

In Confidence – Commercially Sensitive



Organic Waste Treatment Service Contract

- Tender Report

September 2006

CONTENTS

1.0	PURPOSE
2.0	BACKGROUND
3.0	CONTRACTUAL ISSUES
4.0	TENDERS RECEIVED
5.0	EVALUATION
6.0	TENDER RETURNS
7.0	DISCUSSION
8.0	CONCLUSIONS
9.0	RECOMMENDATIONS
Appendix I	SERVICE FACILITIES OFFERED
Appendix II	WHOLE LIFE COSTS
Appendix III	TONNAGE BANDED GATE FEES
Appendix IV	INDICATIVE DELIVERY LOCATIONS
Appendix V	PROJECTED TONNAGES

Organic Waste Treatment Service Contract

1. Purpose

To make recommendations arising from tender action for Organic Waste Treatment services for arc21.

2. Background

As Members are aware, tenders were invited in June 2005, through the European Union Procurement Regulations 1993 - Restricted Procedure, for the provision of Organic Waste Treatment capacity, to process source segregated organic waste collected by arc21 Councils, in accordance with the sub-regional Waste Management Plan.

This involved the compilation of a Select List of Tenderers through a pre-qualification questionnaire procedure. In this case, a Select List of eight Tenderers was approved by the Joint Committee.

3. Contractual Issues

3.1 Tender Documents

The main elements of the tender documents are as follows:

3.1.1 Service Delivery Plan

The specification was designed as an output specification requiring Tenderers to demonstrate through a Service Delivery Plan, how the Client's requirements would be met. The documents specified the minimum requirements to be included in each section of the Service Delivery Plan and the fact that the Plan would be incorporated as a binding contractual requirement in any tender accepted.

3.1.2 Specification

Organic Waste Treatment Service Contract Summary

Objective:

1. To provide an Organic Waste Treatment Service to assist arc21 in meeting recycling targets and the requirement to divert materials from landfill.

Elements include:

- Feedstock material delivered from kerbside collections, primarily commingled (Type 2). Material in a separate stream collected at Civic Amenity Sites (Type 1) will also be presented. Materials will comprise

single stream and commingled source segregated organic kitchen and garden waste.

- Individual Councils deliver kerbside collected waste and Civic Amenity waste to the Contractor's facilities (see Appendix IV).
- Compliant bid to utilise the three offered Council sites located within Antrim, Belfast and Down.
- Option to include alternative bids subject to the inclusion of a compliant bid.
- Contractor may offer start up arrangements to process material in advance of the permanent facilities becoming operational.
- Planning risk with arc21, the Contractor having to comply with reasonably foreseeable planning conditions and with contractual arrangements in place for termination without fault and compensation of agreed costs in the event of planning refusal.
- Permitting risk with Contractor.
- Council sites offered are included as a catalogue with the tender documents, provided without prejudice.
- Recognized Quality Standard specified for output material to ensure landfill diversion and sale of outputs.
- Contractor to market outputs.

3.1.3 Conditions of Contract / Pricing Mechanism

- Single service contract for all facilities.
- Gate fee contract to provide capacity from the processing facilities.
- Gate fee banded by tonnage for input materials.
- Year on year price indexation arrangement.
- Profit sharing mechanism should the market value of outputs rise dramatically.
- Minimum tonnage guaranteed by the Client (80% of projections).
- Minimum feedstock quality guaranteed by the Client (Maximum 10% contamination in any one load – Maximum 5% overall annual average).

In Confidence – Commercially Sensitive

- Projected tonnages and material streams as per arc21 Waste Management Plan and agreed with each Council (see Appendix V).
- First three years tonnages to be agreed with the successful contractor to allow Council roll-out of brown bins to match treatment capacity coming on-line.
- Exclusivity clause requiring all relevant organic kitchen and garden waste feedstock to be committed to the contract.
- Contract duration of fifteen years, with optional extensions of one-year blocks subject to six months advanced notice being given.
- Cost of a bond to the value of £100,000 to be included as an option to be taken up at the Client's discretion.

