



## Project Integra – Strategic Board Minutes

Name of meeting	Project Integra Strategic Board	
Date of meeting	21 <sup>st</sup> February 2023, 10-12	
Venue	Online Meeting via Teams	
Attendees:	<p><b>Councillors:</b>            Cllr Alan Oliver (AO)            Cllr Robert Mocatta (RM)            Cllr Rupert Kyrle (RK)            Cllr Steve Davies (SD)            Cllr Steve Leggett (SL)            Cllr Hayley Eachus (HE)            Cllr Steve Hammond (SH)            Cllr Kelsie Learney (KL)            Cllr Dave Ashmore (DA)            Cllr Lulu Bowerman (LB)            Cllr Ian Bastable (IB)            Cllr Maurice Sheehan (MS)            Cllr Phil North (PN)            Cllr Nick Adams-King (NAK)</p> <p><b>Officers:</b>            Abigail Cooke (AC)            Olivia Longley (OL)            Sam Horne (SH)            Campbell Williams (CW)            Sean Herdman-Grant (SHG)            Gary Squire (GS)            Mark Grey (MG)            Gale Smith (GS)            Paul Wykes (PW)            Linda Bratcher (LB)            Ashley Wild (AWi)            Alan Wheeler (AW)            David Robertson (DR)            Tara Cartledge (TC)            Sonja Reames (SR)            Yvonne Perkins (YP)            David Emmett (DE)            Chris Noble (CN)            Samantha Kenyon (SK)</p>	<p>Hart District Council            East Hants District Council            Eastleigh Borough Council            New Forest District Council            Southampton City Council            Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council            Gosport Borough Council            Winchester City Council            Portsmouth City Council            Havant Borough Council            Fareham Borough Council            Rushmoor Borough Council            Test Valley Borough Council            Hampshire County Council</p> <p>Project Integra            Project Integra            Hampshire County Council            Winchester City Council            East Hants District Council            Fareham Borough Council            Veolia            Eastleigh Borough Council            Test Valley Borough Council            Southampton City Council            Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council            Gosport Borough Council            Havant Borough Council            Hampshire County Council            Havant Borough Council            East Hants District Council            Portsmouth City Council            New Forest District Council            East Hants District Council</p>
Apologies:	Cllr Kimberley Barrett (KB) – Deputised by Cllr Ashmore Paul Naylor (PN) Ruth Whaymand (RW)	Portsmouth City Council  Eastleigh Borough Council Rushmoor Borough Council
		<b>Actions</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions and Domestic Arrangements</b>	

2.	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Cllr Kimberley Barret from Portsmouth City Council – Cllr Dave Ashmore attended as deputy.  Paul Naylor from Eastleigh Borough Council – Gale Smith attended in his place.  Ruth Whaymand from Rushmoor Borough Council.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>3.1 There were no declarations on interest.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising</b></p> <p>4.1 The minutes of the last meeting are for the PI board meeting which took place on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2022.</p> <p>4.2 Point 7.1 Inter-Authority Agreement governance options – see agenda item 6.</p> <p>4.3 Point 7.3 action to organise a member’s workshop – see agenda item 7.</p> <p>4.4 Point 9.3 radio advertisement – RM advised that this project is now complete, and the advert is due to run until March.</p> <p>4.5 The minutes were agreed to be a true record.</p>	
5.	<p><b>National Update</b></p> <p>5.1 AC gave a presentation in the impacts of the DRS, pEPR and Consistency consultations, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals of each consultation</li> <li>• Future recycling composition</li> <li>• Future residual waste composition</li> <li>• Financial flows</li> <li>• Reporting, data, and enforcement requirements</li> <li>• Targets</li> <li>• Key events and milestones timeline, as of February 2023</li> <li>• Outstanding consultations and calls for evidence.</li> </ul> <p>AC outlined that when the Consistency consultation response is released that she would be happy to set up a short session to go through the key information if it would be useful.</p> <p>5.2 RM asked if there have been any discussions with DEFRA on how the reporting system will work and what metrics will be required for EPR. The EPR consultation response was released last year but this did not contain much detail on reporting. DEFRA are hosting regular webinars to update on the details and there was a DEFRA hosted webinar on the reporting requirements due to take place last week, but this was cancelled. When more information is available AC will circulate.</p> <p>5.3 AO asked about the availability of funding capital for food waste collection, whether there are any timelines available or if there will be any rules for how any potential funding can be spent. AC explained that she recently attended a</p>	

