

MRS Workshop 5 - Evaluation Results

The following indicates the views of those stakeholders who completed an evaluation form following the fifth workshop for the development of a Material Resources Strategy.

RATINGS

Poor → Good → Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

1. Range of stakeholders attending Workshop 5

	3	30	37	21
--	---	----	----	----

Comments:

- Only a small number of stakeholders attended the evening session
- Evening session was a little restricted
- More waste companies needed to participate
- Lots of industry stakeholders present
- No Senior Managers or influencers from Southampton City Council - disappointing considering they should be a major player
- Good range of people, though notable absence of small -medium-sized waste companies who would play an important role in delivering the MRS
- Light on retail and other 'upstream' stakeholders
- Still need more representatives from industry and commerce
- Need more private sector input
- Would like to have seen more community recycling organisations in attendance
- Pleased to see a wide cross section of stakeholders
- More councillors required
- Surprised NGO's and community groups weren't represented , (although it was noted that they may have been going to evening workshop)

RATINGS

Poor → Good → Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

2. Quality of workshop briefing material

	3	30	37	21
--	---	----	----	----

Comments:

- Material was technically orientated, but good nevertheless
- We were debating issues based on out of date and incorrect data
- Pages not numbered and unstapled when received by post
- I didn't feel informed at all e.g. technology might be explained but comparisons and implications not
- Excellent, though rather a lot! Will probably read through it again more thoroughly after attending the event
- Timing - little time to digest the material
- Problems finding the briefing material before the workshop
- Too much information, quite confusing sorting it all out
- Unfortunately didn't have time to read some of the handouts
- Comprehensive and informative
- Pity that some papers were only available 'on the day'
- The ELV section didn't state the stretching best practice scenario i.e. the promotion of a plastics processing plant
- Comprehensive but too long to read all beforehand and 3MB email testing to the capacity of our system!
- Too much to read through

RATINGS

Poor → Good → Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

3. Value of presentations

	4	34	46	9
--	---	----	----	---

Comments:

- These are clearly required for background however, as limited time is available, only a minimal amount of information can be presented
- The speakers were very good and the facilitators were excellent
- OK but not really illuminating
- Too brief, but offset by briefing material received

- Information sometimes too detailed

RATINGS

Poor → Good → Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

4. Value of group discussions on the overall resource picture, the preferred recycling solution and how it could be achieved (1st and 2nd discussion sessions)

	5	23	48	14
--	---	----	----	----

Comments:

- Good, though there were some obviously un-informed views which caused a bit of a distraction
- We all struggled with the issues together - good team work!
- An excellent range of views were tabled
- Frequently strayed away from the issue in hand
- Some group problems in understanding various technical points
- Group appeared to have insufficient knowledge in some sessions to gauge meaningful conclusions
- Very tight on time!
- Some of us were struggling at first as we had not had prior knowledge of the documentation.

RATINGS

Poor → Good → Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

5. Value of group discussions on unavoidable waste technologies (3rd discussion session)

	11	31	37	12
--	----	----	----	----

Comments:

- Asbestos containing material should be processed
- Lack of knowledge generally
- I think this whole subject re commercial waste is a bit of a red herring as it assumes investment by companies in major infrastructure. Though it may occur in the longer term, without long-term set contracts (like the Project Integra contract) companies will be not be able to secure financial backing. As such, I think it will be necessary to concentrate on front-end segregation with landfill (however unpopular) remaining important for some time, this may mean it has to be exported from the country unless new sites are found

- Many issues still not fully understood by some of us
- Difficult to quickly understand - we all worked together, but found the subject a bit fuzzy
- Too much time allocated
- These discussions should form the basis for broad scale unavoidable waste options appraisal, but the options should be appraised as part of the integrated sustainability appraisal (incorporating the strategic environmental assessment). There seems to be some confusion about sustainability appraisal and the integrated sustainability appraisal
- Lack some technical knowledge although Onyx helped!
- Not too knowledgeable on this
- Frequently strayed away from the issue in hand - too big an issue for one workshop session really demands half a day or so
- Group appeared to have insufficient knowledge in some sessions to gauge meaningful conclusions
- Can't help feeling it would be better to have sustainability appraisal of options to inform discussion before being asked our preferences

