

# ACTU' ASSISES



August 2013

n°6

## Players in the centre of the action!

A few days away from the next environmental conference and a few weeks away from the 12<sup>th</sup> edition of the Assises des Déchets, a new issue of Actu' Assises highlights the positions of non-profit organizations (FNE), governments (the French and the Dutch Ministries of Environment) and territorial collectivities (AMF) concerning waste prevention and management: thus, avoidance, recycling or even circular economy will undoubtedly be at the heart of the debates at the next edition of the Assises.

Do not miss the  
12<sup>e</sup> Assises des Déchets  
Online registration  
on our website:  
[www.assises-dechets.org](http://www.assises-dechets.org)



### INDEX

-  Overview of the «waste policy».....p2  
**Interview of Bruno GENTY**  
President  
France Nature Environnement
-  Operational lines of new waste policy.....p5  
**Interview of Christine CROS**  
Head of the waste planning/management office  
MEDDE
-  Waste recycling in the Netherlands:  
analysis of the success.....p6  
**Interview of Wilma MANSVELD**  
State Secretary  
Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment
-  20 years of «waste policy» analysed by AMF.....p8  
**Interview of Jacques PELISSARD**  
President  
AMF
-  Provisional program.....p9



## Overview of the «waste policy»

PLenary SESSION 1:  
What are the results of the 2009-2013  
Waste Plan so far?  
Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2013, 11.00 am



**Bruno GENTY**  
President

France Nature Environnement

**An analysis by Mr. Bruno Genty, president of the federation FNE, and speaker at the 1<sup>st</sup> plenary session dealing with the “Waste Plan 2019-2013”.**

**A priori, waste prevention imposes itself at the top of the agenda of waste policy hierarchy. As a player, but also as an astute observer of the sector, how do you analyse the level of consideration of this priority?**

As an outcome of the Grenelle of the environment, waste prevention has benefited from a greater visibility as well as from financial and methodological support, allowing it to really emerge as a public policy in many territories.

This visibility was the result of a political willingness by a group of actors, combined with the perspective of a negotiated and clearly displayed objective: to reduce waste volumes by 7% (which equals some 25 kg per inhabitant per year). Financial support logically came from TGAP increase (the more one incinerates waste, and/or the more waste is put on a rubbish dump, the more one pays). The money collected through this TGAP component is assigned to waste prevention policies, and the ADEME has been very reactive by fixing a methodological setting and by proposing an educational accompaniment for sharing better initiatives.

Many territorial collectivities have been mobilized to integrate a strategy of waste prevention as a complement to their efforts to valorise and treat waste. For some of them, this was even a godsend

opportunity. These collectivities have committed themselves, without always using complementary means to the ones supplied by the ADEME. For the vast majority of collectivities, the environmental importance and very soon the social interests of this policy have been appreciated. Today, for these pioneer collectivities, it is the economic benefits they are seeking (activities in the proximity: reuse, repair, service economy through sharing equipment, shuttle packaging...).

As a conclusion, one can say that waste prevention - I prefer talking about waste avoidance - is a reality in the territories where it is taking an important place, up to favouring networking with other public policies.

**In your opinion, what are the main brakes to be released, and/or the main levers to pull, in order to accelerate the movement and progression of this issue?**

I am thinking of 4 necessary orientations of intervention:

1. I spoke about financial and methodological support for territories. This needs to be continued, while amplifying the virtuous transfer launched by the TGAP (stop exonerations, in particular the ones that are a bonus for immobilism).



Continued on next page



Bruno GENTY

President

France Nature Environnement

2. However, today a new objective needs to be set, new ambitions defined, with an approach per product category. This implies a new global objective to reduce waste quantities. This objective needs to be propped up by:

- objectives of product or product families' avoidance. In other words: we need to assume the products in which we want to interfere in order to avoid, limit and delay waste appearance issued from their use (extension of product lifespan, substitution of an acquisition by services, reuse).

