

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT AND TECHNICAL SERVICES BY  
DEPUTY M. TADIER OF ST. BRELADE  
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 24TH FEBRUARY 2009**

**Question**

Would the Minister inform the Assembly how the criteria applied within the Babbie-Fichtner Technology Review 2008 to all the plants reviewed (namely ‘A key factor in determining the sustainability of facilities has been the ability of the proposed process to deal with the whole waste stream.’) arose and who approved it?

Answer:

Unfortunately the Deputy is only quoting one sentence from the paragraph in question. For completeness, the entire paragraph reads as follows:

*“2008 Technology Review Report:*

*A key factor in determining the suitability of facilities has been the ability of the proposed process to deal with the whole waste stream. A number of technologies listed above are considered proven and commercially available, but have been rejected because they can only process part of Jersey’s waste stream. Pre-treatment processes have not been rejected without careful consideration. The cost of multiple facilities, together with limited land available and a small workforce, means that these are not considered practical or affordable solutions.”*

This paragraph needs to be considered as a whole and in conjunction with the criteria set by the Public Services Committee in 2003 when they issued the OJEC (Official Journal of the European Community) Notice inviting companies to submit an “expression of interest” who could “...supply equipment to replace the existing waste incinerator with a new facility(ies) to dispose of the entire non-inert waste arisings on the Island of Jersey” and “It is essential that the Contractor can offer a proven and reliable solution. The Contractor is requested to provide the following information to demonstrate this capability:

- *A description of the proposed solution for Jersey including proposed plant capacities and drawings showing plant footprints.*
- *Operating records from at least two reference plants of a similar capacity to that proposed. The reference plants should process similar type of wastes. Details should be provided showing several years throughput at each reference plant, together with a contact at each plant.*
- *A Reference list showing similar projects using the proposed solution(s) which have been successfully completed, showing client, location, type of waste, capacity of plant and date of completion.*
- *Evidence that the Contractor can demonstrate compliance with UK (or equivalent) Health and Safety Regulations.*
- *Evidence that the Contractor’s proposed solution will comply with European Environmental Regulations and Best Practice.*
- *Acceptance by the Contractor that the performance of the plant will be demonstrated against commercial process guarantees with consequential liquidated damages.*
- *The Contractor is requested to provide a budget capital cost for the proposed solution together with estimates of annual operating costs and staffing numbers. This information shall be based upon existing operating facilities.”*

The OJEC notice was used as a mechanism to attract any company who could meet the criteria set by the Committee and following their submission of the “expression of interest”, these companies were then evaluated against the criteria.

The Technology Review report considers each individual technology against the criteria set by the Committee and clearly states that many are proven but were rejected when taken in the context of meeting Jersey’s overall requirement.