



**Project Integra – Strategic Board Minutes**

Name of meeting	Project Integra Strategic Board	
Date of meeting	18 <sup>th</sup> April 2024, 10-12	
Venue	Online Meeting via Teams	
Attendees:	<p><b>Councillors:</b>            Cllr Dave Ashmore (DA)            Cllr Ian Bastable (IB)            Cllr Geoffrey Blunden (GB)            Cllr Lulu Bowerman (LB)            Cllr David Drew (DD)            Cllr Steve Hammond (SH)            Cllr Eamonn Keogh (EK)            Cllr Nick Adams-King (NAK)            Cllr Rupert Kyrle (RK)            Cllr Kelsie Learney (KL)            Cllr Robert Mocatta (RM)            Cllr Richard Quaterman (RQ)            Cllr Chris Tomblin (CT)</p> <p><b>Officers:</b>            Linda Bratcher (LB)            Tara Cartledge (TC)            Helen Taylor-Cobb (HTC)            Sean Herdman-Grant (SHG)            Mark Grey (MG)            Sam Horne (SH)            Paul Laughlin (PL)            Olivia Longley (OL)            Stephanie Lucking (SL)            Paul Naylor (PN)            Sophie Nichol (SN)            Yvonne Perkins (YP)            Nicola Plummer (NP)            Sonja Reames (SR)            David Robertson (DR)            Ben Slater (BS)            Gary Squire (GS)            Sarah Ward (SW)            Ruth Whaymand (RW)            Ashley Wild (AWi)            Campbell Williams (CW)            Abigail Wylde (AWy)            Paul Wykes (PW)</p>	<p>Portsmouth City Council            Fareham Borough Council            New Forest District Council            Havant Borough Council            Test Valley Borough Council            Gosport Borough Council            Southampton City Council            Eastleigh Borough Council            Hampshire County Council            Winchester City Council            East Hants District Council            Hart District Council            Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council</p> <p>Southampton City Council            Hampshire County Council            Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council            East Hants District Council            Veolia            Hampshire County Council            Hampshire County Council            Project Integra            Gosport Borough Council            Eastleigh Borough Council            Veolia            East Hants District Council            New Forest District Council            Havant Borough Council            Havant Borough Council            Veolia            Fareham Borough Council            Fareham Borough Council            Rushmoor Borough Council            Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council            Winchester City Council            Project Integra            Test Valley Borough Council</p>
Apologies:	Chris Noble	New Forest District Council
		Actions
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions and Domestic Arrangements</b>	
1.1	Cllr Mocatta opened the meeting and round-the-room introductions were given.	

<p><b>2.</b></p> <p>2.1</p>	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies as above.</p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p> <p>3.1</p>	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>	<p><b>Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (Report 126)</b></p> <p>There were no outstanding actions from the last meeting.</p> <p>The minutes were agreed to be a true record.</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p> <p>5.1</p>	<p><b>National Update</b></p> <p>AWy gave a national update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEEE consultation – at the end of December Defra published a consultation on WEEE recycling. It proposed ways to make it easier for residents to recycle WEEE and included a potential Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) system. PI wrote and submitted a response on behalf of the partners which was circulated to all strategy officers. The consultation closed at the end of March and when the response is released a summary will be sent round to partners.</li> <li>• Disposable vapes ban – the statutory legislation was published for the ban on disposable vapes and the ban is due to start from April 2025.</li> <li>• Statutory Guidance consultation – we are still awaiting the response to the Simpler Recycling statutory guidance consultation. PI has drafted a letter to Defra’s secretary of state outlining the implications of the delay in publishing the response. The letter has been sent round to all partner authorities should they wish to send out a copy. AWy suggested that if RM is happy to sign the letter on behalf of PI, then a partnership copy of the letter could also be sent. RM agreed.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6.</b></p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p>	<p><b>Results of the WSP Modelling and Future Services</b></p> <p>CW and SH gave a presentation on the results of the WSP modelling project and implications for future decision making, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A summary of the variables still awaiting confirmation - statutory guidance consultation response, timing of the statutory instruments being laid, definition of ‘efficient’ and ‘effective’ under EPR and how it links to Simpler Recycling, EPR funding, food waste funding and the Deposit Return Scheme (DRS).</li> <li>• An overview of the additional whole system cost outputs from the WSP modelling.</li> <li>• Further considerations for each of the modelled service options.</li> <li>• A diagram of the different options and the work that is needed for each.</li> <li>• The proposed principles for decision making.</li> </ul> <p>SW provided a summary of the WCA Chief Executive decision making meeting that took place earlier in the week:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background on the meeting was provided. It was outlined that FBC’s Chief Executive Andy Wannell was asked to take the lead on behalf of the WCAs in responding to HCC’s request for a collective decision on a single future dry mixed recycling (DMR) collection system.</li> </ul>	

