

# *2<sup>nd</sup> National EPR Workshop*

## *Appendices*

## First Plenary: What hurdles have we overcome with EPR programs in Canada?

(On Wednesday evening table groups of 6-8 responded to this question after hearing from three panel members speaking on the topic of "Existing Canadian EPR programs." Similar answers were grouped to give six themes)

### ***Industry Acceptance & Implementation***

- Industry is becoming aware of EPR.
- Getting out of starting blocks / Getting buy-in key.
- Initial reluctance of industry (historically did not manage) and reluctance of environmental groups to have faith in industry driven solution.
- Convincing stakeholders that there is something in it for everyone - Industry → solution not as bad as first fears
- US Perspective: Evolution in acceptance from industry that EPR has value. e.g. (grouped similar highlight data from each break-out group)
  - Green marketing tool
  - Regulations less onerous (negotiated)
  - Develop ownership for program
- Taking action to set up a programme before regulatory action.
- Industry cooperation.
- Industry reluctance to participate.
- Transition from government responsibility (management and funding) to industry; movement, along this continuum.
- Stand up, as a small community (PEI) to big business.
- EPR examples require industry to be effective. Government regulation alone isn't EPR.
- Some industries have taken the opportunity to design own programs
- Industry can work together to put programs in place.
- Industry has a responsibility beyond the point of sale.

### ***Consumer Awareness & Understanding – Emphasis on Education***

- Education/Communication.
- Consumer awareness (willingness) to accept programs (recycling).
- Awareness of stakeholders/consumers.
- Consumers are beginning to understand/see the issue of waste and extending the responsibility back to consumers and producers.
- Education and communication is now recognized as extremely important.
- More public awareness.
- The fact that we are even having this workshop in the first place.
- Public acceptance.
- Concept of levies is known by consumers (at least within some jurisdictions).

### ***Waste is Economically Viable***

- Hasn't impacted retail sales.
- Development of concept of waste as a resource/economic development.
- Discovery of economic benefits of waste management.
- Developed new technologies, new markets for recyclables.
- Concept of Environmental Industries as a growth in economic development.
- Recyclers have become part of the process, by identifying new markets/materials.

### ***Government Taking on More Responsibility***

- Government is starting to appreciate the time and need for consultation within regulated industry sectors.
- Convincing stakeholders that there is something in it for everyone - Government → pattern policy development
- Government reluctance to produce backdrop regulation.
- Through regulatory (successfully) framework.
- Recognition of needs – NGO, Governments, academics, researchers (rarely industry).
- Voluntary action and reluctance overcome by threats and penalties regulations
- Need for level playing fields with consumers paying, essential for fairness and equity.
- EPR programs exist.
- There are both voluntary and regulatory programs.
- That there is a cost involved in responsible waste management.

### ***Cooperation and collaboration between players***

- Partnership vs. prescriptive approach.
- Dialogue between industry/government, etc. (government recognizes, not experts: industry recognized value of backdrop).
- Regional/National process – overcome will to go it alone.
- Industry and governments can work together for EPR programs.
- Industry can work together to put programs in place.
- Federal/Provincial cooperation.

### ***Other Hurdles we have/are overcome (ing)***

- Free riders – levy at point of sale (used oil).
- Role of Facilitating Organization – hands on but cannot give guarantees.
- Really good collection systems.
- Issue of funding – lots of variety.
- Better measurement of performance.
- Some examples of working financial models exist.
- Segregated systems in place across Canada rather than harmonized have offered case studies on EPR.
- EPR programs may be having an effect on Design for Environment.

## Questions for Break-out Sessions

### **Session 1: TARGETING PRODUCTS & MATERIAL FOR EPR PROGRAMS** *(Highlight Question - #3)*

---

1. Which products within EPR programs have been targeted anywhere in the world?
2. For which products has EPR been successful & why?
3. What products should we next target in Canada and why?
4. Any other relevant questions/issues you would like to raise re: targeting?

### **Session 2: EPR PROGRAM DESIGN & MECHANICS** *(Highlight Question - #2 & 3)*

---

1. List 5-8 EPR programs you know well. Very briefly indicate the program strengths and areas to strengthen.
2. Based on this analysis, what are the key design elements needed to ensure efficient and successful EPR programs?
3. What supporting mechanisms contribute to successful design and mechanics?
4. What elements of program design are needed to stimulate DfE within industry?
5. Other relevant questions/issues you would like to raise re: design & mechanics?

### **Session 3: FUNDING MECHANISMS FOR EPR** *(Highlight Question - #3)*

---

1. Based on your experiences, what funding mechanisms are working well and in what situations?
2. What other workable funding schemes might you suggest?
3. Given this, What are key considerations in choosing funding mechanisms for EPR programs?
4. Other relevant questions/issues you'd like to raise re: funding mechanisms?

### **Session 4: EPR GOVERNANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY** *(Highlight Question - #6)*

---

1. How do you know if a program is working?
2. How do we ensure transparent (accountable) PROs (including ensuring program revenues are dedicated to original purpose)?
3. What new models/governance features are people embarking on that might be effective?
4. How can we improve accountability through stakeholders involvement and commitment?
5. What challenges exist in gauging and comparing EPR program performance?
6. Overall, how can we improve EPR accountability and measurement?
7. Other relevant questions/issues you'd like to raise re: measurement, governance and accountability? (e.g., targets – why or why not?)

### **Session 5: EPR APPROACHES & PARTNERSHIPS** *(Highlight Question - #A3 & #B2)*

---

A. Partnerships:

1. What are the barriers to cooperation at various levels?
2. What are the benefits of larger scale coordinated approaches?
3. What have we learned about designing and implementing joint efforts/ partnerships and ensuring greater consistency in EPR?

B. Inter-jurisdictional:

1. **What aspects of EPR lend themselves to inter-jurisdictional cooperation and why?**
2. What are some practical steps to improving inter-jurisdictional cooperation (including communication) for EPR?

