Landfill Aftercare Forum Meeting, 19th November 2014, CIWM, Northampton

Detailed Feedback from break-out group exercise – University of Southampton

Comment	Source	Southampton comment
General comments		
asked about background to why the DSS was set up	2	Refer to presentation
The perceived risk is affected by the regulatory regime. For example compare publicly owned unlined landfills with lined Env. Permit sites	2	
Careful about who the target audience is – e.g. not the press.	4	Aimed at fairly broad spectrum
Danger of pressure groups misusing information. [but everything could be]. Restricted access?	1	Restrictions only for uploading of content
The DSS appears to be Acceleration of completion – is that right? [or more generically about aftercare without presumption about what to do]	1	No, it is intended to cover aftercare activities in whatever guise
How are site specific issues e.g. national regulations dealt with?	4	
We rarely publish our mistakes, but they can be the most instructive – could be part of LANDSS	4	
UK has made some poor decisions. Danger that our site may encourage outside-UK people to copy our mistakes	1	
Usefulness and usability		
No one expressed opinion that LANDSS was NOT useful.	All	
Could use LANDSS as a screening tool – help you to get into the right place (key nuggets) – rule things out, identify the most important things. Then need site-specific information and an informed discussion.	1	
Need to think more about how is the information used and how the linkages to decision-making are made? Just a load of information in one place isn't sufficient – need to know what to do with that.	1	
An "expert-system" might be desirable. Want to bottle the knowledge held in expert's minds.	1	
The China wet-landfill was an example where there should be explainers in there saying – "the following does not apply in this event".	1	
Need to deal with uncertainty – conceptual as well as parameter	1	

Comment	Source	Southampton comment
Needs to be able to take into account level of ignorance of the system (operator may not know, for example, much about the inventory of the landfill).	1	
Recognised there is a tension between quality and quantity of information put on site. LANDSS should focus on quality: include context, nuances, and qualifiers, for any data used.	2	
Need for some form of peer review of information on site, to give confidence to users that they can rely on site	3	
Too much information is assumed of user – content needs to be peer reviewed by non-specialist	1	
Think about producing information (perhaps summaries) that will catch attention of CEOs	3	
LA delegate liked the tool and will use it. County council closed sites fall outside the mainstream of guidance and funding because they often lie outside the regulatory regime.	2	
Local Authorities keen on this tool – would especially like to see case studies.	4	
Information can very easily be taken out of context. Think carefully about how data could be misconstrued	Gen	
Important to provide context to any values given (or ideally a range of values from case studies), otherwise industry will find themselves having to answer question (from e.g. public) "why didn't you use published value x which we have found on LANDSS"	3	
Landfills are never the same, so is data site specific or average? Useful if people can compare their sites with a data range contained on website	3	
Site should be viewed as providing information on range of options that may be applicable to site, not what can be done on site		
Should a contractor providing services to a WDA need to demonstrate they have considered content on LANDSS?	3	
Structure of LANDSS		
Site needs a better introduction and a way to show how all the different topic areas are potentially linked. Needs a whole site conceptual model, or conceptual site hub. (regular updating of this hub will be required in an iterative process)	3	
Needs a front-end for decision criteria (what is basis of decision [money, environmental protection, avoiding prosecution], what is it for?) and how are they weighted	4	
Be clearer who target audience is for	4	
Conflict about generic versus specific data. Rather than use global stock of data require more site-specific information. Alternatively – inclined to break free of specific regulatory contexts (which change in time and place).	1	

