



**Report from the NGO Strategy Meeting on
Campaigning for Extended Producer Responsibility
for Electrical and Electronic Waste**



**Prepared by Iza Kruszewska
International Co-ordinator ANPED
Northern Alliance for Sustainability**

June 1999

This NGO Strategy meeting was made possible by the generous funding provided by the EU's DGXI and the Dutch Environment Ministry, VROM

Contents

<i>Report from the NGO Strategy Meeting on Campaigning for Extended Producer Responsibility for Electrical and Electronic Waste</i>	0
<i>1. Introduction</i>	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Programme.....	1
1.3 Goals of the Strategy Meeting.....	2
<i>2. Sharing Information - Industry Perspectives</i>	3
2.1 Perspectives on EPR from a Producer.....	3
2.2 Attitudes towards the WEEE Directive from different players in the sector.....	3
2.3 Implementation of the Dutch EPR law for WEEE	5
<i>3. Sharing Information - NGO Perspectives</i>	7
3.1 The Hazards of the IT Industry and why we should focus on computers.....	7
3.2 The relevance of the Greenpeace trans-Atlantic toy campaign.....	9
3.3 Update on the WEEE Directive	10
3.4 Ideas to Move Forward on EPR - National Reports.....	11
3.4.1 Poland.....	11
3.4.2 Eire.....	12
3.4.3 Canada.....	13
3.4.4 United Kingdom	13
3.4.5 USA.....	13
3.4.6 Sweden.....	13
 <i>The report of Day Two is not available to those who did not attend this second day</i>	
<i>4. Day Two - Preparing Strategies</i>	15
4.1 Overview of the themes from yesterday	15
4.2 Campaign Ideas.....	15
4.3 Open Discussion: What are the campaign targets?.....	16
4.4 Working groups	18
4.4.1 Group 1 - Political Strategy	18
4.4.2 Group 2: Market Strategy	18
<i>5. Work Plan</i>	20
<i>6. Fund Raising</i>	20
<i>7. Other Business</i>	20
<i>Annex A: Agenda of NGO Strategy Meeting on Extended Producer Responsibility</i>	21
<i>Annex B: Participants list</i>	23
<i>Annex C: Overheads used by presentation Mr. G. Krol of Hewlett packard</i>	0
<i>The Northern Alliance for Sustainability</i>	0

1. Introduction

The strategy meeting was organised by ANPED, The Northern Alliance for Sustainability, in Soesterberg, the Netherlands, 13-15 May 1999. It brought together 17 NGOs and academics from Europe and North America. (See Annex B: Participants' List)

Although five guest speakers from different parts of the electronics industry confirmed their participation in the first day of the meeting, only one industry representative from Hewlett Packard actually attended. This is unfortunate, because his presentations and input into the discussions were invaluable. Clearly, the participation of representatives from other sectors of the electronics industry, including the recycling sector, would have contributed positively to this meeting. Apologies from: Brian Atkins, Panasonic; Andrew Baynes, Sony Europe; Jill Ransome, Dell and Claire Snow, ICER (Industry Council for Electronics Recycling).

1.1 Background

At a recent NGO conference, *From Consumer Society to Sustainable Society: Towards Sustainable Production and Consumption* co-organised by ANPED, workshops were held to examine the role of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) in moving towards Clean Production.

Beverley Thorpe from Clean Production Action (Canada) and Ted Smith from Campaign for Responsible Technology (US) presented the emerging **Clean Computer Campaign** (CCC) in North America and invited participants from Europe to join. Its focus is on using producer's responsibility for clean product design (i.e. beyond recycling) and for take-back of computers at the end of their life. The CCC wants to use the opportunities in Europe, created by the forthcoming EU Directive on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) to work together with groups in Europe.

Several NGOs from Western and Central-Eastern Europe subsequently expressed an interest in taking part in such a campaign. ANPED has taken on the role of co-ordinator and fund-raiser, as well as committed to organising a follow-up strategy meeting - the subject of this report.

1.2 Programme

The 2-day meeting was opened on Thursday evening with an introduction from all the participants.

Day One, Friday was used for presenting and distilling information. The morning included presentations by Gerhard Krol from Hewlett Packard and Tim Cooper from Sheffield Hallam University, Centre for Sustainable Consumption. Tim kindly filled in for the industry representatives who had let us down, by giving an overview on the problems of the WEEE Directive from an industry perspective.

In the afternoon, Gerhard Krol presented the practicalities of implementing the Dutch take-back law for WEEE, which came into force in January 1999. Other presentations included: an overview of the hazards associated with computer manufacture, from the US founder of the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition; a presentation from Greenpeace on their trans-Atlantic toy campaign and its relevance to this campaign; as well as an

update on the EU WEEE draft Directive from the Brussels-based EEB. These were followed by with short country overviews of the electr(on)ic sector and ideas for moving forward on EPR from participants from: Poland, Eire, Canada, UK, Sweden and USA.

Day Two was used for preparing strategies. The morning was used to identify the themes coming out of yesterday's presentations and evaluating campaign ideas. This led to the creation of two working groups: one to refine a political strategy and the second, to work on a market strategy. After report-back, the meeting explored fund-raising opportunities and strategies. The meeting ended with a summary of the outcomes of the meeting, the drawing up of a workplan with timelines and commitments from participants for undertaking specific tasks.

The agenda is attached as Annex A.