3.1.4 Other Issues

- arc21 may underwrite the preferred Contractor to produce the information required by the Client to submit planning applications for the Council sites during the two-month period while individual Councils give approval. If the preferred Contractor for some reason is not awarded the contract, reasonable costs for the agreed activities incurred during this period may be awarded by arc21.
- Where a Council delivers less than their guaranteed tonnage resulting in arc21 failing to deliver the guaranteed tonnage to the Contractor, then the Council will be expected to make a payment at the prevailing rate.

4. Tender Returns

Valid tenders were received from four Contractors by the closing date of 3pm on 9th May 2006. The Tenderers were as follows:

Agrivert Limited, Radford, Oxfordshire.

MB Composting, Rugby, Warwickshire.

Natural World Products Limited (NWP), Keady, County Armagh.

**Thames Water Services Limited Trading as Terra Eco Systems,
Reading, Berkshire.**

As requested by the Client, each Tenderer submitted separate compliant bids for the fifteen year contract utilising the three Council sites. In addition, the Contractors submitted a total of six other bids, giving a total of ten tenders.

The remaining four select list Contractors submitted formal withdrawal letters. There was no common reason cited for withdrawal.

The Agrivert compliant bid proposed transfer facilities at Antrim and Down with treatment facilities for all feedstock at Belfast. The one Agrivert variant bid proposed treatment facilities for all feedstock at Belfast with no transfer facilities provided but offering a lower gate-fee.

The MB compliant bid proposed transfer facilities at Antrim and Down with treatment facilities for all feedstock at Belfast. The two MB variant bids proposed a similar service delivery regime, one with a fifteen year period and variant finance package and the other with a twenty-five year period and variant finance package and offering lower gate-fees.

The NWP compliant bid proposed transfer facilities at Antrim and Down with treatment facilities for all feedstock at Belfast. The two other NWP bids also proposed transfer facilities at Antrim and Down but with green waste treatment at Belfast and kerbside collected kitchen and garden waste treatment at a proposed facility on their Glenside site. One bid proposed all kerbside material be delivered to Glenside rather than Belfast and the other offered a transfer station at Belfast with kerbside material going to the closer of Glenside direct or the Belfast transfer station.

The Terra Eco compliant bid proposed a transfer facility at Antrim with treatment facilities for all feedstock at Belfast and Down. The one other Terra Eco bid proposed treatment facilities for all feedstock at Belfast, Antrim and Down but offering a higher gate-fee.

The various service delivery proposals are summarised in tables at Appendix I.

5. Evaluation

5.1 Criteria

Tender Evaluation Criteria used for assessing tenders, were in accordance with the Official Journal of the European Community (OJEC) Notice and the criteria stated in the documents.

The main elements of the Tender Evaluation Process have been grouped into: Cost; Technical; and Quality, with relative weightings as follows:

Assessment - Section	Weighting	Assessment: Sub-Section	Key aspects are likely to include:
Cost	55%	Gate price Financial Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of cost • Value for money • Sustainability
Technical	45%	Service Delivery Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compatibility with ERWVG Plan* • Service structure • Deliverability • Programme • Output streams and quality • Markets availability and security
QA	Scored in the technical element	Service Delivery Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems • Self Monitoring Proposals

(*) The ERWVG Plan is the Eastern Regional Waste Management Plan now more commonly known as the arc21 Waste Management Plan.

Cost is defined as whole life costs, including gate fees, travel costs and residual values.

The cost element also includes the assessment of the Financial Plan, designed to allow the client to evaluate sustainability over the contract period.

5.2 Methodology

The tender process was administered throughout by Jacobs Babbie. The main Evaluation Team consisted of Members of arc21 and the Technical Working Group, supported by Jacobs Babbie staff with an observer from the Strategic Investment Board (Northern Ireland).