Comment	Source	Southampton comment
Or do both		
Generic vs specific: Decision tree/route map required near the front, to guide people through the site and the decision process	1	
There are no operational areas in aftercare areas of sites, so edit these references out of the web site	2	
Would be useful to be able to compare your specific site to the more global data. Nobody has used LeachXS to compare their data to global data	1	
Did like the structure (assume this means Topics and Knowledge base), but needs an intro page and a conceptual model…then drill down from there.	1	
Keith was already acting as an expert in sifting the data etc for us – but we might not be able to. (for example, it was felt a stage is missed out) Need to proof-test with different users.	1	
Don't necessarily need a decision tree/framework – happy to have choice nuggets (as per Keith's example)	1	
Need to refer to risk-based approach, because most guidance is risk based.	2	
Recognise that UK is risk based approach, but many other countries operate under performance criteria	G	
Site might be better UK-focussed – how to get to completion	1	
Ensure cross linking between topics	2	
Need to be guided towards asking the right questions	1	
Have to be able to link Rules of Thumb to original basis, to justify their use in designs, etc. so that users can be confident to accept liability	2	
What are the questions that really need answering?	3	
Be wary about putting up information without background knowledge, which otherwise would have effect of "deskilling" user	3	
The DSS might not drive you towards the right solution. Or might not drive you towards the solution that the EA prefers.	1	LANDSS not meant to "give" right solution, merely provide information that will hopefully support decisions made
May need different pathways (regulatory driven, power-generation driven, leachate management driven …. etc?). Clients are focussed on a particular outcome (e.g. want to do AD). [perhaps in that instance the client cannot be helped]	1	
Models - work in some context but not others. Models which are 'generalist' might get it badly wrong?	1	

Comment	Source	Southampton comment
Models verus monitoring. Danger if models are embedded here that people will complain they don't work. [Model requires agreement over the parameters that are used, what is needed] . Users when faced with models find them too difficult. [e.g. Landsim at first was too generic and people were sceptical as to whether it was useful in practice]	1	
Priorities and relative importance of subject areas to be covered in DSS (retaining focus on aftercare)		
Difficult to prioritise, as will relate to individuals interests. i.e. someone interested in gas will consider gas the priority, whereas someone worried about leachate may consider landfill hydraulics the priority	4	
Why just aftercare focus?	2	
Add HRA to main topics, because HRA review required every few years throughout the aftercare period?	2	[KK: already covered and prescribed elsewhere]
Financial aspect important, including costs of long term management and modelling of financial costs. WMP26b attempted some of this, but has never been updated	3	
Add financial information to the site.	2	
Costs…. Should they be included? Trouble is…differs on context. Likely that local-knowledge will be better than the 'experts' who input to the site. Would be nice, however. Perhaps as indicative sum, possibly via case-studies. A decision is needed about how costs are handled. At the very least to provide a prompt.	1	
UK pathway to completion Might be better UK-focussed – how to get to completion.	1	
Technology as a topic area – what e.g. flow meters do or don't work, failure rates of equipment etc, how often will infrastructure need to be renewed. This relates to how good is data that is actually collected from sites	3	
Life Cycle Assessment	Gen	
Mitigation options. Low cost novel technologies for methane mitigation; cost benefit tool.	Gen	
Need information on bad decisions and failures. Things sometimes go wrong because of tiny bits of specialized knowledge being absent or ignored.	Gen	
Odours, bioaerosols and dust major area of concern for general public	FB	
A combined LandSim and GasSim model would be useful	3	Beyond scope of LANDSS

Comment	Source	Southampton comment
Submission of stakeholders' comments and own material: vetting process, discussion board, dialogue, etc.		
Avoid blog facility being used for sales pitches or slanging matches, but blog facility useful for people to ask questions. Comment/ blog should not be a public discussion forum. People need to register their interest.	2	
Liked idea of a discussion board, where ideas, problems and possible solutions could be shared	FB	
Wiki vs controlled: Should be controlled (mark Bourne), would be better to do that. Perhaps to control content that comes in. But, resource implications….	1	
Site could be linked to UK regulation – and archival store for EA guidance that may be lost in current "consolidation"	3	
Could act as a repository for raw site specific data, although recognised problem of quality control and need for peer review. EA have lots of information	3	
Notes: 1 to 4 = Comments from breakout groups 1 to 4 Gen = Comments made in general discussion FB = comments received subsequent to event		