1.3 Goals of the Strategy Meeting

The general aims of the meeting were to:

- Establish a common focus of the campaign among participants either merging into one computer campaign or using different product focuses within the electronic sector;
- Better understand who are the leaders in the sector;
- Identify who are the main responsible parties for planned product obsolescence and increasing waste;
- Understand EPR, clean product and service as it relates to the electronic sector;
- Understand what industry wants from NGOs and consumers;
- Better understand what industry can deliver

Specific Goals:

- **Agree specific strategies:**

Political - EU WEEE Directive and World Trade Organisation

Market - consumer awareness-building with respect to toxic substances and material efficiency

- **Draw up workplans with timelines**

Workplans should cover the rest of 1999 and consider: What can we achieve with the resources we have?

- **Agree fund-raising strategy**

2. Sharing Information - Industry Perspectives

This section provides overviews of the presentations from the first day. Additional information and copies overheads from some of the presentations can be found in the annexes, as indicated.

2.1 Perspectives on EPR from a Producer

Gerhard Krol, Hewlett Packard

Hewlett Packard's (HP) environmental statement commits the company to:

- improving energy efficiency;
- providing superior performance with reduced materials; and
- preventing or reducing the environmental impacts through better design

Examples include:

- reducing waste by refurbishing products;
- offering product end-of-life return programmes;
- designing products with recycling in mind. Products are designed for today's recycling technologies, since the technologies available in the future cannot be predicted.

Product stewardship was introduced within HP to standardise procedures within HP.

On waste: Despite increases in eco-efficiency, in 1996-97 production waste increased, due to increase in overall production.

On volatile organic compounds (VOCs), there are no regulations on VOC emissions from the products themselves e.g. laser printers due to heating paper.

On flame retardants (FRs), HP does not like them, but they are needed for product safety. HP is not using brominated FRs and avoiding FRs where possible. HP does not know what alternatives are being used for brominated FRs, since it is the plastics industry, and not the product manufacturer that decides on plastics additives.

On labelling: HP does not like environmental labelling and feels there are already too many labels, each using different specifications e.g. to be awarded Germany's Blue Angel label, a product needs to comply with 65 criteria. Applying for eco-labels is cumbersome and an administrative burden, without the benefits commensurate with the effort. Also, the development of eco-labelling is not keeping up with the pace of technology change. There is a move towards self-declaration e.g. the Nordic countries have a standardised SITO declaration, where the TCO label is the standards.

There was some controversy and discussion around HP's notion that it is not industry that decides what products to produce, but consumers who decide what products to buy. However, in the case of ink cartridges, the point was made that the consumer does not want the new cartridge, just the ink.

Information on industry perspectives on the forthcoming WEEE Directive at the Eurobit web-site: www.eurobit.org

2.2 Attitudes towards the WEEE Directive from different players in the sector

Tim Cooper, University of Sheffield, Hallam

A good overview of the electronics recycling industry's position on the WEEE Directive can be found on the web-site of the Industry Council for Electronics Recycling (ICER): www.icer.org.uk. ICER represents electronics manufacturers, material suppliers and recyclers.

According to ICER, the main objectives of the WEEE Directive are:

- waste prevention;
- re-use and recycling
- minimising risks;
- harmonising national measures

Key problems of the WEEE Directive for industry are:

- a possible loss of profitability as the cost of electronics products increases, prices rise and consumer spending patterns change
- an inherent dislike of regulations, as opposed to voluntary approaches
- genuine concerns about the likelihood of real environmental gains
- the imposed life-cycle responsibility, as historically some companies do not take much interest in products once guarantees run out
- the need to provide information on sales, components and materials, which increases costs and raises concerns about commercial confidentiality.

Why the draft WEEE Directive is flawed according to ICER:

- the scope of coverage too broad – there is no demonstrable benefit from small items such as shavers, toasters and musical socks
- the collection target approach is inappropriate due to variations between countries (the 4kg/head target is already met in the UK)
- the recovery targets are too high – they will prove costly to meet, they are not technically feasible for some products, they will be increasing hard for newer products, there is a need for new recycle markets
- limiting the number of plastics limits the freedom of designers - the function for which the material is intended should take priority over recycling considerations
- there are inconsistencies with EOL Vehicles Directive, in which the targets allow for incineration
- consumers will have to pay more for collection, recycling, redesigning and information provision – the environmental benefits relative to economic costs need to be properly assessed
- different interpretations of the Directive will create barriers to trade, particularly if the cost of collection is borne by local authorities in some countries but not others.

The different sectors within industry have slightly different positions on the Directive. The following gives just a flavour of the different perspectives:

Material Suppliers want incineration included in the targets, at least initially for historic waste. They want baseline data to be collected before targets are set. They oppose the substance bans without a prior risk assessment.

Recyclers want more incentives for the use of recycle. They fear that market distortions could be created by different local authority responses. Re-use and recycling should be distinguished.

Retailers do not see themselves as part of the recycling loop. They do not want responsibility for collection, as consumers do not always discard the end-of-life product at the same time as purchasing a replacement. They oppose the inclusion of small

appliances in the Directive. They oppose recovery targets because the material composition of products changes over time.

Manufacturers do not accept responsibility for historic waste. They believe that the costs associated with the Directive should be visible to the consumer. They argue that global standards, not EU standards, are needed.

The strongest arguments for accepting industry's criticism:

1. **Baseline data is needed before setting targets** (member states should be encouraged to collect data well before 2004)
2. **The collection target of 4kg per head is flawed** (BEUC proposes instead a percentage target of waste discarded per household).
3. The fact that **sale and disposal do not happen at the same time** is self-evident, which limits the role of retailers
4. The fact that **many products cannot be easily be returned to shops** similarly limits the role of retailers
5. The use of **language such as 'similar products' is obviously problematic.**

The strongest arguments for maintaining existing draft Directive:

1. **Small appliances need to be included**, since their short life span leads to the considerable consumer dissatisfaction.
2. **Targets are needed** for specific products to achieve change (however the rationale for the figures chosen needs to be made clear)
3. **The minimum specified recycled plastic content** is needed to stimulate the market and enable the recycling industry to invest.
4. The need to **progress with EU standards** is important, as global negotiations may cause undue delay and result in an unsatisfactory compromise.
5. The **information required of producers is essential** and concern about the cost is unconvincing.
6. **Incineration should not be included within re-use and recycling targets**, although a separate target may be appropriate.