- objectives of avoidance linked with the ones determined for recycling material present in waste. The objectives of avoidance and of valorisation are complementary (less waste production and better recycling of the ones produced). Otherwise, one can understand that a manager of a waste-sorting site tries to increase his turnover! *Why avoid waste production if it is only the amount of recovered materials in my territory that is taken into account to evaluate my performance?*

3. This articulation prevention / recycling brings me to a central point of the challenge. The 1<sup>st</sup> EPR (*Extended Producer Responsibility*) plan has been implemented in 1992. This has contributed to the rise of a recycling economy. This economy must be consolidated and it is logically one of the working areas taken into account for the theme of circular economy, on the agenda of the next Conference on environment. As far as prevention is concerned, which is a priority aspect in terms of regulatory hierarchy and expectations of the population, an economy of product lifespan extension remains to be constructed. This means the identification of the

players and the activities that contribute, and like for recycling, with the goal to develop these activities, and to dispose of a financial system associated with marketing all of the products. Only a system associated with product marketing has the capacity to make the economic players move seriously, in particular by encouraging efforts made by those who innovate.

4. Finally, as I said before, the sequence launched in 2009 met a strong mobilization of the collectivities, who, for local prevention programs, mainly turned to their populations. Industrial and public service activity waste should be made visible, and their prevention developed. Let's consider the respective proportions of waste production per large sector... we need to shift up a gear. Once again, we don't start from scratch, since pioneer collectivities have been able to mobilize their services and professional sectors. But what about activity sector commitment per professional branch? It would be the acknowledgment of initiatives taken by some and a challenge to take up for others.

What I just recalled is part of the expectations of prevention professionals working in collectivities. An example: after elaborating directories of repairmen in the territories, and proposing to citizens "discount vouchers" for repair, what will be the commitment of manufacturers or market providers to make products more robust, upgradable and repairable?

**This is the question the next National Waste Prevention Plan should give an answer to.**



Continued on next page



Bruno GENTY

President

France Nature Environnement

## As for mobilization of the public, and in particular concerning the fight against food wastage, what actions - existing or new - do you recommend?

Fighting against food wastage is an indispensable field of work. As an environmental federation, we have greatly contributed to its inscription on the political agenda and praise should be given to the minister Guillaume Garrot for having been able to reunite many players and to obtain their first commitments. Of course, when you say “commitments” one also says “measures to be taken”, and the FNE attends these dynamics to accompany these commitments and new ones to emerge.

The way your question is formulated brings about a reflection. You are right when you highlight the necessity of “main public” mobilization. With food wastage, as for general waste prevention, we are at the crossroads of our production and consumption modes. Activities and players in both camps need their practices to evolve. Yes, as a consumer, we need to change the way we look at product calibration, be attentive to the quantities we buy and “know how to cook leftovers”, just to remember some “small attentions” each of us can have. But as an environmental association, we have emphasized,

and we continue to do so, that food wastage is found at “all levels”. So we shall have to debate certain modes of production and distribution, with respect of all players. We must identify production and distribution systems which lead all the players to waste less in their organization. And, for example, that “gateways” are developed in the territories, linking local producers and consumers. Concretely, we can mention catering in schools and retirement homes. Yes, it is necessary to raise public awareness, to demonstrate that the stakes are important, from an environmental point of view but also economically and socially. Yes, we need an accompaniment in the evolution of behaviour (for instance, share of know-how). But we need alternatives in order to be able to consume in a different way. These alternatives need to exist and be visible and accessible for the majority of people. This is a strong social challenge. That is why the economic players need to be more active in the development of these alternatives. And the public authorities must have the ambition to install levers, with the objective to accelerate the emergence of these alternatives.

FNE website:  
[www.fne.asso.fr](http://www.fne.asso.fr)

\*\*\*\*\*

### \* Award 2013:

The Assises des Déchets have received the **Sustainable Development Trophy** during the «Rencontres France Congrès» in 2012.

France Congrès is the Association of Mayors of Congress Cities that works for the business tourism development.