	<p>call with DEFRA and no spending rules for food waste funding have been outlined, the only details that have been given on capital funding is that it will be available from 2024 but no information has been released on how the funding system will work. AO asked whether there was any appreciation from DEFRA on the supply chain issues that EPR and other legislative changes will cause. AC explained that concerns on procurement and supply chains have been raised on a national level and DEFRA's response was that WRAP have been asked to investigate this. AC has contacted WRAP but is still waiting for a response.</p> <p>5.4 SK asked whether EPR payments would be able to be pooled to enable joint procurement between authorities. AC explained that there is no definite answer, and it would depend on whether authorities would be willing to pool resources.</p> <p>5.5 RK asked how whether there would be a gap between the IAA financial arrangement changes and the implementation of EPR payments. He noted that authorities need to be able to budget and plan for service changes with assurance of payments. AC outlined that authorities are due to receive details of their first EPR payments in November 2023, but the payment date is still unknown. Until recently it was thought that the first payment would be in April 2024 but at a recent webinar DEFRA stated that payments would start from April but could be later in the financial year. SH explained that the first EPR payment should still be a full year payment regardless of when in the year it is received. He noted that HCC's intention is to implement the IAA financial changes from the 1<sup>st</sup> of April 2024 and at the moment the two timelines match up.</p> <p>5.6 RM asked if any EPR payments have been modelled? AC outlined that last year she had put together models for each authority based on current collection cost, potential percentage of EPR material and cost per tonne but this was based on assumptions. RM asked if this could be reshared. AC said that she will update the models when more information is released and will re-circulate.</p>	<b>AC</b>
<p><b>6.</b></p> <p>6.1</p>	<p><b>Inter Authority Agreement and Governance</b></p> <p><b>Inter Authority Agreement (IAA):</b></p> <p>SH gave a presentation on the Inter Authority Agreement which had been prepared for a meeting with chief executives in order to ensure that all authorities and levels were up to date. The presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislative drivers for change</li> <li>• A summary of why the IAA is necessary.</li> <li>• Financial flows</li> <li>• Core financial arrangements</li> <li>• Timelines and key activities – including confirmation that HCC are looking to start building the new MRF in early 2024.</li> <li>• Recommendations</li> </ul> <p>SH indicated that the focus in this meeting was mainly on the financial arrangements and feedback was given on a variety of proposals. He stated that significant pushback was received on the introduction of contamination charges in 2024 considering that the MRF will not be operational until 2025. SH</p>	

	<p>shared that a request was made for HCC to taper this charge which is now being considered.</p>	
6.2	<p>LB asked whether any funding is available either nationally or from HCC for new containers. SH explained that there will not be any funding from HCC for the switch to twin stream and that the government's expectation is that the new burdens funding will cover any changes required.</p>	
6.3	<p>RK asked whether EPR payments will be paid in advance or arrears, indicating that if it is the latter authorities will face significant financial pressures. SH explained that EPR payments are scheduled to start from April 2024 with a full year payment, at the moment the switch to twin stream is planned for mid-2025. He noted that the consistency consultation response will likely outline a transition window for authorities to implement the core recycling collection materials. SH reiterated that EPR new burdens funding is expected to pay for containers and other service change elements.</p>	
6.4	<p>RK asked whether there could be further clarification on what the contamination charges proposed in the IAA will look like for authorities. SH showed a spreadsheet with approximate contamination costs based on current contamination rates and how this could change with the switch to twin stream. He noted that this information has already been shared with strategy officers and that although more work is needed to confirm figures that it should outline the financial situation in relation to contamination charges. RK highlighted that these details would need to be confirmed before authorities agree to the IAA. SH acknowledged this and outlined that all available information will be presented to authorities prior to decision making.</p>	
6.5	<p>PN acknowledged that some changes need to be made to the financial arrangements between partners and districts but expressed that he felt the contamination charges would unfairly penalise authorities if brought in before the new MRF. He noted that TVBC in particular had wanted to move to twin stream earlier than mid-2025 but are limited due to the MRF timeline. SH recognised this and indicated that chief executives had given similar feedback.</p>	
6.7	<p>RM asked whether the IAA is going to clearly set out collection and disposal authorities' statutory responsibilities. SH confirmed that within the context of the IAA it will be made clear that HCC as a disposal authority is responsible for the disposal of residual waste within the county but that they have chosen, together with SCC and PCC, to invest in recycling infrastructure despite not being obligated to. It will emphasise that in order for this arrangement to continue there needs to be a rebalance of finances within the partnership.</p>	
6.8	<p>RM queried what the fallback position is if one or more authorities decide the IAA is not the direction of travel they want to take. SH explained that if one or two authorities decided not to sign up to the IAA, HCC would outline that they would need to make their own recycling arrangements going forward and would ultimately not have access to any HCC infrastructure. SH explained that if a larger number of authorities refused to sign the arrangement, then questions would need to be raised around the validity of the arrangements, he noted that HCC would hope any authorities in this position would already be making this known to them. RM confirmed that if any authorities are fundamentally against the IAA that they need to express this as early as possible.</p>	

