



Project Integra – Strategic Board Minutes

Name of meeting	Project Integra Strategic Board	
Date of meeting	Tuesday 21 st October, 10am-12:30-pm	
Venue	Online Meeting – MS Teams	
Attendees	<p>Councillors:</p> <p>Cllr Dave Ashmore (DA) Cllr Geoffrey Blunden (GB) Cllr Steve Cramoysan (SC) Cllr David Drew (DD) Cllr Christine Guinness (CG) Cllr Stephen Hammond (SHa) Cllr Rupert Kyrle (RK) Cllr Robert Mocatta (RM) Cllr Kirsty North (KN) Cllr Alan Oliver (AO) Cllr John Savage (JS) Cllr Netty Shepherd (NS) Cllr Chris Tomblin (CT)</p> <p>Officers:</p> <p>David Allister (DA) Vanessa Cheung (VC) Gregory Cox (GC) Mick Gore (MGo) Mark Gray (MG) Lisa Hand (LH) Sam Horne (SH) Paul Laughlin (PL) Olivia Longley (OL) Sean Magee (SM) Dan McCartney (DMC) Ashleigh Moore (AM) Mandy Nellthorpe (MN) Chris Noble (CN) Colin Read (CR) Sonja Reames (SR) Kaylee Shaw (KS) Ian Spicer (IS) Helen Taylor-Cobb (HTC) Richard Tebbutt (RT) Ruth Whaymand (RW) Ashley Wild (AWi) Abigail Wylde (AWy)</p>	<p>Portsmouth City Council New Forest District Council Winchester City Council Test Valley Borough Council Rushmoor Borough Council Gosport Borough Council Eastleigh Borough Council East Hampshire District Council Hampshire County Council Hart District Council Southampton City Council Havant Borough Council Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council</p> <p>Eastleigh Borough Council Test Valley Borough Council Southampton City Council Fareham Borough Council Veolia Southampton City Council Hampshire County Council Hampshire County Council Project Integra Southampton City Council Fareham Borough Council Portsmouth City Council Eastleigh Borough Council New Forest District Council Gosport Borough Council Havant Borough Council Winchester City Council Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council East Hampshire District Council Rushmoor Borough Council Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Project Integra</p>
Apologies:	<p>Cllr Ian Bastable (IB) Rob Harbour (RH) Paul Wykes (PW)</p>	<p>Fareham Borough Council Southampton City Council Test Valley Borough Council</p>
		Actions
1.	Introductions and Domestic Arrangements	

<p>2.</p> <p>2.1</p>	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Apologies as above.</p>	
<p>3.</p> <p>3.1</p>	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p>	<p>Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (Report 132)</p> <p>Point 6.1 member briefing presentations - AWy provided an update on the member briefing presentation work discussed at the previous meeting. She explained that following feedback, a summary of the Emissions Trading Scheme is being added to the presentation pack and that once this is complete the pack will be shared with officers before being distributed to members.</p> <p>Point 6.1 JMWMS – AWy shared that following the last meeting a JMWMS working group had been set up to work on the strategy update. This group has been meeting on a monthly basis and are hoping to have a draft of the updated strategy ready for the June/July meeting cycle. She highlighted that this timeline had been chosen to ensure that it did not clash with the local authority elections due to take place next year or the pre-election period beforehand.</p> <p>AWy presented a national update, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key timeline dates for Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), Simpler Recycling, and the Deposit Return Scheme • A Simpler Recycling update, including the work that had been done to ensure compliance for the non-municipal premise deadline in March. • An overview of the food waste new burdens funding being received by each authority. • A summary of the EPR funding authorities is expected to receive. <p>Presentation slides to be circulated with the minutes.</p> <p>The minutes were agreed to be a true record.</p>	<p>AWy</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>5.1</p>	<p>Benchmarking</p> <p>AWy gave a presentation on the benchmarking work discussed at the last meeting, this included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background on the work including data sources and discrepancies • A summary of services across the partnership • Graph of the net cost of waste per household for each authority (excluding internal recharges) • In house and contracted authority key areas of spend • The net cost of collection per household compared to recycling rate. • WCA sources of income • A waste disposal cost breakdown • Impact of ETS on disposal costs • Total cost of collection and disposal • Polices across the partnership – including garden waste and replacement bin prices. 	