# Operational lines of new waste policy

**PLenary SESSION 1:**  
What are the results of the 2009-2013  
Waste Plan so far?  
Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2013, 11.00 am



**Christine CROS**

Head of the waste planning/management office  
Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy

**The days after the environmental conference of September 20 and 21, the Assises des Déchets promise to take stock of the lines of action of the new waste management policy. The highly operational problems concerning the problematic of treatment mode hierarchy, but also the question of transition models to be organized towards a better valorisation of materials, or towards high-performance models of circular economy, these will be the key subjects of the discussions in Nantes.**

*“It is a very rich sequence of reflection and partnership elaboration that will be finalized at the Assises des Déchets”* accentuates Christine Cros, responsible for the waste planning/management issues at MEDDE and session leader of the introductory plenary session at the Assises in Nantes. After having highlighted the waste topic during the 1<sup>st</sup> edition of the environmental conference, a truly active process of consultation has been implemented, in particular around the “Conseil National des Déchets”. The process will be accomplished in September at the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of the environmental conference, and then in October at the Assises des Déchets.

**T**hroughout seven workshops\* of this consultation, the participating parties have affirmed their shared priorities: first of all, the perspectives of circular economy, in particular in terms of activity and employment, and thus the priority to be given to valorisation of materials.

*“For all the actors, the scenarios converge, but the transition of the models has of course yet to be*

*organized”* Christine Cros resumes. *“In a pragmatic manner, it appears for instance that we will not be able to evacuate the energy valorisation overnight, and so a first transitory challenge will be the optimisation of this treatment mode. This is very well illustrated by the implementation of the ERP<sup>1</sup> furnishings sector, which offers good perspectives of material valorisation on the long term, but will first redirect the energy valorisation flows”.*

**I**n any case, the Assises des Déchets will make it possible to take stock of these strategies. While relying on the results acquired through the “Plan Déchets 2009/13”, the debate in Nantes should chart the future challenges and the roadmap for waste, and thus contribute to elaborating a new “Plan Déchets 2020”.

*\*Prevention, circular economy, positioning of treatment modes, ERP<sup>1</sup> sectors, public service financing, industrial waste, public works waste*

*<sup>1</sup>extended responsibility of the producer*

MEDDE website:  
[www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr](http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr)

\*\*\*\*\*

**\* The media support the 12<sup>e</sup> Assises des Déchets**

Techniques - Sciences - Méthodes (ASTEE), Environnement Magazine and Recyclage-Récupération (Victoires Editions), Environnement et Technique and Actu-environnement.com (Cogiterra), Techni.Cités (Territorial), Ecollectivités magazine, Les Cahiers de l’Environnement, Décisions Durables, Le Journal de l’Environnement, Terra eco, Dechetcom, Déchets Infos, Enviro2B, Myjobdurable, AFITE, EPE, Inforisque.info





## Waste recycling in the Netherlands: analysis of the success

1/2



Wilma MANSVELD

State Secretary

Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment (Netherlands)

**The Netherlands is among EU champion countries for waste recycling. Analysis of this success by Mrs. Wilma Mansveld.**

**The Netherlands is one of the countries praised by the EU for its waste treatment methods, especially recycling. Can you explain the reasons for such performance?**

Our country has led the way in waste management for many years: about 78% of the Dutch waste is recycled and 19% is incinerated. Only 3% goes to landfill, compared to the EU average of 40%. These figures underscore our country's commitment to recycling, and reflect good business sense on the part of Dutch waste management companies. Encouraged by EU policy, they are continually developing and introducing new recycling techniques and methods. Striving for better waste management means always being on the lookout for new developments and innovations.

There are several reasons for our good track record in this area. First and perhaps most importantly, is the close cooperation between industry and local, provincial and national authorities. In the Netherlands, we recognise working together as a key factor in effective waste management. A clear division of responsibilities is a second reason. Legislation and the national waste management plan clearly set out who is responsible for what.

Another reason for our success is that we saw the importance of protecting the environment, and recycling, fairly early on. In the late 1960s we found

out that environmental pollution in the Netherlands was much worse than we'd assumed. That resulted in sectoral legislation, that is, separate laws for each type of environmental problem.