*Breakout Group #'s & Facilitators:*

---

1 Barbara MacKay	4 Drew Henderson
or Sheldon McLeod	
2 Bobbie Marshall	5 Dorota Praski
3 Laurie Streich	6 Lana Stowe

## Session 1 – TARGETING PRODUCTS & MATERIAL FOR EPR PROGRAMS

### 1.1: Which products within EPR programs have been targeted anywhere in the world?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tires</li> <li>- Used oil</li> <li>- Paint</li> <li>- Batteries</li> <li>- Carpet</li> <li>- Electronics</li> <li>- Cars</li> <li>- Containers &amp; packaging</li> <li>- Nike running shoes</li> <li>- Skis</li> <li>- Toner cartridges</li> <li>- Sharps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Packaging</li> <li>- Tires</li> <li>- Oil (used)</li> <li>- Beverage containers</li> <li>- Household special waste</li> <li>- ODS</li> <li>- Batteries (re-chargeable vs. auto)</li> <li>- Consumers electronics</li> <li>- Paints</li> <li>- Cars</li> <li>- Carpets</li> <li>- Plastics</li> <li>- Running shoes</li> <li>- Diapers</li> <li>- Sharps fluorescent lights</li> <li>- Mercury products</li> <li>- Pesticide containers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Automobiles</li> <li>- Oil</li> <li>- Electronics</li> <li>- White goods</li> <li>- Beverage containers</li> <li>- Tires</li> <li>- Dairy containers</li> <li>- Packaging</li> <li>- Paint</li> <li>- Pesticides</li> <li>- Refrigerants</li> <li>- Carpet</li> <li>- Batteries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tires</li> <li>- Packaging – containers (drink)</li> <li>- Cars</li> <li>- Batteries</li> <li>- Electronics</li> <li>- HHW (Paint, paint cans, solvents; pesticides, aerosols)</li> <li>- Used oil (filters &amp; containers)</li> <li>- Newspapers</li> <li>- Fibres (paper based materials)</li> <li>- Carpet</li> <li>- Pharmaceuticals</li> <li>- Sharp</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Packaging</li> <li>- Plastics – bags, bailer twine, silage wrap</li> <li>- Beverage containers</li> <li>- Paint</li> <li>- Oil (filters)</li> <li>- Tires</li> <li>- Print materials,</li> <li>- Electric (light bulbs)</li> <li>- Auto</li> <li>- Carpets</li> <li>- Batteries</li> <li>- ODS</li> <li>- Mercury amalgam</li> <li>- Sharps</li> <li>- Prescription drugs (pharmaceuticals)</li> <li>- Hag waste</li> <li>- Styrofoam cups</li> <li>- Agricultural pesticides</li> <li>- Textiles</li> <li>- Fluorescent tubes</li> <li>- Light bulbs</li> <li>- Furniture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vehicles</li> <li>- Packaging</li> <li>- Beverage containers</li> <li>- Household hazardous waste</li> <li>- Used oil</li> <li>- Tires</li> <li>- Carpet</li> <li>- Batteries</li> <li>- Pharmaceuticals</li> <li>- Printed materials</li> <li>- Refrigerants</li> <li>- Paint</li> <li>- EEE</li> <li>- Chemicals (i.e., pools)</li> <li>- Pesticides</li> <li>- Fluorescent tubes</li> <li>- White goods</li> </ul>

## 1.2: Which products have been successful & why?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<p><b>Paint</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- recognized hazard</li> <li>- industry willingness</li> <li>- draconian regulations</li> </ul> <p><b>Beverage containers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- financial incentive &amp; mechanisms</li> <li>- ease of collection</li> <li>- consumer acceptance</li> <li>- obvious problem/ obvious solution</li> <li>- simple, visible product</li> <li>- everyone consumes</li> <li>- well developed processing systems</li> <li>- historical pattern</li> <li>- consumer habit</li> <li>- easy sources of revenue</li> <li>- good fundraiser</li> </ul> <p><b>Tires</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- financial incentives</li> <li>- controlled collection point</li> <li>- recognition by industry &amp; government of recognized hazard</li> <li>- brand owner easily identified</li> <li>- clear problem with end of life</li> <li>- visible</li> </ul> <p><b>Paper</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- existed for long time</li> <li>- market/economic driven</li> <li>- conservation component (secondary)</li> <li>- visible</li> <li>- driven by consumer</li> <li>- piles up quickly</li> <li>- resource recover (paper Ind.)</li> <li>- consumer pressure for recycled content</li> </ul>	<p><b>Lead/Acid Batteries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- product ban</li> <li>- regulations enforced</li> <li>- incentives</li> <li>- value of end product</li> <li>- existing infrastructure</li> </ul> <p><b>Beverage Containers (Al)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high value for Aluminum (Al)</li> <li>- after-market for recycled product</li> <li>- support by industry &amp; strong infrastructure</li> <li>- deposits</li> <li>- convenience</li> <li>- non-Al rebates as well</li> <li>- consumer awareness &amp; education</li> </ul> <p><b>Tires</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- consumer awareness &amp; education</li> <li>- regulations are needed</li> <li>- take back charge/market</li> </ul> <p><b>Paint</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- recognized by public as a hazard</li> </ul> <p><b>Used Oil</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- harmonized across prairies</li> <li>- industry participation</li> <li>- small amount of producers</li> </ul> <p><b>Cars</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- recycled content</li> <li>- cost effective / monitorial value</li> </ul> <p><b>Paper</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- easy product differentiation</li> <li>- need for stock</li> </ul> <p><b>Pesticide containers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- voluntary industry stewardship</li> <li>- regulation</li> </ul> <p><b>ODS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- international regions</li> <li>- financial mechanisms</li> <li>- small number of players</li> </ul> <p>• <i>Financial incentive, convenience, regulation, education &amp; consumer awareness</i></p>	<p><b>Beverage containers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legislation</li> </ul> <p><b>Tires</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consistent</li> </ul> <p><b>Used Oil</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Industry leadership</li> </ul> <p>• <i>Technology forcing successful programs.</i></p> <p>• <i>Must capture best of the many Canadian programs.</i></p>	<p><b>Used Oil, Filters &amp; Containers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Producers involved</li> <li>- Recycling industry support</li> <li>- Level playing field</li> </ul> <p><b>Beverage containers (beer)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deposit = incentive</li> <li>- Public education</li> </ul> <p><b>Paint</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legislation</li> <li>- Industry operation</li> </ul> <p><b>Tires</b></p>	<p><b>Beer bottles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- trade barrier (not environmental reason)</li> <li>- anomaly driven by economics</li> <li>- consumer influence</li> <li>- \$ back</li> <li>- refillable/reusable</li> <li>- return to retailer</li> <li>- high return</li> <li>- self financing</li> <li>- awareness</li> <li>- convenience</li> <li>- economical, environmental &amp; social</li> </ul> <p><b>Oil</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- salvage value of containers low (deposit system difficult to establish)</li> <li>- hazardous waste (containers not)</li> <li>- backdrop regulation</li> <li>- inter-jurisdictional legislation</li> <li>- oil easily recovered (containers/filters the problem)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unsuccessful?</li> <li>- Responsible party important – shared vs. ultimate (clear understanding)</li> <li>- Organics - problems with responsibility, i.e. food waste, compost, stickers on food, marked/traced</li> <li>- Redesign/better design of products – hard to apply to food waste</li> <li>- Life cycle approach – environmental impacts</li> <li>- Government legislation</li> <li>- Positive refund</li> <li>- Convenience/incentives</li> <li>- Regulation vs. legislation</li> <li>- Include stakeholders</li> <li>- Awareness/education of public (ease of access/ understanding)</li> <li>- Self-enforcement</li> <li>- Self-monitoring</li> <li>- Leader – set example (government, environmental group)</li> <li>- Strong partnerships</li> <li>- Strong facilitating</li> <li>- “doers”</li> <li>- Product bans (mercury)</li> <li>- Need to have solutions</li> <li>- Measurable standards</li> <li>- Open information</li> <li>- Flexibility in program design</li> <li>- Define outcome</li> </ul>

### 1.3: Which products should we next target in Canada and why?

Note: Data merged into categories & #s refer to number of groups (out of six) noting this as a priority.

