



M A R B E K
Resource Consultants Ltd.

**NATIONAL EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY
(EPR) WORKSHOP**

**Charlottetown
September 27-28, 2006**

– Final Report –

Prepared for:

Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment

Prepared by:

Marbek Resource Consultants

December 14, 2006

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Objectives	1
1.3	Opening Remarks.....	1
2.	EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY	2
2.1	Introduction.....	2
2.2	EPR Programs in Canada.....	2
2.3	EPR Definitions and Principles	3
2.4	EPR Tools	6
2.5	CCME Outcomes and Roles for EPR	7
3.	EPR FOR PACKAGING	8
3.1	Introduction.....	8
3.2	EPR for Packaging in Canada.....	8
3.3	CCME Outcomes and Roles for Packaging.....	10
4.	INDUSTRY AND DESIGN FOR ENVIRONMENT	11
4.1	Introduction.....	11
4.2	Industry and DfE.....	11
4.3	How Can DfE be Encouraged in Canada?.....	12
4.4	How Could CCME Promote DfE in Canada	13
5.	SUMMARY: NEXT STEPS.....	14
5.1	CCME Role for EPR / Packaging.....	14
5.2	CCME Role for DfE	14
5.3	Next Steps	15
5.4	Closing Remarks.....	15

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: List of Participants
- Appendix B: Agenda

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) works to promote effective intergovernmental cooperation and coordinated approaches to inter-jurisdictional environmental issues. The Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) Task Group, formed in 2005, reports to CCME's Environmental Planning and Protection Committee. The Task Group's mandate is to provide guidance on the development and implementation of EPR and product stewardship programs, and to deal with packaging as a first priority. The Task Group has undertaken some initial work on EPR, including developing proposed definitions, principles, and tools for undertaking EPR programs in Canada. A national EPR workshop was held to solicit stakeholder feedback on this work, and to identify potential roles for CCME with respect to EPR.

The workshop, hosted by CCME and the Prince Edward Island Department of Environment, Energy, and Forestry, was held at the Best Western Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, September 27th to 28th, 2006. This report summarizes the highlights of presentations, main discussion points, and key areas of agreement from the workshop.

1.2 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this national workshop were to:

- Seek input, feedback, and consensus (where possible) from stakeholders concerning issues, outcomes, CCME role, and tools designed to support Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) and Design for Environment (DfE).
- Seek input, feedback, and consensus (where possible) from stakeholders concerning the application of EPR and DfE to packaging.

1.3 OPENING REMARKS

Don Jardine, Chair of the CCME EPR Task Group gave opening remarks and welcomed participants to the workshop. Following this, there was a round of introductions. Mr. Jardine reviewed the objectives and the key desired outcomes for this workshop.

John McQuarrie, Deputy Minister of the PEI Department of Environment, Energy and Forestry and Chair of CCME's Environmental Planning and Protection Committee, also gave opening remarks. He noted that the most challenging issue for the EPR Task Group to address is to identify what the role of government should be in this field. He highlighted that provincial Ministers are clearly interested in this topic and would appreciate some concrete feedback on these issues. He noted that the task of workshop participants is to develop specific recommendations for CCME on how to address packaging dilemmas.

Don Jardine introduced George Matheson as facilitator for the workshop. Mr. Matheson welcomed participants and reviewed the agenda for the workshop. Following this, Anjanette Zielinski of the CCME Secretariat gave an overview on CCME and the EPR Task Group, including their mandate, structure, and work plan.

2. EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The next sections outline presentations and discussion surrounding the following EPR topics:

- An overview of EPR programs in Canada
- EPR definitions and principles proposed by the CCME EPR Task Group
- EPR tools proposed by the CCME EPR Task Group
- CCME proposed outcomes pertaining to EPR.

2.2 EPR PROGRAMS IN CANADA

Laurie Giroux of Marbek Resource Consultants gave an overview of current EPR Programs in Canada. This presentation was based on a recent assignment undertaken for Environment Canada to update their EPR/Stewardship inventory of programs. She reviewed the purpose of the inventory, the methodology used to undertake this update, as well as the types of information collected in each program profile. She highlighted that the inventory should not be viewed as static but rather evolving, and presented some preliminary analysis:

- There are approximately 60 programs in total, including seven at various stages of development.
- Approximately 43 of these are EPR programs with producer involvement in either administering or funding the program, while the remainder are government operated.
- The majority of the 60 programs (77%) are mandatory.
- The programs cover a wide variety of sectors, with a higher number of programs operating in the beverage container and tire categories, while a newly evolving sector is electronics.
- Most of the EPR programs use an administrative oversight body, with the majority using a Producer Responsibility Organisation (PRO) while others use a third party.
- The majority (47%) of EPR programs charge fees to consumers, 31% use producer levies, and 22% charge no fees at all.
- Regional partnerships are evolving.
- CCME has played a role in the evolution of a number of programs, for example through national action plans (e.g. for the Environmental Control of Ozone-Depleting Substances); guiding principles (e.g. for Electronics Product Stewardship); and national protocols.

