



Surrey Heath Borough Council
Surrey Heath House
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey GU15 3HD
Telephone: (01276) 707100
Facsimile: (01276) 707177
DX: 32722 Camberley
Web Site: www.surreyheath.gov.uk

Department: Democratic Services
Division: Corporate
Please ask for: Katharine Simpson
Direct Tel: 01276 707100
E-Mail: democratic.services@surreyheath.gov.uk

Wednesday, 12 September 2018

To: The Members of the **Joint Waste Collection Services Committee**

Councillor Beryl Hunwicks, Woking Borough Council (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Surrey Heath Borough Council (Vice Chairman)
Councillor Glenn Dearlove, Elmbridge Borough Council
Councillor Mike Goodman, Surrey County Council
Councillor Patricia Wiltshire, Mole Valley District Council

A meeting of the **Joint Waste Collection Services Committee** will be held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on **Thursday, 20 September 2018 at 10.00 am**. The agenda will be set out as below.

Please note that this meeting will be recorded.

AGENDA

	Pages
1 Apologies for Absence	
To receive apologies for absence and note any substitutes in attendance.	
2 Minutes of Last Meeting	1 - 4
To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee held on 19 th July 2018.	
3 Declaration of Interests	
Members are invited to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and non-pecuniary interests they may have with respect to matters which are to be considered at this meeting. Members who consider they may have an interest are invited to consult the Monitoring Officer or the Democratic Services Officer prior to the meeting.	
4 Mobilisation Update	
To receive a verbal update on the work to mobilise the joint waste contract across the partnership area.	

- 5 Contract Performance Update**
- To receive a verbal update on the performance of the joint waste contract across the partnership area.
- 6 2018/19 Budget Monitoring** **5 - 8**
- To receive a report setting out the financial status of Joint Waste Solutions as at 31st August 2018.
- 7 Improving Recycling Rates in Flatted Developments** **9 - 18**
- To consider a report setting out proposals to improve the recycling rates of flatted developments.
- 8 Incorporation of Joint Waste Solutions and Extension of the Inter Authority Agreement** **19 - 20**
- To consider a report summarising the implications of incorporating Joint Waste Solutions.
- 9 Communications and Engagement Policy Alignment** **21 - 24**
- To consider a report setting out proposals to align communications and engagement across the partnership area.
- 10 Stakeholder Newsletter**
- To agree the content of the next newsletter to stakeholders which will be circulated after the Joint Committee meeting.
- 11 Date of Next Meeting**
- The next scheduled meeting of the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee will take place on Thursday 15th November 2018 at 10am.



Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 19 July 2018

Present: Councillor Beryl Hunwicks, Woking Borough Council (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Surrey Heath Borough Council
Councillor Glenn Dearlove, Elmbridge Borough Council
Councillor Patricia Wiltshire, Mole Valley District Council

In Attendance: Ismina Harvey, Joint Waste Services
Simon Houlahan, Amey
Ray Lee, Elmbridge Borough Council
Kelvin Menon, Surrey Heath Borough Council (Finance)
Tim Pashen, Surrey Heath Borough Council
Matt Smyth, Joint Waste Services
Douglas Spinks, Woking Borough Council
Mark Stammers, Amey
Jack Straw, Mole Valley District Council
Helen Trew, Surrey County Council

Apologies: Councillor Mike Goodman, Surrey County Council

1/JW Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee held on 22nd February 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Matters Arising

Minute 22/JW Mobilisation Update

It was reported that crews could now see details of missed collections on their rounds via the In-Cab Technology. Updates were provided in real time however the frequency of data downloads was dependent on the 4G network coverage in an area.

Minute 23/JW Joint Waste Contract Performance Report – Quarter 3

In an effort to increase the number of drivers, Amey had taken the decision to increase wages. Alternative recruitment routes were also being explored for example recruiting HGV drivers currently serving in the Army but nearing the end of their service period.

Analysis of crew waiting times to enter waste transfer sites had found that waiting times of 30 or more minutes were not uncommon and Amey was working to identify a long term solution to this problem.

2/JW Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

3/JW Joint Waste Services Strategy and Work Programme

The Committee considered a report setting out a proposed strategy and work programme for the Joint Waste Service (JWS).

The draft strategy included a vision, mission statement, values and three priorities which would be used to develop a more detailed work programme. It was noted that to date the focus of the JWS programme had been on mobilising and stabilising the collection contract and adoption of the strategy would enable the future development of JWS as an organisation.

RESOLVED that the vision, mission values and priorities for Joint Waste Solutions be approved.

