


**RECORD OF EXERCISE OF DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY OFFICER PURSUANT TO
REGULATION 13 OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS)
(MEETINGS AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012 &
THE OPENNESS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT BODIES REGULATIONS 2014**

<u>SUBJECT OF DECISION</u>	
Procurement of route optimisation system for waste operations – G14-Cloud Framework	
<u>DECISION REFERENCE</u>	<u>SOURCE OF AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE</u> (i.e. Committee/ Constitution/Minute No. etc.)
DO/27/2025 (KH)	3D Officer Delegations – Part A – General Delegations 3D.1 (of the Constitution)
<u>DATE OF DECISION</u>	<u>DECISION MAKER (Name and Job Title)</u>
<u>1st August 2025</u>	Kevin Hollis Strategic Director – Public Services 
<u>RECORD OF THE DECISION</u>	
<p>a) The issue – NBBC does not have route optimisation software for the management of routing schedules for its vehicles, without this software making efficiencies on a wide scale is not possible and also we would be unable to incorporate new legislative requirements of a free food waste collection service or the possible changes to the recycling service – and the possibilities this presents for usage of vehicle efficiencies.</p> <p>b) The Decision The first ranked call off option be pursued, via G14-Cloud Framework, in order to appoint a suitable route optimisation software to support NBBC waste operations throughout the borough.</p> <p>Subject to compliance with the Councils Contracts Procedures Rules, the first ranked named and most economically advantageous supplier be appointed.</p>	
<u>REASON FOR THE DECISION</u>	
To ensure a suitable supplier is appointed to support NBBC waste operational requirements, whilst maintaining cost efficiency.	

<u>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED IN MAKING THE DECISION</u>
Previous route optimisation project was carried out in 2023 by using Coventry City Council software, this was a one of project which does not allow us to proactively monitor and change routes to meet the demands of a growing borough, therefore the use of another authorities systems was rejected.
<u>WARD RELEVANCE</u>
<u>All</u>
<u>FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</u>
Projected 4 year (3+1) estimated contract costs £35,884.00
<u>CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN WITH MEMBERS/OFFICERS</u>
Discussions with relevant officers from waste management and portfolio holder Presented to Senior Leadership Team for sign off
<u>ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARED BY ANY MEMBER CONSULTED</u>
None
<u>IN RESPECT OF ANY DECLARED CONFLICT BY A CABINET MEMBER, ANY DISPENSATION GIVEN BY THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE</u> (Note if the decision is a non-executive decision, no dispensation can be given).
<u>None</u>
<u>EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS (including any Equality Impact Assessment)</u>
None
<u>HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS</u>
None
<u>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</u>
As per Financial and Budget Implications above.
<u>HEALTH EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS</u>
None
<u>SECTION 17 CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS</u>
None

<u>RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS</u> Failure to award suitable supplier could severely disrupt implementation of food waste service and prevent waste operations from providing an efficient use of vehicles and all collection services.
<u>SME (SMALL/MEDIUM ENTERPRISES) & LOCAL ECONOMY IMPLICATIONS</u> None
<u>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS</u> Increased carbon emissions, increased fuel consumption.
<u>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</u> <u>Potential legal challenges</u>
<u>ANY OTHER COMMENTS</u> None

PLEASE RETURN TO THE MONITORING OFFICER AS SOON AS A DECISION IS MADE OR AS REASONABLY PRACTICABLE THEREAFTER