Discussion

There was some discussion regarding the use of the terms “EPR” and “product stewardship”. Participants agreed that there is a grey line between the two categories, and that the terms are often used inter-changeably. The need for an appropriate term for government-operated stewardship programs was highlighted. It was pointed out that the federal government is looking to identify what the potential federal role could be with respect to EPR, in addition to current work on guidance for EPR program monitoring and reporting.

Participants commented that there is a wide variety of programs operating in Canada, which makes it difficult to compare the programs and understand how to transfer lessons learned. The

point was made that municipal programs may not meet the criteria for this inventory, but may offer lessons learned with elements of good practices. Another dimension to consider is whether the programs on the inventory represent a significant volume of the waste stream.

2.3 EPR DEFINITIONS AND PRINCIPLES

Don Jardine gave an overview of the work of the EPR Task Group completed to date on the definition and principles for EPR. He presented both the proposed definition of *EPR*, and of *Producer*, as well as a list of sixteen proposed principles for EPR programs.

Discussion: Definitions and Principles

Definition: EPR

Participants discussed terminology surrounding the aspects of responsibility which should be included in the definition. There was a suggestion to remove the terms “*physical and/or financial*” from the definition to avoid limiting the range of responsibility. However, there was more support to clearly articulate this responsibility, with some participants supporting the proposed text while others were of the opinion that the text should be more definitive, such as “*physical and financial*”. One participant felt that the term “*solely responsible*” should be used, while most participants felt that consumers should also bear some responsibility for their choices. There was further discussion as to how to define terminology for government operated stewardship programs. Participants agreed that the term “*stewardship*” often infers responsibility, and consideration should be given to the relationship of this terminology to the EPR definition.

Participants supported alignment in principle with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) definition for consistency. There were other suggestions not supported, such as removing the word “*extended*” from the term “*extended producer responsibility*”; using the word “*waste*” to refer to a product’s end of life; and the potential inclusion of the term “*economic aspects*” in addition to environmental aspects.

The ultimate use of this definition was discussed, and it was clarified that the intention is for it to be part of an environmental policy tool used by jurisdictions for waste management. One participant pointed out that it is important for the Task Group to also consider waste products that are not part of the municipal waste stream such as institutional waste.

Definition: Producer

Participants discussed the various roles which should be comprised within the term “*producer*”, including brand-owner, franchisee, assembler, filler, first importer, distributor, retailer, etc., and the corresponding issue of capturing products which have a number of components from various brand-owners. Participants agreed to use the term “*brand-owner or most responsible entity*”, followed by a list of parties that this might include. Another thought was to require a brand name on all products sold to be able to trace the brand owner.

Principles

General Themes

There was some initial discussion regarding the context of the principles, and it was suggested that they would supercede the National Packaging Protocol (NAPP) principles as guidance for the design of EPR programs. There was some concern voiced as to whether CCME should try to streamline the principles and define them more precisely so they are not open-ended.

Overarching Principles

Participants discussed some overarching principles which should be highlighted. There was general support for inclusion of the concepts of minimizing environmental impacts and maximizing environmental benefits. A suggestion was made to include DfE aspects (a reference for further reading was proposed: William McDonough).

Some participants felt that the principles are vague with respect to outlining responsibilities, and suggested using stronger language to clearly articulate the physical and financial responsibilities for producers in particular. The suggestion was made that an outline of the hierarchy of the level of responsibility for different stakeholders be included (for example, the responsibilities of third party agencies).

Design and Implementation Aspects

There were numerous suggestions for specific changes to the sixteen principles presented. The following list captures each suggestion (each number in parentheses corresponds to a principle presented):

- The suggestion was made, and supported by others, that the word “incentives” for producers be replaced with the word “encourage”, since the term “incentive” usually implies a particular mechanism (#1).
- The suggestion was made, and supported by others, that the word “environment” should have high priority, through use of terminology such as “environmental benefits should be maximized” (#3).
- The suggestion was made, and supported by others, that mandatory programs should be emphasized by appearing first in the list, rather than voluntary programs (#11). However, one opinion raised felt that voluntary programs should be on par with mandatory programs.
- The suggestion was made, and supported by others, that the term “economic dislocations” should be “minimized” rather than “avoided” (#14).
- The suggestion was made, and supported by others, regarding the importance of engaging with stakeholders to improve the program design, rather than consulting with stakeholders on the program’s acceptability (#9).