<p>5.2</p>	<p>AWy asked for any questions or feedback:</p> <p>SC thanked AWy for the presentation and asked if any work has been done to further investigate the correlation between lower costs and higher recycling rates. AWy said that analysis had not been done but that she was happy to facilitate this if authorities felt it would be useful. She also noted that the majority of authorities with higher recycling rates and lower costs are in-house authorities which may be a contributing factor.</p> <p>SC agreed that this would be interesting to research further and asked to what extent senior management costs were included in the work, indicating that from verbal feedback it appears that senior officers in contracted out authorities have more time to spend on strategic work rather than HR and staff management. AWy explained that the data sheets circulated to authorities were designed to capture their actuals and that any staff time allocated to waste should have been included, although would vary between authorities.</p> <p>JS explained that SCC have experienced ongoing issues with missed bins and asked whether this would impact recycling rates or whether missed bins has been factored into the benchmarking work at all. AWy outlined that she had been asked to include data on missed bins in the work but currently hasn't received data from all authorities. Once this information has been received then a comparison can be done between missed bins and recycling rate. JS indicated that this would be helpful and also explained that often in SCC collections are delayed rather than completely missed which is also a concern when considering recycling rates. AWy acknowledged the difference and said this could also be incorporated into the work.</p> <p>RM asked whether HCC could provide a more detailed explanation as to the composition of the contamination mentioned in the presentation data.</p> <p>SH explained that currently the contamination rate at the MRFs is around 23% and although some of this is composed of materials that cannot currently be recycled in Hampshire, for example plastic pots, tubs, and trays, that it also contains essentially residual material. Increases in contamination and inflationary pressures associated with managing the material is driving up the cost of contamination, which unless addressed is likely to continue rising even with the implementation of Simpler Recycling.</p>	
<p>6.</p> <p>6.1</p>	<p>Simpler Recycling Compliance</p> <p>Roadmap to Compliance:</p> <p>AWy explained that earlier in the year HCC, PI and a few other authority representatives met with Defra to discuss Hampshire's compliance with Simpler Recycling. The outcome of this meeting was that PI would produce a roadmap to compliance which would outline the steps the partnership was taking to meet the Simpler Recycling requirements. After the June meeting cycle AWy sent out a request for information to all partners to complete the roadmap. However, to date only 3 responses have been received. She acknowledged that authorities are busy with their food waste roll outs but reiterated the importance of submitting their information for the roadmap ahead of the deadline in March 2026.</p> <p>RM reiterated the request for authorities to send AWy their information.</p>	

6.2	<p>MRF Update:</p> <p>PL presented an update on the twin stream MRF project, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of the civils repricing work and reasoning behind this • Key next steps including vegetation clearance work which is due to start in January or February 2026 • An update on the discharge of the pre-planning conditions which is scheduled to finish around Christmas time. • Waste flow work. • The exploration of AI and robotics for the MRF • The estimated operational date of 2028 based on the plans of a 2-year build (1st year structure and 2nd equipment fitting) 	
6.3	<p>Transition of Collection Services:</p> <p>SH explained that the transition of collection services from the current operation to twin stream will be a large and complex project which will need to be carefully managed and planned in detail. HCC and Veolia work continuously on mapping the waste flow across the network which is vital for ensuring that both the collection and disposal elements of the network run efficiently. The waste flow will be a key informant in planning the transition between collection services.</p> <p>SH outlined that the flow of material into the transfer stations by the collection authorities will need to be planned to ensure that both the MRF and ERF sites are receiving the correct volumes of material to operate. This will involve an open and transparent dialogue between HCC, Veolia, and the collection authorities to ensure that each authority's plans align. For example, it wouldn't be possible for all authorities to deliver residual material to a transfer station one week and DMR the next, as the right balance of material wouldn't be achieved. HCC need to know what authorities are planning in terms of their collections to manage the waste flow and make any necessary adjustments as a collective. Ideally, the transition window will be as short as possible to avoid running two services concurrently which reinforces the need for detailed planning as a partnership. SH further reiterated this by noting the large size of the project, and emphasising how it is critical to get the plans right to ensure that the infrastructure runs correctly and to avoid any disruption to collection services.</p>	
6.4	<p>Questions:</p> <p>NM asked whether the process by which the collection authorities can discuss their future collection service plans with HCC has been set up. SH replied that nothing has been established yet but that the aim is to group the collection authorities based on the transfer stations they use, discuss their plans with them, and map the waste flows. HCC will reach out to authorities once the building work has started on the MRF, sometime in early 2026. RM asked if this work will be shared amongst the partnership. SH confirmed that the process will be fully open and transparent so that all partners are aware of what is happening.</p>	
7.	<p>Food Waste Rollout</p>	
7.1	<p>New Forest District Council Food Waste Roll Out:</p> <p>CN presented on the progress of the food waste service roll out in the New Forest, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background on the wider service changes, including introducing wheeled 	