While the main Evaluation Team worked on the overall and technical elements of the tender assessment process, supported by the UK Composting Association, two sub-groups worked in parallel to assess the Financial Plan and Transport Costs, using the bespoke financial and transport models previously designed for this purpose.

The financial sub-group consisted of staff from arc21 with support from accountants in the Finance Sub Group and Caledonian Economics, a company specialising in this type of work. The transport sub-group consisted of Jacobs Babbie staff who had originally designed the transport model. The financial sub-group was provided with supplementary support through other specialist sources, particularly from PriceWaterhouseCoopers (Accountancy) and White Young and Green (Quantity Surveying).

The Evaluation Team evaluated the interface elements of the Service Delivery Plan while the UK Composting Association evaluated the process elements of the Service Delivery Plan. The UK Composting Association was chosen as the leading authority in the field, being both co-author and certificating body for the UK National Composting Standard, PAS100. The UK Composting Association used their standing consultants, ORA, to assist them in the work. It is of note that ORA are part of the IGW Group who are acknowledged as World experts in composting, having first pioneered source segregated collections of organic municipal waste and composting of the arisings in Germany in the 1980's.

In accordance with a pre-agreed programme, the Evaluation Team and sub-groups met on a number of occasions to assess the tenders, using a pre-determined structured marking system and proforma.

This process resulted in a number of clarification queries with all four Tenderers. The clarification queries were addressed in writing and through a formal meeting held with each Tenderer. A number of site visits to contractor reference plants were also held to finalise the technical aspects of the evaluation arising from the clarifications received.

The Team met on a number of further occasions to review the tenders, taking into account clarification responses and input from the sub-groups and UK Composting Association, with the last review meeting being held on Monday 25th September 2006.

Due to the nature and extent of tenders, the whole process has been necessarily detailed with the consequence that the programme has slipped by one month.

5.3 Marking System

The Evaluation Team marked tenders in accordance with the criteria agreed, using whole life costs for the tonnages projected in the tender documents, assessing the impact of total gate fees, transport costs and residual value.

In addition, sensitivity analyses were undertaken using a range of varying tonnages and residual life cycle valuation of assets.

6. Tender Outcome

As stated above, ten tenders have been received from four Select List Tenderers. These propose a range of alternatives including alternate and additional site locations, longer contract durations and alternate financing mechanisms. The other Select List Contractors submitted letters of withdrawal.

6.1 Cost

All tenders are considered acceptable in cost terms, with the lowest three tenderers being particularly competitive in relation to gate fee when benchmarked against recent experience in both Northern Ireland and Great Britain.

All Tenderers have responded to the tender in a way that demonstrates the advantages of collective working and achieving economies of scale. Three Tenderers have completed the Form of Tender on a reducing scale of gate fees as increased tonnages are delivered.

In terms of the NWP proposals it is of note that while the three tenders were competitive, none was the least cost.

6.2 Locational Issues

All four Tenderers propose the use of one main central processing facility. One Tenderer proposes the use of two transfer stations on client sites with a variant for none, at reduced cost; one proposes the use of two transfer stations on client sites; one proposes two transfer stations on client sites with options for the central processing facility to be on its own site and the third client site to carry a green waste facility or a green waste facility and a third transfer station; and one proposes the option to use a small satellite processing facility on one client site and a transfer station on the other or a small satellite processing facility on each.

All propose new processing capacity in the event of award.

6.3 Technical Merit

While there are some service delivery issues with all tenders, with three tenderers these are considered to be minor in nature and acceptable in terms of the established technical criteria.

With regard to the NWP tenders however, the UK Composting Association / ORA Report stated that the NWP proposals ‘... would not adequately process peak feedstock volumes without significant changes to facility design and operational plans’ and concluded that it was ‘... likely to be unable to meet the output specification in respect of a large amount of the annual tonnage’.

