

Proceedings for 2nd National EPR Workshop



**Fort Garry Hotel
Winnipeg, Manitoba
March 6-8, 2002**

Hosted by: **Manitoba Conservation & Environment Canada**

Manitoba
Conservation



Environment
Canada

Environnement
Canada

Facilitated by: **North Star Facilitators**
Phone: (204) 475-7113
Email: bmackay@facilitate.ca
www.facilitate.ca

with

SLMcLeod Consulting
Phone: (204) 261-1240
Email: smcleod@mts.net

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	5
Background on Workshop	9
Workshop Objectives:	8
Agenda	8
Key Recommendations	11
Other Key Results	11
I. First Plenary: What hurdles have we successfully overcome with EPR programs in Canada to date?.....	11
II. Breakout Sessions:	11
(1a). What products or materials do we target next and why?.....	11
(1b). Other key points related to targeting products:.....	12
(2a). What are the key design elements needed to ensure efficient and successful EPR programs?.....	12
(2b). What supporting mechanisms contribute to successful design and mechanics?	13
(3). What are key considerations in choosing EPR funding mechanisms for EPR programs?.....	13
(4). How can we improve EPR accountability and measurement?.....	14
(5a). What have we learned about designing and implementing joint efforts/ partnerships and ensuring greater consistency in EPR?.....	14
(5b). What are some practical steps to improving inter-jurisdictional cooperation for EPR?.....	15
III. Final Plenary Recommendations:.....	16
(A). Detailed Key Recommendations: What are our recommendations coming out of this EPR conference?	16
(B). Other Plenary Outcomes:	17
• Messages to Take to OECD Conference:.....	17
• Next EPR Workshop – When and What?.....	17
• Municipalities Role	18
• Environment Canada & CCME Roles.....	18
• Action Plan: Electronics Sector	19
• Action Plan: Encouraging DfE.....	20
• Action Plan: Expanding Regional Programs to the National Level.....	21
• Enhancing Communication Nationally & Internationally.....	22
List of Appendices:	23

Acknowledgements

The Organizing Committee of the 2002 National Workshop would like to thank the following individuals and agencies for their contribution to the success of the Workshop.

Volunteer Reporters

- Delaine Barth, University of Manitoba
- Lynn Bereza, Manitoba Product Stewardship Corporation
- David Crawford, Manitoba Product Stewardship Corporation
- Lisa Quinn, University of Manitoba
- Laura Raimondi, University of Manitoba
- Gerald Villegas, University of Manitoba

Facilitators

- Barbara MacKay, North Star Facilitators
- Sheldon McLeod, SLMcLeod Consulting
- Drew Henderson, Henderson Training and Consulting
- Bobbie Marshall, Straight to the Top
- Dorota Praski, Victory Group Consulting
- Lana Stowe, Stowe Training and Consulting

Documentation

- Lise Carbonneau, Whirlwind Enterprises

Workshop Organizing Committee

- Duncan Bury, Environment Canada
- Jim Ferguson, Manitoba Conservation
- Michael Vanderpol, Environment Canada
- Laurie Streich, Manitoba Conservation
- Debbie Rostkowski, Manitoba Conservation
- Karen Warren, Manitoba Conservation
- Brock Epp, University of Winnipeg

Workshop Sponsors

- Environment Canada
- Manitoba Conservation
- Manitoba Product Stewardship Corporation
- Alberta Used Oil Management Association/Saskatchewan Association of Resource Recovery Corp./Manitoba Association of Resource Recovery Corp.

Executive Summary

Over 90 participants took part in the second national workshop on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) in Winnipeg, Manitoba on March 6, 7, and 8th, 2002. The majority of these participants are directly or indirectly involved in single or multi-product programs across Canada. During the conference part of the event, experts in the field described the challenges they had faced and the successes they had achieved. During the workshop portion of the event, all participants provided answers to many critical questions including:

- What hurdles have we overcome with EPR?
- What products should we next target in Canada and why?
- What are the key design elements needed to ensure efficient and successful EPR programs?
- What supporting mechanisms contribute to successful design and mechanics?
- What are key considerations in choosing funding mechanisms for EPR programs?
- How can we improve EPR accountability and measurement?
- What have we learned about designing and implementing joint efforts/ partnerships and ensuring greater consistency in EPR?
- What are some practical steps to improving inter-jurisdictional cooperation for EPR?

The intention of the workshop was not to generate in-depth or agreed upon solutions to any of the questions above. Rather, it was to “take the pulse” of EPR in Canada and gain possible direction from speakers and expert participants about how to improve progress already made.