Areas where future debate should focus:

1. Is the feedback mechanism enough to ensure that **the principle of producer responsibility will result in improved design**?
2. What should be the **penalties for non-compliance** if countries do not meet targets?
3. What should happen to **materials which cannot be recycled** e.g. thermoset plastics?
4. Will banned substances be **replaced by alternatives that are certain to be less toxic**?
5. Are the rules concerning **liability for historical waste** satisfactory (especially 'orphan waste')?
6. How will **logistics of recovery and recycling** be established such that the overall environmental impact (i.e. including transport) is minimised?

Responses from Hewlett Packard

- **Historical waste** creates an unknown liability for the company
- The manufacturer cannot be responsible for **collection targets**, since it is consumers who influence this.
- The WEEE Directive attempts to regulate the product, not the substance. Therefore, any **bans on hazardous substances should be addressed horizontally**, not by product sector.

2.3 Implementation of the Dutch EPR law for WEEE

Gerhard Krol, Hewlett Packard

The Netherlands has introduced a new law on EPR for WEEE: since 1 January 1999, all white and brown goods have to be taken back; from 1 January 2000 this will apply also to all small appliances. The law bans land-filling and incineration for WEEE and includes historical waste.

The municipality has to collect all WEEE from the end user, even orphan products. The take-back scheme is funded by a product fee, used for collection of WEEE e.g. US\$12.5 on TVs. Revenues from the up-front fee, paid by the first owners of a product, flow to a foundation for setting up the take-back system and to cover costs of managing orphan products. (See Annex ? for information on the logistics of the Dutch take-back system)

The computer industry did not want a pool system or fees. Manufacturers of PCs want a direct link to end-users. HP sees it as a disadvantage in the Dutch system that producers have taken on responsibility for orphan products. On the issue of plastic recycle, HP tried to use recycle, but the Dutch Environment Ministry (VROM) disagreed due to the content of brominated flame retardants in old plastic. (Today, plastics with brominated FRs are incinerated or downcycled into posts).



all the participants outside the venue

3. Sharing Information - NGO Perspectives

This section provides overviews of the presentations made by NGO participants.

3.1 The Hazards of the IT Industry and why we should focus on computers

Ted Smith, International Campaign for Responsible Technology, USA

Ted Smith presented several overhead slides which made the following points: (each of the following points is illustrated in more detail on the SVTC/I-CRT web site):

1. SVTC was formed in 1982 following the discovery of groundwater contamination at high-tech manufacturing sites in San Jose, Ca --
<http://www.svtc.org/history.htm>
<http://www.svtc.org/mission.htm>
- 2 Why we should focus on computers -
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/news/hiprice.htm>
2. IT is the fastest growing industry in history --
<http://www.svtc.org/slides.htm>
4. High-cost of high-tech -- <http://www.svtc.org/hightech.htm>
<http://www.corpwatch.org/trac/feature/hitech/index.html>
<http://www.svtc.org/dark.htm>
5. Computers are made of various components which are manufactured using many toxic compounds -- <http://www.svtc.org/hightech.htm>
7. Materials used and wastes generated are enormous --
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/larachart.htm>
8. The Materials inventory for a single semiconductor site is huge and very toxic--
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/liquid.htm>
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/inventory.htm>
8. There are many carcinogens used in semiconductor manufacturing --
<http://www.svtc.org/natsem/chem1.jpg>
<http://www.svtc.org/natsem/chem2.jpg>
9. There are also many reproductive hazards used in semiconductor manufacturing --
<http://www.svtc.org/natsem/natsem1.htm#repro>
10. High-tech manufacturing is very innovative and the materials change frequently, but it can take a long time to phase out significant hazards:
 - Toxic timeline to phase out glycol ethers -
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/getime.htm>
 - Activists held a major rally in San Jose to promote CFC phase out at IBM--
<http://www.svtc.org/natsem/ibmad.jpg>

10. And health and safety professionals aren't involved in the design processes --
<http://www.svtc.org/health.htm>
12. The legacy of high-tech pollution is documented in interactive maps on the SVTC web site--
http://www.mapcruzin.com/svtc_ecomaps/
13. The legacy of high-tech water pollution has been documented in the book *Sacred Waters* --
<http://www.svtc.org/execsum.htm>
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/news/study.htm>
14. Global expansion of high-tech production is documented on global maps on the web
<http://www.svtc.org/inttable.htm>
<http://www.svtc.org/global/index.htm>
15. Global Semiconductor Health Hazards have been exposed –
<http://www.svtc.org/natsem/natsem1.htm>
16. The high cost of accidents has been well documented --
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/news/taiwan.htm>
17. Japanese electronics firms also have polluted groundwater -
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/letters/letter16.htm>
18. Corporate welfare and global whipsawing is also a major problem--
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/news/corpwelf.htm>
19. What can be done about these problems? --
<http://www.svtc.org/natsem/natsem1.htm#solution>
20. Closed loop processes are being developed --
<http://www.svtc.org/loop.htm>
21. Share holder resolutions on International standards --
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/natsem/shresol.htm>
22. I-CRT has organized letter writing campaigns to support the WEEE directive
 - Letter to EC in support of WEEE --
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/cleancc/weeeletr.htm>
 - Letter to Vice President Gore on WEEE --
<http://www.svtc.org/cleancc/weeeustr.htm>
23. The Precautionary principle is key but under attack at the WTO --
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/cleancc/weeeletr.htm>
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/letters/letter6.htm>
24. The Silicon Principles set out a vision of sustainable high-tech production-
<http://www.svtc.org/siprinc.htm>
25. I-CRT has been formed to bring accountability to global high-tech production --
<http://www.svtc.org/crt.htm>
<http://www.svtc.org/icrt.htm>