- There was a question whether principle #6 was needed since it may be redundant because each jurisdiction will use this guidance on a case-by-case basis anyway (#6).
- Participants supported the concept of including core elements of performance monitoring and reporting in the principles, in order to have an overall concept of consistency.
- Participants discussed the value of including a principle on incorporating full cost accounting into program design (where environmental, economic, social objectives are included). There was some debate on this issue.

Summary

Definitions

In terms of the EPR definition, workshop participants indicated:

- Support for general consistency with OECD
- Support to keep the terminology “*environment*”
- Support for keeping the term “*product*” rather than “*waste*”, consistent with the OECD
- Regarding elements of responsibility, the Task Group should consider opinions raised on both sides (“*and/or*” vs. “*and*”), noting that “*and*” provides a more clearly articulated definition
- The Task Group should consider other terminology suggestions and how they relate to the definition (i.e., “*stewardship*”)
- The Task Group should consider how to address post-consumer waste that is not in the municipal waste stream.

In terms of the definition of Producer, workshop participants indicated:

- Support for using the term “*brand-owner*” or most responsible party, followed by a list of others whom this could include.

Principles

There was general consensus among participants that Task Group should seek to:

- Streamline the principles where feasible (possibly reduce the overall number of principles)
- Define the principles more precisely.

There was also general consensus that the principles should begin with two key overarching principles defining the key characteristics of EPR:

- EPR should transfer of end-of-life responsibility to producers . . .
- . . . in order to reduce environmental impact and generate environmental benefits.

There were some specific terminology suggestions offered by participants (outlined in Section 3.2), with overall support for the following suggestions:

- Include the core elements of performance measurement
- Articulate types of responsibilities for stakeholder parties involved
- “*Encourage*” producers, rather than using the term “*provide an incentive*”
- “*Engage*” rather than “*consult*” with stakeholders
- Emphasize mandatory programs by appearing first in the list, rather than voluntary programs
- Economic dislocations “*minimized*” rather than avoided.

2.4 EPR TOOLS

Duncan Bury, member of the EPR Task Group, gave an overview of the proposed product evaluation matrix. He outlined the evolution of the tool, and offered some general guidance on the structure and use of the tool as it could be applied to EPR programs. He noted that the intent of the matrix is to be a guidance tool available for use by jurisdictions to assess products which they are considering as candidates for EPR. He pointed out that the intent of the matrix is to include both municipal as well as other waste streams, such as construction waste for example.

Discussion

There was some discussion regarding the overall mechanics of scoring within the matrix, and whether a specific point score should be allocated for each sub-question, or whether each sub-question should be weighted differently. Some participants suggested that weighting should be heavier for waste volume, toxicity, and for some products that pose inherent difficulties to manage but which may not be a significant portion of the waste stream (i.e., such as plastic bags). One participant highlighted the fact that using the matrix for packaging is constrained by other considerations such as security for health reasons, etc. Participants agreed that guidance in the application of the matrix will be required.

Participants agreed that the overall idea of the matrix is to identify whether a product is a good candidate for an EPR program, while it could also be used for the purpose of prioritizing a list of products. The notion was raised that a jurisdiction could also use the tool to rationalize their preferences, since using the tool is subject to discretion of the user. One participant suggested that CCME finalize the mechanics of the matrix, then use it to assess each product on the list and provide a list of priority products.

There was some discussion pertaining to industry readiness and public input factoring into the mechanics of the matrix. The suggestion was made that the industry readiness/public interest criteria be considered separate from the scoring grid. There was some but not unanimous support for this suggestion. The input of the public was viewed as important to consider in the discussion on responsibilities, awareness, interest, and support.

Summary

Generally, participants agreed that:

- It is important to have a tool of this type

- The tool has several purposes, including development of a short list of target EPR products
- There is a need to consider the weighting of criteria (not necessarily equal), and also consider the mechanics of scoring
- There is a possible additional criteria for products/packaging that are difficult to handle
- There is a possible deleted criterion: industry readiness/public interest, which should be considered separately, with opposite views expressed.

2.5 CCME OUTCOMES AND ROLES FOR EPR

Participants were asked to discuss the proposed CCME outcome with respect to EPR in Canada i.e. what CCME will achieve through the development, endorsement and dissemination of the guidance materials that are underway by the Task Group and being discussed as the subject of this workshop. Participants were asked to reflect on whether the proposed outcome is valid, and what the potential CCME roles would be in achieving this outcome.

Discussion

Participants discussed the proposed CCME outcomes on EPR. They agreed that the general idea was to have more environmentally successful EPR programs operating in Canada, and that guidance was needed to achieve this consistently across jurisdictions.