The UK Composting Association / ORA presented their report to the Evaluation Team. The report included significant evidence supporting their conclusions. This evidence was based on the tender submissions, clarification answers received and reference plant visits together with application of their scientific expertise and knowledge / experience of similar facilities operating throughout the UK and Europe.

In considering the report the Evaluation Team was aware of its duties both in respect of fairness to all the bidders in the evaluation process and protection of public funds in recommending the bid that would provide the optimum balance between quality and price, as expressed by the published tender award criteria. The Evaluation Team found the UK Composting Association / ORA report to be compelling and persuasive and concluded that the diligence of the study therein was consistent with those duties.

The Evaluation Team sought the opinion of Senior Counsel in respect of the impact of the conclusions of the UK Composting Association / ORA report on the completion of the tender evaluation process.

Acting on the advice received, the Evaluation Team concluded that the NWP tenders were not acceptable and were evaluated no further.

6.4 Financial Sustainability

The financial evaluation was conducted independently of the technical evaluation and in this context, all tenders are deemed to be financially sustainable.

6.5 Service Delivery Plan

Each remaining Service Delivery Plan was considered to be sufficient for the purpose of Tender Evaluation. However, given that the Service Delivery Plan forms the main element of the contract, it was considered that all required to be read together with the written clarifications received.

Accordingly, the Evaluation Team recommends that an award to any of the three Tenderers must be based on a final Service Delivery Plan, which will incorporate the clarifications received and form the basis for the contract.

6.6 Quality Systems

All remaining Tenders were deemed to contain some deficiencies in the quality system proposals; however the Evaluation Team considered that these were very minor and procedural in nature and could be addressed in the contractual version of the Service Delivery Plan.

6.7 Bond

Two Tenderers completed the Form of Bond in the tender return documents, at costs in the region of 5% of the specified value. The Evaluation Team considers these costs to be acceptable and recommends that the Bond option is taken up in the contract subject to costs being confirmed at these levels.

7. Discussion

As stated, two of the remaining Tenderers have submitted variant bids. The Evaluation Team determined that in order to merit consideration of acceptance, a variant bid would have to demonstrate economic advantage when compared to the most competitive compliant bid.

7.1 Variant Bids

The MB Composting variant bids contain fifteen and twenty five year financing options. The fifteen year variant is not competitive in comparison with the compliant bids from other tenders. The twenty five year variant only approaches the level of competitiveness of the compliant bids from other tenders when offset by the un-guaranteed potential revenue sharing offered.

The Agrivert variant bid comprises a central treatment facility on the client site in Belfast with no transfer facilities provided at Down and Antrim. The additional client transportation costs required to haul all the feedstock material to the Belfast site render this bid less competitive.

The Evaluation Team considers that:

1. Neither the MB Composting 15 year variant bid nor their 25 year variant bid demonstrate economic advantage when compared to the most competitive compliant bids, even when allowing for un-guaranteed potential revenue share.
2. The Agrivert variant bid, omitting transfer stations, does not demonstrate economic advantage, in comparison with the most competitive compliant bids.

Accordingly the Evaluation Team concluded that these variants did not merit consideration of acceptance.

8. Conclusions

As noted above, a full evaluation has been carried out of all acceptable tenders in accordance with the criteria set out in the contract documents relating to cost, quality and technical issues.

Details of whole life gate fees for the four relevant tenders, are given at Appendix II. These figures are based on the feedstock tonnage estimates given in the tender documentation.

In relation to the evaluation matrix, the Terra Eco compliant bid 1, comprising a main treatment facility at the Belfast client site together with a satellite treatment facility at the Down client site and a transfer station at the Antrim client site is ranked highest and represents the most economically advantageous tender, at an estimated whole life value of £68,462,127 or an average whole life gate price of £43.38 per tonne. The bid is based on tonnage banded gate fees as shown at Appendix III.