26. The I-CRT list serve has been established to connect people around the world to promote sustainable high-tech development -
<http://www.svtc.org/listserv.htm>
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/listarch.htm> -- (CRT list serve archive)

3.2 The relevance of the Greenpeace trans-Atlantic toy campaign

Madeleine Cobbing, Greenpeace International

Greenpeace Campaign on soft PVC toys (1997 - 1999)

Although it was difficult at first to get campaigners to agree to focus on such a small section of the PVC market (even within Greenpeace), once the campaign's success in a few countries became obvious, campaigners came on board.

There were two main strategies to the campaign: market and political. Although initially it was envisaged as a market campaign, the political aspect became increasingly important as it became clear that each was influencing the other. We approached the major companies at least a year before the campaign was launched, and entered into negotiations with ICTI (International Toys Association), with no success.

After the launch of the campaign, it was government calls for voluntary action that led to retailers withdrawing certain products. Bans in the most progressive countries (initially Austria, Sweden and Denmark) and the threat of EU action made the big toy manufacturers take action. This took the form of lobbying the US Department of Commerce (by Mattel, the biggest toy company & Exxon, a major phthalate producer), who put pressure in turn on the EU and stopped an emergency ban. Greenpeace exposed the lobbying and succeeded in getting ABC (American Broadcasting Corporation) in the US to do a major documentary about it. In anticipation of negative publicity, Mattel announced that they would phase out phthalates in certain baby toys (but not soft PVC).

After the ABC programme was aired (& Greenpeace launched the campaign in the US & Canada) a number of companies followed Mattel's lead, which in turn led to 95% of the market there becoming phthalate free for a limited number of toys, including worldwide retailer Toys R Us. This led to other countries taking steps - Mexico, Greece, Finland and Norway. In December, Vice President Al Gore wrote a letter to Congressmen where he reversed the US lobby position.

This removed a major obstacle to EU action, and the proposal for an emergency ban was revived - unfortunately the crisis in the Commission put a stop to it, but the pressure for national bans continues as long as the EU fails to act. Italy has now banned phthalates in toys (interestingly the major Italian company Chicco is going PVC free for baby toys, removing opposition from the market to a ban) and Germany plans to take steps. For Greenpeace, the market success of the toys campaign has led to other companies in other sectors taking steps to go PVC free. Although the toys market was not significant, it was very important for the reputation of PVC.

The campaign shows the importance of creating a 'domino effect' with countries and with companies. Key to the success was the early negotiations with the toy industry, the building of political allies in Europe and NGO allies in the US, the access to information on lobbying in the US and timing.

3.3 Update on the WEEE Directive

by Elena Lymberidi, European Environment Bureau, Brussels

Key Points in current draft of the directive, July 1998

- Producers to bear financial responsibility for collection, treatment, recovery, disposal from private households.
- Phase out of lead, mercury, cadmium, hexavalent chromium and halogenated flame retardants by the year 2004.
- Incineration is excluded from recycling and recovery targets.
- Reuse/ recycling targets to be set for recycling of household and commercial WEEE.
- Collection target of 4kg per inhabitant per year of WEEE has been set.
- Target that plastic in new EEE contains a min of 5% of recycled plastic, by 2004.
- Shows clearly the hierarchy in waste management: prevention, re-use, recycling and recovery, environmentally safe treatment and disposal.

Further NGO requirements

- The role of Waste Prevention (referred to in 1st draft) needs to be put back in.
- Quantifiable targets, reporting and planning for waste prevention.
- Further measures to encourage durability, labelling of products with their expected lives, obligation to offer free extended guarantees.
- There is a softening on incineration between the 1st and 2nd drafts.
- Producer responsibility should cover both commercial and household waste.
- More details required on setting up of good collection systems.
- Need separate reuse and recycling targets.
- Wording needs to be tightened.

Position of Industry

This includes the trade associations: Orgalime (Liaison group of European mechanical, electrical, electronic and metalworking industries), Eurobit (European Association of Manufacturers of Business machines and IT Industry) .

- Step-by-step approach proposed.
- Phase outs of chemicals to take place only once scientific and economic studies have been carried out, and only if substitutes exist. Phase outs to be dealt by horizontally.
- Design requirements constitute barriers to trade.
- Financial and organisational responsibility for collection to be borne by local authorities
- Last owner to bear the cost for recovery
- Historical waste to be excluded; last owners to pay for collection, treatment, recycling and recovery services.
- Limited reporting of information

Lobbying Activities

- Environmental NGO Letter writing campaign to DGXI (Environment)
- Other DGs mainly DG III (Industrial affairs) but also DG I (External affairs) follow the line of Industry
- US position is along the lines of Industry.
- Pressure from the American Chamber of Commerce, the US Mission to the EU and the US Government directly.
- They argue that some provisions of the directive may constitute barriers to trade.
- A draft statement for AEA-Europe (American Electronics Association), has been produced, which states that if the current proposal is adopted, it would cause the Community to violate its international trade law obligations with respect to the Restriction of substances and Recycled content rule.
- Member States : No major resistance. Generally in favour.

- UK opposes substance phase outs, want risk assessments and cost-benefit analysis.

