who is the product stewardship institute?
some of our partners and advisory council members:
our goal

reduce the health & environmental impacts of products across their lifecycle
product stewardship vs. EPR

- Product stewardship
- Manufacturer ("producer") responsibility
- Other government regulatory programs
- Voluntary programs
- Mandatory programs (e.g., EPR)
voluntary + mandatory programs in CT

- electronics (2007)
- paint (2011)
- thermostats (2012)
- mattresses (2013)
U.S. EPA data: 1960 – 2013
PPP generation + recycling

PPP includes:
- paper/cardboard
- glass
- metals
- plastics

packaging* recycling
europe vs. USA 2011

Source: PSI modification of chart from the Extended Producer Responsibility Alliance (EXPRA)

*Data does not include printed paper
current system is...

• **too narrowly focused** on single-family homes
  • insufficient collection from multi-family residences
  • insufficient collection from commercial/institutional sources
  • insufficient “away from home” collection

• **inefficient, fragmented** infrastructure
  • patchwork of municipal/private collection
CT barriers to material recovery
state + local

current system is...

• inconsistent

• lacks participation from CT citizens
  • public outreach efforts vary greatly

• dependent on local tax base + willingness to spend tax $$
  • recycling vs. police officers? vs. teachers?

• challenged by annual budget cycles
  • difficult to plan/invest long-term
  • may not be able to respond to changing commodity prices

• system is reactive to material changes by brand owners
the opportunity: significantly increase material recovery
strategic options

- regulatory efforts
- voluntary initiatives

OPTIMIZATION

full EPR

shared responsibility

GAME CHANGERS

reward

risk

Product Stewardship Institute
EPR for PPP in CT

- legislative oversight
  - define scope of packaging and printed materials
  - require producer financed + managed system
  - performance targets by material

- CT DEEP oversight
  - plan submitted to agency for approval
  - create level playing field, reduced government role
  - funded by administrative fees from PROs

- funding designated to PROs, not general fund
PPP scope

• no universal definition
• CT can customize scope in the law
• in most cases residential MSW only
• example - british columbia PPP definition
  • all packaging generated by a residential consumer
  • printed paper includes all paper used for communication (incl. phonebooks)
EPR for PPP benefits

• opportunity for increased recovery
• cost savings for government – 50% to 100%
• eliminates municipal patchwork
• can improve material quality
• not subject to uncertainty of municipal budgets
• creates incentive for waste reduction
packaging EPR in 2015

Source: EPI, 2015
u.s. stakeholder perspectives

all want a **cost-effective system** that results in an **increased** supply of **high quality** materials
many stakeholders are needed to design + implement successful EPR system

- state + local governments
- consumer packaged goods
- retailers
- waste + materials management industry
- commodity associations
- environmental groups + others

key stakeholders
stakeholder considerations

• concerns over maintaining/improving service levels in relation to current system
• transitioning to EPR – local collection + recycling infrastructure
• who owns the material?
• how to address stranded public assets?
packaging design policies in EPR systems
### Packaging Design/EPR PET Example

In France, Belgium, and Ontario, the PRO charges less for clear/blue PET than for colored PET.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Clear/Blue PET Fee (USD)</th>
<th>Colored PET Fee (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>$0.0082</td>
<td>$0.009 (plus unit fee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>$0.0038</td>
<td>$0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>$0.0037</td>
<td>$0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** EPI, 2015
packaging design/EPR

glass example

- **japan** obligated companies are charged three times more for colored glass compared to clear and amber glass
- **ontario** one PRO charges lower fees for clear glass compared to colored glass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jurisdiction</th>
<th>clear glass fee (USD)</th>
<th>colored glass fee (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>japan</td>
<td>$0.003</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ontario, canada</td>
<td>$0.007</td>
<td>$0.0121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EPI, 2015
disruptor materials & eco-design incentives in france

- packaging that presents problems for recycling stream incur additional fees
  - glass packaging with ceramic or porcelain cap +50% fee
  - plastic PET bottles containing aluminum (labels, plugs, caps, inks), using PVC sleeves, or silicone +50% fee
  - packaging paper and cardboard reinforced with polyester +50% fee
  - non-recoverable packaging or packing with sorting instructions but no recycling stream (stoneware, PVC and PLA bottles) +100% fee

- packaging that is eco-designed receives discounts
  - 8% discount for the use of on-pack labeling
  - 8% discount for source reduction

Source: EPI, 2015
**examples of existing EPR programs funding schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jurisdiction</th>
<th>producer funding</th>
<th>government funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ontario</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saskatchewan</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manitoba</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quebec</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>british columbia</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: PSI Summary Report, 2014*
full vs. shared EPR

control and cost
(control = ownership of material + decision making power)

full = producers have control and pay all

shared = producers pay some, taxpayers pay some, control is divided
policies working together
PAYT + bottle bill + EPR
policies working together

**bottle bill + EPR**

- container deposit systems implemented prior to EPR law generally remain intact
- areas where deposit systems and EPR work together
  - austria, belgium, germany, netherlands, british columbia, quebec
policies working together

**PAYT + EPR**

- european countries with EPR + mandatory PAYT
  - belgium
  - france
  - germany
- PAYT incentivizes behavior to recycle, thereby increasing participating in the EPR program
  - residents are ultimately the ones who will help brand owners meet their recovery goals

Source: PSI Summary Report, 2014
roles + responsibilities

- State government: Recycling policies
- Local government: Recycling policies
- Producers: EPR, PAYT
- Consumer: PAYT
sustainability today

zero waste

cradle to cradle

producer responsibility

circular economy
thank you!

scott cassel
founder + ceo
617.236.4822
scott@productstewardship.us

www.productstewardship.us