- The purpose of the Chief Executive meeting was to discuss and take a step forward in terms of the future of waste collection in Hampshire.
- There was a general consensus amongst the WCAs that the preferred option is for a fully co-mingled DMR collection system. This excluded EBC who indicated that their preference would be for a co-mingled excluding glass system but there was recognition that a single disposal system could accommodate their variant collection approach.
- PCC and SCC attended the meeting but agreed that they were not in a position to express a preferred collection option at this time, in light of the need for further certainty on the points outlined in the previous presentation.
- It was recognised that there might be whole system cost benefits and advantages for residents if a different DMR collection system was chosen, in particular operating a co-mingled system with separate glass collections. The WCAs agreed that they would be happy to consider this system if it were the WDAs preference, provided that any increased collection cost would be covered by a whole system benefit and that this arrangement be formalised in a binding agreement.
- A twin-stream system (paper and card separate) was not rejected but it was the least favoured option.
- It was agreed that it is important to involve residents in Hampshire's recycling and waste reduction journey. It was emphasised that residents need to be a consideration in whatever collection system is taken forward.
- The WCAs identified that the biggest problem is uncertainty, both in terms of the national situation but also the Chief Executives felt that there is not enough data to base a decision on or make a recommendation to cabinet.

The meeting resulted in five action points that the chief executives would like PI to take forward:

1. Understanding the cost of change at an individual LA level for WCAs, especially related to glass collection, receptacle changes, etc.
2. Testing assumptions on "household behaviour" re waste/recycling
3. The impact of delivering the disposal infrastructure on implementing a new system
4. Refreshing the waste system costs so they are suitable for financial planning purposes. It was agreed that the 2019/20 costs used in the WSP modelling would not be sufficient to make a decision.
5. Developing a realistic implementation timeline.

6.3 RM asked what the Chief Executive group meant by a binding agreement and whether there was any indication of what format this would take. SW outlined that the group did not go into the details of what the binding agreement would look like just that an agreement would be required. It was agreed that the WCAs did not want to be in a similar position to earlier in the year when HCC shared that the WCAs would no longer retain their DMR income.

6.4 RM asked who the WSP modelling has been shared with. AWy explained that a copy of the full report had been shared with the strategy officer from every authority.

RM asked whether Defra had any indicative timeline for the release of the statutory guidance consultation response or if there's any clarity on the timeline

of when changes will happen. SH outlined that currently Defra officials are sticking to their current delivery timelines of:

- Simpler recycling requirements to start from April 2025 for businesses and April 2026 for households.
- Soft plastic recycling to start from 2027.
- Separate food waste collections required from April 2026. It is expected that details on transitional funding will be released soon.
- EPR to start from 2026 with local authorities receiving their indicative payment amounts from November 2024.

SH explained that Defra have said that they intend to lay the statutory instruments for Simpler Recycling before this year's summer recess but if they do not then the consensus is that this then won't be done until 2025 after the general election. RM indicated that from this information it is hard to understand how WCAs can make a decision with so much uncertainty. SH agreed and highlighted that this message has been passed on to Defra both at officer and ministerial levels. The National Association of Waste Disposal Officers (NAWDO) have written to Defra outlining that without certainty local authorities are not in the position to invest in any new infrastructure. However, from a ministerial perspective it has been made clear that nothing can be changed until it is known what is happening with the general election.