There was a recommendation that the roles, responsibilities and benefits for stakeholders in EPR programs should be more clearly outlined, including the collective role for governments. Similarly, the roles and responsibilities for producers could be outlined in the outcome, such as producers being responsible for producing a fully recyclable package. There was some discussion regarding the available mechanisms for industry to initiate EPR programs, and that these should be outlined, including tools, etc. Based on successful implementation in some jurisdictions, stewardship organisations were put forward as an appropriate infrastructure mechanism which should be advocated, and stewardship plans could outline the responsibilities, including proposed end-of-life management of their product and packaging. The point was made that outlining the environmental hierarchy principles for stewardship organisations was important to ensure their efforts focus primarily on reduce, reuse, then recycle or recover. It was noted that consumers are also responsible for making good choices in product purchases; however this may be beyond the scope of influence of a measurable CCME outcome.

Along similar lines, participants agreed that there should be an indicator for measuring the performance of achieving outcomes, and it must be defined in a way that is measurable (true-cost accounting was the suggested concept to consider in defining performance). Suggestions for measuring performance included a range of ideas including the following:

- The establishment of stewardship organisations for EPR programs in all jurisdictions
- The estimated percentage of waste diverted from landfill nationally due to EPR programs
- An increase in the number of true EPR-type programs in Canada (where municipalities no longer pay for the waste management of the product)
- The degree of harmonization regarding EPR program parameters among jurisdictions
- The number of products on a CCME priority list addressed through EPR programs
- The number of submissions of acceptable plans for DfE by a producer

- Endorsement of the definitions, principles, or guidance tools developed by CCME.

Summary

Participants did not offer word-smith type revisions to the proposed CCME outcome with respect to EPR; rather they offered specific direction to the Task Group in revising the outcome as follows:

- Roles, responsibilities and benefits for all stakeholders, including government, could be outlined in a more definitive way
- The available mechanisms/tools for industry to initiate EPR programs could be outlined (for example, use of producer responsibility organizations (PROs), stewardship plans, etc.)
- The intent is to have *more* environmentally successful EPR programs operating in Canada so this point should be included in the outcome.

Participants agreed that guidance was needed to achieve a higher level of environmentally successful EPR programs across jurisdictions. To make this measurable, the potential role of CCME was to define explicit targets for the EPR programs, and provide guidance to outline stakeholder roles, responsibilities, and benefits.

3. EPR FOR PACKAGING

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The next sections outline presentations and discussion surrounding implementing EPR for packaging in Canada, and proposed CCME outcomes in relation to EPR for packaging.

3.2 EPR FOR PACKAGING IN CANADA

John Sinclair gave a presentation entitled “*Getting Serious about Packaging*”. He highlighted that the context of EPR is a transfer of responsibilities for waste from municipalities to the players who can do the most to reduce or eliminate waste, producers and consumers, including physical, financial, informational, and legal responsibilities. He noted that packaging is a complex sector with a variety of packaging types, large volumes of material, large number of players, great number of sectors involved, complex policy, and variability of material durability. He outlined some key policy elements of a successful EPR program for packaging including mandatory producer take-back; integrated levy systems; measurable targets; restrictions on how targets can be met; formation of PROs; encouraging product development; and support mechanisms.¹

He noted the importance of avoiding a patchwork of EPR programs across the country, and identified three areas for action by CCME to implement a national EPR program for packaging:

¹ Details are available in the workshop presentation by John Sinclair and in the following paper: Quinn, L. and A.J. Sinclair. 2006. Policy challenges to implementing extended producer responsibility for packaging. *Canadian Public Administration*, 49 (1): 60-79.

1. Leadership for Action on EPR

- Develop a clear national definition of EPR
- Promote the need for mandatory EPR for packaging within the federal community
- Promote the need for mandatory EPR within the policy community
- Negotiate agreement on the key packaging EPR policy elements and principles
- Bring the packaging waste issue to public's attention with national education

2. National EPR Program Parameters

- Legislate minimum national reduction, reuse and recycling targets
- Design and implement a model packaging stewardship regulation
- Establish national performance measures including an audit regime, reporting standards
- Help industry finalize national PROs for packaging waste that are fair and proactive
- Develop and maintain a national products listing

3. Initiate Research and Development

- Determine how to set-up and monitor targets for reduction and reuse
- Assist provinces in finding ways to optimize their programs in place (best practices)
- Provide guidance on support mechanisms (landfill bans, landfill taxes, user pay, etc.)
- Establish consumer education programs
- Help industry to design and coordinate environmental programs
- Initiate research into improved materials for packaging

Discussion

The question was raised as to whether there were any jurisdictions that have successfully addressed packaging through EPR. The German program was highlighted as a “model” EPR program. However, it was noted that transportation issues and population statistics vary greatly between countries, and this would have to be taken into account in a national program in Canada. The comment was made that the CCME National Packaging Protocol (NAPP) made substantial advances in domestic packaging technology to change the way it was designed, and industry has been increasingly proactive in this area throughout the past decade. However, the point was made that packaging produced in Canada is not necessarily the primary concern; it is packaging produced elsewhere and imported with consumer products for sale in Canada.

