

**Minutes of the Re-municipalisation of Waste Collection Service Subcommittee held on  
17<sup>th</sup> June 2021, Via MS Teams**

---

In Attendance:

Members:

Cllr Daithí Doolan (Chair) **(D.D.)**

Cllr. John Lyons **(J.L.)**

Peter Nolan, FORSA **(P.N.)**

Adrian Kane, SIPTU **(A.K.)**

Officials:

Liam Bergin, Executive Manager **(L.B.)**

Eithne Gibbons, Senior Executive Officer **(E.G.)**

Chris Carroll, Administrative Officer **(C.C)**

Ciarán McGoldrick **(CMcG)**

Apologies

Cllr Sophie Nicoullaud

1. Introductions

Introductions were made which are set out below

- Ciarán McGoldrick, Senior Staff Officer, Environment & Transportation Department, Administration Unit – Responsible for Administering the meetings of the Subcommittee **(CMcG)**
- Eithne Gibbons, Head of Waste Management Services
- Adrian Kane, Divisional Organiser, SIPTU
- Cllr. John Lyons, looking forward to working with group to progress and build on the work of the Committee to date.
- Chris Carroll, Administrative Officer, Environment & Transportation Department, Administration Unit

- Liam Bergin, Executive Manager, Environment & Transportation – welcomed the opportunity to attend the meeting
- Peter Nolan, National Secretary FORSA representing Local Government workers. Peter is also Vice-President of the European Public Service Union, Confederation of Local Government workers which is spearheading a campaign for remunicipalisation of services.

### **Order Noted**

2. Procuring research in to the Re-Municipalisation of Dublin City Waste Collection Service.

Councillor Doolan made the following observation on relation to the PIN document that was circulated

- Cllr. Nicoullaud on behalf of the Subcommittee engaged with the City Council's procurement Unit.
- A Prior Information Notice has been developed for the purpose of carrying out market consultation for the provision of research into the Re-Municipalisation of Waste Collection Service
- There are no contractual obligations attached to the PIN
- He believes that there is €70,000.00 in this year's budget to carry out the research

Liam Bergin raised the following points / questions

- Is it the City Council or the Subcommittee that will be publishing the PIN
- He spoke with the Procurement Unit who advised it was the impression that the Subcommittee were to issue the PIN. It was advice to the Subcommittee. The City Council would generally not operate this way.
- A Subcommittee of an SPC cannot request this information on behalf of the City Council that has not been approved.
- It is the function of a Subcommittee to recommend a matter to the SPC which in turn (if approved) makes a recommendation to the CPG and the CPG thereafter makes a recommendation to the City Council.
- The companies / institutions reading the PIN will need to know the likelihood of business accruing from the PIN. Prospective tenderers should not be misled.
- Procurement is highly complex and litigious
- It is vital that the governance of this process is clearly established.
- I cannot recollect Members compiling a PIN for a local authority

- Members do not have the power to sign a contract.
- If PIN notice issues from members without the authority to sign a contract – this could cause problems
- The Pin in its current format is problematic by design and structure.
- Typically the SPC would request the executive to review the PIN
- It suggested that the Executive review the document (PIN) and report back with suggestions.

Members made the following points / observations

- It is my understanding that the objective of this Subcommittee is to fulfil a motion agreed by the City Council to procure a report in relation to the re-municipalisation of waste collection service **(P.N.)**
- It is the position of the City Council that a report be procured **(J.L.)**
- When and agreed position (by the Committee / SPC) is reached it should be a matter for the Executive to carry out the appropriate procurement **(J.L.)**
- How do we now proceed to get this piece of work completed **(D.D.)**
- What is sought from management is how best to proceed with this (procurement of a report)

Liam Bergin responded.

- The PIN in the current format has number of errors e.g. confining the competition to Ireland, it must be open to the EU. This could be litigious.
- I suggest that the Executive review the PIN and respond to the group
- It is recommended the Subcommittee proceed with advice given by the Executive. This will endeavour to protect Councillors and the Executive alike.
- We will revert to the committee the Executive's recommendations on the working document to a future meeting of the Subcommittee.
- We will revert to the to the Subcommittee with an approach for endorsement
- When endorsed the Executive will complete the detail and resubmit for consideration and thereafter to the SPC for approval.

**Order: Noted. It was agreed that the Executive will review the document (PIN) and bring back a proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration by the SPC and ultimately the Council.**

**Cllr. Daithí Doolan**

***Chairperson, Re-Municipalisation of Waste Collection Service Subcommittee***