

CABINET

9 NOVEMBER 2011

PROJECT INTEGRA 2011 - 2016 REVIEW

REPORT OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT)

Contact Officer: Rob Heathcock Tel No: 01962 848476

RECENT REFERENCES

CAB 2136 – Project Integra Annual Action Plan And Review, 13 April 2011

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In March of this year Cabinet considered a report regarding the conclusion of the Project Integra Review (CAB 2136 refers). As a result comments on the review were agreed and submitted by the City Council for consideration. This report updates Cabinet on developments since that time.

Based on the comments received in response to the review a number of options for the future direction of the Partnership have been put forward top partners for consideration.

As the City Council now works in partnership with East Hampshire District Council on waste services a report describing these options was considered by the Joint Environmental Services Committee (JESC) on 28th October. Their conclusions are included in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Cabinet:

- 1) Endorses the responses to the Project Integra Review implementation report as set out in paragraphs 2.5 of this report.
- 2) Confirms that it agrees with the comments made in 2.6 of this report.
- 3) Agrees that these responses are sent by the City Council to the Review Board.

CABINET9 NOVEMBER 2011PROJECT INTEGRA 2011 - 2016 ACTION PLAN AND REVIEWREPORT OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT)DETAIL:1 Introduction

1.1 In March of this year Cabinet considered a report regarding the conclusion of the Project Integra Review (CAB 2136 refers). As a result comments on the review were agreed and submitted by the City Council for consideration. This report updates Cabinet on developments since that time.

2. Current Position

2.1 All of the comments received from partner local authorities have now been considered and the conclusions published in a report which was considered by the Project Integra Strategic Board on 28th July 2011.

2.2 The conclusion of the Board was to recommend a number of options for the future direction of the Partnership for consideration by the partners and agreement on future implementation.

2.3 As the City Council now works in partnership with East Hampshire District Council on waste services a report describing these conclusions was considered by the Joint Environmental Services Committee (JESC) on 28th October as attached at Appendix 1.

2.4 The report refers to additional appendices which include the original Project Integra review conclusions document but this is not included with this report because of its size. However, a copy has been placed in each of the Member's rooms for perusal if required. It is also available on the Information For Members pages of the Intranet.

2.5 The JESC agreed with the conclusions within the report from the Client Team Manager and are therefore recommending that the following comments are sent to Project Integra on the preferred options.

'That the Committee notes the content of the report at Appendix 1, produced by the Project Integra Strategy Group, and support the following recommendations that the Review of Project Integra should be implemented as per Option 3 but to:

- **Seek to reduce expenditure on training, implement 50% reduction in MAF and 'Recycle for Hampshire' expenditure.**
- **Reduce the number of Project Integra meetings (4 to 3)**
- **Consider bringing Recycle for Hampshire into Project Integra**
- **Review role of the Project Integra Executive Officer**

2.6 Insofar as the proposals relating to the Project Integra Scrutiny Board were concerned (as outlined in para 4.2.2 of the report) the JESC felt this was an issue for individual authorities to comment on and did not consider this in detail. Cabinet is therefore asked whether they agree with the so Members are asked to confirm whether they agree with the conclusions of the review; namely

- Policy Review and Scrutiny Committee should be renamed Policy Development & Scrutiny Committee.
- The Committee should go forward with a more active scrutiny role in support of Project Integra – with its own agenda to develop and review policies not bound by Project Integra Scrutiny Board (PISB) meeting agendas.
- The committee should meet at a similar frequency to the PISB.

2.7 As responses have to be submitted from individual authorities it is recommended that Cabinet endorse these responses and they are submitted on behalf of the City Council.

3. Risk Assessment

3.1 There are no specific risk issues associated with this report.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

4. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CORPORATE CHANGE PLANS

4.1 Involvement with Project Integra is a key role in terms of delivering the waste minimisation outcome within the High Quality Environment element of the Sustainable Community Strategy for 2011 onwards.

5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 There are no costs associated with this report. It may be that following implementation of the review recommendations that partner contributions could be reduced in the future but these have not yet been discussed or quantified.

5.2 Current contributions are divided into three areas as follows:

Subscriptions	£9,602
Project Fees	£8,532
<u>Material Analysis Contributions</u>	<u>£5,242</u>
<u>Total Costs</u>	<u>£23,377</u>
<u>Expenditure Budget</u>	<u>£28,000</u>

6.0 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

As listed in Appendices below and copies of documents placed in the Member's rooms

APPENDICES:

1. Joint Environmental Health Services Committee report – Review of Project Integra - implementation

Appendix 1

NON-EXEMPT**EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

EHDC & WCC Joint Environmental Services
Committee

28 October 2011

REVIEW OF PROJECT INTEGRA - IMPLEMENTATION
Client Team Manager

EXJR.51/11

FOR DECISIONPortfolio: ENVIRONMENT (EHDC) - CLLR JUDY ONSLOW;
QUALITY ENVIRONMENT (WCC) - CLLR VICTORIA WESTON**HIGH****Key Decision: No**

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To present to East Hampshire District Council and Winchester City Councils, as Project Integra Partner Authorities the proposal of the Project Integra Strategic Board (PISB) for implementation of the Review of Project Integra.
- 1.2 To clarify the proposed next steps and timetable for implementation.