4/JW Inter Authority Agreement 2 and Variation Agreement

The Committee considered a report setting out a proposed Variation Agreement which, if agreed, would formalise the transfer of Surrey County Council's partnership functions, and associated Waste Development staff, into Joint Waste Solutions, agree more detail on how JWS and partner authorities would work together and agree more detail on the functions that JWS would be carrying out for the five partner authorities.

It was noted that the Variation Agreement should be viewed alongside Inter Authority Agreement 2 and that a new Inter Authority Agreement would be drafted to take into account upcoming planned changes to the governance arrangements of JWS and the Surrey Waste Partnership.

The Committee noted that the Service Level Agreement had also been updated to reflect the changes.

RESOLVED that the Variation Agreement be approved.

5/JW Budget and Finance Update

The Committee received a report setting out the JWS budget for the first quarter (April to June) of the 2018/19 financial year.

It was reported that Amey had recruited a new member of staff to their financial team who would assume responsibility for future invoicing.

RESOLVED that parties agree to being invoiced for the first quarter 2018/19 Contract Management Office costs of £14,935 each (£74,674 in total).

6/JW Mole Valley Mobilisation Update

The Committee received a report providing an update on work to mobilise the joint waste contract across Mole Valley.

It was reported that mobilisation in Mole Valley would take place on 6th August 2018 on an 'as is' basis with crews driving the same routes and rounds as they were currently. New rounds would be introduced once the new ways of working had bedded in. Engagement

with staff had started on 18th May 2018 and an induction would take place on 4th August 2018. Although feedback from staff was positive, a pool of agency staff was also being inducted and would be placed on standby from Day 1 of the transfer.

Arising from Members' questions and comments the following points were noted:

- Additional vehicles had been brought and were currently operational in other areas. These would move to Mole Valley on the 6th August 2016.
- One of the Surrey Heath Supervisors would transfer to Mole Valley on a two-week secondment to provide additional support during the initial mobilisation period.
- Following a recent spate of vehicles requiring new tyres, Amey had changed their tyre provider. Supervisors were conducting daily checks on vehicles and the tyre supplier was also conducting regular checks. A supply of ready to fit tyres had been made available so if a vehicle required replacement tyres these could be fitted straightaway.
- Under TUPE regulations, Biffa employees had until midnight the day before the contract mobilised to decide whether to transfer over to Amey.
- An additional stage had been added to the call escalation process. If a resident called to say that a reported missed collection still had not been collected the matter was now escalated to Amey's Operations Manager for a resolution.
- Improvements in the engagement between Amey and Council Officers was starting to show positive results in Elmbridge.
- As crews became more familiar with the In-Cab technology the information gathered would form a knowledge pool that agency staff could draw on.

The Committee noted the update.

7/JW Joint Waste Contract Annual Performance Report

The Committee was informed that work to resolve data issues had delayed the performance report and the item would be deferred to a future meeting.

8/JW Contract Improvement Plan

The Committee received report setting out a first draft of the Contract Improvement Plan.

The contract placed a requirement on Amey to produce an improvement plan and this had been developed in partnership with JWS to ensure that the added value elements of the bid were put into place. The Improvement Plan focused on seven key areas:

- Optimisation of rounds
- Culture Change
- Streets Outcome based schedules
- Technology improvements
- Safety and wellbeing of staff
- Business process engineering review
- Contact Centre complaints management review

The Committee noted the draft Improvement Plan.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank



Title: Budget and Finance Update
Author: Louise Nettleton, Finance Officer
Date: 20 September 2018

2018/19 Budget Monitoring

The total JWS costs to the end of August 2018 are £158,029.

The major expenses incurred since June 18 are made up as follows:

- Mobilisation costs £ 15,496 design/printing/postages
- CMO charges (salary) £ 39,435
- Laptops/mobile charges £ 2,005
- Legal costs £ 14,049
- Corporate Support charges £ 2,656
- Surrey Wide Communications £ 8,596 paid by SCC.

Looking to year-end, there is an anticipated spend of £ 908,202 leading to a saving of £ 72,813 and resulting in a total spend of £181,640 per Partner.

This is due to:

- a reduction in the Communications Marketing budget. This has arisen due to money received from the Surrey Waste Partnership for service guides, reduced amount of recycling improvement activity due to increased time required on mobilisation comms including dealing with reactive issues and alignment of existing materials. Cost for cross boundary reorganisation comms remains currently as timing is not yet confirmed
- an increase in the legal/consulting costs to cover added expenditure with Sharpe Pritchard to cover work relating to the KPI dispute and GDPR
- the additional work Eunomia are carrying out on reviewing the data supplied by Amey.