RATINGS

Poor → Good → Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

6. Value of group discussions on minerals and soils issues (4th discussion session)

1	20	39	22	6
---	----	----	----	---

Comments:

- Proposed Hampshire apportionment 2.52 mt accepted
- Confusing issue needed input from organiser to enable discussion to get going
- Interesting
- This was too short. The C&D waste stream had the most people represented but I think this was rushed so the discussions were not as valuable as they could be
- Most of our group had left, as such it was not possible to have group discussion - it is a pity that minerals was given this small slot at the end of the process
- I guessed this would be cut short by 'end of the day' time constraints
- The subject area I least understand
- None of us felt qualified to make a judgement
- Didn't clearly understand what we were being asked to discuss
- Knew very little about this subject so was unable to give any valuable contribution
- Didn't know much so couldn't really contribute
- Insufficient time

- Unfortunately not enough time to discuss properly
- Definitely need more time - may need to make more time in the process to accommodate
- Very little time available
- Needs more knowledgeable stakeholders & statutory consultees present, (evening session may make up for this)
- Rather short of time
- Group not too knowledgeable but fun
- Know too little about minerals to be of much use
- Too short for an in depth subject
- Insufficient time to explore ideas more fully
- Rushed due to time constraints

RATINGS

Poor → Good → Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

7. Extent to which you felt able to have your views heard and recorded

1	1	27	43	19
---	---	----	----	----

Comments:

- I sometimes felt clueless compared to others but I had a chance to speak
- Yes - feedback given appears to have been taken on board
- Very good open discussion
- Bit difficult to hear what everyone was saying (over 12 people at our table) However I felt that my few comments were heard by people and listened to by the facilitators
- Table well facilitated
- I have had a limited input into most of the technical discussions. Any views/points I have made have been noted. However, the workshops enable me to provide feedback on the MRS to work colleagues (Planning Policy)
- It is very good that “archaeological” points of view was invited.
- Very comfortable discussion group

Any other Comments

- More input required from the waste industry
- Thank you for a very informative day
- Helpful session in relation to objectives
- An interesting day again! Well done
- Very good to see Hampshire attempting to “get their act together”
- I enjoyed this meeting very much
- Keep it going very interesting
- Good venue, good food
- A very informative day, well done to our table facilitator
- Again, a well organised and useful day from which I benefited.
- Good Forum!!
- The best workshop to date.
- The whole process is too ‘waste’ focussed rather than resources focussed which is building the wrong foundation for the future
- Have enjoyed the day. Food good, would have liked a pudding !!!!!
- Streets ahead of what is happening in other counties!
- Very useful day but hard to grasp all the detail in the time
- Very short on time for the afternoon discussions
- I found it hard to contribute much due to my low knowledge level. However, it was a very useful learning exercise for me. I learnt a lot. Very well arranged. Time keeping very well done without it feeling too rushed. Excellent lunch!! Thank you
- Very informative and constructive
- Please try and distribute data reports etc further in advance of future workshops
- How does this process connect with the SEA regulations?
- The MRS process has been too slow to date, we need to get down to the detail of sites, waste technologies etc. instead of spending too much time talking about principles. Concerned that 19% of waste cannot be categorised. Why can't we have landfill sites on chalk downland?
- A very constructive day, well organised and facilitated
- Whilst the MRS is very “workmanlike” it's important not to be swamped with paperwork on arrival, less is better i.e. brief Briefing Notes that are quick and easy to read and understand
- Small sites in many locations close to the arisings and end use would be better than larger sites!
- Problems experienced in printing briefing papers from the web-site - costly in paper and ink.
- Unfortunately not enough time during evening session