<b>Electronics (5) because:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume (upcoming), Toxicity</li> <li>• What price if we do not deal with now?</li> <li>• Contamination problem</li> <li>• Expansion of industry</li> <li>• Short lifecycle</li> <li>• High consumption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Price to repair; high volume; new purchase price</li> <li>• Mercury, Toxicity</li> <li>• Hazardous waste, short-life cycles, volumes, design for the environment, recycling technology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already underway</li> <li>• Will increase in volume</li> <li>• Large national companies</li> <li>• Implementation at local level</li> <li>• Toxicity</li> <li>• Volume</li> </ul>
<b>Hazardous Waste: (5) - Industrial, Household because:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction, recycling</li> <li>• Follow products through life</li> <li>• EPR paradigm shift</li> <li>• Should industry take a jump?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on generation and residual effect</li> <li>• Reduce lifecycle and environmental impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toxicity</li> <li>• Elevated risk to health &amp; environment</li> <li>• National Guidelines</li> </ul>
<b>Fast Food Containers (3) - Plastics (including non-recyclables (3); Disposables (one-time use products); &amp; Packaging Waste (Residential/Industrial) because:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased national relevance (very important)</li> <li>• Legislative aspect important</li> <li>• Identifiable responsible party</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy directive</li> <li>• Public does not understand</li> <li>• Volume, visible (litter), expand beyond beverage containers, lifestyle changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recycled content, long life, toxicity</li> <li>• Industry not doing anything</li> <li>• Produce marketable product (end use)</li> </ul>
<b>Organics (4) because:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume sent to landfill</li> <li>• Climate change gases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be looking back at product (Aluminum – hazard to whales)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good future candidate because of high waste issue (but not EPR)</li> </ul>
<b>Construction/shingles/roofing materials (3) because:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who do you target</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High volume</li> </ul>	
<b>Ozone Depleting Substances (1) (medical end) (1) because:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ozone depletion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume</li> </ul>
<b>Mercury containing products (incl. Thermometers) (2); Toxins or have environmental impact; Pesticides; Heavy metals</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toxicity</li> <li>• Resource recovery</li> <li>• Highest cost – health safety, environmental</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazardous waste – elimination of its use</li> <li>• Produce marketable product (end use)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPR needs to be tested. Level of difficulty of implementation</li> <li>• Environment</li> </ul>
<b>Glycol (2)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruining/polluting soil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toxicity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementable</li> </ul>
<b>Carpet (2)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good model to work from, timely</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nylon can be recycled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wasting resource</li> </ul>
<b>Automobiles (2); Auto shredder residue</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mercury, hazardous waste</li> <li>• Volume</li> <li>• European EPR coming to NA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Still large amount of residue in landfills</li> <li>• Complex product</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplier driven approach (US auto makers)</li> <li>• Mercury switches</li> </ul>
<b>Animal/Human Waste (goes into fresh water); Municipal solid waste</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raw sewage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large companies produce</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollution of soil</li> </ul>

1.3 Combined Responses Continued: What products should we next target in Canada and why?

**Newspaper (paper & fibre) (2); Corrugated packaging; Litter**

- *Inexpensive to do*
- *Secondary market*
- *To reduce total volume of waste*
- *Impact on eco-tourism, aesthetics*
- *Recycled content*

**Used oil – National system**

- *Toxicity*

**Road salt**

- *'Mountains' being used*
- *Damage to nature*

**Gold**

- *Production of arsenic*
- *Pollution of ecosystems (need to address local needs)*

**Household Batteries (e.g., button batteries, rechargeable, lead/acid) - Need to look at impacts of each product to target.**

- *Effect on environment*

**Electronic Air Furnace Dust**

- *Volume*
- *Toxicity*

**Lighting**

- *Been around for a while*
- *Energy efficient*

**Other Notes:**

Keep working on:

- Tires
- Beverage containers
- Used oil
- Programs we know work (yet not all provinces involved)
- Easy programs

Need national direction! (e.g., CCME) – Industry Sectors

All provinces should target same product – harmonization.

Need national agreement.

#### **1.4: Any other relevant questions/issues you would like to raise re: targeting?**

- How do we set criteria as to what do we start with first?
- How do we measure success?
- National approach?
- Economics?
- Define characteristics of waste stream need to be considered when targeting next products.
- Prioritize waste types.
- Take advantage of opportunity when available (e.g., capitalize on CARE in USA and bring to Canada)
- Target any products with implications to human health.
- National Perspective:
  - Standardization
  - Industry Support
  - Jurisdictional Limitations
  - Partnership – Government and Industry
- EPR & Producer Responsibility in Canada
  - Leadership
  - Need a “definition”
  - Not an excuse for inaction
- Build upon or protect existing programs.
  - Use as a catalyst
  - Use existing infrastructures
- EPR as a Tool – Where does responsibility lie?
  - Integrate cost into product
  - Lack of public awareness
  - Consumer may not see ‘big picture’
  - See product, not process
- Oil Containers:
  - Not considered hazardous waste
  - Special education.
  - Return incentive is low
  - Financial, convenience, awareness
  - Larger sizes are used by farmers

## Session 2 – EPR PROGRAM DESIGN & MECHANICS

### 2.1: List 5-8 EPR programs you know well and indicate program strengths & areas to strengthen.

Group	EPR Programs:	Strengths:	Areas to Strengthen:
1	• Deposit return on bottles	- Consumer acceptance	Increasing reliable markets & non-reg. containers
	• Refrigerant management program	- National program – harmonized - Pro-active	Targets only commercial side; does not address full range of toxins
	• MPSC (Manitoba)	- Multi-material program - Incentives to municipalities - Covers 80% of cost	Levy comes from beverage containers
	• Pesticide containers	- National program, voluntary	Farming program broadened to urban market
	• Eco- peinture (Quebec)	- Industries willingness to participate as long as strong government regulations - Internalized cost (no eco-fees)	- Find new markets - Expand to other markets & products - Not full EPR
2	• Beverage container stewardship	BC & industry operated	BC- Low cost -Consumer confusion
	• Lead/Acid batteries	AB – industry operated	AB – equitable handling needs definition
	• Used oil	SK– 90% of containers back, high return	SK – get finances out of government
	• Pesticide Containers	MB – simple (2 cent levy)	MB – none?
	• Tires	PEI – 3 R’s practiced, 17 trips/container NS – not industry operated, high recovery rate, funding of municipal diversion	PEI – more education NS – improve relations with industry, commonality of programs
3	• Used Paint – Nova Scotia	- All paint; convenient	Quantity issue (too much waste paint)
	• Deposit/return – P.E.I.	- Run solely by manufacturer - Solely refillable	Communications, PR
	• Used Oil – Western Canada	- Regulatory backdrop	- Limited scope, limited sites/access - Communications
	• Used Oil – P.E.I.	- Regulatory backdrop	- Containers & filters - Measuring/monitoring
	• Ottawa Take Back	- Multi-product, - Retailer involvement	- Limited sites, limited products - Accountability
	• Recyclable batteries		- Reporting
4	• Prairie – W. Canada oil, filter, container	- Fully integrated/seamless in MB, SK, AB - Industry funded & operated - Consumer convenience	- Nationalize program - Container recycling (42% recovery)
	• BC Paint	- Industry run & funded	- Collection system (need to share with municipalities) – 1 stop shop drop off
	• Sarcan		
	• Alberta Tire Mgmt		
	• MPSC		
• RBRC	- Harmonized, 90% voluntary involvement - Education – National programs	- Better communication, persuade public - Infrastructure, Make a business priority	
5	• Manitoba Product Stewardship Program	- Excellent support to municipalities (financial, technical, education, promotion) - Cost efficient - Multi-stakeholder process - Covers a lot of materials - Funds/levies are dedicated	- Level playing field funding – cross subsidization - Free loaders, Beyond municipal focus - Expand sources beyond residential - Design for Environment - No recovery targets in regulation - Funding formulas (adjustments)
6	• Paint Recovery Program (Quebec)	- Industry responsibility/driven recovery - Mandatory recovery - Cater to containers & paint residuals - Stimulates DfE because run by industry - Cost of collection internalized	- Collective resp weaker than individual - Accountability of industry on economic, social, environmental issues - New vs. recycled (conflict of interest re: profits) - “Piece meal approach” not 3R complimentary
	• ‘UBC’ program used beverage containers	- Identifies responsible party	- Accurate costing
	• Used Oil	- Multi-provincial	- Increasing container recovery - Extend collection outlets