Over the second half of the year, projected spend will continue to be reviewed and in-year savings sought wherever possible.

This page is intentionally left blank



Joint Waste Solutions Budget

ANNEX

		JWS Budget 2018/19	JWS Actual Spend to Aug18	EBC	WBC	SHBC	MVDC	SCC	SCC seconded staff	2018-19 Estimate as at Aug18	SWP joint budget	SWP financial mechanisms budgets
		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£		
RING-FENCED BUDGETS												
Contract Management Office Budget Summary												
Mobilisation costs	Communications/Marketing	£ 335,000	£ 30,310							£ 234,147		
	Other Mobilisation costs	£ 78,000	£ 21,310							£ 48,240		
CMO staffing and other costs	CMO Staffing costs	£ 318,015	£ 80,946							£ 326,415		
	Other CMO costs	£ 38,500	£ 7,802							£ 87,900		
Surrey Wide Communications costs		£ 140,000	£ 8,596							£ 140,000		
SWP joint budget and financial mechanisms											£ 1,498,507	£ 5,624,441
Corporate Support Costs		£ 55,500	£ 5,125							£ 55,500		
Overheads and hosting costs		£ 16,000	£ 3,940							£ 16,000		
Total CMO Budget excluding TUPE'd staff		£ 981,015		£ 196,203		£ 908,202	£ 1,498,507	£ 5,624,441				
Total CMO Spend excluding TUPE'd staff			£ 158,029	£ 31,606								
Less SCC funded to August 2018			-£ 8,596					-£ 8,596				
CMO costs payable by each Partner			£ 149,433	£ 31,606	£ 31,606	£ 31,606	£ 31,606	£ 23,010		£ 181,640		
Total Salaries TUPE'd staff	Budget	£ 777,107		£ 183,284	£ 157,409	£ 184,170	£ 166,948		£ 85,296	£ 777,107	£ 306,563	
	Actual		£ 357,462	£ 77,476	£ 61,411	£ 107,521	£ 76,533		£ 34,521			
Total CMO budget + staff		£ 1,758,122	£ 506,895	£ 109,082	£ 93,017	£ 139,127	£ 108,139	£ 23,010	£ 34,521	£ 1,685,309	£ 1,805,070	£ 5,624,441
Outside CMO	SCC recharge due to rejected loads (contamination) Jul-Dec to be claimed from Amey KPIs		£ 37,424							£ 77,424	Payable out of KPIs	
	KPI deductions											

This page is intentionally left blank



Improving Recycling Rates in Flats – Proposal to Seek Surrey Waste Partnership Match Funding
Report Author: Sally Hunt
Date: 20th September 2018

1. Background

- 1.1 The Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP) Members' Group agreed at their last meeting to make the flats recycling team a permanent part of the SWP to provide ongoing support to rollout services to flats and improve recycling performance at other hard to reach properties.
- 1.2 Based on the success that the team's work has had so far, the SWP agreed to provide up to £700k of match funding towards the capital costs for bins and communication materials, for the following activities, in ranked priority order:
1. Expanding food waste services to all flats and HMOs.
 2. Expanding dry mixed recycling (DMR) services to all flats and HMOs.
 3. Reducing DMR contamination.
 4. Expanding textiles and small electricals services to flats and HMOs.
- 1.3 The ranked priority order was determined based on the anticipated benefit of each activity in terms of increasing recycling rates and tonnage capture.
- 1.4 The partnership will be inviting all authorities to submit an expression of interest by the end of December, so that the match funding can be allocated between authorities and the delivery of the work can be planned, with work starting from April 2019.
- 1.5 To prepare an expression of interest for JWS, this paper sets out a proposal for discussion and the estimated business case for each activity.

2. Expanding food waste services to all flats

- 2.1 Table 1 shows the current approximate coverage of food waste services to flats across the JWS areas. This shows there is significant potential to increase the provision of food waste collections to around 12,900 households.

Area	% coverage	No. flats with service	No. of flats without service
Elmbridge	40%	5,135	7,703
Mole Valley	80%	5,710	1,427
Surrey Heath	33%	1,819	3,694
Woking	99%	9,885	100

Table 1: Approximate coverage of food waste collection services at flats

- 2.2 From the trials that the flats team have undertaken three different container options have been identified, the cost of each option and the estimated benefit from rolling out a food collection service to all remaining flats is shown in annex 1.
- 2.3 Option 1 involves using food housing units so residents don't have to touch the bin and odours are more contained (see image in annex 2). However, these units are costly.

