

MRS Workshop 6 - Evaluation Results

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

	RATINGS						
	Poor	→		Good	→		Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5		
1. Range of stakeholders attending workshop 6	0	2	22	36	14		

Comments:


- Provided amusing and intelligent discussion.
- Pity the Environment Agency (EA) not there, also little Friends of the Earth, RSPB, Chamber of Commerce and FSB.
- Seemed to be less than previous workshops – don't think it affected outcomes and discussions though.
- No EA representation.
- Lack of neighbouring authorities, EA and Hampshire Waste Service.
- Excellent balance of individuals able to contribute knowledge and ideas.
- Younger stakeholders needed.
- Good balance – disappointed no representative from the EA.
- Lack of representation from the EA and commercial outlets disappointing.
- Noted no EA representative today.
- Extremely professional again.
- Good mix.
- Noticeably less industry representatives compared to previous workshops.
- An impressively wide variety of organisations and opinions.

	RATINGS						
	Poor	→		Good	→		Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5		
2. Quality of workshop briefing material	0	4	27	34	10		

Comments:

- Some material failed the “plain English” test.
- Sometimes it can be too much information to look through on the day.
- Confusing – a lot to take in.
- Not all the papers were handed out – though I was a late arrival!
- I know it is costly, but printed material is better than e-mail only.
- Adequate.
- Confusing – mentioned minerals although there was no debate.
- Confusing – not relevant to the discussion questions.
- Varied material – not always sufficient information e.g. the maps.
- Given individuals' level of knowledge and understanding, more detail would have only served to confuse.

RATINGS




3. Value of presentations

Comments:

- Good introduction to the discussions.
- Most speeches were clear, concise and interesting.
- All relevant.
- Important but not very inspiring.
- Couldn't always hear what was being said.

RATINGS




4. Value of group discussions on the overall preferred stakeholder option for resource management in Hampshire (Group work 1)

Comments:

- For me it was spoiled by NIMBY attitudes.
- Feedback time was well managed – better than asking all tables for comments, when a lot may be duplicated (as at previous workshops).
- Perhaps needed a more representative group on Table 2 – perhaps need to allocate.
- Interesting.
- Probably covered some ground covered in previous workshops.
- Not sure that all feedback picked up all concerns accurately (but hope the outcome report will).

RATINGS




5. Value of group discussions on assessment criteria for identifying sites for recycling and unavoidable waste facilities (Group work 2)

Comments:

- For me it was spoiled by NIMBY attitudes.
- Enjoyed freedom of brainstorming – feedback session managed well.
- Good group.
- Poorly defined. Various waste streams not highlighted.

RATINGS




6. Value of group discussions on identification of where future recycling and unavoidable waste facilities need to be located (Group work 3)

Comments:

- For me it was spoiled by NIMBY attitudes.
- Output should only be seen as a light-hearted indication – we didn’t have enough information to tackle it too seriously.
- Didn’t necessarily consider all environmental and social impacts – difficult to know if land is available in areas chosen.
- Group felt that the criteria should guide the identification of sites – should be commercially led.
- Felt unable to make any informed decisions. Unfair to expect us to do so.
- Surprisingly no NIMBY bias to the discussion.
- Enjoyed this, but you need to be a planner to understand the key issues.
- Very difficult to decide on this general map in such a short time.
- The map was not complete – it was felt that more information would have been helpful.

RATINGS



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

Comments:

- Groups were not too big (9 including facilitator and scribe) – better than workshops 3 and 4, where there were 12+ people on tables. Good mix of people.
- Small grouping allowed everyone to have their say.
- Facilitator and scribe very good.
- Yes – even though they are extreme!
- Very good open discussions.

Any Other Comments:

- A very interesting evening – I look forward to seeing further progress.
- For some reason I have not been kept informed of previous meetings.
- Looking forward to the draft MRS publication.
- Well organised – look forward to the draft.
- All workshops have been well managed and organised. Perhaps reviews need to be held in future to monitor the MRS – 2/3 times per year?
- Should policy consider the SE emerging policy that suggests Greenbelt could be used where impacts was not an issue.
- I must admit, I felt very sceptical about these workshops initially. I felt I was suffering from stakeholder fatigue. English Nature only managed to attend 3 workshops due to clashing commitments. However, having attended the workshops I have felt that I have learnt alot. I have appreciated the

opportunity to share views with people in the minerals and waste industry. However, I often felt that I was learning more than I was able to contribute. I congratulate HCC on attempting this new way to develop strategic minerals and waste plans. Also, congratulate consultants on maintaining their enthusiasm.

- Taped records? Table management in terms of facilitation – need to be firmer on big mouths like me!
- Good balance between presentations and group discussions. Impressed with our table 2 facilitator (J Smith), who managed to pull together the diverse threads of the group discussions. Usual high standard of overall co-ordination and management of the workshop by Alison and her Entec colleagues.
- Good informative day – very thorny issue.
- Good venue – useful to have feedback on the big screen as generated – good idea. Nice to bring the programme to a successful conclusion.
- Concerned that the word minerals was contained in the session literature, but that there was no discussion about the mineral extraction sites or criteria for selecting sites in the future.
- I have found my second workshop of great interest once again. Please keep me informed of future event, gatherings, meetings etc.
- Superb initiative.
- Extending good practice based on this process to other authorities / organisations – need for cross border discussions.
- The only downside was insufficient information on sites on the maps.
- I have attended a number of meetings organised in the past 15 months and without exception, these workshops have been the best in local context and involvement. Thank-you.
- Another memorable event.
- Well done everybody.
- A well run exercise.
- Hampshire should run a competition for a “snappy” title for the MRS.
- Legislation is a problem. Central government seems distracted or lethargic and unable to make the necessary reforms. The initiative should therefore come from Hampshire and partners – draft Bills and introduce as Private Members’ Bills through the Hampshire cross-party group of MPs.
- A well run process with definite progress from one workshop to the next.
- Guildhall – an excellent venue for meetings.
- A very worthwhile and well run exercise.

Suggestions for a Memorable Title for the MRS:

Resources Galore!

Use It

Hampshire Consumer Strategy

Consume (Hampshire) Strategy

Resource Sustainability Strategy

Action Not Talk!

HIMS (Hampshire's Integrated Materials Strategy)

Zero Waste

Waste Away

Resource Forward

Waste Plus

Waste: Think About Our Future

Waste: The Quality of Your Future

Materials Matter in Hampshire

Resources Not Waste Courses

Planning Waste as a Resource

Hampshire MaRes

Think Waste, Think Resource

Recycle

Moving on Up!

War on Waste

Project 58 (*reflects 58% recycling target*)

Recyclotron 2016

Waste-Less

Trash-Bash

Trash for Cash

Waste-Wise

Rock, Paper, Scissors (cut down on waste)

Hampshire Resource Management

How Green in My Valley / County?