Participants discussed various mechanisms that could be used to address packaging in Canada, such as standards, vs. more consumer oriented tools, such as deposit-return systems. It was generally agreed that mechanisms for certain types of packaging such as beverage containers are feasible for deposit-return systems, and in many jurisdictions in Canada most types of beverage containers are already successfully handled this way (with a few exceptions, i.e., Ontario). However, the point was made that most other types of varied packaging from a wide range of sources such as paper, plastics, and styrofoam, etc., are not returnable or reusable. Some participants were of the opinion that charging a consumer fee to cover the cost of recycling each piece of packaging sold with a product would not be feasible for the following three reasons: a) establishing a collection mechanism along with an administrative organisation to oversee such a system would be daunting; b) the fee for each package would be so small that it would be difficult to administer; and c) it does nothing to encourage DfE at the producer's end. However, other views included the plausibility of mandating returnable packaging to the producer, or,

mandating the types of packaging used for products for sale in Canada (whether domestic or imported), as well as the importance of standardizing packaging for certain consumer products.

3.3 CCME OUTCOMES AND ROLES FOR PACKAGING

Participants agreed that the CCME outcome on packaging should refer to reducing the net impact to the environment. In addition, a specific reference to the three “R’s” hierarchy should be included. A qualifier on the word “*reduced*” such as “*excess*” packaging was suggested; however this was a minority view. There was a suggestion that a reference be included pertaining to the challenge of infrastructure access for recycling.

There was support that the outcome on packaging should be linked directly to EPR by adding the word “*producers*”. Participants also supported the notion that the outcome should have some aspect for measuring and reporting the performance of EPR programs. There was general support for use of targets for measurements, similar in concept to targets used in the NAPP.

Regarding federal roles, the suggestion was made that the Minister of Environment could take action on this topic, along with other departments (e.g. Industry). It was pointed out that there are some avenues where the federal government could take action in order to avoid a patchwork of regulations across the country. It is clear that coordination among federal departments, other governments, and other associations (including municipal and industry associations) is important. Potential areas of federal action included: legislation on packaging produced for new products; developing standards for packaging (material input, design, consistency, recycled content, labelling) and requiring imported products to meet these guidelines; regulating toxics in product packaging; funding programs; reviewing health regulations for packaging; and implementing procurement strategies. Participants agreed that clarification of potential federal roles with respect to packaging would be valuable in deciding a path forward.

There was a round table discussion on the potential CCME role in relation to packaging, and the key elements that emerged are captured in the following list, grouped into four categories:

1. Leadership

- Provide structure and context, encourage consistency/harmonization across jurisdictions
- Provide baseline information (clarify legal authorities regarding packaging and EPR)
- Help provinces and territories set priorities, while considering regional issues
- Establish a list of priority products and tools to expand/refine the list
- Set targets with a challenging timetable to be adopted by Ministers, implemented by jurisdictions, with accountability for results (e.g. 50% reduction in impact “x”)
- Report on status of EPR in Canada annually
- Seek clear buy-in at a higher level for CCME involvement, formalized with timelines and key elements
- Encourage specific financial and policy commitment to engage in packaging.

2. Guidance

- Create model regulations/standards regarding EPR, types of packaging, labeling (support for standardizing product labeling nationally)
- Develop guidelines or principles for EPR and packaging

- Develop or disseminate guidelines/tools/information on best practices.

3. Commitment

- Encourage specific financial and policy commitment to engage in packaging
- Endorse mechanisms to support EPR programs (retail sales bans, user pay, etc.)
- Advocate a strong political will across jurisdictions of CCME representatives for EPR and formalize this through a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with targets, timelines, and key elements.

4. Awareness

- Focus efforts on consumer education since they will be paying any increased costs
- Consider engaging in market development activities for EPR products.

Summary

There was general support among participants for the following revised CCME outcome:

“Producers are responsible for reduced packaging and increased reuse, recyclability and recycled content of packaging, while generating a positive net environmental impact”.

In terms of potential CCME role, see the list of four categories (above) for a summary of participants’ recommendations.

4. INDUSTRY AND DESIGN FOR ENVIRONMENT

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The next sections outline presentations and discussion surrounding design for environment (DfE) in Canada, and how CCME could contribute in this area.