- 2.3 Option 2 is a 'lid in lid' bin, where a wheeled bin has a locked lid and residents have a smaller aperture to open to put in their food waste (see annex 2). This option is much more cost effective and achieves a similar experience for residents.
- 2.4 The third option is to use standard 140 litre wheeled bins, as are mostly commonly used across the JWS areas. However, when opening the lids of these bins residents can see the food waste and be subjected to odours and the waste is not kept secure. An unpleasant experience for residents could discourage use, thereby reducing the amount of food waste that is recycled.
- 2.5 Recommendation – based on the cost and resident experience it is proposed that option 2 is favoured, using 'lid in lid' bins. The capital cost is predicted to be paid back in one year.
- 2.6 However, the annual benefit of expanding food services, is anticipated to be around £35,000 from the current SWP financial mechanism, but this would not cover the additional collection costs that Amey would charge under the current pricing schedule, of around £113,000 (£8.74 per household). Therefore the benefit of providing a universal service to all residents that would increase recycling rates and bring in around 1,200 additional tonnes of recycling should be considered alongside the investment required.
- 2.7 Amey's ability to deliver the service to the additional households should also be considered and a rollout should only go ahead once there is confidence that an effective collection service can be provided.

3. Expanding DMR to all flats

- 3.1 There is much greater coverage of DMR collection services to flats within the JWS area, as shown in table 2, with only around 350 flats without a service.

Area	% coverage	No. flats with service	No. of flats without service
Elmbridge	99%	12,710	128
Mole Valley	99%	7,066	71
Surrey Heath	99%	5,458	55
Woking	99%	9,885	100

Table 2: Approximate coverage of DMR collection services at flats

- 3.2 Annex 3 summarises the business case for expanding DMR services to all flats. The capital cost is anticipated to be around £9,000 which would be paid back in three years and the annual income benefit is anticipated to be higher than the collection cost.
- 3.3 Recommendation – that DMR services should be rolled out wherever possible, however as there are only a limited number of properties without a service and therefore the scope for delivering benefit is small, this should not be a high priority. It should also be recognised that there are likely to be reasons why services haven't been introduced at these properties, such as lack of bin store space and it may take more time to work with housing provides or managing agents to find appropriate solutions.

4. Reducing DMR contamination

- 4.1 Through the trials that the flats team have carried out so far they have found successful methods to reduce contamination in DMR bins by introducing restricted aperture lids, improving signage and providing residents with reusable recycling bags to store and transport their recycling. On average this has reduced the number of contaminated bins from 21% to 9%, increasing the proportion of bins that can be emptied by recycling vehicles and increasing material quality.
- 4.2 Annex 4 summarises the business case for delivering this same intervention to flats within JWS where there are currently no restricted aperture lids – all of Elmbridge, Mole Valley, Surrey Heath and half of Woking’s recycling bins.
- 4.3 There are two options. The first is to replace existing plastic bins with new metal bins and restricted aperture lids. Mole Valley currently have all metal bins, so in this area only new lids would be needed. But this option is costly, with a capital cost payback period of 11 years.
- 4.4 The second option is to modify the lids of existing plastic bins to a design that was produced and tested by the flats team in conjunction with JWS colleagues (see Annex 5). The lids need to be modified because reduced aperture lids for plastic bins aren’t currently available on the market. This option is much cheaper and would payback in three years with an anticipated annual benefit of £32,000 and no additional collection costs.
- 4.5 Recommendation – to pursue the second option of modifying existing bin lids due to the lower cost. This would also avoid disposing of plastic bins that are not at the end of their useful life. When plastic bins do come to the end of their life, and for new developments, it is recommended that 1280 litre metal bins with restricted aperture lids are bought as standard as they perform the best, but the cost of wholesale replacement now would be prohibitive.
- 4.6 It is recommended that work to reduce DMR contamination is prioritised as it is expected to bring the greatest benefit and can be rolled out without a dependency on Amey amending their collection rounds.

5. Expanding textiles and small electricals to all flats

- 5.1 There is only limited coverage of textiles and small electrical collections at flats, as shown in table 3, with the potential to roll out a service to nearly 32,000 households.

Area	% coverage	No. flats with service	No. of flats without service
Elmbridge	0%	0	12,838
Mole Valley	0%	0	7,137
Surrey Heath	5%	276	5,237
Woking	35%	3,495	6,490

Table 3: Approximate coverage of textiles and small electricals services at flats

- 5.2 Annex 6 shows the business case and annex 7 shows the two container options. Option 1 is to use metal sackholders, as are currently used in Woking, whereas option 2 is a cheaper option designed by the flats team and JWS colleagues to utilise existing excess 140 litre bin stocks.