The summary below provides the most frequently cited responses to these questions from participants and final recommendations emerging from the workshop. A separate CD provides the speakers’ presentations.

What hurdles have we overcome with EPR?

Both industry and consumer acceptance of EPR is much higher than five years ago. Consumers seem to understand the concept of levies for example. Education and communication for and with consumers are recognized as extremely important. Industry cooperation, startup of programs even before regulation, and industry design of their own programs is now more commonplace. Industry is discovering that waste can be economically viable and that there are new markets for recyclables and waste.

Likewise, governments are taking on more responsibility. Government is starting to appreciate the time and need for consultation within regulated industry sectors. There are more regulatory frameworks and awareness of the cost involved in responsible waste management. Participants noted increased levels of cooperation between industries, various levels of government, and industry and government. Participants also noted overcoming some free-rider issues, setting up good collection systems, better performance measures and the variety of funding mechanisms.

What products should we next target in Canada and why?

Electronics, household/industrial hazardous waste, and plastics/fast food containers were among the products most frequently cited to target next. Other priority products ranged from organics (which are not now considered to be part of EPR) to glycol, mercury thermometers, ozone depleting substances, construction material, automobiles, lighting, used oil and containers, batteries and more. EPR proponents should keep working on “easy” products such as beverage containers until high recovery rates are reached on a national scale. Criteria to take into account in choosing next products to target included: volume; toxicity; characteristics of the waste stream; economics; possible piggybacking on other programs; availability of existing infrastructure; whether hazardous to human health; and jurisdictional limitations.

What are the key design elements needed to ensure efficient and successful EPR programs?

Participants repeatedly noted five elements that must be considered in designing EPR programs that work. These included:

- Strategies and incentives for both producers and consumers to participate in EPR. Ideas ranged from having one organization responsible for all program elements, to acceptable end use or market for products, education and promotion, government support, convenience and simplicity
- Clear allocation of responsibility (could include shared responsibility)
- Environmental and social objectives (e.g., reduction of material, bans, lifecycle analysis, sound environmental management)
- Sustainable and accountable funding (e.g., control system, transparent, arms length from government, sustainable funding, infrastructure. Also see question #3)
- Measurable progress-report mechanisms (e.g., internal tracking, performance targets, feedback mechanisms. Also see question #4)

What supporting mechanisms contribute to successful design and mechanics?

In addition to the five elements noted above, ideas included: backdrop regulation; labeling requirements for hazardous substances; communication and education; looking for synergies between programs; supporting infrastructure and technology or funds to provide these; functional administrative systems and others. Ideas to stimulate Design for Environment (DfE) were also noted (See Appendix).

What are key considerations in choosing funding mechanisms for EPR programs?

Common points raised in choosing EPR funding mechanisms were: creating a level playing field; recognizing limitations of regional differences; dedicated fund with surpluses going to trust funds; making it convenient and easy for both the consumer and the industry to participate; accountability of program funds; and influencing DfE and/or environmental, economic and social goals. Participants did not appear to agree on whether levies should be visible or invisible to consumers although they felt the fee structure should change consumer behaviour. Participants pointed out that the choice of funding mechanism is determined by the point of intervention in the lifecycle. There was a concern that it is not possible to capture all the details in this setting because funding mechanisms are a very complicated issue.

How can we improve EPR accountability and measurement?

Ways to measure EPR progress included: independent environmental audits; setting measurable waste reduction objectives; voluntary agreements with targets; ways to compare cost and benefits; remittances on specific products; standardized measurements (financial, physical, baselines); monitoring quality of end product and others. Once again, participants noted the importance of transparency to the consumer. The public or interested community should have a way to “see into the EPR program - resulting in influence”. Other items included that industry must be the leaders of change, that there is need to decouple political culture from science, and a need to define terminology.

What have we learned about designing and implementing joint efforts/partnerships and ensuring greater consistency in EPR?

Participants articulated the importance of stakeholder consultation and dialogue at critical stages. They also said it was important to have clear and agreed upon goals, objectives and responsibilities. They emphasized the need to strive for consensus and/or win-win situations. One suggestion was to target industry leaders to build momentum. Participants noted that it takes time to build partnerships, especially across jurisdictions but when partnerships work well they save dollars, increase efficiency and lower

administrative costs. As noted in other sessions, transparency, regulatory framework (adapted for partnerships) and dedicated resources are also important elements for partnerships to work. Commitment is also essential.