Present situation

- NGO lobbying activities put WEEE back on DG XI's agenda.
- DG XI now has a clear position and have decided to go forward
 - Point on phase outs will be kept
- However, some issues have been affected:
 - Responsibility for collection from private households: ???
- “MS shall ensure that collection schemes are in place....” Open to interpretation
 - Technical problems.
 - No problem with the commercial waste
 - Minimum recycled plastic content: OUT, due in part to problems with trade, e.g.
- Taiwan does not have much recycled plastic....

3.4 Ideas to Move Forward on EPR - National Reports

Before the meeting, NGO participants were asked to undertake some research into the electrical/electronic sector in their country, on the basis of the questions below:

1. Profile of electronic sector in your country. Any producers? Assembly plants? Who are they, what do they produce?
2. If process (manufacturing) plants, do you have access to their permits? Emissions data? Worker health and safety policy?
3. Is the electronic industry expanding in your country?
4. EPR in your country; Current political context. What is your government's policy on EPR?
5. What is the yearly amount of electronic waste in your country? Any assessment done? Statistics?
6. Is electronic scrap considered hazardous waste in your country? Has your country signed the Basel Convention?
7. Where does electronic waste currently go? (Ask some main companies and suppliers if they know)
8. If incineration is an option, have studies been done of dioxin emissions related to electronic scrap?
9. Do any companies have take back schemes in place? For corporate or large clients? If so, do you know what happens to retrieved products?

When presenting their findings, participants were asked to consider which products they would focus on and what strategies might be appropriate. They were also asked to bear in mind the trade implications of the WEEE Directive and the campaigning opportunities around Y2K.

3.4.1 Poland

All waste in Poland currently goes to landfill, as there are no municipal or hazardous waste incinerators. Policy and legislation is increasingly based on the EU, as Poland is an accession country.

Company research is essential to identify **double standards**.

Need information campaign to create public awareness.

Need more **design for re-use and upgrades** to ensure not just more recycling, but to ensure that consumption is also addressed.

3.4.2 Eire

Due to the high rates of unemployment in the 1960s, the IDA (Industrial Development Agency) pursued a State-sponsored policy of bringing industry to Ireland, in particular the electronics and chemical/pharmaceutical industry. Various factors, such as low operating costs (including employment costs), low corporate taxes and generous start-up incentives combined to make Ireland the most profitable location in Europe for overseas investors.

There were concerns that Ireland was a "pollution haven" for foreign industry and that we are interested both in exposing companies operating on **double standards** and in learning from other countries' experiences.

Ireland now has the fastest economic growth rate in Western Europe which is supported to a large extent by the development of high tech industries. Ireland has been dubbed the "Celtic tiger".

Today over 300 electronics companies develop, market and manufacture a wide range of leading edge products in Ireland. In recent years, companies such as IBM, Intel, Gateway, Dell and other leaders of the computer and electronics industries have built new facilities in Ireland. Many of the leading multinationals such as Analog Devices, Phillips, SCI Instruments, Motorola, undertake complex manufacturing and development activity from their Irish base.

Electronic products are Ireland's largest single category of export. They generate a 1/3 of the country's total exports and employ over 35,000 people. Around 98% of all electronic goods are produced for export. Nearly 1/3 of all the PCs sold in Europe are now made in Ireland.

The Importance of Multi-nationals (MNCs)

Company profiles include MNCs and a few relatively large indigenous companies, as well as smaller mainly Irish-owned companies acting as suppliers and sub-contractors.

Ireland has received 40% of all American investment in European electronics since 1980 and American firms form by far the largest part of the electronics sector (61%) and account for 82% of total employment. Irish-owned companies account for only 10% of total employment in the electronics industry

Other electrical equipment produced in Ireland includes: domestic appliances, such as food mixers and blenders, coffee grinders, electric carving knives, kettles, vacuum cleaners, shavers, hair dryers and curling tongs. These are produced by just a handful of mainly foreign-owned companies which employ relatively large numbers of people.

Fate of WEEE in Ireland

Ireland has an urgent waste problem, due to lack of landfill space and the fact that we export most of our hazardous waste. Clearly, this leaves Ireland in a vulnerable situation as no alternative exists if for any reason the export option closes. Some 63% of WEEE goes to landfill

WEEE Directive

At this time, Ireland has **no national policy concerning this directive or any other EPR initiatives**. The 1996 Waste Act contains a provision for producer responsibility but to date this has not been used. **IBEC (Irish Business and employers Confederation) oppose the WEEE Directive** stating that the proposals "*will place an enormous burden on electrical and electronic distributors and manufacturers in this country*". They are lobbying

the Commission and the appropriate National Authorities, with respect to this directive and are "*achieving positive feedback*".

Another area of concern is the lack of interest in Health and Safety issues in these industries. According to an HSA (Health and Safety Authority) Official, the electronics industry is clean, sophisticated and there is not a problem of widespread use of carcinogens.

3.4.3 Canada

Canada has 8 manufacturers of EEE including IBM, Compaq, Bell Canada and Nortel. In 1999, 1 million computers, weighing 30,000 tons will be 'retired'; 10% of which will end up in schools, and the remaining 90% will go to landfill or to the Noranda smelter. The latter takes cathode ray tubes (CRTs).

No federal EPR initiative.

3.4.4 United Kingdom

EEE producers are mainly in South Wales and NE England. Most WEEE is landfilled, but incineration is a growing issue. There are voluntary re-use schemes and 3-4 dedicated electronics recycling companies. Unfortunately, the WEEE Directive is being handled by the DTI (Dept. of Trade and Industry) and not the DETR (Dept. of Environment, Transport and the Regions). DTI opposes the toxics phase outs along with ICER, which is also very actively opposed.

How do we get the public engaged?

- Need to undertake research into the economics of EPR to find out the Economic benefit of EPR
- Need to undertake survey of individual companies
- Need to examine the relationship between the product and waste; and between producer and what that producer might look like in the future.
- **Undertake outreach to local authorities - EPR allies should be local authorities**
- How to tie product design to its end of life?