- 5.7 Recommendation – to pursue option 2 of modifying 140 litre bins as this option is less than half the cost with capital payback expected in only a year. Annual benefits are anticipated to be significant, around £45,000 compared to an annual collection cost of £14,000. The benefits for these materials are higher due to the income that can be gained from selling textiles.
- 5.8 However, it should be noted that rolling out textiles and small electrical collections to flats will require Amey to provide an effective collection method to do so. It is suggested that work starts by rolling out the service to flats where there are currently issues with textiles and electricals contaminating the DMR bins.

6. Summary and next steps

- 6.1 Members are invited to discuss the recommendations and agree the work for which match funding will be sought from the Surrey Waste Partnership.
- 6.2 Members are also invited to discuss how the JWS/district and borough contribution could be funded, including the option of using funds from contract deductions.
- 6.3 To summarise, the recommendations are as follows:

For JWS to consider funding and requesting match funding from the SWP to:

- i. Reduce DMR contamination by modifying existing bin lids (or replacing bin lids in Mole Valley).
- ii. Expand textiles and small electrical services to all flats, using modified 140 litre bins, subject to agreeing a satisfactory collection approach with Amey.
- iii. Expand food services to all flats, if it is felt that the investment required is acceptable.
- iv. Expand DMR services to all flats, wherever possible.

Annex 1 – Business case for expanding food to all flats

Container option	Area	Capital cost to JWS	SWP match funding	Annual additional collection costs	Annual JWS benefit	JWS capital payback (years)	Annual taxpayer benefit	Taxpayer capital payback (years)
Option 1 - Housing unit	Elmbridge	£88,012	£87,504	£67,322	£20,739	4	£51,848	3
	Mole Valley	£16,327	£16,233	£12,475	£2,792	6	£6,980	5
	Surrey Heath	£42,204	£41,961	£32,283	£10,882	4	£27,206	3
	Woking	£1,141	£1,134	£873	£256	4	£641	4
	Total	£147,685	£146,832	£112,954	£34,670	4	£86,675	3
Option 2 – Lid in lid bins	Elmbridge	£19,746	£19,238	£67,322	£20,739	1	£51,848	1
	Mole Valley	£3,659	£3,565	£12,475	£2,792	1	£6,980	1
	Surrey Heath	£9,469	£9,225	£32,283	£10,882	1	£27,206	1
	Woking	£256	£249	£873	£256	1	£641	1
	Total	£33,130	£32,277	£112,954	£34,670	1	£86,675	1
Option 3 – Standard 140 litre bins	Elmbridge	£14,162	£13,653	£67,322	£20,739	1	£51,848	1
	Mole Valley	£2,624	£2,530	£12,475	£2,792	1	£6,980	1
	Surrey Heath	£5,313	£5,070	£32,283	£10,882	0	£27,206	0
	Woking	£184	£177	£873	£256	1	£641	1
	Total	£22,283	£21,430	£112,954	£34,670	1	£86,675	1

Annex 2 – Food waste container examples

Housing unit



'Lid in lid' bin



Annex 3 – Business case for expanding DMR to all flats

Container	Area	Capital cost to JWS	SWP match funding	Annual additional collection costs	Annual JWS benefit	JWS capital payback (years)	Annual taxpayer benefit	Taxpayer capital payback (years)
1280 litre metal bins with reduced aperture	Elmbridge	£3,351	£3,323	£986	£1,117	3	£2,792	2
	Mole Valley	£1,863	£1,847	£548	£587	3	£1,468	3
	Surrey Heath	£1,439	£1,427	£423	£514	3	£1,286	2
	Woking	£2,606	£2,584	£767	£816	3	£2,041	3
	Total	£9,260	£9,182	£2,724	£3,035	3	£7,588	2