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

- Industry responsible for their waste.
- Individual company responsibility.
- Having immediate, short-term and long term goals.
- Regulatory support.
- Landfill bans.
- Reduction of material.
- Material identification (labeling)
- External targets.
- Multi-stakeholder involvement.
- Optimal recovery.
- Simplicity of program.
- Convenience.
- Cost recovery.
- Harmonized program.
- Material consistency.
- Identify responsible party (key position in supply chain).
- Level playing field through backdrop regulation (economic or legislative consequences).
- Need for performance targets.
- Monitoring standards.
- Shared responsibility (including financial)
- Financial secure business plan.
- Control system to ensure things are done cost effectively.
- Acceptance and commitment of individual.
- End-user consumer acceptance and buy-in.
- KIS (Keep it simple)
- Full range of players at table.
- Secondary markets.
- Recycling infrastructure.
- Economic viability.
- Incentives for manufacturers.
- Product specific.
- I.D. (clearly) responsible party.
- Fund source
- 'Champion'
- 1 organization responsible for all program elements
- don't break-up
- lifecycle analysis
- performance targets/recycling targets
- targets should be I.D.
- clear roles
- public involvement in design
- good reporting relationships with government/stakeholders
- internal tracking
- fund be utilized only for EPR purpose and arms length from government
- regulatory background
- ban – but be careful, i.e. landfill as a mechanism/tool to influence – policy tool
- regulatory framework to support environmental position
- government supported sector – waste industry
- Objectives must be clear.
- Performance indicators (measurement of performance).
- No free riders.
- Means to address orphan products.
- Financial physical shift.
- Cost must be attached to producer. (clear producer responsibility.)
- Healthy interaction between government and industry.
- Viable technology (environmentally sound) tracking mechanism.
- Convenient for consumer.
- Environmental management plan.
- Supporting mechanisms.
- Government must set targets – inclusion of stakeholders.
- Effective communication/public education.
- Clear program criteria – cost to industry must not act as disincentive.
- Adequately funded.
- Customer convenience.
- Clear allocation of responsibility.
- Sustainable funding.
- Targets/Goals – legitimate, realistic.
- Tailored to industry/business.
- Acceptable end-use or market.
- Contingency plans (what if?)
- Consider social; environmental benefits.
- Harmonized across jurisdictions.
- People get committed.
- Public, private, community involvement (achieving consensus)
- Finances: reward/penalty
- Accountability/transparency of the program.
- Feedback mechanisms
- Use knowledge base of in dustry and private sector.
- Monitoring and evaluation systems.
- Goals, objectives
- Quantitative/qualitative measurement (using appropriate measures)
- Education, promotion, communication

### 2.3: What supporting mechanisms contribute to successful design and mechanics?

- Retail take back
- Modern governance.
- Education.
- Price indicators.
- Regulatory framework.
- Identified end use markets.
- Process.
- Supporting infrastructure.
- Requires capital if infrastructure needs to be established.
- Functional administrative systems.
- Technology in place or does it need to be developed.
- Good communication (on-going).
- Feedback on achievements.
- Report on successes/benchmarks.
- Dedicated funds (no general revenues or cross-subsidization)
- Earth 911 (U.S.) – household hazardous waste.
- Look for synergies between programs.
- Communication back to individuals regarding improving programs (2-way communication).
- Phase out products of concern
- Import/export issues (permits)
- Incentives for beyond compliance
- Tool kit (regulatory to performance agreements)
- National support programs
- Timeframe
- Agree on goals/targets (Ref: Environment Canada)
- Partnering and educational process of industry.
- Backdrop regulation.
- Bag limits/user fees/user pay (Household waste)
- Landfill bans
- Regulatory “stick”/guideline (expression of intent)
- Disincentive to landfill.
- Strong government direction.
- Incentives/disincentives for industry.
- Effective public/political/industry education.
- Formalized stakeholder participation.
- Don’t wait for total agreement.
- Labeling requirements for hazardous substances.
- Enhanced public relations/recognition.
- Supportive policies (ie. preferential purchasing) – market pull-through.
- Enforcement.
- Level playing field.
- Efficient collection structure.
- Sound management.
- Financial sustainability.
- Education.
- Penalties for non-compliance.
- Promotion
- Appeal to public/political interest (on the public radar).
- Consistency/convenience
- Ease of use for participants
- Flexibility
- Needs to be clear definition between collection/processing
- Network/communication between private and community and public sectors
- Keep bigger picture
- Interface with other provinces

## 2.4: What elements of program design are needed to stimulate DfE within industry?

(Definition of DfE is “a systematic way of designing products to anticipate and minimize any potential environmental impacts of a product during its entire life cycle.”)

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minimum standards on product content design (e.g., lead-free solder)</li> <li>- Procurement programs/policies</li> <li>- Look at EU (trade &amp; economic issue)</li> <li>- Finding innovations which make DfE economical – requires support</li> <li>- Key driver is EPR, key driver is economics</li> <li>- Should e decided by market – DfE will solve itself</li> <li>- Bans</li> <li>- Important, but must get EPR program in place first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No cross subsidies</li> <li>- Practice all 3 R’s</li> <li>- Life cycle analysis</li> <li>- Global EI</li> <li>- Depletion of non-renewable resources</li> <li>- Fee structures</li> <li>- Use eco-profiling</li> <li>- Responsibility by all sectors</li> <li>- Toxic material bans (i.e., Hg)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Producers must have some type of financial incentive</li> <li>- Differential levies/ industry controlled levies</li> <li>- Market based mechanisms</li> <li>- Level playing field</li> <li>- Material bans</li> <li>- Solid scientific backing</li> <li>- Labeling of hazardous materials content</li> <li>- Can’t count on market factors alone (broader than goals of program only)</li> <li>- Understand other factors (i.e., health protection)</li> <li>- Info to consumer – public support</li> <li>- Education in design schools re: packaging design &amp; hazardous product content</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Threat of ban (push)</li> <li>- Penalties</li> <li>- Consumer demand</li> <li>- Targets &amp; measures</li> <li>- Funding</li> <li>- Patience</li> <li>- Available technology</li> <li>- Rewards or incentives (pull)</li> <li>- Consider non-Canadian decision makers/ multi-nationals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It has to cost industry re: must be incentives built-in for design (e.g., rewards for recycled content)</li> <li>- Substance bans</li> <li>- Individual firm responsibility creates incentive for DfE; collective responsibility requires further mechanisms</li> <li>- Mandating minimum warranty which would force manufacturer responsibility</li> <li>- Move from selling goods to selling services (leasing vs. selling)</li> <li>- Differential advanced disposal fees (bulk purchases)</li> <li>- Integrating environmental costs into products</li> <li>- Legislation</li> <li>- Recycling targets</li> <li>- Environmental education programs for industry, producers, &amp; consumers (e.g., of program – Ecologo program – Environmental Choice Program)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Accurate financial signals</li> <li>- Get message to brand owner/distribute opp. to consumer</li> <li>- EPR program may hinder DfE in some cases</li> <li>- Procurement</li> <li>- Lifecycle analysis</li> <li>- Identify future products</li> <li>- Harmonization</li> <li>- Shift from products to services</li> </ul>

**2.5: Other relevant questions/issues you would like to raise re: design & mechanics?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
Shared responsibility: - What does this mean? Who is 'we'? - What are we sharing? (Participation? Money? Admin program?) - Should EPR require shared responsibility?	N/A	N/A	- Needs to be marketable (use, performance, price) - Third party independent Boards (gov'ts should not be operators) - Plan & nurture - Efficiency & cost effectiveness! - National perspective – CCME (best practices, national acceptance?)	N/A	N/A