3.4.5 USA

Using the term not **producer** responsibility, but **shared product** responsibility. Hence we have an **ideological battle**.

11% of GDP is generated by the IT industry. 300 million computers discarded 1985-2005

Keep the 'product' definition out of disposal to avoid a legislative problem

3% of electrical waste currently recycled

Heavy metals are the main problem for incineration

Waste plastic is exported to Asia. US has never signed the Basel Convention which bans waste exports from OECD to non-OECD countries.

3.4.6 Sweden

Full financial responsibility on producers and importers of EEE and looking to extend EPR to all products. The Swedish Chemicals Inspectorate (Kemi) is less interested in recycling than in stopping the import of toxic products, which will later become toxic waste.

The new Swedish environmental policy framework is looking to bring together all the existing environmental regulations.

- Brominated flame retardants (BFR) recognised as worker hazard
- Voluntary phase-out of PVC additives proposed in new chemical policy to be followed by legislation if no compliance.
- **Product labelling** and lists - exporters to Sweden must comply. Currently, the toxicity of EEE cannot be evaluated, because it's not known what substances are in EEE.

OSPAR agreement to phase out all hazardous discharges by one generation (2020).

Sweden is preparing a new chemicals policy to implement OSPAR. It has realised that with the vast amount of chemicals on the market (some 80,000) and the slow rate of assessment, we will all be dead before action is taken. So, Sweden has decided that instead of examining chemical-by-chemical, they will take action on substances by product sector. Since determining the toxicity of substances is so disputed, Sweden has also agreed that it is sufficient to prove that a substance is persistent or bioaccumulative for action to be taken. **Chemical bans legislation proposed. But, how will this effect trade?**

4. Day Two - Preparing Strategies

This day was closed to industry participants. Its purpose was to preparing campaign and fund-raising strategies. The day started by identifying the themes coming out of the previous day.

4.1 Overview of the themes from yesterday

Iza Kruszewska

1. **Exposing double standards** - not just on EPR, but also on life-cycle issues.
2. The **need to reduce consumption** - highlight product obsolescence.
3. **Disposal** - whether to landfill or incineration. Disposal options, such as use of Noranda smelter in Canada, will increase the use of plastics in EEE.
4. **Engaging the public.**
5. **Finding allies** e.g. local authorities.
6. **Is EPR/take-back really leading to clean product design** or just more recycling.
7. Ideological battle between extended **producer** responsibility (in Europe) versus extended **product** responsibility in North America.
8. **Right to know** - product labelling.
9. **Trade** issues.

4.2 Campaign Ideas

Beverley Thorpe

Report Card

What do we want to use the report card for? Market analysis? Identify double standards?

Aims of the Report Card:

- Increase producer accountability
- provide consumer information
- effect the market by identifying progressives and through green procurement
- identify/isolate manufacturers responsible for obsolescence
- focus on EPR to provide the first consumer 'hook' to product life-cycle
- expose double standards

Report card questionnaire would be sent to original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) and Intel and Microsoft. The questions could be set to help us find double standards. Are we going to run a **corporate or product campaign?**

Questions to include:

- Do you practice worker right to know?
- Do you provide consumer information (environmental product declaration?)
- Do you intend to phase out mercury, lead, cadmium, hexavalent chromium and PVC?
- Do you facilitate product upgradeability?
- Do you provide for product re-use?
- Do you accept EPR/financial responsibility for household products?

4.3 Open Discussion: What are the campaign targets?

Facilitator: Ken Geiser

Research - Report Card Survey? Market Analysis?

The discussion started with the question: will companies respond to the Report Card Survey?

The experiences of Greenpeace and FoE EWNI suggest that companies will not respond.

But this may depend on the approach taken: co-operative vs. confrontational approach

A market analysis or a campaign sensitivity analysis might be a more reliable way of identifying a target. The key is to look for a soft target e.g. a company expanding rapidly or one looking for a niche market. We need to think strategically e.g. iMac are not including an environment component in their message; or choose the largest computer manufacturer e.g. Dell or Compaq. But it is difficult to blame Compaq or Dell for product obsolescence, since so many of the computer components are proprietary which makes upgrading very difficult.

Research may need to be made both via Report Card Survey and market analysis.

Objectives of the Campaign

EPR must lead to clean product design ie. phase out of toxics and reduction in consumption AND NOT JUST MORE RECYCLING. In the Dutch EPR system, the feedback to the producer is weak and hence unlikely to deliver upgradeable products ie. beyond recycling.

Key objectives of the campaign:

1. Achieve a strong WEEE Directive
2. Greener Products/DfE
3. Focus on computer industry - design of computers

Strong WEEE Directive means:

- financial responsibility on the producer
- Phase-outs of hazardous substances
- No incineration
- Materials efficiency

Innovation will be needed to achieve clean products and the demand for clean products will drive innovation. The WEEE Directive is driving innovation now.

The choice is: design for re-use versus standardisation and **no innovation.**

We don't want to stop innovation. **We want innovation to include toxics phase-out and more efficient material use** - not just cheaper, smaller and faster IT equipment.

Part of today's innovation is miniaturisation, which supports incineration. But we need the ecological footprint of a PC to become smaller.

Ken suggested the following formulation for our campaign objective:

Electronics Sustainability Commitment

Each generation of technical improvement in Electrical and Electronic Products should include a parallel and proportional improvement in environmental, health and safety, and social justice attributes.

Involving the Public?

Is this a campaign in which we want to involve the public or just via the media? If we want to interest the consumer, we need to feed their disappointments with IT. According to Tim, there is general consumer satisfaction with the life span of IT equipment and more support might be gained by targeting small appliances or even white goods, where people expect a longer life span.