Annex 4 – Business case for reducing DMR contamination

Container option	Area	Capital cost to JWS	SWP match funding	Annual JWS benefit	JWS capital payback (years)	Annual taxpayer benefit	Taxpayer capital payback (years)
Option 1 – New metal bins with restricted aperture lids (new lids only for Mole Valley)	Elmbridge	£161,988	£160,668	£13,641	12	£34,102	10
	Mole Valley	£16,381	£15,853	£7,564	2	£18,909	2
	Surrey Heath	£101,235	£58,658	£6,301	16	£15,753	10
	Woking	£71,581	£70,987	£4,743	16	£11,859	13
	Total	£351,184	£306,166	£32,249	11	£80,623	8
Option 2 – Modify / replace existing bin lids	Elmbridge	£33,518	£33,518	£13,641	2	£34,102	2
	Mole Valley	£16,381	£15,853	£7,564	2	£18,909	2
	Surrey Heath	£16,041	£16,041	£6,301	3	£15,753	2
	Woking	£13,770	£13,770	£4,743	3	£11,859	2
	Total	£79,709	£79,181	£32,249	3	£80,623	2

Annex 5 – Modified plastic bin lids to add a restricted aperture



Annex 6 – Business case to expand textiles and small electricals to all flats

Container option	Area	Capital cost to JWS	SWP match funding	Annual additional collection costs	Annual JWS benefit	JWS capital payback (years)	Annual taxpayer benefit	Taxpayer capital payback (years)
Option 1 – Metal sackholders	Elmbridge	£33,437	£32,621	£5,777	£16,707	2	£17,037	4
	Mole Valley	£18,945	£18,492	£3,212	£2,979	6	£3,221	12
	Surrey Heath	£13,903	£13,570	£2,357	£15,568	1	£16,022	2
	Woking	£17,228	£16,816	£2,921	£10,270	2	£10,727	3
	Total	£83,513	£81,500	£14,266	£45,524	2	£47,007	4
Option 2 – modified 140 litre bins	Elmbridge	£13,403	£12,588	£5,777	£16,707	1	£17,037	2
	Mole Valley	£7,808	£7,355	£3,212	£2,979	3	£3,221	5
	Surrey Heath	£3,297	£2,964	£2,357	£15,568	0	£16,022	0
	Woking	£7,100	£6,688	£2,921	£10,270	1	£10,727	1
	Total	£31,608	£29,595	£14,266	£45,524	1	£47,007	1

Annex 7 – Textiles and small electrical container examples

Metal sackholders



Modified 140 litre bin





Title: Incorporation of Joint Waste Solutions and Extension of Inter Authority Agreement: Summary of implications
Author: Sharpe Pritchard
Date: 20 September 2018

1. Purpose

- 1.1 To set out the implications of upcoming changes to governance arrangements to ensure that the views of the Board are built into the next phase of work.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 For over a year, Surrey's authorities (via Surrey Waste Partnership) have been working towards establishing a new form of governance for all joint work involving waste management. The objectives are to remove the organisational boundaries that can lead to a 'them and us' mentality, consolidate the staff that do the joint work into a single effective management structure, and improve the formality and transparency of decision making. In essence the change is about evolving the way county-wide joint work is delivered, from a temporary and informal process, to one that is permanent, structured, flexible and efficient.
- 2.2 The new governance arrangements intend to combine the decision making processes of the five authorities that use Joint Waste Solutions with those used by all 12 authorities, i.e. Surrey Waste Partnership. The result would be a single joint committee which would oversee all joint work, including the work currently delivered by Joint Waste Solutions. Proposed principles for the new arrangements were presented at the last partnership Members' group on 11 July 2018.
- 2.3 This report considers the implications of the proposed changes to the governance arrangements for the five authorities that use Joint Waste Solutions.

3. Background

- 3.1 At present Joint Waste Solutions has two roles:
- It undertakes contract management functions in respect of the Joint Waste Services contract.
 - It also carries out the Surrey WDA Partnership Functions.
- 3.2 These functions are carried out by an integrated team who have been transferred from the various member authorities and who are now being transferred under TUPE to the employment of Surrey Heath Borough Council. The arrangements between the four authorities who are currently parties to the joint waste services contract and Surrey County Council are governed by an inter authority agreement (IAA).
- 3.3 In addition to the governance changes described above, Joint Waste Solutions will operate as a company rather than simply as a team of employees working jointly for the relevant authorities. This will also have implications on decision making, which are explained below.

4. Joint working

- 4.1 The commitment to joint working will be reflected in certain functions being delegated to the joint waste committee by all the Surrey authorities. This will mean the expansion

of the committee to include these further members. Their representatives on the committee will be able to vote on the functions exercised jointly by all the Surrey authorities but not on issues relating to the joint waste services contract.

- 4.2 The arrangements for the expanded joint waste committee will likely be mirrored by arrangements for the Waste Partnership Board. The board will be joined by representatives of the other district and borough councils who will have input on the issues where there is joint working.
- 4.3 Although the responsibility for the management of the joint waste services contract will rest with the authorities which are parties to it, the intention of the new arrangements is to promote joint working. With this in mind, it is intended that at meetings both of the Committee and the Waste Partnership Board, the representatives of the authorities which are not parties to the contract will be present at discussions about issues affecting the contract.