A fourth reason is the concept of producers' responsibility, introduced in 1990. We decided producers should still be responsible for their products in the waste phase. This later became an important instrument in both national and international legislation (e.g. on car wrecks and waste from electrical and electronic equipment). Finally, financial instruments have also played an important role. Examples are landfill tax, producers' responsibility for several products, and differential rates for household waste collection. The introduction of landfill tax in 1995 led to a sharp decline in the need for orders and injunctions to achieve full capacity utilisation of waste incineration plants. In the end, the tax could be abolished because waste companies no longer needed the disincentive for landfill disposal.

**How are the various treatment methods organised, given the non-negligible part of incineration?**

As I mentioned before, only 3% of waste goes to landfill while 78% is recycled. So incineration is not the main treatment method in the Netherlands. How waste treatment is organised depends on the waste



Continued on next page



# Waste recycling in the Netherlands: analysis of the success

2/2

Wilma MANSVELD

State Secretary

Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment (Netherlands)

stream. It would take several pages to describe the entire system, so I will only give a brief outline. Currently, 75% of the remaining capacity for landfill and 60% of the incineration capacity is in public hands. The City of Amsterdam, for instance, has its own incineration plant. Others are owned by groups of municipalities – like HVC, which is owned by 48 municipalities and 6 water authorities. Provincial authorities are the main shareholders of companies like Attero.

Composting facilities are run by both public and private companies, while private companies carry out most of the recycling activities: crushing and sorting building/demolition waste, treating and recycling glass, paper and metals, and so on. Legislation known as product decrees lays down rules for the collection and recycling of several waste streams, including cars, tyres, electrical equipment, packaging waste and batteries.

Household waste collection is a municipal responsibility. Local authorities decide how the waste is collected, and by whom (a municipal service or a private company). The collection of all other waste is the responsibility of business and industry.

## **What are the perspectives and the main projects in your country in the field of waste treatment?**

We have to change the way people think about waste in general and move towards a circular economy and resource efficiency.

In achieving this transition, the programme 'From waste to raw material' is a key policy instrument. A circular economy means achieving a closed chain

in which the parties in the chain know each other, understand each other and complement each other. So, if a flowerpot manufacturer wants to use recycled plastic, it is essential for the recycler to know what requirements the plastic must meet, and for all the parties involved in collecting and sorting the plastic to take these requirements into account. Good cooperation within the chains is a prerequisite.

The 'From waste to raw material' programme focuses on the 'pack' and on the 'leaders'. Its main elements are strategic use of market incentives, a dynamic legislative framework that promotes green growth and innovation, innovation, and government in the role of network partner. The main programme objectives are creating legislative and financial instruments that support the transition to a circular economy, encouraging recycling of secondary raw materials, and creating scope for innovation and growth. The programme also addresses specific chains and waste streams, and encourages the development of financial and other market incentives.

The Netherlands is a frontrunner, but innovation and more cooperation are necessary if we want to stay in the lead. An important target is to increase the percentage of household waste that is recycled from 50% to 65%. In the Netherlands, each person produces about 500 kg of waste a year. That's about 1.5 kg of waste a day. For the country as a whole that would fill about 24 football stadiums. We still throw away valuable materials which could also be used in making other products. Other important goals that we're pursuing are better collection and recycling of packaging waste, especially plastics, and curbing or banning microplastics.



Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment website:  
[www.government.nl/ministries/ienm](http://www.government.nl/ministries/ienm)



## 20 years of «waste policy» analysed by AMF

**PLENARY SESSION 4:**  
Challenges and  
propositions for the future  
Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2013, 2.30 pm



**Jacques PELISSARD**

President

Association des Maires de France

**More than 20 years of “waste policy”, marked by continuing prospective debates at the Assises des Déchets...**

### **I**n your analysis, what is the main progress booked during this time period?

The institutional, political, economic and technical situation has profoundly changed. At the time, it seemed incongruous to engage the responsibility of citizens, local authorities, distributors and companies, and it was unimaginable to make the different players collaborate in a partnership. Organizing important waste recycling, creating opportunities for products from separate waste collection, renew collecting and treatment techniques, invent sorting systems, mobilize citizens: these are the challenges that have been taken up by the local authorities. Finally, the modernization of treatment equipment and the battle against unauthorized dumping are equally important to preserve the environment.