### Session 3 – FUNDING MECHANISMS FOR EPR

#### 3.1: Based on your experiences, what funding mechanisms are working well and (in what situations)?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Voluntary levy (original blue box, ON)</li> <li>- Eco fees, consumer paid (Paint – legislated by government but not collected by government, BC)</li> <li>- Levy on beverage pays for variety of materials (MPSC)</li> <li>- Deposit-refund (many variations)</li> <li>- Industry levy (flat container fee)</li> <li>- Share of market on basis of sales</li> <li>- Last owner fee /disposal fee (Switzerland – bicycles, refrigerators)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deposit refund (refillables – local take back, financial incentive)</li> <li>- Advanced disposal fee (tires, oil, packaging, dedicated funding)</li> <li>- Eco-taxes/levies, visibility</li> <li>- User fees/tipping fees (municipal systems to encourage recycling)</li> <li>- Half-back system (generates revenue)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Visible levy approach &amp; cost (Industry varies contributions according to needs)</li> <li>- When levies are dedicated to waste reduction objectives</li> <li>- Established systems (e.g., beer bottles)</li> <li>- Type of funding mechanisms relates to cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Front end fee (Tires)</li> <li>- Advanced Disposal Surcharge (Tires)</li> <li>- Levy</li> <li>- One organization per group responsible for shortfalls</li> </ul>

**3.2: What other workable funding schemes might your suggest?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Non-recyclables fund recyclable (levy on non-recyclable)</li> <li>- Charging more for virgin material (add levy)</li> <li>- Remove tax breaks for primary industry</li> <li>- Favourable taxes for recycling infrastructure</li> <li>- Incentive vs. mandatory (green) weighted procurement process</li> <li>- fee on second generation products to pay for orphan products</li> <li>- IKEA solution (lease products, never give up ownership, e.g., Christmas Tree program)</li> <li>- Tax</li> <li>- Levy on non-refillable containers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leasing vs. purchasing</li> <li>- Penalties/fines</li> <li>- Tax write offs/capital depreciation allowances</li> <li>- Internalizing externalities</li> <li>- Disposal taxes (dedicated)</li> <li>- Nationally consistent subsidies</li> <li>- Emission trading credits (greenhouse gases)</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advanced disposal fees</li> <li>- End-of-life charge</li> <li>- Industry funded</li> <li>- Deposit</li> <li>- 'Upstream tax subsidy' - government collected</li> <li>- Levy – industry collected (wholesale, retail, producer)</li> <li>- Government subsidy</li> <li>- Scrap/salvage value– high value end-of-life (e.g., junkyard)</li> <li>- Cross subsidies (pop can money used for paper)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

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

- Financial incentives to increase participation.
- Simplicity and fairness.
- Sustainable.
- Start-up costs.
- Segregate funds.
- Create a level playing field.
- Retro-activity.
- Reserves.
- Visible to consumer.
- Invisible to consumer.
- Change consumer behaviour.
- Offering consumer choice.
- Adds value to end of life.
- Levy at manufacturer level.
- Dedicated fund.
- Transparent (meant for consumer).
- Problems with surpluses – should be on zero based budget.
- Incentive opportunities.
- Clear program objectives and targets.
- Balance between level of sophistication of funding mechanism and program scope.
- Whether cross-subsidization is allowed?
- Should be transferable provincially (national standard).
  - Depends on scale of program.
  - Should NOT stop programs from proceeding (flexibility).
- Non-governmental national EPR program.
- Consult municipalities.
- Accountability (e.g., visibility on bill).
- Visibility of financial management.
- Look at shared funding mechanism options.
- Incorporation of eco-fees in product price.
- Identify (for public) who will get funding (fairness).
- At producer level.
- Public aware of what they are getting (behaviour change).
- Dollars are used for designated fund.
- Product cost reflects full cost of program.
- Adequate return incentives (collection).
- Regulatory backup.
- Formal structure to service delivery.
- Pay for results.
- Flexible implementation/guiding principals.
- Efficiency vs. effectiveness as relates to environmental and economic impact.
- Fee structure shouldn't result in a disincentive for consumers.
- One organization/group responsible for shortfalls.
- Convenience for end product user.
- Visibility of charge – pros and cons – debatable
- Education/awareness/understanding for consumer
- Fee structures to change consumer behaviour (influences deposits behaviour)
- Adequate funds are generated to operate the program.
- Fees structured in a way to influence environmental effectiveness and/or pay to operate program.
- Create blended financing options where appropriate.
- Ensuring funding mechanisms don't make industry noncompetitive.
- Dedicated funds.
- Should encourage return.
- Collect fee prior to disposal stage or collect fee at disposal (fees should be product specific).
- DfE should be considered.
- Simple for consumer to understand.
- Recognize limitations.
- Cost effective.
- Mechanism should be variable over time (up/down).
- Recognize regional differences, populations, accompanying issues.
- Level playing field.
- Capture “virtual” transactions – no free riders – IT stewardship – recognize role of Federal and Provincial government.
- Fee visibility – perception of a tax.
- Level playing field.
- Designated for a specific EPR program.
- Funds dedicated – surplus to trust funds, not general revenue.
- Self-sustaining.
- Easy application.
- Audit-able.
- Efficient.
- Visible to consumers – education tool; forces stewardship.
- Politics – acceptable, realistic
- Risk of free-riders.
- Level playing field across industry (sectors).
- Clear program objectives and goals.
- Funding mechanisms must work towards – environmental, economic and social goals. Linking producer responsibility with all sustainable development goals.
- Clear goals – link mechanisms.
- Local considerations
- Economic goals – that disadvantage.
- Local businesses.
- Not possible to capture all details in this setting: re: very complicated issue.
- General statement: choice of funding mechanisms determined by point of intervention in lifecycle (maximizing leverage re: most efficient).

**3.4: Other relevant questions/issues you'd like to raise re: funding mechanisms?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
- N/A	- N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Accountability</li> <li>- Not-for-profit, are consumers paying too much? Funds should not be treated as profits.</li> <li>- How to control size of levy?</li> <li>- Dedicated funds (used as intended) – environmental trust-fund</li> <li>- Keep eye on goal – reserves may be essential to cover off fluctuating markets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May need to broaden playing field</li> <li>- Must not disadvantage a product by the funding mechanism (packaging), e.g., beer cans – consumption drops</li> <li>- Will the funding mechanisms change the behaviours of (a) producer? (b) consumer?</li> <li>- Does the mechanism allocate the responsibilities?</li> </ul>	- N/A	- N/A

## Session 4 – EPR GOVERNANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY

### 4.1: How do you know if a program is working?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Waste composition study (starting point, continually monitor)</li> <li>- Is it meeting its objectives? (environmental, economic, &amp; social)</li> <li>- Public surveys – is program important? Is program working? (qualitative &amp; quantitative)</li> <li>- Percentage recovery (product specific)</li> <li>- Is public actually participating?</li> <li>- Cost effectiveness</li> <li>- Level of flak (consumers)</li> <li>- Evolving, developing &amp; integrating with other programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Return rates</li> <li>- Diversion rates</li> <li>- Cost efficiencies</li> <li>- Consumer interest &amp; support</li> <li>- Lack of complaints</li> <li>- Industry is engaged</li> <li>- Participation levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of complaints</li> <li>- Volume of materials collected</li> <li>- Measures in place</li> <li>- Goals for the program</li> <li>- Business &amp; market development</li> <li>- Staff buy-in</li> <li>- Citizen buy in and understanding</li> <li>- Cooperation between stewards</li> <li>- Financial stability</li> <li>- Not a lot of bureaucracy to supervise</li> <li>- Innovation and responsive to change</li> <li>- New product design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Public awareness</li> <li>- Diversion targets</li> <li>- Return rates</li> <li>- Improved product design (DfE)</li> <li>- Sustainability (regulatory, financial/ accountability)</li> <li>- No political interference</li> <li>- Decrease in municipal costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It's not out of money</li> <li>- High recovery rate</li> <li>- Annual reports (accountability, measure, transparency)</li> <li>- Convenience for users</li> <li>- Achieving objectives</li> <li>- Low unit cost of diversion</li> <li>- Ongoing involvement with industry stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsibility of producer?</li> <li>- Producer responsible/ behaviour as a result of EPR program (behaviour modification for less waste)</li> <li>- Change in product design or better recovery</li> <li>- Time lag – paradigm shift</li> </ul>