5. Company Incorporation

- 5.1 The Inter Authority Agreement sets out the potential for Joint Waste Solutions to become a company in the future. This would have a number of advantages in terms of streamlining its operation, belonging jointly to the authorities but operating on an arm's length basis and being in a position to undertake functions itself if this proves necessary. The model for incorporation would reflect the need to deliver functions delegated by the partner authorities without going through a procurement process.
- 5.2 The company will have shareholdings. At present it is envisaged that the shares should be held equally between five authorities (i.e. the four authorities which are parties to the joint waste services contract and Surrey County Council). Its operations will be under the control of a board of directors. The preliminary view is that the directors will be officers from the five authorities which will own shares.
- 5.3 The staff who are currently working in the Joint Waste Solutions team will be transferred under TUPE and will be employees of the company.
- 5.4 The directors of the company will be subject to the general duties of directors under sections 171-177 of the Companies Act 2006 essentially:
 - To act within the company's powers
 - To promote the success of the company
 - To exercise independent judgement
 - To exercise reasonable care, skill and diligence
 - To avoid conflicts of interest
 - Not to accept benefits from third parties
 - To declare interests in proposed transactions and arrangements.
- 5.5 This means that issues relating to the way in which the company operates will be matters for the directors of the company once the new arrangements are put in place.
- 5.6 A more detailed incorporation proposal will be considered at the next meeting of the Joint Committee.



Title: Aligning Communications and Engagement
Author: Pat Hindley
Date: 20 September 2018

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 11 July 2018 the Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP) members group agreed to the principles of a report setting out the future governance arrangements for partnership working in waste. Under the proposals, a new joint committee would be established to reduce duplication and ensure greater integration and co-ordination of waste services across Surrey. The report set out the joint functions which would be delivered by the joint committee, with all other functions to be retained by the individual authorities. The proposed terms of reference of the joint committee were outlined and the members were advised that it would operate as a commissioning body for joint work.
- 1.2 Members were given a brief overview of the proposed staffing arrangements, noting that partner authorities had previously indicated a preference of joint functions to be undertaken by a single team. It was therefore intended that the functions previously carried out by employees seconded to Joint Waste Solutions (JWS) from Surrey County Council (SCC) and staff who worked directly for SWP would be undertaken by a single team at JWS.
- 1.3 The functions to be delivered include joint communications, so this paper reviews current branding, digital media presence and governance arrangements and proposes how they could be aligned for efficient delivery by a single team in the future.

2. Background

- 2.1 Since April 2015 the SWP has employed two full time communications staff who are hosted within the SCC central communications service and managed by an SCC communications manager. These three staff members, supported by members of the SCC waste development team (now part of JWS), are currently responsible for delivering the communications work programme which is agreed annually by the SWP member group.
- 2.2 This team also managed the communications activity for the joint contract during the procurement stage and it was agreed that the communications for the contract mobilisation period would be delivered by adding additional capacity to the team (0.8 FTE). This would ensure maximum alignment and benefit from the work being undertaken by the SWP communications team.

3. Current arrangements

3.1 Branding

- 3.1.1 There are currently three brands that are used in addition to those of the individual partner authorities – SWP, JWS and Recycle for Surrey (RfS), the local version of the WRAP recycling mark.



3.1.2 The current branding agreement for SWP joint communications is as follows:

- SWP is used for internal and industry communications.
- RfS is used on all resident facing communications alongside the brand of the authority funding the work. For countywide campaigns this is SCC, for local collection communications this is the district or borough council/JWS.
- RfS is used on work wholly funded by SWP alongside the SWP strapline 'Your councils working together'.

Note: WRAP recently announced a change to its local recycling mark so it was agreed by SWP members in July to change RfS to the new version, Surrey Recycles, as and when assets and materials need to be updated.

3.1.3 For joint contract mobilisation communications it was agreed to use the local partner authority brand alongside the JWS brand for the first communication advising residents of the contract change. Then the JWS brand alongside RfS for future communications.

3.2 Websites

3.2.1 In line with the three brands currently in use there are also three websites:

- SWP – hosts the joint strategy and information about SWP projects and partners.
- JWS – primary site for residents in the joint contract areas with information and reporting tools.
- RfS – resident facing SWP site, used for joint campaigns and contains extensive information about recycling, waste reduction and fly-tipping.