What are some practical steps to improving inter-jurisdictional cooperation for EPR?

Two steps cited frequently were:

- Structure ways for stakeholders to share information and successes on a timely basis
- Set up an umbrella national organization, either new or using CCME, federal government and/or national/regional EPR associations

Key Recommendations

In table groups, participants recommended what needs to occur for EPR in the near future. These ideas were grouped as follows:

- Coordinate a national approach allowing for regional differences.
- Establish industry-government partnerships to lead establishment of EPR programs (sector specific).
- Develop a reporting system to share information and success/failures.
- Clarify/define roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.
- Increase focus on DfE and full life cycle.
- Design programs to be convenient, effective and efficient

Other key needs emerged during the workshop and each table group discussed one of these at the final plenary session. These included the need to:

- Expand currently successful regional programs to the national level
- Focus on hazardous/toxic substances and especially electronics in the near future (one group drafted a plan for a national electronics program)
- Define roles for national coordinating or supporting bodies such as Environment Canada and CCME
- Define roles for municipalities and ways for them to be supported
- Re-examine the concept and implementation of DfE and decide if it is useful and if yes, how to ensure it occurs
- Decide on key messages to take to OECD, when to plan another national workshop and how to set up a national communication strategy/mechanism.

Conclusions

There was much enthusiasm, interest and high levels of participation from the attendees during the entire event. This suggests that there is significant interest in sharing information and expanding the scope and depth of EPR programs.

Background on Workshop

Manitoba Conservation and Environment Canada co-coordinated the delivery of the second national workshop on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR). The first workshop took place in May 1997 in Ottawa, Canada in preparation for the then upcoming OECD EPR workshop, which focused on defining “Who is the Producer?” The emphasis of the second workshop was on lessons learned from existing programs, defining emerging programs and products, and identifying where cooperation can be enhanced. During the second workshop, interest and enthusiasm for the progress being made in EPR was apparent. Keen discussions occurred over the two and a half days. This report provides both the highlights and detail of facilitated discussions.

The Terms of Reference cited three objectives for March 6-8 2002 workshop:

- 1) Share information and perspectives on Canadian and International EPR programs, policies and planned initiatives.
- 2) Improve inter-jurisdictional cooperation and communication on EPR programs to enhance product steward responsibilities for designated products or materials in Canada.
- 3) Improve the performance and measurement of existing and planned EPR programs.

Over 170 representatives were invited to participate in the workshop. About 90 participants attended. They included EPR policy-makers, practitioners and program operators from all levels of government, product stewardship boards, industry, universities and environmental NGOs. Prior to the workshop, invitees received a background paper provided by *Stratos Inc.* defining issues and options for a more cooperative approach to EPR.

During the workshop, participants heard from 12 speakers about existing and emerging programs in Canada, in Europe, and in the USA. During facilitated breakout sessions, six groups of about 15 diverse participants each discussed five topics areas related to EPR:

1. Targeting products and materials for EPR programs
2. Program design and mechanics
3. Funding mechanisms
4. Governance and accountability
5. Cooperative approaches and partnerships

The questions asked for each of these topics are in Appendix 2. Small groups simultaneously answered highlight and other supplementary questions during five break-out sessions. Volunteers from each session picked out key points to bring back to the plenary sessions. These key points were then consolidated from the six groups and reported to all participants from the first three sessions at end of Thursday late afternoon. Then, they repeated this process at the beginning of the final Friday afternoon plenary for sessions four and five.

The key points noted at the plenaries are summarized in the main report. The Appendices provide unedited responses to all facilitated questions asked during the workshop.

Participants also developed final recommendations in the Friday afternoon plenary and “action steps” for eight priority areas. These are outlined in the next section of the main report.

By the end of this second national workshop, participants had a much better idea of what is going on in EPR around the country and elsewhere and had an opportunity to explore areas for further future collaboration and cooperation among jurisdictions.

Workshop Objectives:

- Share information and perspectives on Canadian and International EPR Programs, policies and planned initiatives.
- Improve idea-sharing, cooperative approaches and communication on EPR programs to enhance product stewardship responsibilities for designated products or materials in Canada.
- Improve the performance and measurement of existing, planned, and future EPR programs.