**4.2: How do we ensure transparent (accountable) PROs (including ensuring program revenues are dedicated to original purpose)?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inclusive/open</li> <li>- Broad governance structure</li> <li>- Steward to Minister</li> <li>- Delivers of program needs to be accountable (funding, objectives)</li> <li>- Stakeholders input through process, program (interim reporting)</li> <li>- Annual and bi-annual reports (public)</li> <li>- Third party independent auditing (financial &amp; performance)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transparency: people can get information easily, money trail tracked</li> <li>- Proper definition of EPR</li> <li>- Governance standards, auditing, board structure, public access, reporting, etc. – conformance (e.g., TSE)</li> <li>- Compliance: regulation &amp; enforcement</li> <li>- Reporting</li> <li>- Performance measurement</li> <li>- Education of board members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Composition of the Board (NGO representation)</li> <li>- Audited financial statements</li> <li>- Product specific</li> <li>- Transparency/public disclosure, information available to the public (“Follow the field &amp; follow the dollars.”)</li> <li>- Regulation: Business plan review process; Designated producer responsibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual report</li> <li>- “Transparent” = full disclosure</li> <li>- Financial audits for public organizations</li> <li>- Consumer understanding of cost</li> <li>- Public representation on management boards (also market representation on board)</li> <li>- Government reps on boards shouldn’t have voting privileges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal framework (agreement, regulations)</li> <li>- Visible fee vs. hidden fee</li> <li>- Shift in responsibility back to producer so they redesign product</li> <li>- Show there is additional charges</li> <li>- Reporting: public vs. producer</li> <li>- Understand disposal methods and reporting for disposal</li> <li>- Access to information (regulations)</li> <li>- Access to data &amp; audits (results &amp; achievements of recycling rates)</li> <li>- Legislative process</li> <li>- Accountability to legislature and to membership</li> </ul>

**4.3: What new models/governance features are people embarking on that might be effective?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key stakeholder and independent members at large (1/3) of people sit on the board (NAVCAN)</li> <li>- Project by project basis ensure right people involved</li> <li>- Dual accountability (NRCAN)</li> <li>- Training of board members on governance</li> <li>- Boards govern &amp; manager manages</li> <li>- Both multi and single product boards exist</li> <li>- Stakeholders representation needs to be fair</li> <li>- Broad (umbrella) stakeholder board, with single product boards under it</li> <li>- Stakeholder must include private, public &amp; community sectors</li> <li>- Stakeholders need to have appropriate support (equity)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advanced disposal fee</li> <li>- Eco taxes</li> <li>- Western Canadian Oil Program</li> <li>- Voluntary agreements, e.g., AB, NS</li> <li>- Trade-able credits</li> <li>- Producer Resp Org vs. multi-stakeholder stewardship board</li> <li>- Industry audit and participation , e.g., SWICO system</li> <li>- WDO model, e.g., ON</li> <li>- Design for environment</li> <li>- Refillable containers</li> <li>- Voluntary stewardship</li> <li>- CPIC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nav. Canada Model: non-share capital (n.f.p., TSE &amp; board structure) representative board within corporate structure</li> <li>- E.g., Gasoline – government regulation in market system resulting in environmental benefit</li> <li>- beer industry refillables (not new but good industry standard) – commercial &amp; environmental policy together</li> <li>- leasing rather than buying (service rather than product)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Durables – collecting \$ for future disposal; insurance secured money</li> <li>- Inclusion of social mandate(s), e.g., employment of disabled persons</li> <li>- Representation of special interest groups</li> <li>- Cultural – First Nations consensus approach</li> <li>- “Big picture” approach: strategic, ISWM, Multi-year</li> <li>- Plan, holistic – DfE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leasing products (e.g., Xmas tree, carpet)</li> <li>- Advisory groups               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides forum, encourages dialogue with stakeholders</li> <li>- Allow interest groups to be heard</li> <li>- Mutual respect between advisory group and industry</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Trust funds ensures money is used for programs (i.e., stewardship programs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requirements of organization to submit stewardship plans (elements of what they will address)</li> <li>- Import foreign products (How do you get at the issue?)</li> <li>- Standards: reporting easier to compare across jurisdictions</li> <li>- Communication of info to public/industry</li> <li>- Keep focused on sustainable development</li> <li>- Efficiency of program</li> <li>- One responsible party vs. many</li> <li>- One responsible party = efficiency and ease</li> </ul>

**4.4: How can we improve accountability through stakeholders involvement and commitment?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appropriate breadth of stakeholder</li> <li>- Boards at governance level</li> <li>- Independent audits</li> <li>- The more successful programs are the more difficult it is to get stakeholder involvement</li> <li>- Willingness to work with stakeholder groups (not only reps) when making decisions</li> <li>- Interagency trust</li> <li>- Boards can help remove political element</li> <li>- Support for stakeholders to ensure ability to participate</li> <li>- Early involvement of stakeholders</li> <li>- Embrace new opportunities for communication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stakeholder advisory committee and board</li> <li>- Eliminate cross subsidization by product</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensuring you know who stakeholders are</li> <li>- Include “watchdogs” (lesser involved stakeholders) and ensure involvement and influence</li> <li>- Education of board</li> <li>- Clear goals and objectives and board acceptance &amp; commitment</li> <li>- Financial/physical contributions</li> <li>- Strategic planning</li> <li>- Board effectiveness and clarity of roles</li> <li>- Inclusion of all players</li> <li>- Regular audit check of boards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regulation</li> <li>- Early involvement</li> <li>- Funding for some stakeholders, NGO’s</li> <li>- Diverse Board composition</li> <li>- Clear responsibility to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Industry</li> <li>- Legislative review</li> <li>- Audit process</li> <li>- Assigned at the outset</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Role of government &amp; relationship between government &amp; PROs</li> <li>- Opportunity for private, “for-profit” corporations to become PROs</li> <li>- Develop/establish guidelines and best practices on accountability measures (e.g., How stewardship boards should operate.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Producer should show responsibility (have down loaded responsibility)</li> <li>- Shift responsibility back to producer</li> <li>- Voluntary program</li> <li>- Building relationships</li> <li>- Performance targets, measures &amp; reporting</li> <li>- Standards for volunteer programs – be as rigorous as mandatory programs</li> <li>- Third party involvement</li> <li>- External audit (standard)</li> <li>- Rewards program (improve accountability in stewardship program)</li> </ul>