3.3 Social media

3.3.1 There is also a range of social media accounts in use for partnership communications and engagement activity:

- SWP Twitter – updates and profile raising with the waste industry.
- JWS Twitter – mobilisation comms and recycling information for residents.
- RfS Twitter – recycling information for residents with a particular interest in the topic.
- Surrey Matters Twitter, Facebook and Instagram – as the SWP comms team is currently hosted and managed within the SCC communications service these SCC owned channels are the primary channels used for joint campaign messaging and information for residents including both organic and promoted (paid) posts.

3.4 Governance

3.4.1 For SWP joint communications the governance arrangements were agreed by the members group in October 2015. This involves the direction being set by the member and officer groups; involvement from the Waste Operations and Recycling Group (WORG) in developing campaigns and materials; and review and input of campaign plans and creatives from one representative each from the officers group and the Surrey Communications Group.

3.4.2 For the joint contract mobilisation a communications protocol was developed and agreed by the Contract Partnering Board (CPB). This involves how the relevant

people within the authorities input into the direction and messaging as well as handling of proactive media relations and reactive media enquiries.

4. Future Proposals

4.1 Branding

4.1.1 With the new governance arrangements for partnership working in waste due to come into effect from 1 April 2019 there is an opportunity to simplify the current branding. As the intention is for a single team at JWS to be commissioned to carry out joint work on behalf of the whole partnership, the new branding arrangement could work as follows:

- From 1 April 2019 replace SWP and JWS with a new single brand name - potentially an evolution of the two current brands.
- Choose a name that reflects a wider environmental remit than waste, in line with the current JWS vision.
- Use this new single brand on any waste communications and materials which currently use SWP, JWS or SCC branding, for all audiences.
- Use Surrey Recycles alongside this new brand where the topic being communicated is recycling.
- Authorities that are not part of the joint entity continue to use their own branding for any waste and recycling communications they produce, alongside Surrey Recycles.

Benefits

4.1.2 Potential benefits to this new branding approach include:

- It would signal a new era in joint working in waste in Surrey and demonstrate a combining of the two current partnerships.
- The focus to date has been on the contract mobilisation. We have not been proactive in trying to building the JWS brand, so don't believe it is widely recognised by residents yet.
- There is currently some confusion in the relationship between JWS and Amey. A change of branding would be an opportunity to bring greater clarity to the relative roles and responsibilities of the two organisations.
- We could launch the new brand with a strong narrative for residents, staff, stakeholders, Government and industry about the new governance arrangements and the successful evolution of waste partnership working in Surrey.
- The change can be achieved without great expense, e.g.:
 - The branding design could be an update of the existing JWS brand rather than creating something new.
 - Printed items can just be updated as they run out.
 - Vehicle livery can be patched rather than replaced.

4.2 Websites

4.2.1 A significant amount of resource is involved in maintaining the three sites, so alongside the simplification of branding it proposed to rationalise the web presence. This could be achieved by combining the three existing websites into one website.

4.2.2 There would be some cost involved in combining the websites, but this would be a one off investment that would result in cost and time savings in the future.

4.3 Social media

- 4.3.1 The proposal for social media is to combine the existing SWP, JWS and RfS Twitter accounts into a single account under the new brand name and create new Facebook and Instagram accounts under the new brand name.
- 4.3.2 These would then become the primary channels used by the team delivering joint waste communications work. The SCC communications team would share waste communications content on its Surrey Matters channels in the same way that the district and borough council communications teams do currently.

4.4 Governance

- 4.4.1 It is proposed that a new single communications and engagement protocol is developed to take effect alongside the new governance arrangements for partnership working in waste. This would incorporate all of the aspects included in the current agreements and additionally cover websites, social media and brand guidelines. It would be developed in consultation with representatives from communications and engagement teams in partner authorities and customer service representatives where appropriate.
- 4.4.2 Alongside this the communications protocol between JWS and Amey would also be reviewed and updated where appropriate.

5. Potential considerations

- 5.1 Whilst there are significant benefits to the proposals there are a few points that the committee may also want to consider:
- Have members in the partner authorities and residents now got used to Joint Waste Solutions? Would it confuse them to change it?
 - The agreed vision covers a wider environmental remit than waste, but is April 2019 too soon for the branding to reflect this?
 - Whilst it would be kept to the minimum, there would be a financial cost to implementing the proposals.

6. Recommendation

- 6.1 It is recommended that the committee considers the proposals and agrees a way forward, with a view to taking them to next round of SWP officer and member meetings for wider discussion.