One idea for getting media was a **dumping action** to increase consumer awareness. Possible targets were mentioned. Another was to use PC advertising slogans to discredit their claims e.g. imac's claim that its new range of coloured computers is different could be challenged on the grounds that they are just as toxic.

Need both sticks and carrots to bring consumers on board. There are lots of examples, but we need to choose those most relevant to consumers. Consumers want innovation, but also security.

Need to contact Betsy Taylor, Center for a New American Dream. They conduct consumer polls. The questions we want to ask: What do consumers regard as appropriate life span?

We also need to know how long products actually last.

Tim informed us that Sheffield University and Surrey School of Art are undertaking research to find out where EEE ends up.

What product focus?

Since the PC industry drives obsolescence, need to put our efforts there. Ted provided us with a host of reasons why this should be:

- The computer industry is opposed to the WEEE Directive (in the US),
- fastest growing industry
- most sensitive to public pressure
- PC industry is courted by governments

Use the WEEE Directive to frame the debate on EPR, since it is already driving innovation now.

Tim argued that the brown goods industry is also very innovative, but they are doing things which are disappointing customers eg. digital radios will make existing radios obsolescent, boxes on TVs for digital reception.

Trade Perspectives

The American Electronics Association together with the US Trade Representative have been lobbying against the WEEE Directive on the grounds that some of its provisions constitute a barrier to trade. The US EPA disapproves, but is powerless to do anything about it.

Moreover, business globally is attacking the precautionary principle.

We should use the forthcoming World Trade Organisation (WTO) meeting in Seattle to building coalitions with NGOs working on trade, including those groups working to

defeat the fast-track procedures on trade. They are organising around 5 issues and the electronics sector is one.

4.4 Working groups

In the afternoon of Day 2, participants formed 2 Work Groups:

Group 1: Political Strategy focused on WEEE Directive and the trade issues (WTO)

Group 2: Market strategy focused on building consumer awareness, eliminating toxics and improving materials efficiency

Tasks of each group:

- Brainstorm tactics
- Identify allies
- Prepare timelines
- Identify research needs
- Identify targets

4.4.1 Group 1 - Political Strategy

- Identify a coalition
- Create a list serve (Pieter)
- Prepare a white paper (Elena)
- Create a sign-on letter to New Commission
- Prepare scheduling for Commissioners on DGs 1, III and XI
- lobby for Integrated product policy at the EU meeting in June
- lobby for chemical bans via OSPAR
- Select one company
- Push USEPA to confront US Trade Representative
- Research: push for Commission support - Who is Who?
- Undertake outreach to ANPED and EEB groups

On Trade:

- Prepare letter to Congress (Michael)
- Set up Core Group
- Meet with DC groups (June)
- Undertake activity around Seattle WTO meeting (November)
- Use CSD 8 where trade and environment are on the agenda (April 2000)

4.4.2 Group 2: Market Strategy

- Pick one company
- Find telling stories
- Identify upcoming events eg.Y2K
- Use ComDex Conference (October 1999)
- New Spring Conference (2000)
- London Conference (Sept 1999)
- Cal Resource and Recovery Association (June 1999)

Tactics:

- Report card
- Computer game (non-violent)
- Information web-site

- Consumer-friendly facts

Research:

- Develop criteria
- Additional consumer surveys
- Technical innovations

Allies:

- anti-incineration groups
- local authorities
- groups working on waste trade (Basel BAN)
- green procurement

Focus on waste: varying definitions of waste leading to double standards e.g. WEEE from corporate customers classified as haz waste; WEEE from households considered municipal waste

Write model articles (Bev, Anna)



The group on day 1

5. Work Plan

- By 1 June 1999:** List serve - Pieter
Fact sheet (criteria) - Bev
White paper (1st draft) - Elena
Report card (1st draft) - Bev
Mission statement for TAN for CP
- June 15 1999** DC Meeting
Congressional letter - Ted
- Sept 1999** London Electronics meeting
Funding (via OSPAR) - Maddy
- Sept 1999** Trade, Investment and Sustainable Development, NL - Pieter
(Preparatory meeting for CSD 8)
- Nov 1999** WTO, Seattle

6. Fund Raising

Emphasise collaboration

Link with universities

Government opportunities: Finland, Sweden,
Canada (Millennium Fund) - Bev, John

Foundations: Goldsmith
Heinrich Boell Stiftung (+ BUND, FoE Germany)
German Marshall Fund (+ BUND, FoE Germany)
Mott, Rockefeller

German NGO connection - Elena

Subjects pertinent to chip_net/TAN for CP: Education, Research, Campaigns,
Publications, Outreach & Diffusion

Assistance - Pawel, Elena

Industry funding ??????

7. Other Business

During the meeting the name agreed for the network was TANforCP or Trans-Atlantic Network for Clean Production. However, later the name CHIP_net, which stands for Clean and Healthy Innovation and Production Network was proposed. A final decision still needs to be made.

Annex A: Agenda of NGO Strategy Meeting on Extended Producer Responsibility

Thursday evening - 13 May

Opening Session

Introduction and welcome by Iza Kruszewska, ANPED
Introductions by participants

Friday - 14 May

Day One - Information Gathering

Morning

Chair: Iza Kruszewska

Perspectives on EPR from a Producer

by Gerhard Krol, Hewlett Packard

Attitudes towards the WEEE Directive from different players in the sector

by Tim Cooper, University of Sheffield, Hallam

Question and Answer session followed by discussion

Afternoon

Chair: Beverley Thorpe

Implementation of the Dutch EPR law for electrical and electronic goods

by Gerhard Krol, Hewlett Packard

The Hazards of the IT Industry

by Ted Smith, International Campaign for Responsible Technology

The relevance of the Greenpeace trans-Atlantic toy campaign

by Maddy Cobbing, Greenpeace International

Update on the WEEE Directive

by Elena Lymberidi, European Environment Bureau

Ideas for moving forward on EPR

Short country overviews of the electr(on)ic sector from participants from:

Poland

Eire

Canada

UK

USA

Sweden

Saturday, 15 May

Day 2 - Preparing Strategies

Morning

Overview of the themes from yesterday

Iza Kruszewska

Campaign Ideas

Beverley Thorpe

Open Discussion: What are the campaign targets?