Agenda **2002 NATIONAL WORKSHOP ON EPR**

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 2002 – EVENING KICK-OFF SESSION

5:30 p.m. CATERED RECEPTION (*CONCERT HALL*)

6:30 p.m. EPR WORKSHOP PURPOSE & AGENDA (*CRYSTAL BALLROOM*)

- Jim Ferguson, Manitoba Conservation
- Duncan Bury, Environment Canada

(6:40) **WELCOME & OPENING REMARKS**

- Gord Steeves, Councillor, City of Winnipeg

6:50 p.m. PANEL REVIEW - EXISTING CANADIAN EPR PROGRAMS

- (6:50) ▪ EPR - Can it be Win/Win?
 - Derek Firth, Nova Scotia Resource Recovery Fund Board
- (7:05) ▪ Implementing a Used Oil EPR Program for the Prairie Provinces
 - Denis Hambleton, Alberta Used Oil Management Association
- (7:20) ▪ Refrigerant Management Canada
 - Warren Heeley, Heating Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Institute of Canada
- (7:35) ▪ Group Discussions - Key Learnings/Questions & Answers

7:55 p.m. COFFEE BREAK (*CRYSTAL BALLROOM*)

8:15 p.m. PANEL REVIEW - EMERGING CANADIAN EPR PROGRAMS

- (8:15) ▪ Quebec Plan d'Action
 - Marie Dussault, Ministère de l'Environnement du Québec
- (8:30) ▪ EPR Challenges in the Information Technology Sector
 - Dave Betts, Information Technology Association of Canada
- (8:45) ▪ Waste Diversion Ontario
 - Keith West, Ontario Ministry of the Environment
- (9:00) ▪ Group Discussions - Key Learnings/Questions & Answers

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 2002 – PRESENTATIONS & WORKSHOP SESSIONS

- 7:45 a.m. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST** (*CONCERT HALL*)
- 8:35 a.m. EPR WORKSHOP PURPOSE & AGENDA** (*CRYSTAL BALLROOM*)
- Jim Ferguson, Manitoba Conservation
 - Duncan Bury, Environment Canada
- 8:45 a.m. OPENING REMARKS- Manitoba Product Stewardship Initiatives**
- Oscar Lathlin, Minister, Manitoba Conservation
- 9:00 a.m. KEY NOTE ADDRESS: EPR IN EUROPE**
- Thomas Lindhqvist, Lund University, Sweden
- (9:30) – Questions & Answers
- 9:45 a.m. COFFEE BREAK** (*CRYSTAL BALLROOM*)
- 10:05 a.m. PANEL REVIEW – INTERNATIONAL EPR PROGRAMS**
- (10:05) ■ EPR: International Programme Implementation and Activities
 - Claudia Fenerol, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
 - (10:25) ■ Product Stewardship in the U.S.A.: A State's Perspective
 - Garth Hickle, Minnesota Office of Environmental Assistance
 - (10:45) ■ Switzerland Electronics Take Back Program
 - Peter Bornand, Swico Environmental Commission
 - (11:05) ■ Panel Discussion - Questions & Answers/Group Discussion- Key Learnings
- 11:25 a.m. WORKSHOP BREAKOUT SESSIONS BEGIN (SIX GROUPS)**
- **WORKSHOP SESSION # 1: TARGETING PRODUCTS & MATERIALS FOR EPR Programs**
 - Facilitated Discussions (Breakout Groups to be assigned)
- 12:30 p.m. LUNCH** (*CONCERT HALL*)
- 1:45 p.m. WORKSHOP BREAKOUT SESSIONS CONTINUE**
- **WORKSHOP SESSION # 2: EPR PROGRAM DESIGN & MECHANICS**
 - Facilitated Discussions (Breakout Groups to be assigned)
- 2:55 p.m. COFFEE BREAK** (*NORTH MEZZANINE*)
- 3:10 p.m. WORKSHOP BREAKOUT SESSIONS CONTINUE**
- **WORKSHOP SESSION # 3: FUNDING MECHANISMS FOR EPR**
 - Facilitated Discussions (Breakout Groups to be assigned)
- 4:20 p.m. REPORTS FROM BREAK-OUT SESSIONS** (*CRYSTAL BALLROOM*)
- **Break-out Group Reports on Key Ideas from Sessions 1, 2, and 3**
 - Summaries of key learnings

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 2002 – EVENING SESSION

5:00 p.m. FREE TIME

6:00 p.m. DINNER & SOCIAL (*THE CLUB*)

- (7:30) ■ **KEY NOTE PRESENTATION:** Extended Producer Responsibility and Sustainability
 - Gary Davis, University of Tennessee, Center for Clean Products & Clean Technologies
 - Note: this speaker was unable to attend
- (8:00) ■ **ENTERTAINMENT:** Walle Larsson Jazz Quartet

