience. Articles and also an electronic and printed newsletter is distributed.</p>	
<i>Global to Local</i>	<p>Procurement event where LEAP was represented, information on the website, newsletter. Sustainable Community Summit early next year, G2L will have an event on procurement. Magazine that is sent out to local authorities.</p>	
<i>Leicester</i>	<p>Festival at the end of another project that will be used to disseminate the results.</p>	
<i>ESPOO</i>	<p>Support of somebody important</p>	
<i>Sutton</i>	<p>Articles in the municipalities magazine, posters to promote the websites. Meeting with councillors and senior executives, also with other senior staff, integrated in the annual report 2004 that goes to a high number</p>	

	of people.	
<i>Amaroussion</i>	Municipal newspaper will be published with information on environmental projects.	
<i>ICLEI</i>	Website, Leaflet, BIG-Net, Procura+, Procurement update, Sendai Conference, BIG-Net expert seminar in Aix October 2004, France, Austria, European Circular, Initiatives.	
	<p>Each partner has to contribute to the dissemination activities according to the proposal.</p> <p>Work done should be shared, for example articles and training courses, overheads.</p>	<p>Each partner to send a breakdown of how the time for dissemination will be used and what activities are planned to Alison until 12 November.</p> <p>ICLEI to put presentations on LEAP on the LEAP website.</p>
		Check if all are on the LEAP mailing list
<i>Leicester</i>	Project Management – 2 nd 6 monthly report	<p>Pro forma distributed to all partners for 2nd 6 monthly report</p> <p>Deadline for return to Leicester 12th November</p>
<i>Leicester</i>	<p>Time Management</p> <p>Last 6 months have been many delays in receiving back from partners, this has resulted in ICLEI having to chase partners resulting in their time being spent on chasing rather than the tasks they are sub-contracted to do.</p>	All partners to respond to requests for information within deadlines
<i>G2L</i>	Evaluation Procedures	All partners to read procedures and send comments to HL at G2L. Before report goes out.

		Tool leads to produce a matrix to address criteria
G2L	<p>Benchmarking</p> <p>6th EAP</p> <p>Test Tools against criteria in 6th EAP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cumulative Organisational Impact 2. Resource and Environmental Impact 3. Impact on local communities <p>Do tools help to improve on best practice?</p>	<p>Presentation to be sent out with notes from meeting.</p> <p>All tool leads to check tool against the criteria</p>
ICLEI	<p>Joint Procurement Model</p> <p>Meeting with Commission has highlighted some problems with original procurement model. Legal problems and unsolved issues to continue with model</p> <p>New procedure: „coordinated procurement“ rather than joint.</p> <p>Each participating authority puts out a call for tender at the same time in the journal and will reference other tenders and a special OJEU notice explaining what we are doing.</p> <p>Lewisham: important to have 2 stage process (pre qualification) in order to be able to assess supplier`s environmental policy and performance</p> <p>ESPO: would this approach work if authorities were operating to different timetables?</p> <p>SC: advert stage would be the same but after that process would differ between partners.</p> <p>Central Purchasing Body: new EU directive will allow for these to be established.</p> <p>Almada: concerns over 2 stage approach as they find this time consuming</p> <p>Lewisham: 2 stage approach does not need to be time consuming</p> <p>Contract should be the same between</p>	<p>Joint Procurement Working Group to discuss the new approach further and produce a more detailed procedure.</p> <p>All partners agreed that they use restricted process</p> <p>Working Group meeting needed to work-up a more detailed procedure.</p> <p>Tender Evaluation Tool to work alongside Joint Procurement Procedure</p>

	<p>partners as different contracts may affect the prices offered.</p> <p>ESPO: important that we use the same procedure either open or restricted and would recommend restricted as this simplifies process.</p> <p>HL: recommends a joint evaluation stage would be useful</p> <p>Prior Indicative Notice: PIN alerts market, one is needed for each country</p>	<p>Agreed a PIN would be advantageous</p>
<p>ICLEI</p>	<p>Commitment to Participation Private Companies: further investigation is needed to ascertain whether private companies could buy through the proposed contract.</p> <p>Leicester-ESPO: ESPO are happy to be part of the joint procurements, ESPO supply 7 large local authorities and their district authorities, and can also supply any other local authority.</p> <p>Almada: have just bought 200 computer and are not sure how many they will buy as part of this procurement.</p> <p>Cleaning Products: service is contracted out</p> <p>Barcelona: Cleaning is contracted out.</p> <p>Monitors: will have to ask IT how many they buy and when, unsure how many they buy at a time.</p> <p>Goteborg: will not be taking part</p> <p>Sutton; Building cleaning contracted out until 2006, TFT monitors,</p>	<p>Procurement Sub Group</p> <p>SC will amend Commitment and feedback is required by 12 th November</p> <p>Document to be signed and returned by end of November.</p> <p>Clause for variable technical specification during contract to ensure spec can stay up to date and reduction in price.</p> <p>Legality of subsuming suppliers into</p>

	<p>contracted to consortia, and will be talking to them to stock</p> <p>Lewisham: can not gurantee quantity monitors are bought through IT contract</p> <p>Sandwell: framework contracts are in place until March 06. Looking at having another franework alongside existing one and IT happy with this</p> <p>Cleaning: more complicated and not sure whether can take part</p> <p>Question: can authorities join contract at different dates? How long will contracts run for? UK happy with 3+1 years Holargos will investigate if this will be ok.</p> <p>Holargos: happy to take part, Mayor has signed document. Unsure what funding will be available to buy products (esp monitors)</p> <p>Amourousson: final version of commitment document</p> <p>Kalitheia: Municipal company need to make a formal decision and will do this at the end of October</p>	existing contracts (ICLEI)
<i>Goteborg</i>	<p>Are not taking part in Joint Procurement so will spend sometime on working with producers and suppliers.</p> <p>Cleaning Products: meet with producers to discuss different formula used in different countries.</p>	Goteborg to produce a plan of how they intend to do this and send to ICLEI by end of November.
	<p>Invite Desk Officer to next meeting</p> <p>Investigate next meeting at House of Commons via London Borough MP.s</p>	