4.2 INDUSTRY AND DFE

Larry Dworkin, Packaging Association of Canada (PAC), gave a presentation on the packaging industry in Canada. Mr. Dworkin noted that 60% of all packaging is from the food sector. Packaging is broken down as follows: paper-based 40%, plastic 35%, and 25% glass and metals. He pointed out that food safety has the highest priority in terms of packaging design, and that new technologies are entering the market to ensure security. The PAC collaborates with Agriculture Canada and Health Canada on international safety standards, as well as recent U.S. initiatives (i.e., radio-frequency) on food security. Mr. Dworkin noted that future potential use of radio-frequency chips for traceability purposes may cause packaging issues. He urged the Task Group to keep in contact with Agriculture Canada and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) on food security issues.

The important achievements made by PAC in the NAPP were highlighted. However, Mr. Dworkin also pointed out that some DfE improvements can have negative consumer impacts (for example, thin-walling steel cans result in easier denting). In addition, he felt that consumers should bear some responsibility for their choices, and suggested complementary mechanisms

such as user pay for garbage. He pointed out that there is only a small amount of packaging produced in Canada that is not recyclable (13%), however, one significant problem is that approximately 40% of packaging used in Canada is imported. Mr. Dworkin stated that EPR should be seen as part of a holistic approach to packaging that also includes other elements. The Packaging Association is willing to work with government in these areas, and has a strong track record to draw upon.

Discussion

Participants discussed the issue of imported packaging, and that one potential avenue to address this issue is through the supply chain: encourage large retailers to adopt guidelines for packaging on products that they import for sale. Wal-Mart was noted as one example of a large retailer who has made some recent advances in this area. The importance of encouraging a level playing field with respect to domestic packaging requirements versus imported packaging requirements was emphasized. One suggestion was for the federal government, through current packaging legislation, or through the new product registration process, mandate packaging standards applicable for both domestic and imported packaging.

Participants noted that there is room for improvement in both how materials are collected and how materials are separated. In addition, participants discussed the issue of Canadian-made packaging that is not recyclable, as well as packaging that is designed as non-returnable where similar-use packaging is returnable (i.e., one-way water jug coolers). The challenge of reaching out to manufacturers who value market niches above environmental issues was stressed; jurisdictions that engage in dialogue with industry associations on a regular basis have demonstrated progress on this issue. Another suggestion was that industry innovation should not be underestimated, and a regulation requiring that certain packaging standards be met by all Canadian manufacturers might be worthwhile.

4.3 HOW CAN DfE BE ENCOURAGED IN CANADA?

Jennifer Cooper, of Five Winds International, gave a presentation on DfE in Canada. She highlighted the importance of sharing lessons learned for DfE. She reviewed the following stimulants which can drive DfE: the market (evidence of knowledgeable paying customers, and interested decision-makers), expertise, flexibility (to pursue improvements, to challenge), rewards for leadership, partnerships, and research and development (R&D) support. She reviewed three case studies on DfE including a ceiling tile manufacturer, a cleaning product manufacturer, and an outdoor shoe manufacturer, all of which identified a market interest in DfE as an impetus to their decision. The case studies also demonstrated opportunities for cost savings regarding material inputs in some instances, which support most industry business plans.

Discussion

Participants pointed out that government procurement power is one key avenue that can have a significant market impact with respect to DfE. Participants also discussed consumer buying power, including the nuances surrounding labelling green design aspects of a product, and the differing levels of consumer awareness of this issue. The aspect of green labelling was identified as a challenge that could benefit from some CCME leadership. A communication initiative for

consumers would be valuable to generate more awareness on DfE. The suggestion was made that CCME partner with a national waste management environmental non-governmental organisation (ENGO) to deliver this communication initiative, although participants pointed out that there is a lack of a national level ENGO active in the field of waste management. Along the same theme, participants suggested that getting the message into engineering and design schools was important. This would help to ensure that environmental standards for products become a given, on par with consumer confidence that a product is safe if it's on the market.

4.4 HOW COULD CCME PROMOTE DfE IN CANADA

Participants discussed the possible roles for CCME to encourage DfE in Canada. There was extensive support for the idea of implementing green procurement policies across jurisdictional and national departments (“just do it/ let’s do it”). The challenge related to this idea is that the government procurement system is based on price per point, and there may not be a strong political will to change that to include environmental aspects. Another participant pointed out that identifying suppliers for green procurement is a challenge. The suggestion was made that CCME could potentially coordinate this initiative among jurisdictions and at the national level. Sharing current best practices, developing guidelines on the attributes for green procurement and for vendor qualifications, would be valuable. Participants agreed that monitoring the success of the initiative and reporting on it was important, possibly through a national report card supplemented by an awards process. Participants suggested that a certain level of formality similar to the Canada-Wide Standards process would be valuable. The initiative should build on existing work done, and build on current champions (i.e., the Atlantic Ministers). The suggestion was made to check for any relevant recommendations from the Auditor General.