6.5

RM asked whether the fully co-mingled collection option would require two MRFs and if the WSP modelling included any details on this. SH explained that the WSP modelling did not look at infrastructure, but that HCC has previously done some work which indicated that the Chickenhall Lane site would not be sufficient in its current planned form to accommodate the material from a fully co-mingled collection service. Although the footprint of the site may potentially be large enough, there are other planning constraints such as vehicle movement limitations that would present significant problems. As a result, it is thought that a planning application for a fully co-mingled MRF would be rejected. Therefore, a fully co-mingled collection service would require two MRFs and consideration would need to be taken as to what combination of sites this would be, for example Chickenhall lane and either Portsmouth or Alton MRFs.

6.6

AWi highlighted that there are WCAs and WDAs who are currently operating a fully co-mingled collection system, under a TEEP / TEP+E assessment. He asked whether PI could operate a fully co-mingled collection method using the same assessments or whether HCC believe that the Statutory Instrument won't allow for fully co-mingled given that Defra's published preference is for segregation?

SH explained that Defra have consulted on two potential exemptions to allow both co-mingled DMR and co-mingled organic (food and garden) however the outcome of this is currently not known. Prior to the proposed exemption the Environment Act outlined that the government's collection preference would be source segregated and if local authorities wanted to deviate away from this either through a co-mingled or twin stream system then they would need to complete a TEEP assessment. Therefore, whilst it still may be possible to operate a fully co-mingled system under Simpler Recycling it is not known how this will link to other policies, such as EPR. The concern is that if Hampshire opts for a fully co-mingled system that it won't be deemed 'efficient and effective' under EPR and therefore authorities will be subject to deductions to their EPR payments of up to 20%.

DR noted that a TEEP assessment would also be required for a twin stream collection system and that all the options presented in the WSP modelling would be subject to the same requirements.

DR suggested that given the conditions of the TEEP assessment that environmental considerations be included in the key principles for decision making. SH agreed, highlighting that environmental aspects feature in the JMWMS but would make a good basis for any future decisions too.

RM asked whether a TEEP assessment would include elements such as vehicle movements. SH explained that the guidance around TEEP assessments is vague and TEEP itself isn't clearly defined. He reiterated Defra have confirmed that if the co-mingled exemption is included in the Statutory Guidance, then a TEEP assessment will not be required for a co-mingled collection system.

6.7 IB asked what assurance PI has that residents will properly implement the chosen collection system and that it will produce the desired outcome in relation to increasing recycling rates. SH indicated that robust data on this is limited, which has been identified as a problem, but that there is evidence from other local authorities around the country on the performance of different systems.

AWy explained that the recycling performance data included in the WSP report was based on work done by WRAP through their annual resident survey. WRAP has done a lot of work on looking at the differences in recycling performance and have concluded that there is little difference between a co-mingled and twin stream DMR system. WRAP have found that reducing residual bin capacity makes the biggest difference to recycling rates. She highlighted that it might be worth asking WRAP to confirm this in more detail ahead of any decision making in Hampshire.

RM asked why data from 2019/20 was used in the WSP modelling instead of more recent data. AWy explained that the modelling was used to compare the collection options like for like and including current data for the co-mingled option would skew the comparisons.

6.8 DD asked what information is needed to decide on a collection system and whether there is any indication of a timeline, emphasising that members are under a lot of political pressure to act. SH explained that there are two key elements that need to be confirmed before a decision can be made, the contents of the Statutory Instruments and funding. He noted that indicative EPR funding may be available from November which might be sufficient for some authorities to decide. However, partners need to consider how or if changes will be made to the range of materials collected in Hampshire if for some reason EPR and Simpler Recycling do not go ahead. This is especially important given we are approaching the end of the disposal contract with Veolia in 2030.