10:00 p.m. CLOSE

FRIDAY MARCH 8, 2002 – WORKSHOP SESSIONS & CONCLUSIONS

7:45 a.m. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST (*CONCERT HALL*)

8:30 a.m. PLENARY SESSION – OPENING REMARKS (*CRYSTAL BALLROOM*)

- **PRESENTATION:** Manitoba's Household Hazardous Waste Management Plan
 - Rod McCormick, Manitoba Conservation

8:50 a.m. WORKSHOP BREAKOUT SESSIONS CONTINUE

- **WORKSHOP SESSION # 4: EPR GOVERNANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY**
 - Facilitated Discussions (Breakout Groups to be assigned)

10:15 a.m. COFFEE BREAK (*NORTH MEZZANINE AND THE CLUB*)

10:30 a.m. WORKSHOP BREAKOUT SESSIONS CONTINUE (*CRYSTAL BALLROOM*)

- **WORKSHOP SESSION # 5: EPR APPROACHES AND PARTNERSHIPS**
 - Facilitated Discussion (Breakout Groups to be assigned)

11:45 a.m. LUNCH (*CONCERT HALL*)

12:45 p.m. PLENARY SESSION (*CRYSTAL BALLROOM*)

- **PRESENTATION:** Nova Scotia Used Sharps Take Back Program
 - Barry Friesen, Nova Scotia Environment and Labour

1:00 p.m. CONCLUDING PLENARY QUESTIONS (*CRYSTAL BALLROOM*)

- A facilitated discussion to draw important conclusions from our work at this workshop.

(2:30) **WORKSHOP ROLL- UP**

- Jim Ferguson, Manitoba Conservation

(2:45) **WORKSHOP EVALUATION – LOOKING AHEAD**

- Duncan Bury, Environment Canada

3:00 p.m. FINAL ADJOURNMENT

Key Recommendations

Key recommendations emerging from the workshop: (See page 14 for a detailed listing of responses)

- Coordinate a national approach allowing for regional differences.
- Establish industry-government partnerships to lead establishment of EPR programs (sector specific).
- Develop a reporting system to share information and success/failures.
- Clarify/define roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.
- Increase focus on Design for Environment and full life cycle.
- Design Programs to be convenient, effective and efficient.

Other Key Results

(See detailed responses to all questions in Appendix)

I. First Plenary: *What hurdles have we successfully overcome with EPR programs in Canada to date?*

(Clustering of similar responses from plenary table groups)

- Industry acceptance & implementation.
- Consumer awareness & understanding – emphasis on education.
- Waste is economically viable.
- Government taking on more responsibility.
- Cooperation and collaboration between sectors.
- Other.

II. Breakout Sessions: *(The results listed below summarize the responses of the six breakout groups)*

(1a). What products or materials do we target next and why?

The top four products/materials to target next in Canada appear to be:

- Electronics *because of upcoming volume, toxicity, short life-cycle and the fact that programs are already underway in some areas.*
- Household and industrial hazardous waste *because of elevated risk and programs would reduce lifecycle and environmental impacts.*
- Organics although not noted as an EPR program *because of high volume and climate change gases.*
- Plastics and fast food containers *because there is an identifiable party, and it has visible volume; it has a secondary end use and industry is not doing much in this area.*

(1b). Other key points related to targeting products:

- ❑ National harmonized approaches are important for competitive reasons and may be required with respect to certain materials. Environment Canada and CCME should provide strong leadership.
- ❑ Successful EPR models from one region should be “exported” to other regions using It is obvious from this workshop that there is significant interest in sharing information and expanding the scope and depth of EPR programs. provincial systems as a catalyst to incorporate infrastructure and economies of scale.
- ❑ Waste stream characterization is basic starting point in targeting products; we should take into account the environmental, economic, and social impacts throughout the entire lifecycle.
- ❑ Toxic materials (mercury, lead, etc.) that are ubiquitous in many products, should be targeted.
- ❑ Organics are important due to volume, greenhouse gas considerations, and upstream feedstock quality (toxicity reduction is a factor) – to produce marketable quality. However there is difficulty in identifying “producers”.
- ❑ Some products are highly visible/identifiable to the public/consumers and therefore have resulted in EPR programs. Programs that create confusion on the part of consumers as to what products are covered (e.g., NI-CAD batteries but not carbon zinc) are likely to achieve lower than optimal recovery results.
- ❑ The value of collecting and disposal management of specific products is the same no matter whether they come from the household or ICI streams.
- ❑ European EPR standards may affect N.A. market export.