- bins, an alternate weekly collection service, a new depot and fleet.
- New waste service timeline
- A summary of the three phased comms approach
- Key issues experienced – container delivery delays, missed collections, livestock accessing containers & periods of high customer contact.

CN asked for any questions:

DD thanked CN for the presentation and shared that TVBC has had some reports of roaming animals in the first few weeks of their service. He said that it was helpful to hear NFDC's experience and indicated that the team may be in touch. CN said that he was happy to discuss their experience and that NFDC is considering their options extensively.

SC asked whether NFDC's service was in-house or contracted out, noting that they had a lot of data on the roll out. CN explained that the service is run in-house but that the container delivery was completed by a contractor.

NS shared that HBC also use Bartech and asked whether this was used in the service roll out. CN confirmed that it was, explaining that mapping and address information was used to inform the container delivery plan. He noted that the contractor did not perform as well as expected and that the team are considering how this can be improved for the next phase.

7.2 **Food Waste Updates:**

RM asked for each authority to provide an update on their food waste service plans.

BDBC/HDC – HTC shared that BDBC and HDC have started their service and that the roll out had gone well so far. They had a success rate for caddy deployment of around 98% and the number of missed deliveries dropped significantly as the deployment progressed. Vehicle delivery was delayed and as a result Serco has had to use a hire fleet initially, but the purchased vehicles are now arriving. Participation in the service has been good, and the tonnage collected increased in the second week. Overall, the roll out has gone well.

EHDC – RT outlined that EHDC is currently progressing through the vehicle procurement process which will then inform the timeline for caddy procurement and the overall delivery date for the service.

FBC – MG explained that FBC has planned to start their food waste service from March 2026. The service is being run in house, and they have already taken delivery of both the vehicles and caddies. FBC is planning to run their container delivery in-house and are hiring staff early to complete this as it worked out cheaper than contracting it out. The comms campaign has started and will build up towards the launch date.

GBC – CR shared that GBC is in the process of finalising the tenders for their vehicles and containers, he indicated that the majority of returns have suggested that the delivery time scale will be the middle of 2026. As a result, GBC is not expecting to start their service in April 2026 as originally planned. GBC is also concerns about the uncertainty around the revenue income from Defra, they are aware that this should be confirmed in the financial settlement later this year, but they have written to Defra about the risks of procurement for food waste without revenue confirmation.

HBC – SR indicated that HBC have a cabinet decision going forward in December regarding who will deliver their food waste service. She explained that they are not expecting to have the service operational by April 2026 but are potentially considering running a pilot scheme around that time. HBC also share GBC’s concerns around finances.

SCC – JS explained that SCC have scheduled their food waste service to go live from February 2026 and that they have purchased their vehicles but haven’t taken receipt of them yet. The next steps are an all members briefing in the autumn where the service will be discussed and to launch the comms campaign.

TVBC – DD outlined that TVBC started their service last week and it was going well although there had been some reports of missed bins. He indicated that they were encouraged by NFDC’s experience of decreasing missed bins and are hopeful that the service continues to run well. VC added to this, highlighting that 80 tonnes of food was collected in the first week and that participation was higher than anticipated. She explained that there had only been 110 missed bins and despite the fact that their policy is not to return to missed bins they are taking a soft approach initially.

RM asked if VC was able to provide participation rates for TVBC. VC explained that currently participation is being estimated anecdotally but they are planning to conduct a participation study in November to provide percentages.

