

pre-waste



PREWASTE : sharing good practices for waste prevention


Jean-Benoit BEL - ORDIF

Brno – 13^o September 2011



ORDIF : a quick presentation

- Ile-de-France Region Observatory for Waste Management
- Non-profit organisation created in 1992 by the State and Ile-de-France Region
- 3 main missions:
 - Regional waste management monitoring
 - Dissemination of waste management informations
 - Promotion of exchanges among regional actors of waste management.



PREWASTE

- Interreg IVC project: interregional cooperation
- 10 European partners
- 3 years – Start in February 2010

Prewaste : main goals

« Improve the effectiveness of waste prevention in European territories »

- Help local authorities to significantly reduce waste quantities and toxicities
- 2 working components:
 - Identification and exchange of good practices
 - Definition of a common way to monitor waste prevention actions

Partnership



Partnership



Partnership



Exchanges of good practices

- Identification of about 100 good practices over Europe in 2010
- Choice of around 50 good practices according to partners' expectations
- Data collection and analysis:
 - Identification of key of success
 - Transferability studies
 - Quantitative assessment of results
- ▶ Main goals:
 - Identification of new ideas: **actions, tools**
 - **How to make actions durable and how to spread them?**

Work on indicators

- State of the art
- Identification of local differences
- Work on a common set of indicators
 - Resources
 - Results
 - Impact (costs, environment, social)
- ▶ **Goals:**
 - Common webtool to monitor and analyse prevention actions
 - Identify benchmarking elements to help with the monitoring

Prewaste and biowaste

- 9 good practices about biowaste
 - 3 on home composting
 - 2 about restaurants
 - 2 about food waste campaigns
 - 1 about food in schools
 - 1 about « reuse » of food products
- Different approaches for each action

An example: home composting

- 3 examples:
 - Municipality of Karlskrona (Se)
 - Tampere Region (Fi)
 - Brussels Region (Be)
- 3 different actions, 3 different approaches:
 - Different local specificities (opportunities / limits)
 - Different tools used
 - Different results

Local context

Karlskrona	Tampere	Brussels
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -1 municipality - 64 5000 inh - 1 500 inh/km² - Selective collection available for biowaste 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -17 municipalities - 412 000 inh - 35 inh/km² - Selective collection available for biowaste - biowaste generation: ~120 kg/inh 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -19 municipalities - 1 000 000 inh - 6 500 inh/km² - Selective collection available only for garden waste - biowaste generation: ~160 kg/inh

Procedure and used tools

Karlskrona	Tampere	Brussels
<p>Main tool: differentiated fees</p> <p>Information campaign with door to door visits before</p>	<p>Main tool: free training session to inhabitants</p> <p>Communication via website and invoices</p>	<p>Voluntary trained composter masters, who then raise awareness and train inhabitants</p> <p>Communication: general (brochures), demonstration tools, direct training sessions</p> <p>Financial aids to community composting projects</p>

Results

Karlskrona	Tampere	Brussels
<p>Reduction of 22% of mixed residual waste production</p> <p>Around 62 kg/inh/yr avoided</p>	<p>Around 250 participants/yr</p> <p>(in 15 yrs: 4 000 inhabitants)</p>	<p>12 % of the population reached</p> <p>30 % of participation among gardens owners</p> <p>-6 kg/inh/yr avoided</p> <p>Among participants: about -65 kg/inh/yr avoided</p>

Main difficulties and solutions

Karlskrona	Tampere	Brussels
<p>Some problems with odors: training sessions</p> <p>If inspection is needed: 75 € of fee</p>	<p>Few monitoring</p> <p>No real difficulty identified</p>	<p>Many household without gardens</p> <p>Access to shredder or shredded materials</p> <p>Difficulties with selling compost</p> <p>Continuous support needed</p>

+ / -

Karlskrona	Tampere	Brussels
<p>Good results</p> <p>Requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - important information campaign before the launch -Continuous controls 	<p>Few resources needed</p> <p>Participation less important than for the others</p>	<p>Overall good results</p> <p>Requires continuous allocation of resources to work properly</p>

Comparisons of different actions

- Interesting to see the different approaches along with the results
- Requires further analysis
- Difficulties:
 - Importance of local specificities?
 - Comparable indicators for sound comparisons?
- ▶ **Currently working on the question of transferability**

PREWASTE : follow up

- Data collection: to be completed
- Analysis and comparisons:
 - Identification of interesting tools
 - Identification of key factors for success
 - Transferability?
- Monitoring: difficult topic
 - Identification of a general approach but difficult to make it operational
 - Definition of a shared webtool to ease the monitoring

Thank you for your attention !

Jean-Benoit BEL - ORDIF

Project Manager

Jb.bel@ordif.com

<http://www.prewaste.eu/>