Other questions we need to ask before choosing specific targets include:

- ❑ How do we measure success? How do we set the criteria as to what we should tackle next? (e.g., some or all of economics/toxicity/volume/existing infrastructure?)

(2a). What are the key design elements needed to ensure efficient and successful EPR programs?

- ❑ Identify the key participants.
- ❑ Foster partnerships, as they are fundamental in the design and implementation stage.
- ❑ Communications will facilitate successful design.
- ❑ Foster consumer awareness and cohesiveness.
- ❑ Ensure good reporting. Organization needs to convey necessary information to demonstrate efficiency and cost accountability to stakeholders.
- ❑ Undertake lifecycle analysis to ensure we are going in right direction overall.
- ❑ Design elements and supporting mechanisms to work across jurisdictions.
- ❑ Consider the ‘User Pays’ concept (for the individual product alone).

(2b). What supporting mechanisms contribute to successful design and mechanics?

- ❑ Industry involvement.
- ❑ Government support.
- ❑ Financially sustainable.
- ❑ Backdrop regulations (and preparedness to strengthen and enforce) or the threat of regulation; consequences for not participating.
- ❑ National support program (target a national program – not provincial or regional) – harmonization.
- ❑ EPR: Does EPR require, exclude, or may include “shared responsibility”; Apparent conflict between encouraging re-use of old product and marketing new product.

Other things to be aware of in designing supports:

- ❑ EPR vs. DfE: Broad mandate maximizes results but breeds detachment; Voluntary enhances DfE.
- ❑ N. American models often drive demand side; European models drive supply side and gap – solve the problem.

(3). What are key considerations in choosing EPR funding mechanisms for EPR programs?

- ❑ Reduce waste – 3 R’s – Reduce → Reuse → Recycle.
- ❑ Simplicity and fairness (to producer and consumer). Disincentives should be avoided. Flexible implementation.
- ❑ Economic, efficient, effective are different considerations; Dedicated and transparent fund representing net cost of managing a particular product efficiently.
- ❑ Sustainable.
- ❑ Must create a level playing field.
- ❑ Consider EPR costs in relation to product costs. Balancing revenue with cost over time. Local considerations for social, economic and environmental goals.
- ❑ Should motivate consumer behaviour toward desired outcomes; Incentives for collections are important. Formalized structure of program is important.
- ❑ Fees: Collect fee at appropriate point, i.e., at time of sale or disposal and determined by nature of the product and its EPR program; fees could be incorporated in prices or disclosed separately; fees can be structured in a manner to influence environmental effectiveness; pros and cons to disclosure of fees or absorbing within prices; front-end fee/advance disposal surcharge on beverage containers; assessed at brand-owner level to consumer.
- ❑ Has a PRO ever been organized as a “for-profit”?

(4). How can we improve EPR accountability and measurement?

- Transparency to consumer regarding the cost, where the money is used, and governance. “We” should be able to see into EPR programs and how they work.
- National harmonization.
- Fair and open government structure.
- Stakeholders accountable, empowered (“we” should feel we can influence how they work).
- Measurable waste reduction objectives for PROs – quantitative, qualitative, non-prescriptive and reported.
- Standards for program comparison.
- Need to measure full lifecycle environmental benefits vs. costs.
- Shared and equal responsibility:
 - Regulators.
 - Municipal (waste management).
 - Industry.
 - Consumers.
- Built-in financial incentive mechanism to stimulate green design within industry. E.g., proactive industry pays less – status-quo industry pays more.
- Penalties and enforcement drive accountability.
- Social components of programs.
- Simple model.
- Business plan (private implications) working towards defined targets.
- No cross-subsidization.

(5a). What have we learned about designing and implementing joint efforts/partnerships and ensuring greater consistency in EPR?

- The emerging role of the provincial regulatory is to encourage EPR sustainability by creating the winning conditions of level playing field, scale, cost effective results, and respect for local needs.
- EPR ineffective to stimulate DfE.
- Need – Federal and Provincial government Green Procurement Protocols that are standardized; across the board will stimulate immediate shift.
- Flexibility in design.
- Stakeholders in early/fairly.
- Consultative networking between and within three sectors (Public, Private, Community) continues and increases.
- Effective (environment) and consistent.
- Efficiency.
- Don’t have to be led by government – industry has the ability to proactively lead the partnership EPR process.
- Communication/harmonization/consistency in program objectives.
- Senior champion to coordinate/drive agenda.

(5b). What are some practical steps to improving inter-jurisdictional cooperation for EPR?