### **A**nd what are the main fields of progress that remain to be implemented?

An objective evaluation of the policy conducted over the last 20 years is indispensable. The multiplication of EPR (Extended Producer Responsibility) requires the introduction of further coordination. Waste market development for recycling and the substantial increase of revenues created by the sale of materials also impose a reflection on this desirable and possible economic model.

The resurgence of unauthorized waste dumps preoccupies the politicians, in particular the mayors. So it is necessary to determine people’s motivations. We may have assigned too much importance to technical issues at the expense of people behaviour and their evolution. And finally, I particularly pay attention to renewing partnership between all the players and to restoring confidence.

### **P**lanning and prevention have become the “keywords” of waste policy. How do you consider their relevance and the reality of actions induced?

I deplore an ever increasing temptation to change from a culture of conciliation and consensus towards a culture of authoritarian planning. Moreover, the tendency to plan on ever increasing territories may well lead to a loss of insight in field reality and material constraints. Planning without conciliation with collectivities that implement measures has a fair chance to remain without effect.

Prevention is in the same scope of the fight against wastage as is energy control. So it requires an effort of sensitization on a national scale. However, it cannot constitute the only component of a national waste policy management.

### **A**ccording to you, what are the main “territorial waste” concerns today, and in particular for councils: at present, and for the years to come?

Today, the main “territorial waste” concerns are cost control, the consequences of incentive pricing implementation, the fragmentation of collected deposits and the future of collective equipment. The increasingly fragmented waste flow separation according to their nature leads to a mechanical cost increase. In the meantime, recyclable waste likely to allow generating revenues increasingly escape from the local and regional authorities, in particular in the so-called operational EPR’s. Collectivities are thus confronted with a double movement: a more and more precocious separation of flows which drives the cost up and the disappearance of part of the profitable deposits, which leaves them with waste that is increasingly expensive to treat.



AMF website:  
[www.amf.asso.fr](http://www.amf.asso.fr)

# 12<sup>e</sup> Assises des déchets

## WEDNESDAY 2<sup>nd</sup> OCTOBER 2013

- 09.00 am Welcome of participants
- 10.00 am Opening of the conference  
Welcome speeches
- 11.00 am Debate in plenary session: PS1  
What are the results of the 2009 - 2013, Waste Plan so far?
- 12.30 am Lunch
- 2.00 pm Debate in plenary session: PS2  
Is hierarchy in prevention needed?
- 3.30 pm Break
- 4 to 6 pm Parallel technical workshops:
1. Statistics: a public policy tool to improve ?
  2. Treatment capacities: a new sizing pattern
  3. Recycling: proximity versus industrialisation?
  4. How can organic waste be (properly) recovered?
- 8.30 pm Dinner



## THURSDAY 3<sup>rd</sup> OCTOBER 2013

- 8.30 am Parallel technical workshops
5. Waste from building sites: a resource that needs to be explored
  6. Energy recovery perspectives
  7. Technologies: the new potentials that can be exploited
  8. Nuclear facilities: dismantling and lifecycle-related challenges
- 10.30 am Break
- 11.00 am Debate in plenary session: PS3  
Superposition of plans threatens coherence
- 12.30 am Lunch
- 2.00 pm Speech of Mr. Sean SPENCER-WORT,  
Bristol City Council's Recycling Officer
- 2.30 pm Debate in plenary session: PS4  
Challenges and propositions for the future
- 4.00 pm Intervention of a personality
- 4.30 pm Closing of the Assises



**ELECTRICITE DE FRANCE**

**MEDDE**

**ECO-EMBALLAGES**

**TOTAL**

**12<sup>e</sup>**



# Assises des déchets

2 et 3 octobre 2013 Cité des Congrès de Nantes

**ADEME**

**DREAL**

**NANTES METROPOLE**

**ANDRA**

**CEA**



**ASN**

**PAPREC**

**SITA FRANCE**

**CONSEIL REGIONAL DES PAYS DE LA LOIRE**

**VEOLIA PROPRETE**

**SECHE ENVIRONNEMENT**

Direction of publication: Association des Assises Nationales des Déchets

Editor: Rue Premion

Photo credit: Julie Hattu and Assises Nationales des Déchets

ISSN 2264-9980