The Terra Eco compliant bid 2, comprising a main treatment facility at the Belfast client site together with satellite treatment facilities at the Down client site and the Antrim client site is ranked second at an estimated whole life value of £77,191,774 or an average whole life gate price of £48.91 per tonne. The bid is based on tonnage banded gate fees as shown at Appendix III.

These tenders both propose the construction of new facilities providing new capacity.

It should be noted that it is essential to achieve or exceed the contractual minimum guaranteed tonnage (80% of projections), emphasising the need to achieve projected tonnages if best value is to be achieved and economies of scale are to be accrued. Projected arisings and indicative delivery locations are given at Appendices IV and V.

It is also essential for member Councils to endeavour to deliver organic waste feedstock material to the contract within the tender contamination levels (Maximum 10% on any one load – Maximum 5% annual average). Where contamination exceeds the levels stated, the contractor is due the actual additional costs incurred (open book accounting procedures apply) plus the tendered percentage uplift on those costs.

9. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. The tender is awarded to Terra Eco, in accordance with the offer expressed in their Compliant (1) bid for a fifteen year contract period with optional extensions of one year increments, up to a maximum of five years, as the tender which represents best economic advantage.
2. The award of the contract will be based on the contractual version of the Service Delivery Plan including the written clarifications received.
3. A Bond to the value of £100,000 is entered into in accordance with the provisions of the tender, subject to confirmation of costs.
4. Subject to Joint Committee's approval, the recommendations are then considered as soon as possible by each Council in accordance with the requirements of the arc21 Terms of Agreement.
5. Pending the outcome of the democratic process, arc21 advises the Contractor of the decision of the Joint Committee and underwrites the contractor to produce technical information necessary to proceed with planning applications for the facilities, up to a sum of £45,000, in accordance with the provisions of the tender.

Appendix I

Summary of Service Delivery Facilities Offered

		Agrivert Compliant	Agrivert Variant
Feedstock 1	North	Antrim Transfer	None
Feedstock 2	North	Antrim Transfer	None
Feedstock 1	Central	Belfast Treatment (IVC)	Belfast Treatment (IVC)
Feedstock 2	Central	Belfast Treatment (IVC)	Belfast Treatment (IVC)
Feedstock 1	South	Down Transfer	None
Feedstock 2	South	Down Transfer	None

Notes Both Treatment and Transfer include Reception of Feedstock Material
 Antrim, Belfast and Down are client sites
 IVC = In Vessel Composting
 Feedstock 1 = Civic Amenity Green Waste
 Feedstock 2 = Brown Bin – Kitchen & Garden Waste

		MB Composting Compliant	MB Composting Variants
Feedstock 1	North	Antrim Transfer	Antrim Transfer
Feedstock 2	North	Antrim Transfer	Antrim Transfer
Feedstock 1	Central	Belfast Treatment (AD)	Belfast Treatment (AD)
Feedstock 2	Central	Belfast Treatment (AD)	Belfast Treatment (AD)
Feedstock 1	South	Down Transfer	Down Transfer
Feedstock 2	South	Down Transfer	Down Transfer

Notes Both Treatment and Transfer include Reception of Feedstock Material
 Antrim, Belfast and Down are client sites.
 Variant offers contractor site at Down
 AD = Anaerobic Digestion
 Feedstock 1 = Civic Amenity Green Waste
 Feedstock 2 = Brown Bin – Kitchen & Garden Waste

		NWP Compliant 1	NWP Compliant 2	NWP Compliant 3
Feedstock 1	North	Antrim Transfer	Antrim Transfer	Antrim Transfer
Feedstock 2	North	Antrim Transfer	Antrim Transfer	Antrim Transfer
Feedstock 1	Central	Belfast Treatment (IVC)	Belfast Treatment (IVC)	Belfast Treatment (IVC)
Feedstock 2	Central	Belfast Treatment (IVC)	Glenside Treatment (IVC) & Belfast Transfer	Glenside Treatment (IVC)
Feedstock 1	South	Down Transfer	Down Transfer	Down Transfer
Feedstock 2	South	Down Transfer	Down Transfer	Down Transfer