- ❑ Provinces move forward together instead of on their own on new EPR programs (e.g., IT).
- ❑ Non-threatening forums.
- ❑ Advancing common issues.
- ❑ Bottom-up empowerment of a national body or national approach.
- ❑ Network between EPR agency through, where possible, existing national organizations.
- ❑ Need a formal coordinating body to share information and develop inter-jurisdictional partnerships.
- ❑ A dedicated, moderated web site and forum for collection and dissemination of high quality information and data.
- ❑ Create opportunities for international cooperation and harmonization .

III. Final Plenary Recommendations:

(A). Detailed Key Recommendations: What are our recommendations coming out of this EPR conference?

(Table groups of 6-8 persons responded to this question – similar answers were clustered to create six recommendations)

1. Coordinate a national approach allowing for regional differences.

- Move towards national harmonization.
- There would be synergies from a national EPR strategy.
- New agency may be necessary to provide national coordination for EPR (should be multi-stakeholder and accountable).
- Identify programs that lend themselves to a national approach.
- National and regional cooperation on design and implementation of programs.
- National coordination of policy and guidelines.
- Consistent regulatory approaches across Canada.
- Set national priorities for EPR (based on, for example, criteria such as toxicity, volume, ease of success).

2. Establish industry government partnerships to lead establishment of EPR programs (sector specific)

- Joint leadership role required of Federal and Provincial governments in collaboration with other interested parties where deemed appropriate.
- Pursue industry and government partnerships.
- Pilot national EPR programs to generate national consistency and improve efficiency of program delivery.
- National electronics program that can be customized to adapt to regional differences.
- Keep it moving.
- Just do it (EPR).

3. Develop a reporting system to share information and success/failures.

- Document and share EPR program successes and failures: provide a concise abstract; Contacts.
- Talk to local governments and stakeholders about successes and opportunities for EPR development in Canada.
- Share successes and failures on a web site.
- Come to a common understanding across Canada of what EPR is.

4. Clarify/define roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.

- Drive to more clarity on roles and responsibilities for governments.
- Define the role of municipalities with EPR.
- Acknowledge the requirement for shared responsibility.

5. Increase focus on Design for Environment and full life cycle management approach

- Integrate DfE as a key program objective in EPR.
- Target products with highest environmental risks.

6. Design Programs to be convenient, effective and efficient.

- Improve convenience, efficiency, and environmentally sound management of EPR programs.
- Consumer convenience is critical for program success.

(B). Other Plenary Outcomes:

MESSAGES TO TAKE TO OECD CONFERENCE:

- 1. Analysis that addresses characteristics between low and high performance systems.**
- 2. Perform analysis and provide information regarding EPR of products not usually addressed. (Program design and instruments used in implementation).**
- 3. Examine whether DfE objectives are being achieved.**
- 4. Evaluation of 1 to 5 products and programs (data on operations, data on design changes).**

NEXT EPR WORKSHOP – WHEN AND WHAT?

March 2004

“Be Part of the Canadian EPR Experience:”

“Working Towards a National EPR Strategy”

Topics:

- Establishing consistency – best practices nationally.
- International participation, insight, exposure, provincial program overview.
- Progress updates on current & emerging topics.
- Build on and extend existing topics.

Location: Halifax, Nova Scotia was identified as a possible location.

MUNICIPALITIES' ROLE

- A. Future Role of Municipalities in EPR:
- Unit-based pricing for waste (waste management as a utility).
 - Facilitate negotiation.
 - Participate with EPR agencies to develop most cost effective and efficient program.
 - Economies of scale.
 - Inform consumers about cost of waste management.
- B. Kind of Supports Needed to Fulfill this Role and Who Can Provide Them:
- Benchmarking existing system costs & efficiencies.
 - Create forums to exchange municipal information.
 - Develop mechanisms for industry/municipalities to discuss these issues.
 - Providers (E.g., FCM, National organization of stewardship agencies).

ENVIRONMENT CANADA & CCME ROLES

A. What can Environment Canada &/or CCME do to support EPR in Canada?

CCME:

- Sponsor research/studies.
- Bring consensus from Provinces to whatever process happens.
- Establish a network of EPR like the P2 network (they already have several).

Environment Canada:

- Sponsor research/studies.
- Develop national framework under which programs operate (legislation, guidance?).
- Provide coordination/peer matching role.
- Facilitate national forums for stakeholders, perhaps focussing on specific materials or products.