Other awareness-raising initiatives regarding DfE could be lead by CCME, and supported by the environmental non-governmental organisation (ENGO) community, if they had a stronger presence with respect to waste management. One participant pointed out that a regulation mandating a certain proportion of recycled content would also make a significant impact.

Summary

In relation to the CCME role to encourage DfE in Canada, support was indicated as follows:

- Provide leadership and set an example regarding green procurement policy
- Develop guidelines, or best practices on green procurement implementation for governments in Canada (provincial/territorial/federal)
- Engage in dialogue with other government departments, and consider advocating DfE criteria for technology development programs
- Monitor and report on success of the initiative, provide recognition for leaders
- Engage in dialogue with industry associations as well as large retailers
- Engage in dialogue with education ministers regarding introduction of DfE into engineering curricula
- Consider consumer awareness-raising initiatives, and foster networks
- Consider application of regulatory inputs (mixed views).

5. SUMMARY: NEXT STEPS

5.1 CCME ROLE FOR EPR / PACKAGING

With respect to the CCME role for EPR and packaging, participants outlined the following three priorities:

1. *Commitment from Ministers to get buy-in for development of a national plan (the national plan should include definitions, principles, vision, goal, and a work plan with time-specific targets (for both the action, and completion date)*
2. *Priority list of products for EPR programs*
3. *Strategies and tools, including targets, benchmarks and monitoring.*

Immediate actions: Before Minister's meeting in fall 2006:

- Participants to brief their provincial Ministers on this initiative, and history of work done.
- Find a champion to promote these concepts in the upcoming October 2006 Minister's meeting to facilitate commitment.

Medium-term actions: Before Minister's meeting in spring 2007 (to be determined) have the following completed:

- Definition, principles, proposed action plan with targets, list of priority products.
- Key elements of a model regulation (if possible).

Medium-term actions: Before Minister's meeting in fall 2007 (to be determined) have the following completed:

- An outline of a model regulation or guideline on EPR for packaging, including consideration of how to foster DfE through EPR
- Status report on EPR in Canada.

Workshop participants agreed that the detailed suggestions concerning possible CCME roles, as presented in Section 3, provide additional guidance with respect to the above-noted actions.

5.2 CCME ROLE FOR DfE

With respect to the CCME role for DfE, participants outlined the following two priorities:

1. *Commitment (vision, goals, plan of action) – this is part of the EPR commitment package (#1 in Section 5.1)*
2. *Strategies and tools (guidance)*

Medium-term actions: before Minister's meeting in spring 2007 (to be determined) have the following completed:

- Locate current green procurement commitments
- Brief Ministers on interest to drive commitment for procurement
- Status report on green procurement implementation across departments in Canada.

5.3 NEXT STEPS

CCME will publish this workshop report on their website (www.ccme.ca), and it will be emailed to participants. Future stakeholder consultations on moving this topic forward have not been planned at this point in time. The CCME secretariat will coordinate any input on this issue.

5.4 CLOSING REMARKS

The Honourable Jamie Ballem, Prince Edward Island Minister of Environment, Energy and Forestry gave closing remarks. He noted that on this issue, consistency among jurisdictions is important in order to have a level playing field for industry, and the intent is not to drive manufacturers to locate elsewhere in the country. He highlighted the importance of providing the Council of Ministers with options on a path forward, along with realistic targets. The proposed action plan and tools under development should include options for roles and responsibilities, legislative options, and a range of targets and goals. All input should be supported by rationale, to ensure that the lowest common denominator is not the base level commitment.

Minister Ballem also urged participants to consider the reality that election years should be factored into any action plan, which always brings new players, and thus new viewpoints, to the table. Traditionally, health issues matter more to voters than environmental issues, and this is a challenge, although both issues are interrelated. He stressed that a package which Ministers may consider might be a small piece of the overall puzzle but enough to get the ball rolling.