WCC – SC shared that WCC has launched the first of 7 phases of their service, and it is going well so far. The service is contracted out and the crews are delivering the caddies themselves in the lead up to the roll out of each phase. WCC have recruited 2 recycling officers who are working with Biffa on comms and any reported issues. There have been some problems in communal areas and a few comments on social media from residents who are likely to be late adopters of the service. Overall, the service roll out is going well and is due to be completed in March 2026.

KS expanded on this and shared that in the first week of the service 10 tonne of food was collected but that this had dropped to 8 tonnes in the second week. Participation observations are based on the in-cab system which records properties that haven’t presented a bin. In the first week participation was around 46% and 41% in the second week. KS noted that this is lower than the 70% figure which was modelled for but the team are hopeful that participation will increase as the rollout continues.

RM thanked everyone for their updates.

7.3 **Food Waste Processing:**

SH gave a presentation update on food waste processing, which included:

- Background on the offtake contracts with the AD plants
- A summary of the delivery arrangements – mix of direct delivery and bulk haulage via Transfer Stations
- Confirmation that guaranteed tonnage has been secured with a 50/50 split between the sites to ensure contingency.
- Input specifications aligned and shared.

8. **Disposal Contract Update**

8.1 SH provided an update on the disposal contract and explained that the focus has

8.2	<p>been on the MRF project, procurement of the civil engineers, and waste flow data. He also noted that Veolia have started a piece of work into how bulky waste is managed, both from the HWRCs and also from the kerbside, to see if the amount being landfilled can be reduced. However, this project is still in a very early stage.</p> <p>SH presented on the Emissions Trading Scheme and the impacts it will have on disposal costs for unitary authorities, this included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background on the scheme • An overview of the 'cap and trade' system • The challenges that local authorities will face when EfWs are included in the scheme from 2028. • A summary of carbon price tracking and data from recent years • Key considerations for Hampshire, including how costs can be reduced and managed. 	
9.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>9.1 KN highlighted that a lot of the meeting discussion was forward thinking e.g. new services and LGR and although this is important the partnership also needs to consider decisions that are being made today. In light of this KN said that she would be happy to facilitate meetings going forward on Simpler Recycling compliance in Hampshire and future collection services, either individually or in groups. She emphasised that following HCC decision to go ahead with the twin stream MRF that the momentum needs to keep going, not only to ensure progress is being made but also to align with the partnership roadmap to compliance being produced for Defra. She said that she was aware that some authorities remain unhappy with the direction of travel and encouraged them to have a discussion with HCC so that the issues can be worked through collaboratively.</p> <p>9.2 SC emphasized that, under LGR, the current infrastructure may not align equitably with the new unitary authorities. He stressed the importance of authorities understanding the scope of existing and future contracts to avoid being locked into systems that could conflict with their long-term priorities.</p> <p>SH explained that the current disposal contract runs until December 2030 and until then all existing arrangements will continue. The contract will then transfer to the new authorities along with all the systems required to manage this. He explained that the infrastructure was originally designed to function as a regional system. While there are individual sites in different areas, effective operation depends on the system working as an integrated whole. This approach enables both planned changes—such as scheduled outages at the MRF or ERFs—and unexpected incidents, like the fire at the Portsmouth MRF a few years ago, to be managed with minimal disruption. Without shared infrastructure, handling these situations would be extremely challenging. SH stressed that any future changes must consider how the system operates as an integrated whole, rather than focusing solely on individual components.</p> <p>HTC asked when HCC is planning to go out to the market to re-let the disposal contract. SH outlined that work on this has already begun as due to the size of the contract it was estimated that 5 years would be needed to prepare. HCC are actively looking at all the options, one of which is to extend the contract for a further 5 years. HTC highlighted that there would be merit in considering an extension period as this would allow the new unitary authorities to participate in a procurement process further down the line. SH acknowledged this as a viable option and noted that, based on his understanding, once legislation for the new authorities is enacted, a</p>	

	joint committee will likely be established. Any decisions concerning the new authorities would then need to be referred to this committee.	
8.	Date of Next Meeting Proposed date: TBC – March 2026	