**4.5: What challenges exist in gauging and comparing EPR program performance?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standardized data</li> <li>- Need to be able to compare multi-product &amp; single product programs (commonalties in objectives) (all in the context of the 3Rs for example)</li> <li>- Comparing country data very difficult</li> <li>- Must recognize different provinces have different objectives, not comparable</li> <li>- Public &amp; proprietary data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Differing goals/ objectives between provinces</li> <li>- Existing regulations differ</li> <li>- Ability to adjust programs design to improve performance (in a non-statutory &amp; timely way) – must enable change</li> <li>- differing infrastructures</li> <li>- lack of consistency in reporting</li> <li>- agreement in what we're counting &amp; how goals are set</li> <li>- communication between directors/jurisdictions</li> <li>- lack of mentoring</li> <li>- need to approach nationally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of reliable information/standards</li> <li>- Politics</li> <li>- No formal process to do so</li> <li>- Lack of performance indicators</li> <li>- Lack of environmental management standard integrated into process</li> </ul>

#### 4.6: Overall, how can we improve EPR accountability and measurement?

*(Combined responses)*

- Environmental audits.
- Annual reports.
- Transparency.
- Multi-stakeholders.
- Backdrop regulatory framework  
OR
- Voluntary agreements
  - Goals
  - Mandate
  - Targets
- Business plans.
- Stakeholder involvement (empowered and accountable).
- Harmonization (program).
- Transparent reporting.
- Accountability to stakeholders and government.
- Measurable waste reduction objectives – quantitative, qualitative.
- Measure, report on outcomes.
- Fair and open government structure.
- Rewards program
  - Encourage a shift
  - Tax subsidies
  - Recognition
- Formal communication structure for PRO's to communication back to producers.
- Focus on redesign.
- A way to compare, i.e. costs and benefits.
- Standard reporting mechanism.
- The right stakeholders are included in process.
- Full voting members, multi-stakeholders.
- Accountability framework model, e.g., WDO, Director of Liability
- De-couple political culture from science.
- Consistent reporting standards.
- Clear objectives with buy-in.
- Community of interests see into EPR program and how it works – resulting in influence.
- Open to scrutiny.
- Transparent to consumer.
- Education to consumer.
- Visibility of levies (issues/debate).
- Jail and fines big enough – defined penalties.
- Reward changes in behaviour.
  - \$\$
  - Tax credits
  - Public recognition.
- Standardized measurement(s)
- Financial
- Physical flow
- Established baseline(s).
- Remittances on specific products.
- Definitions of terminology.
- Sourcing public and private data
- Comparability
- Compliance
- Independent auditing
  - System quality
  - ISO 14001
  - Financial
  - Social
- Ensure representation of regulated party (and EG: retailers)
- Measurable targets (realistic targets).
- Program specific benchmarks (current).
- Effective implementation of change.
- Industry must be leaders of change – being proactive vs reactive.
- Watch/monitor quality of end product.
- Developing methods to quantify/measure environmental quality (improvement) of a product (DfE).
- Measure environmental benefits / against recovery costs.

**4.7: Other relevant questions/issues you'd like to raise re: measurement, governance and accountability?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
- N/A	- N/A	- N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EPA super-fund: fund historical past, environmental liabilities</li> <li>- Training &amp; standards (pro's &amp; staff)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarity &amp; role of government &amp; stakeholder needs to be established</li> <li>- Public user complaints/ criticism effective measure of program success, i.e. user approval</li> <li>- There are cases in which Industry has taken full stewardship responsibility. Should they be completely transparent or should they be left alone?</li> <li>- "cases" – material/ situation specific</li> </ul>	- N/A

## Session 5 – EPR APPROACHES & PARTNERSHIPS

### Part A - Partnerships

#### 5A.1: What are the barriers to cooperation at various levels?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify which stakeholder can add most value (group would judge)</li> <li>- Cost</li> <li>- Markets</li> <li>- Jurisdictional (different reg)</li> <li>- Some come to table willing, others are pushed or do not have to come. (lack of backdrop legislation, no level playing field)</li> <li>- Different assumptions/positions (e.g., concept of shared responsibility is one body responsible?)</li> <li>- Companies' cultural &amp; philosophical differences</li> <li>- Competing interest of stakeholders (in areas of governance, administration, &amp; treatment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mistrust between industry, NGOs (previous history, grudges)</li> <li>- Thinking in terms of blame</li> <li>- Different agendas</li> <li>- Economic reasons</li> <li>- Funding – who pays? (champions at high level)</li> <li>- Clarity of roles, goals, transparency</li> <li>- Lack of common vision</li> <li>- Cultural differences</li> <li>- Time</li> <li>- Lack of recognition of potential benefits (obligation to shareholders)</li> <li>- Internal bureaucracy within companies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Trust</li> <li>- Common understanding</li> <li>- Information on the table</li> <li>- Common goals &amp; objectives</li> <li>- Empathize with different positions</li> <li>- Acknowledging cost of programs                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education re: cost of programs</li> <li>- recognition of all costs – financial &amp; environmental</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Consider all options and all points of view (manufacturer, consumer, municipal, etc.)</li> <li>- Reduce fear of change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Established systems</li> <li>- Conflicting objectives</li> <li>- Trust/distrust – history, prior experience</li> <li>- Personalities</li> <li>- Turf/control</li> <li>- Lack of commitment, motivation</li> <li>- Resource imbalance</li> <li>- Lack of mandate(s) or authority</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Different priorities for why EPR programs set up</li> <li>- Different agendas</li> <li>- Different revenue sources &amp; ideologies</li> <li>- Differences between provinces: population, geography, demographics, &amp; different systems</li> <li>- Regionally based industries – regionally based stakeholders</li> <li>- Existing infrastructure</li> <li>- Different levels of political will – bureaucracy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of open communication</li> <li>- Lack of trust</li> <li>- Culture/politics</li> <li>- No agreement on baseline data &amp; scope of the problem</li> <li>- Disagreement of outcome</li> <li>- To identify the right stakeholder and undertake outreach to establish relationships and share information</li> </ul> <p><i>Other issues:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objective of EPR?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Could be many</li> <li>- \$, waste diversion, DfE</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Residential vs. total waste stream</li> <li>- What should industry be accountable for?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expectations/ support required</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**5A.2: What are the benefits of larger scale coordinated approaches?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Efficiency</li> <li>- Economy of scale</li> <li>- Avoid patchwork quilt approach</li> <li>- Lower transaction costs and lower administrative costs</li> <li>- Assurance of supply</li> <li>- Create opportunities</li> <li>- Provincial template approach to reduce duplication of effort</li> <li>- Avoid pitfalls</li> <li>- Drive innovation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sharing of some expenses</li> <li>- Eliminates potential for product fraud</li> <li>- Provides scale – increases economic value</li> <li>- Similar rules</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cost reduction</li> <li>- Consistency – message to public</li> <li>- Economies of scale (producer, consumer, waste management system)</li> <li>- One set of rules (regulatory, operational)</li> <li>- Collection efficiencies</li> <li>- CCME – potential leadership role?</li> <li>- Proactive industry leadership &amp; initiation (oil, electronics)</li> <li>- Lack of inter-provincial communication is an issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Synergy</li> <li>- Economies of scale</li> <li>- Uniformity</li> <li>- Level playing field</li> <li>- Enhanced market power</li> <li>- Flexibility</li> <li>- Consistent measurement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Economies of scale, less administrative costs</li> <li>- Standards</li> <li>- Convenience to the consumer</li> <li>- Efficiencies/cost</li> <li>- Building capacity &amp; infrastructure</li> <li>- Unification in approaching industry</li> </ul>

### 5A.3: What have we learned about designing and implementing joint efforts/partnerships and ensuring greater consistency in EPR?