6.9	<p>DR commented on the financial flows diagram shown in SH's presentation, highlighting that it would be useful to add the transition to twin stream costs. SH agreed this would be helpful.</p> <p><b>Governance:</b></p>	
6.10	<p>AC gave an update on the governance arrangements. At the October board authorities were asked to submit their governance arrangement preferences, since then all authorities have done so, and the results have shown that there is a tie between the two options. At a strategy officers meeting in December, it was suggested that the possibility of a hybrid option be presented to Bonds to assess if this would be possible. AC explained that a meeting has been held with Bonds who are now putting together a delegation's matrix that would outline decisions and at what level they can be made. AC noted that this piece of work is still ongoing and that updates will be shared as soon as possible.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Outcome of Members Workshop</b></p> <p>7.1 RM shared that the member's workshop discussed previously at the October board meeting had gone ahead in January. He thanked those who attended and outlined it had been a useful format for discussion.</p> <p>RM explained that AC had prepared report 120 summarising the outcomes of the workshop and that this had been circulated with the meeting agenda. RM shared that the workshop had established several key recommendations but that it was also acknowledged that authorities are at different stages in terms of planning for the switch to twin stream and that aligning everyone will be difficult.</p> <p>RM outlined the recommendations and suggested whether to take them further be put to a vote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint procurement of vehicles and caddies</li> <li>• Additional PI resource</li> <li>• Joint comms</li> <li>• Amendment of the JMWMS</li> </ul> <p>7.2 PN asked for clarification on the JMWMS amendment recommendation, indicating he thought that the switch to twin stream and implementation of food waste collections had already been agreed in the JMWMS. RM outlined that the suggestion was to update the JMWMS to include an agreed and more detailed timeline of changes. AC built on this explaining that the suggestion was to update the JMWMS to include more details of authority timelines but that this would require the JMWMS going back through individual decision-making processes.</p> <p>7.3 LB outlined that the vote would just be to agree whether to explore the recommendations further rather than making a final decision. RM agreed and explained that the vote would confirm that the PI board supports officers in investigating options further.</p> <p>7.4 DA asked whether as a deputy he should vote. RM confirmed that as a representative for PCC he should take part in the voting.</p>	

7.5	Voting took place and it was agreed that all four options would be explored further.	
<p><b>9.</b></p> <p>9.1</p> <p>9.2</p> <p>9.3</p> <p>9.4</p>	<p><b>Disposal Contract Update</b></p> <p>SH gave a presentation on the waste disposal contract, this included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on tonnage reduction</li> <li>• Material market fluctuations including significant variations to the value of glass.</li> <li>• Ongoing projects including the new MRF construction and Portsmouth EfW stack replacement.</li> <li>• Contamination, including information on the two key problem waste streams of small WEEE and sharps/clinical waste.</li> <li>• An update on POPs</li> </ul> <p>RM asked what had been driving the value of the glass market. SH outlined that it is difficult to know, explaining that in lieu of EPR there is currently a PRN system to encourage use of glass items and that recently the value of PRNs has gone up which could be driving the market. He also indicated that it may be the market responding to DRS as it has been confirmed that glass will not be included as a DRS material in the UK. Overall, SH noted that it exemplifies the volatility of markets.</p> <p>RK asked if there have been any capacity issues at the ERFs since the new POPs procedures, highlighting that diverting other material to landfill would be a significant step backwards. SH acknowledged that capacity is an issue but currently the reduction in tonnages as mentioned in the presentation means that the facilities are running below capacity. He outlined that HCC works closely with Veolia to manage capacity and will continue to monitor the situation. MG added that contract waste takes priority over commercial waste at ERFs and that the introduction of food waste is expected to reduce tonnages at ERFs which will increase capacity for other materials.</p> <p>RK asked what work is being done by Veolia on recycling exports and ensuring that Hampshire is recycling in a sustainable manner. SH explained that Veolia always seek to find the best market for materials, but the reality is the UK does not have the capacity to manage all the recycling produced. MG agreed, outlining that there is a balance between getting the best value and ensuring sustainability. MG shared that Veolia is always looking for innovative ways to manage recycling in the UK and will continue to explore options going forward. He noted that during the planned Portsmouth outage all materials will be sent to facilities in the UK. SH highlighted that Veolia undertakes significant duty of care work to ensure they are selling materials to credible markets.</p>	
10.	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
11.	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>Proposed date: Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> June 2023.</p>	