In December 2004, the Minister of the Environment designated WEEE as a program material under the Waste Diversion Act and directed that the program be 100% funded by the industry (brand owners, first importers, franchisors, and assemblers) of electronic goods to pay for program costs. Staff participated in the consultation processes for the plan.

In September 2007 the Ontario Electronic Stewardship (OES), the Industry Funding Organization (IFO), was established to implement the WEEE Program Plan. The Phase 1 Plan was to address desktop and portable computers, computer peripherals, monitors, printers, fax machines and televisions. Phase 2, which also involved the consolidation with Phase 1 and includes the addition of telephones, cameras and audiovisual equipment, was approved in August, 2009. The program is intended to provide for the reduction, reuse and recycling of WEEE in all sectors including
residential and Industrial Commercial and Institutional (ICI), promote the program and shift costs to the industry.

The funding for municipal WEEE collection programs was set at $165 per tonne.

**Municipal Considerations**

Although staff supports any efforts to reduce the amount of WEEE going to landfill, there are expectations that the manufacturers of WEEE goods will continue to research and develop products that can be more readily reused or recycled.

This program plan is a step towards full Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), however, consideration has not be satisfactory regarding the ability of municipalities to accommodate the program with existing infrastructure, staffing and administrative resources relative to the funding of $165 per tonne. The City’s Community Recycling Centres cannot accommodate the sorting, packaging and transfer requirements without capital investments. This is further complicated by the need to ensure the safety of the public while dropping off WEEE materials.

**WEEE Program Costs**

The collection requirements and related costs are the main reasons that the City has not registered to be a collection agent for the program. OES has established that collection agents, including municipalities like Hamilton, will be paid $165 per tonne of electronics collected if the materials are collected and stored in the method prescribed by the program.

Based on 2008 tonnage data the City’s current program costs to collect and dispose of electronics at the CRCs is $238 per tonne. In order to meet the program requirements, these costs would be increased at an amount greater than the revenue received, thus offsetting any benefits from the $165 per tonne funding.

Table 1 illustrates the costs of the City’s current program compared with the WEEE Program Costs. Net operating costs would increase from $238 to $876 per tonne.

**Table 1 - Comparative Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Program Cost</th>
<th>WEEE Program Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection, Disposal, and Processing costs per year *</td>
<td>$141,134</td>
<td>$116,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing costs per year</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>$286,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (capital one time cost)</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$141,134</strong></td>
<td><strong>$432,228</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for Program from OES per year **</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$68,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$141,134</strong></td>
<td><strong>$363,737</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Cost per Tonne</strong></td>
<td><strong>$238</strong></td>
<td><strong>$876</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 593 tonnes of electronics collected in 2008
** Assume 70% of WEEE is Phase 1 which equals 415 tonnes

**Conclusion**

The City supports Waste Diversion Ontario's waste diversion initiatives, however, has not registered as a collection agent for the WEEE Diversion Program due to the
concerns and issues outlined in this report. More specifically space limitations at
CRCs, potential capital financing requirements, insufficient cost recovery, and the
operating costs associated with additional staffing and equipment are remaining
obstacles to participating in this program.

Staff will continue to monitor the progress of this plan and communicate the need for
greater flexibility and adequate compensation.

The contents of this report have been reviewed and are supported by the Solid Waste
Management Master Plan Steering Committee.
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