Facilitator: Ken Geiser

Afternoon

Two working groups:

- 1. Political campaign**
- 2. Market campaign**

Drawing up a time-table of activities

Fundraising

Summary and Commitments

Annex B: Participants list

Michael Bender
Mercury Policy Project
1420 North St.
Montpelier, VT 05602
t: +1-802-223-9000
f: +1-802-223-7914
MTBenderVT@aol.com
www.mercurypolicy.org

Madeleine Cobbing
Consultant, Greenpeace International
P.O. Box 63, Stroud,
Glos GL5 3YD
United Kingdom
t/f: +44-1453-758489
madeleine.cobbing@diala.greenpeace.org
www.greenpeace.org

Tim Cooper
Centre for Sustainable Consumption
Sheffield Hallam University
Pond Street
Sheffield S1 1WB
United Kingdom
t: +44-114-225-4838
t.h.cooper@shu.ac.uk

Anne-Marie Cunningham
Voice of Irish Concern for the Environment
14 Upr. Pembroke Street
Dublin 2
Republic of Ireland
Phone: +353-1-6618123
ammc@irelands-web.ie
or
avoice@iol.ie
www.voice.buz.org

Sheila Davis
Materials for the Future Foundation
P.O. Box 29091
San Francisco, CA 94112
USA
t: +1-415-561-6530
f: +1-415-561-6474
sheiladavis@materials4future

Ken Geiser
Massachusetts Toxics Use Reduction
Institute, Lowell Centre for Sustainable
Production, University of Massachusetts,
Lowell
Lowell, MA 01354
USA
t: +1-978-934-3275
f: +1-978-934-3050
kgeiser@TURI.org

Pawel Gluszynski
Waste Prevention Association
Ul. Slawkowska 12
31-014 Krakow
Poland
t/f: +48-12-4222264, 4222147
mob: +48-501-752106

uugluszy@cyf-kr.edu.pl
<http://gemini.most.org.pl/otzo/>

John Hanson
Recycling Council of Ontario
489 College St., Suite 504
Toronto, Ontario
Canada
M6G1A5
t: +1-416-9601025 ext. 13
f: +1-416-9608053
john@rco.on.ca

Gerhard Krol
Hewlett Packard
Startbaan 16
P.O. box 667
1180 AR Amstelveen
the Netherlands
gerhard_krol@hp.com

Elena Lymberidi
European Environment Bureau-EEB
34 Boulevard de Waterloo
B-1000 Brussels
Belgium
t: +32-2-2891302
f: +32-2-2891099
ecoproducts@eeb.org
www.eeb.org

Naomi Roht-Arriaza
Human Rights Advocates
Hastings College of Law
University of California
200 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
t: +1-415-565-4629
f: +1-415-565-4865
rohtarri@uchastings.edu

Jacek Schindler
Eko Idea
University of Wroclaw
Szewska 50
50-319 Wroclaw
Poland
t/f: +48-71-402-826
t: +48-71-3116417
jacek@ekoidea.most.org.pl
<http://gemini.most.org.pl/ekoidea/>

Ted Smith
SVTC/CRT
760 N. 1st. Street
San Jose, CA 95112
USA
t: +1-408-287-6707
f: +1-408-287-6771
tsmith@igc.org
www.svtc.org

Anna Thomas
Friends of the Earth
26 Underwood St.
London N17JQ
United Kingdom
t: +44-171-5061686

annat@foe.co.uk

Beverley Thorpe
Clean Production Action
5964 Notre Dame de Grace
Montreal Qc
Canada H4A 1N1
t: +1-514-4844207
f: +1-514-4842696
bthorpe@web.net
website under construction

Bill Walsh
Greenpeace USA
1436 W Street N.W.
Washington D.C. 20009
USA
t: +1-202-319-233
f: +1-202-462-5407
bill.walsh@wdc.greenpeace.org
www.greenpeaceusa.org

Alex Young
International Institute for Industrial
Environmental Economics
P.O. Box 196
Tegnerplatsen 4
221-00 Lund
Sweden
t: +46-46-222-0200
iim98aly@student3.lu.se

ANPED STAFF

Iza Kruszewska
t: +44-181-672-3454
+31-30-230100
ikruszewska@anped.antenna.nl
iza@cpa-iza.u-net.com

Pieter van der Gaag
pjvdgaag@anped.antenna.nl

Sabine van Grafhorst
svgrafhorst@anped.antenna.nl

P.O. Box 12111
3501 AC Utrecht
The Netherlands
t: +31-30-2310300
f: +31-30-2340878
anped@anped.antenna.nl
www.antenna.nl/anped/

Annex C: Overheads used by presentation Mr. G. Krol of Hewlett Packard

Do manufacturers care as much about the next generation of children as they do products?

"We eat our young" CEO, Intel



The Northern Alliance for Sustainability

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 12111
3501 AC Utrecht
The Netherlands

Visiting Address: Oudegracht 312
Utrecht

Telephone : +31-(0)30-2310300

Fax : +31-(0)30-2340878

E-mail : anped@anped.org

webpage : www.anped.org