APPENDIX A

2006 CCME National Extended Producer Responsibility Workshop Participant List

Participant List

Organization	Representative
Waste Management Organizations	
Island Waste Management Corporation	Gerry Moore
Multi-Materials Stewardship Board of Newfoundland & Labrador	Gary Ryan
New Brunswick Solid Waste Association	Peter Fenety
Recycling Council of Alberta	Christina Seidel
Recycling Council of British Columbia	Brock Macdonald
Recycling Council of Ontario	Jo-Anne St. Godard
Resource Recovery Fund Board Nova Scotia	Dale Lyon
Waste Diversion Ontario	Glenda Gies
Environmental Non-Government Organizations	
Citizens Network on Waste Management	John Jackson
Municipalities	
Colchester County	Tom McMillan
Federation of Canadian Municipalities	Mary Jane Middelkoop
South Shore (Region 6), Nova Scotia	Valda Walsh
Industry	
Canadian Council of Grocery Distributors	Jeanne Cruikshank
J.D. Irving	William Borland
Laurentide ReSource	Pierre Landry
McCain Foods	Ian Maclean
Academia	
Université de Moncton	Yves Gagnon
Government	
Alberta Environment	Pat Kane
British Columbia Ministry of Environment	David Lawes
Environment Canada	Duncan Bury
Manitoba Energy, Science and Technology	Jim Ferguson
Ministère du Développement durable, de l'Environnement et des Parcs du Québec	Marie Dussault
New Brunswick Ministry of Environment	Frank LeBlanc
Newfoundland & Labrador Environment & Conservation	Derrick Maddocks
Nova Scotia Environment & Labour	Bob Kenney
Ontario Ministry of the Environment	Adam Ciulini
Prince Edward Island Department of Environment, Energy & Forestry	John MacQuarrie
Prince Edward Island Department of Environment, Energy & Forestry	Don Jardine
CCME Secretariat	Anjanette Zielinski
Facilitator	
Marbek Resource Consultants	George Matheson
Speakers	
Five Winds International	Jennifer Cooper
Marbek Resource Consultants	Laurie Giroux
Packaging Association of Canada	Larry Dworkin
University of Manitoba	John Sinclair



APPENDIX B

2006 CCME National Extended Producer Responsibility Workshop Agenda

**National Extended Producer Responsibility Workshop
Cavendish & Brackley Room
Best Western Charlottetown**

Agenda – September 27

- Continental Breakfast* (8:00 – 8:30)
- 1) Setting the Stage** (8:30 – 8:50)
- Welcome and introductions by Don Jardine, Chair, CCME EPR Task Group
 - Review workshop objectives and desired outcomes
 - Overview on CCME and EPR Task Group by Anjanette Zielinski, CCME Secretariat
- 2) EPR Programs in Canada** (8:50 – 9:30)
- Presentation by Laurie Giroux, Marbek Resource Consultants
 - Questions and open discussion
- 3) EPR Definitions and Principles** (9:30 – 10:15)
- Presentation by Don Jardine, Chair, CCME EPR Task Group
 - Review and discuss/revise the draft definitions and principles
- Break* (10:15– 10:30)
- 4) EPR Product Evaluation Matrix** (10:30– 12:00)
- Presentation by Duncan Bury, CCME EPR Task Group
 - Review and discuss/revise the draft evaluation matrix
- Lunch* (12:00 – 1:00)
- 5) CCME Outcomes on EPR** (1:00 – 1:30)
- Review and discuss/revise the draft CCME outcome for EPR
 - Facilitated discussion of possible CCME contributions to achieving this outcome
- 6) Getting serious about EPR for packaging** (1:30 – 3:00)
- Presentation by John Sinclair, University of Manitoba
 - Facilitated discussion
- Break* (3:00 – 3:15)
- 7) CCME Outcomes on Packaging** (3:15 – 4:15)
- Review and discuss/revise the draft CCME outcome for packaging
 - Facilitated discussion of possible CCME contributions to achieving this outcome
- 8) Wrap-up** (4:15 – 4:30)
- Summarize the day’s discussion

**National Extended Producer Responsibility Workshop
Cavendish & Brackley Room
Best Western Charlottetown**

Agenda – September 28

- Continental Breakfast* (8:00 – 8:30)
- 1) Setting the Stage** (8:30 – 8:45)
- Review workshop objectives and desired outcomes
- 2) CCME Outcomes Review** (8:45 - 9:15)
- Review draft CCME outcomes on EPR and packaging from previous day
- 3) Industry and DfE** (9:15 – 10:00)
- Presentation by Larry Dworkin, Packaging Association of Canada
 - Questions and open discussion
- Break* (10:00– 10:15)
- 4) How can DfE be encouraged in Canada?** (10:15– 12:00)
- Presentation by Jennifer Cooper, Five Winds International
 - Facilitated discussion on how to promote DfE in Canada
- Lunch* (12:00 – 1:00)
- 5) Can EPR drive DfE?** (1:00 – 2:00)
- Facilitated discussion on whether EPR can drive DfE
- 6) What’s the CCME role?** (2:00 – 3:00)
- Facilitated discussion on the CCME role, if any, in supporting DfE in Canada
- 7) Wrap-up** (3:00 – 3:15)
- Summarize the day’s discussion
 - Closing remarks by Don Jardine, Chair, CCME EPR Task Group

Workshop adjourns no later than 3:15 pm

EPR Task Group will meet privately from 3:30 pm to 4:30 pm