2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the content of the report at **Appendix 1**, produced by the Project Integra Strategy Group, and support the following recommendations that the Review of Project Integra should be implemented as per Option 3 but to:

- Seek to reduce expenditure on training, implement 50% reduction in MAF and 'Recycle for Hampshire' expenditure.
- Reduce the number of Project Integra meetings (4 to 3)
- Consider bringing Recycle for Hampshire into Project Integra
- Review role of the Project Integra Executive Officer

- 2.2 To express a view in response to recommendation as set out 4.2.2

3.0 Summary

- 3.1 The Review of the Partnership was undertaken in 2010/11. This was carried out by a Review Team comprising senior officers and overseen by a Review Board comprising elected members and chief executive level officers.
- 3.2 Following feedback from all Partners, Strategy Officers developed a report containing several options for implementation of the findings of the Review. These were presented for consideration to: The Project Integra Strategic Board on 28 July 2011 and The Project Integra Policy Review and Scrutiny

committee on 4 August 2011. The PISB agreed a proposed approach to implementation.

- 3.3 The Partnership is constituted as a Joint Committee of the 14 waste collection and disposal authorities so significant matters such as this require formal consideration and response from partners individually before the Board can take action.
- 3.4 The Cabinet member for the EHDC Environment Portfolio, Councillor Onslow, who is also the EHDC member representative on the PISB, is authorised to make any minor changes to this proposal on behalf of EHDC at the forthcoming PISB on November 10th in light of feedback from other authorities at the meeting. Cllr Victoria Weston, the WCC High Quality Environment Portfolio Holder, is similarly authorised to make minor changes on behalf of the Winchester City Council Cabinet.

4.0 Subject of Report

4.1 Summary of the minutes of the Project Integra Strategic Board (PISB) 28.07.11

- 4.1.1 As the Vice-Chairman had been acting as Chairman and had been involved in the preparation for this item, and with the agreement of the Board, he took the Chair to lead discussion on the PI Review. The three Officers who were potentially affected by the staffing issues in the Report were asked to leave the room for the duration of this item. John Redmayne, Maggie Smith and Andy winter left the room. Notes for this item were taken by John Mascal, NFDC.
- 4.1.2 Presentation by Colin Read (CR), Chairman of PI Strategy Officers Group, provided a brief overview of early PI history, a summary of the PI Review outcomes and a summary of responses received from Partner Authorities to the Review Report.

In reviewing the responses, there was no clear consensus from Partner Authorities to indicate any emerging preferred model for PI. However, based on these responses Strategy Officers had prepared three options for consideration by the Board:

- Option 1 – Basic Partnership Working
- Option 2 – Reduced Project Integra
- Option 3 – Revised Project Integra

- 4.1.3 Comments made during the debate included;

Presentation does not represent the views of Review Board, PI should progress, not go backwards. This should not be an exercise to save money, should be to improve quality.

Vice Chairman – Not a presentation on findings of PI Review Board – presentation based on responses from Member Authorities having considered the PI Review. Meeting today needs to focus on this feedback and consider what is achievable.

Why no option 4 i.e. move PI forward without cutbacks?

Vice Chairman – Any proposal will need to go back to Partner Authorities and an option without efficiencies will not be agreed.

PI should have a stronger strategic role and the 3 options range from cuts to treading water. Set aside fears (HCC, Joint Waste Authorities etc.). More transparency needed. Scrutinise disposal and collection costs as a whole. Need an Option 4 and to save money as a whole.

Deliver an Option 4 via Option 3 – want to save money and there is the potential for invest to save projects. Use knowledge to focus on outcomes – deliver more for less.

Need clear instructions to Executive Director. The Executive Director is responsible to Chairman of PI and the Board.

Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) is over 5 years old and overdue for a review. Is there any idea of costing of external JMWMS? No – but last time £20/£30k.

As review of JMWMS is not starting with a blank sheet, consider should be capable of being done in-house.

Are we going around in circles? One year spent already seeking a way forward. Districts will want to see savings, not more spending.

Tempted by Option 2 but costs will still exist. No problem in asking Authority for more money in the future, where there is a business case and once savings have been achieved. Need to have more joint working.

Option 2, reduced 'Recycle for Hampshire' and put it within PI.

Option 2 savings would be lost by need to spend money on shortfalls in officer resources. Recycle for Hampshire is scalable or make it 'Pay as You Go'; Option for more flexibility of the MAF. Too much time salami slicing rather than looking for achievable cuts.

Joint Waste Authority could deliver significant savings – do not need 14 Strategy Officer, 14 support structures etc... but Partner Authorities have clearly said no to this. £200m invested over 10 years – now less than 10% waste going to landfill (original PI objective). Effectively PI's 'task & finish' objectives achieved. Is infrastructure capable of dealing with waste for next 10-15 years? Yes. Do we need existing PI structure or will a slimmed down one deliver?