Notes Both Treatment and Transfer include Reception of Feedstock Material
 Antrim, Belfast and Down are client sites. Glenside is a Contractor Site
 IVC = In Vessel Composting
 Feedstock 1 = Civic Amenity Green Waste
 Feedstock 2 = Brown Bin – Kitchen & Garden Waste

		Terra Eco Compliant 1	Terra Eco Compliant 2
Feedstock 1	North	Antrim Transfer	Antrim Treatment (VCU)
Feedstock 2	North	Antrim Transfer	Antrim Treatment (VCU)
Feedstock 1	Central	Belfast Treatment (IVC)	Belfast Treatment (IVC)
Feedstock 2	Central	Belfast Treatment (IVC)	Belfast Treatment (IVC)
Feedstock 1	South	Down Treatment (IVC)	Down Treatment (IVC)
Feedstock 2	South	Down Treatment (IVC)	Down Treatment (IVC)

Notes Both Treatment and Transfer include Reception of Feedstock Material
 Antrim, Belfast and Down are client sites
 IVC = In Vessel Composting
 VCU = Vertical Composting Unit
 Feedstock 1 = Civic Amenity Green Waste
 Feedstock 2 = Brown Bin – Kitchen & Garden Waste

Appendix II

Whole of Life Costs and Gate Fees for each remaining bid are as follows:

Name	Type of Bid	£ Value (Whole of Life)	Ranking	£ Per Tonne (Whole of Life)
Tenderer 2	Compliant 1	£68,462,127	1	£43.38
Tenderer 2	Compliant 2	£77,191,774	2	£48.91
Tenderer 1	Compliant 1	£84,406,556	3	£53.49
Tenderer 4	Compliant 1	£129,850,484	4	£82.28

Note : these figures are based on Gate Fees at 100% of projected tonnage, Transport Costs, Residual Assets Costs and a credit for the Estimated Value of Assets being acquired by the Authority at the end of the contract period using an economic useful life of 40 years.

Appendix III

Type 1 Material – Garden Waste – Gate Fee

Band	Tonnage	Terra Eco (1)	Terra Eco (2)
1	0 to 5,000	24.50	24.50
2	5,001 to 10,000	24.50	24.50
3	10,001 to 15,000	24.50	24.50
4	15,001 to 20,000	24.50	24.50
5	20,001 to 31,000	24.50	24.50
6	31,001 to 45,000	21.50	21.50
7	Above 45,000	21.50	21.50

Type 2 Material – Kitchen Waste – Gate Fee

Band	Tonnage	Terra Eco (1)	Terra Eco (2)
1	0 to 6,000	44.50	51.00
2	6,001 to 15,000	44.50	51.00
3	15,001 to 32,000	44.50	51.00
4	32,001 to 45,000	41.50	48.00
5	45,001 to 60,000	41.50	48.00
6	60,001 to 75,000	41.50	48.00
7	Above 75,000	41.50	48.00

Residual Assets

The cost to the Authority of the residual assets at the end of the 15 year contract period is NIL due to them having been paid for through the gate fee over the life of the contract.

The estimated value of residual assets to be transferred to the Authority at the end of the 15 year contract period is £3,404,997.

Appendix IV

Indicative Delivery Locations

Belfast Facility	Antrim Facility	Down Facility
Ards	Antrim	Down
Belfast	Ballymena	Lisburn (Closer Wards)
Carrickfergus	Larne (Closer Wards)	
Castlereagh		
Newtownabbey		
North Down		
Larne (Closer Wards)		
Lisburn (Closer Wards)		

Appendix V

Projected Tonnages

Note - First three years tonnages to be agreed with the successful contractor to allow Council roll-out of brown bins to match treatment capacity coming on-line.