6.9 RM asked whether any work had been done to determine how much each authority will receive from EPR payments, including how much HCC will get. AWy outlined that she had done some modelling work for each authority when EPR was first announced which gave an indication of EPR payments based on a cost per tonne basis. However, HCC was not included in this, and it is a

	<p>theoretical piece of work rather than fact. SH indicated that HCC is expecting to receive a relatively large sum from EPR and highlighted that nationally the EPR budget is £1.4 billion.</p>	
6.10	<p>RM highlighted that the five actions given to PI as outcomes of the chief executive's meeting are substantial pieces of work and it is hard to see how they will be achieved without additional resource. He suggested that members consider whether their authorities would be happy to put additional funding into this.</p>	
6.11	<p>RK asked whether work has been done looking at vehicle capacity and wear for each of the options, highlighting the inclusion of glass in a fully co-mingled system might impact vehicle longevity. He also asked what the contractor thought of the inclusion of glass in a co-mingled system given the likelihood of the material quality decreasing. SH said he was not best placed to comment on Veolia's opinion on the inclusion of glass in DMR but other authorities operate a similar system so data will be available on quality and impact to vehicles.</p>	
6.12	<p>RK asked if data reporting would be quicker once a new collection system was implemented, noting that currently there is a lag between reporting and authorities receiving data. SH explained that the data time is unlikely to change due to the processes involved in the system and the fact it works a month in arrears. He highlighted that the reason the data isn't publicly available straight away is because it needs to go through Defra's validation process which typically takes a long time.</p>	
6.13	<p>CW shared that WCC's cabinet have already decided that a fully co-mingled system is their preference but recognise that this might not be the best option for the whole system. As part of this decision WCC looked at top performing co-mingled authorities, researching their bin capacities and any problems they encountered implementing the service. This showed that in the majority of cases problems resolved themselves after a few months of the new service.</p> <p>RM asked who the top performing authorities are. CW outlined that WCC looked at South Oxfordshire and Three Rivers District Council.</p> <p>AWy added that PI had also done some work compiling data on the top performing authorities including their bin size information. She noted that she has contacts at several of the top authorities so can ask for more detailed information on their services if it would be helpful.</p>	
6.14	<p>RM asked AWy whether PI would need any additional funding to complete the Chief Executive requested work. AWy outlined that it would depend on the nature of the projects but highlighted that PI's contribution to the WSP modelling project used up any available funds and if similar work were to be undertaken it would depend on partner contributions.</p> <p>SW expressed that the view of the Chief Executives was that no further investments in modelling or other work should be made until there is certainty from the government. There is other work that can be done in the meantime that doesn't require funding, including projects on resident behaviour, costings for each authority and projects that ensure the partnership is prepared for change when the required details are released. She explained that the work is about using combined resources to ensure all authorities are ready for service change and should include things like specifications, reports, and briefs. RM</p>	

	<p>suggested that the PI strategy officer group meet to determine whether they have the capacity to collectively take on the additional work. AWy agreed and that the group will need to meet ahead of the next scheduled meeting in June to determine what work can be done.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Disposal Contract Update</b>	
7.1	<p>SH provided an update on the disposal contract:</p> <p>The team continue to be busy running the everyday operational aspects of the contract but broadly there have been no significant changes in recent months.</p> <p>HCC and Veolia are still working to be compliant with the Environment Agency’s hazardous waste consignment requirements. SH noted that this has been a challenging piece of work but thanked authorities for their patience and indicated that a further update will be provided as soon as possible.</p> <p>The threat of vapes and battery fires continue to be a concern with large numbers coming through the system. Authorities were encouraged to continue their messaging on correct disposal of WEEE to residents.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
9.1	<p>NAK encouraged authorities to talk to HCC and Veolia about their food waste collection plans so that they can ensure capacity and plan appropriately at transfer stations.</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
9.1	<p>Proposed date: Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> June 2024, 10am-12pm.</p>	
9.2	<p>RM suggested that the date for the June board meeting be flexible and if there are no national updates on the statutory guidance consultation response then the meeting be delayed. AWy agreed, indicating that PI is happy to review the situation and decide whether the meeting should go ahead closer to the proposed date.</p> <p>AWy suggested that if it is decided to postpone the June board meeting that a briefing be put together after the local elections for any new members of the board. It was agreed that this was a sensible plan.</p>	<b>AWy/OL</b>