Option 2 will mean end of PI with reduced Member input.

Why can't Option 3 make savings;

- Downgrade Exec Officer support
- Cut 'Recycle for Hampshire' by 50%
- Cut PI training programme
- Reduce PI meetings etc... (3 per year)

Therefore Option 3 with savings and retain Member led board.

4.1.4 Cllr S Parker put a proposal to the Meeting that: The Review of Project Integra should be implemented as per Option 3 but:

- Seek to reduce expenditure on training, implement 50% reduction in MAF and 'Recycle for Hampshire' expenditure.
- Reduce the number of PI meetings (4 to 3)
- Consider bringing Recycle for Hampshire into PI
- Review role of Executive Officer

Each Member to make recommendation to their own Authority

This report should come back to PI Board for decision

This proposal was agreed unanimously.

4.2 Summary of the minutes of the Project Integra Policy Review & Scrutiny Committee (PRSC) 02.08.11

4.2.1 Following a wide ranging discussion PRSC concluded that the proposal in Report D (background paper attached) that the Committee should be disbanded was not supported by them.

4.2.2 The proposal from the PISB meeting on 28 July (that the scrutiny of the Board should be by each authority nominating Members to Scrutiny Committee – but that this Committee should only meet if requested) was considered. Members felt that this would be an ineffective approach – and that the reality would be that the Committee would never meet.

Members proposed and agreed the following alternative approach:

- PR&SC should be renamed Policy Development & Scrutiny Committee.
- The Committee should go forward with a more active scrutiny role in support of Project Integra – with its own agenda to develop and review policies not bound by PISB meeting agendas.
- The committee should meet at a similar frequency to the PISB.

Members asked that this proposal be reported to the board and to the Strategy Officer meeting on 4 August.

4.3 Timetable

August & September

Strategy Officers working in groups carry out efficiency reviews of Executive, Recycle for Hampshire and Materials Analysis Facility.

September & October

Partner Authorities:

- Consider, at the appropriate level, the PISB proposal for implementation of the Review of Project Integra; and
- Seek authority for their representative on the PISB to agree at the PISB meeting any minor changes to this proposal in light of feedback from other authorities.

September 29th

Propose to cancel the scheduled PRSC meeting as the Board will not have met since the last PRSC meeting.

November 10th

Revised date for PISB meeting (scheduled for 6th October).

Board:

- Considers feedback from all Partners on their proposal;
- Considers feedback from Strategy Officers on efficiency reviews of the main elements of the Partnership;
- Agrees changes to the Partnership in response to the Review;
- Asks Strategy Officers to prepare a Draft Action Plan for 2012/13 incorporating the changes.

November & December

Strategy Officers prepare Draft Action Plan

January 2012

PISB (meeting date currently set for 12.01.12)

Board:

- Agrees a Draft Action Plan, budget and partner contributions.
- Recommends them to Partner Authorities.

January – March 2012

Partner Authorities individually approve the Draft Action Plan.

April 2012

Commencement of new partnership arrangements.

5. Implications

5.1 Resources: Finance/Staffing - The Project Integra annual subscription for EHDC is currently £26,000 and for WCC is £25,600, and this may be reduced in the future. It should be noted that there also could be a slight increase to this subscription as a result of implementing the changes in the PI Review to incorporate PI staff costs in relation to redundancy and pensions.

5.2 Legal - No implications

5.3 Strategy:

Addresses the EHDC Council Strategy aim of 'caring for our natural environment' and targets within the WCC High Quality Environment Change Plan, by constantly reviewing the way in which we deliver our statutory waste services in an effort to;

- Minimise waste
- Increase recycling
- Reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill
- Obtain the best prices for our recovered materials
- Adopt best practice
- Work in partnership with neighbouring local authorities
- Reduce carbon outputs

- 5.4 Risks: (Environmental, Health & Safety and Customer Access Impact Assessment) -** No risks identified.
- 5.5 Communications:** This will be managed by the PI communications team who will be expected to liaise with each authority.
- 5.6 For the Community:** There will be a minimal impact as a direct result of the Review, however any future changes/improvements to service delivery will involve consultation and communication.
- 5.7 The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)** has been completed and concluded the following: That there is no direct impact on any individuals or groups.
- 6.0 Consultation**
- Officers and members of the 14 partner authorities within Hampshire.
- 6.1 Appendices:**
- Appendix 1 -** Report D - Implementing the PI Review – Options & Recommendations
- Appendix 2 -** Appendices to Report D which includes:
- Summary of Feedback from Partners
 - Current arrangements & costs
 - Employment issues
 - Approach to development of options
 - Option 1
 - Option 2
 - Option 3
 - PI Meetings Structure & Cost Analysis
 - PI Action Plan 2006 – 2011 – lessons from review of achievements
- Appendix 3** Background to Report D – Responses received from PI partners to the Review Team's report.
- 6.2 Background Papers:** As listed above.

Contact Officer: Brian Turner
Job Title: Joint EHDC/WCC Environmental Services Client Team Manager
Telephone: 01730 234283
E-Mail: brian.turner@easthants.gov.uk