B. Is there another, different structure needed to support EPR in Canada? If yes, what would it look like? Who would it involve? What would it do?

- Multi-stakeholder organization (board) empowered by Feds/Provinces/Municipalities to work with industry on developing common national characteristics/similarities for EPR programs.

Note: National EPR Programs would be good to have. It would improve efficiency, level the playing field, and bring industry to the table. Can it be done?

ACTION PLAN: ELECTRONICS SECTOR

Name of Action Plan: Draft <i>Electronics Work Plan</i> (formulated by one table group in final plenary)			
Specific measurable accomplishment: <u>National EPR Program for Electronic & Electronic Waste</u>			
Action steps to reach measurable accomplishment (sequenced)	By (date)	Who* does what ? (Specific or general)	Estimated costs &/or resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders working group (Industry, Government, Public, Recyclers) • Establish priorities, policy • Launch a pilot program (1) Election (2) Re-build/Re-use (3) Recycling • Verify Best Practices • Infrastructure Study • Create Full EPR Business Plan (regulation, funding mechanisms, time-lines, assign responsibility) • Launch 	<p>June 2002</p> <p>Sept 2002</p> <p>Jan 1, 2003</p> <p>Jan 1, 2003</p> <p>April 1, 2003</p> <p>Sept 1, 2003</p> <p>Jan 1, 2004</p>	<p>Industry</p> <p>Gov't Working Group</p> <p>Working Group</p> <p>Working Group</p> <p>Consultant</p> <p>Stakeholders</p>	<p>\$500,000 (loan from industry associations)</p> <p></p> <p>\$100,000</p> <p>\$15,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$375,000</p> <p>Pay back seed funding</p>

ACTION PLAN: ENCOURAGING DfE

Name of Action Plan: Draft <u>Encouraging DfE</u> (<i>formulated by one table group in final plenary</i>)			
Motivating Slogan and Image : “ <i>Less material, more function</i> ”.			
Action steps to reach measurable accomplishment (sequenced)	By (date)	Who* does what ? (Specific or general)	Estimated costs &/or resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place DfE directly into goals/objectives/mandate of the PRO/industry • Build price signals/mechanisms to push towards DfE into the programs (penalties, incentives) • Get EPR stewardship principles taught to the business unit responsible for making packaging (e.g., marketing department) • Demonstrate value to industry (positive opportunities, cost savings) for doing this • DfE credits? E.g., if you reduce your waste at source, you get “credited” or pay less for recovery program. • Put levies/charges, etc. on non-recyclable materials <u>instead</u> of the waste materials that are being managed properly • Have a good fundamental waste management system in place that clearly reflects the costs (economic and environmental) 	Continuous improvement		

ACTION PLAN: EXPANDING REGIONAL PROGRAMS TO THE NATIONAL LEVEL

Name of Action Plan: Draft Expanding Regional Programs (formulated by one table group in final plenary)

Specific measurable accomplishment: Number of Programs that are National

Motivating Slogan and Image: *“Canadian or Canadian”, eh*

Action steps to reach measurable accomplishment (sequenced)	By (date)	Who* does what ? (Specific or general)	Estimated costs &/or resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify programs that could/should be national • Identify industry person/group that can be assigned responsibility to make program work (a champion/advocate) • Meet with provincial representatives to formulate national program • Communicate draft plan to other stakeholders to seek agreement and consensus • Implement agreed upon program on a Canada wide basis (e.g., oil, beverages, EEE, sharps) 		CCME	

ENHANCING COMMUNICATION NATIONALLY & INTERNATIONALLY

(Formulated by one table group in final plenary for 1-3 year timeframe)

A. Dedicated Non-Government Maintained Website

- Find resources for operation of website
- Catalogue high quality best management practices
- Catalogue all workshop PowerPoint presentations
- Catalogue sources of high quality information
- Catalogue sources of high quality data
- Links to external high quality EPR related websites

B. Dedicated Non-Government Moderated Forum

- Find human resources to moderate forum
- Maintain and develop high quality practitioner in EPR – including attendees this week
- Networking via forum
- Immediate facilitation of information exchange
- All email addresses protected

List of Appendices:

APPENDIX 1: First Plenary Session

APPENDIX 2: Breakout Sessions

- Summary of Breakout Session Questions and Facilitators
- Session 1 – Targeting Products & Materials for EPR Programs
- Session 2 – EPR Program Design & Mechanics
- Session 3 – Funding Mechanisms for EPR
- Session 4 – EPR Governance and Accountability
- Session 5 – EPR Approaches and Partnerships