(Combined responses)

- Communication of goals and objectives up-front.
- Clear and quantifiable.
- Stakeholder consultation (meaningful)
- Model on successes.
- Put DfE in goals.
- For voluntary agreements build in consensus.
- Clearly defined process, meeting frequency, timelines.
- Need for commitment.
- Understand the drivers of different parties.
- Companies will verbally buy-in, but want to make \$ and do not want to be told what to do. Must build in & monitor incentives.
- Community Enterprises – rural areas, keep on top of environmental issues.
- Find best model for circumstances (may be a mix of solutions).
- Have both industry and municipalities at the table (model which works).
- On-going financial assistance and training (comprehensive support).
- Clear understanding of financial sustainability.
- Consult with industry in adequate fashion.
- Include participatory model. (All partners there before starting design.)
- Mutually agree on objective.
- Need to be flexible, e.g., different ways to obtain objectives.
- Communication – planned/formal and intrinsic in the approach.
- Require regulatory backdrop.
- Gap analysis:
  - Perform, i.e., data front and back end.
- Infrastructure
  - Capacity building.
- Consensus may not be needed but need to work towards.
- Target industry leaders first and then smaller players to build momentum.
- Unclear objectives i.e. goal orientation.
- DfE – is this an objective?
- I.D. of outcomes hoping to drive.
- Commitment of government, i.e. targets and plans.
- Recognize industry as the experts who know what they can/can't do.
- Buy-in from industry/senior management.
- Rudimentary business plan – help industry – show logical process.
- Network between government and industry associations to assist industry to increase EPR activity.
- Win/win situation (make it).
  - Build unanimous stakeholder support.
- Individual negotiations may not lead to consistent results.
- Leverage to negotiate.
- Agreement and acceptance of clear goals.
- Must still acknowledge local concerns.
- Regulatory level must include inducements for partnerships.
- Regulator can't create partnerships.
- Sharing results in lowered costs – critical mass needed.
- It takes time!
- Clear objectives.
- Define responsibilities.
- Listen clearly to partner (clarify).
- Research previous successful model (or failures).
- Seek leadership – 'champion'.
- Identify and involve all involved stakeholders.
- The waste is "ours", society's.
- Communicating.
- Requires \$ and resources.
- Transparency – very important for consistency → inclusive (e.g., Ontario Waste Diversion – communication process of requirements needs, inclusive of all parties.
- Takes a long time to do things across jurisdictions.
- Save \$, efficiency lowered administration costs.
- Understanding roles is crucial.
- Eliminate a layer of government.
- Dialogue between stakeholders is essential.
- Leadership is needed.
- Successful regional programs can be applied/expanded to larger, national programs.

#### *Other Relevant Issues:*

- Need for quality international information (info from internet).
- Necessary to be able to compare apples to apples.
- Need presenters to be able to share the good, the bad and the ugly (even through it is difficult).
- No one group can do this alone.

**Part B - Inter-jurisdictional**

**5B.1: What aspects of EPR lend themselves to inter-jurisdictional cooperation and why?**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consistency, measurement</li> <li>- Fairness</li> <li>- Life cycle analysis</li> <li>- Labeling for efficiency</li> <li>- Marketing and communication of programs</li> <li>- Efficiency: labeling, marketing, communication, reduced costs, public education, more effective &amp; systematic</li> <li>- Sharing success and knowledge</li> <li>- Creating a level playing field across country (regional variation)</li> <li>- Product specific</li> <li>- DfE (enabled by scale)</li> <li>- Environmental effectiveness creates economic opportunity and reduced costs</li> <li>- Global harmonization (Canada participating)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Product</li> <li>- Development of markets, R&amp; D, information sharing, training &amp; mentoring</li> <li>- Creating a pool of managerial talent</li> <li>- Uniform descriptions of designated materials</li> <li>- Level of toxicity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Common products</li> <li>- Industry driven programs                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of governmental intervention</li> <li>- HRAI</li> <li>- CPIC = pesticide containers</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Threat of legislation/ regulation</li> <li>- Sector specific: controlled substances, fewer companies in the sector (e.g., used oil in MB, SK, AB vs. BC. QC, ON)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Industry wants uniformity</li> <li>- Affects industry's ability to perform</li> <li>- Industry can become the driver, e.g., IT waste issue</li> <li>- Addressing trade barriers across jurisdictions</li> <li>- Formal dialogue</li> <li>- Leadership from federal government &amp; CCME (also from Canadian Federation of Municipalities)</li> <li>- Communication between jurisdictions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Same producers, same products</li> <li>- Similar goals</li> <li>- Waste dangerous goods: same issue, provincially &amp; federally regulated</li> <li>- More efficient shipping &amp; handling</li> <li>- Classification of what is a hazardous waste – potential barrier to the recycling and processing, lots of debate</li> <li>- Federally regulated products (more)</li> </ul>

## 5B.2: What are some practical steps to improving inter-jurisdictional cooperation (including communication) for EPR?

*(Combined responses)*

- New national working group or body to take leadership role.
- Sharing of information and successes.
- Product specific action plan (choose a winner).
- Establish consistent measurement.
- Bottom-up empowerment of national body.
- Increase dialogue.
- Send expert staff.
- Including NGOs.
- Need consistency across jurisdictions (do not want to derail any EPR programs).
- A better shared understanding and communication
- Knowledge sharing in non-threatening forums (eg. this conference).
  - National/International
  - Public, Private and Community Sectors (Gain different perspectives and new ideas.)
- Early and broad engagement.
- Broad waste management framework (CCME play role).
- Good model – “charge up for recycle”.
- Must look at variety of parameters for consistency (eg. regional, environmental).
- Inter-jurisdictional cooperation.
- National program needed.
- National program stake a long time to organize and implement.
- Pilot projects important (regional basis).
- CATRA – helps to identify how areas can work together and acknowledge areas that cannot be dealt with jointly.
- Requires administrative/ organizational mechanism/forum.
- Right people must be involved (those with working knowledge of processes).
- Need for associations.
- Umbrella (flexible), national organization (PRO) with smaller regional/provincial groups (carry out actual programs/projects).
- Be engaged with CCME level to address the issue.
- Informal sharing across jurisdictions and formal mechanisms to communicate.
- Involve decision makers (need) – political level.
- Briefing up chair of communications – provincial and federal departments to ministerial level.
- I.D. body for leadership, ie. create, needs a home (CCME, federal or new).
- Communication.
- Formal mechanisms for information exchange to build or ensure consistency and create a common approach.
- Supportive framework for EPR to get buy-in and get buy in for EPR and S.D. in general.
- Cultural Shift
  - From throw away to ethic
  - Education and action
  - Unless infrastructure is in place it is difficult to get a shift.
  - Green procurement model key government.
- Should create a Canadian association of (EPR) stewardship organizations.
- Analysis to determine roles.
- Use of learn from existing national (ie. Canadian Chamber of Commerce).
- Clearing house for database.
- Expand CCME role:
  - Policy
  - Guidelines
  - Information (Existing water information sharing is an example.)
- Role of industry - Advocate
  - EPR
  - National harmonization.
- Expand EPR networks.
- Formal dialogue between groups.
- Engaged national and regional associations.
- Addressing trade barriers.
- Making sure all levels of government are involved.
- Making use of current informational technology, ie. internet, email, chat lines – to share information.
- National conference (2-3 years) – Should be open to public, not invitation only
- Historical context of conferences made available to anyone.
- Moderated forums on a regular basis, eg. internet conferencing; info list serves; chat lines; networks. eg. Resource Conservation Waste Minimization Website (Ontario).
- Useful site to be made/designed for the summer 2002.
- Need funding allocated to look at bigger picture & to administration.