Feedstock Material Type 1

Council	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Antrim	4,260	4,464	2,956	1,394	1,417	1,440	1,463	1,485	1,507	1,529	1,549	1,569	1,588	1,606	1,623	1,639
Ards	6,654	6,770	4,174	1,486	1,510	1,535	1,559	1,583	1,607	1,629	1,651	1,672	1,692	1,711	1,730	1,747
Ballymena	2,890	2,941	2,246	1,521	1,546	1,571	1,596	1,621	1,645	1,668	1,690	1,712	1,732	1,752	1,771	1,788
Belfast	9,355	12,875	7,887	2,724	2,769	2,813	2,858	2,902	2,945	2,987	3,027	3,065	3,102	3,137	3,171	3,202
Carrickfergus	2,423	3,033	1,805	534	543	552	561	569	578	586	594	601	609	615	622	628
Castlereagh	2,846	2,896	1,934	433	440	447	454	461	468	474	481	487	493	498	504	509
Down	3,887	3,955	2,233	451	459	466	473	481	488	495	501	508	514	520	525	530
Larne	1,583	1,849	1,054	232	236	239	243	247	251	254	258	261	264	267	270	272
Lisburn	7,070	8,317	6,117	1,775	1,804	1,832	1,861	1,888	1,915	1,941	1,965	1,989	2,012	2,033	2,053	2,073
Newtownabbey	6,250	7,215	4,690	2,075	2,109	2,144	2,177	2,211	2,244	2,276	2,306	2,336	2,364	2,390	2,416	2,440
North Down	5,914	6,427	4,095	1,662	1,689	1,715	1,742	1,768	1,793	1,817	1,840	1,862	1,883	1,903	1,922	1,941
Total	53,131	60,742	39,192	14,286	14,521	14,755	14,987	15,217	15,440	15,655	15,862	16,062	16,252	16,433	16,605	16,770

Feedstock Material Type 2

Council	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Antrim	0	0	2,342	4,763	4,842	4,920	4,998	5,076	5,151	5,223	5,294	5,361	5,425	5,487	5,545	5,600
Ards	0	0	3,717	6,539	6,647	6,754	6,861	6,968	7,071	7,171	7,267	7,359	7,448	7,532	7,612	7,688
Ballymena	0	0	2,003	6,720	6,832	6,942	7,052	7,161	7,268	7,370	7,469	7,564	7,655	7,741	7,824	7,901
Belfast	0	0	8,544	17,376	17,663	17,949	18,233	18,516	18,790	19,055	19,311	19,556	19,791	20,015	20,228	20,428
Carrickfergus	0	0	2,229	4,534	4,608	4,683	4,757	4,831	4,903	4,972	5,038	5,102	5,164	5,222	5,278	5,330
Castlereagh	0	0	3,195	6,497	6,604	6,711	6,817	6,923	7,026	7,125	7,220	7,312	7,400	7,484	7,563	7,638
Down	0	0	2,324	4,726	4,805	4,882	4,960	5,037	5,111	5,183	5,253	5,320	5,384	5,444	5,502	5,557
Larne	0	0	1,449	2,948	2,996	3,045	3,093	3,141	3,188	3,233	3,276	3,318	3,357	3,395	3,432	3,466
Lisburn	0	0	6,652	13,525	13,745	13,963	14,181	14,392	14,597	14,794	14,984	15,166	15,339	15,504	15,660	15,815
Newtownabbey	0	0	4,444	9,039	9,188	9,337	9,485	9,632	9,774	9,912	10,045	10,173	10,295	10,412	10,522	10,627
North Down	0	0	3,679	6,261	6,383	6,507	6,631	6,755	6,878	6,999	7,120	7,240	7,359	7,476	7,592	7,710
Total	0	0	40,580	82,927	84,312	85,693	87,069	88,431	89,755	91,038	92,277	93,471	94,617	95,713	96,757	97,761

Blank Page