



## Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning

PO Box 500, East Melbourne,  
Victoria 8002 Australia  
delwp.vic.gov.au

### **Individual Feedback**

1. Having read the Proposed Policy Package Summary I cannot see a proposal which will address one of the key weaknesses of the current system. In my council area (Glen Eira) e-waste is collected as part of hard rubbish, which means it is simply booked and placed on the nature strip. The problem is that people often scavenge e-waste in the belief that it might still be usable and as a result, it never gets to be collected. I have had old cable modems taken as well as many other units.

I would prefer a drop-off place where units can be taken and placed in a large bin which cannot be opened except by authorised staff.

*Postcode – 3162*

2. Option C makes a profit so I expect there will be no cost for households. No increase in council waste collection fees, no increase in product cost at point of sale, and no increase in disposal fees. We will see how that works out.

Second point, govt needs to start considering the cost of adding these complexities to our lives in terms of added mental load and the time taken by individuals to implement these ideas. Organisational skills and time management skills required of individuals is too high (eg sorting through energy plans from retailers, phone plans, sorting household rubbish into four categories). People are suffering under the weight of all this choice and many just cannot take this load. What's the cost of that?

*Postcode – 3350*

3. Yes please! Landfill and environmental destruction will catch up. Let's save resources, time and money and start taking responsibility now.

Thanks for this initiative.

*Postcode – 3029*

4. This is a useful and important further step forward in the responsible management of waste.

Our local experience of a Library-based e-waste collection bin is mainly positive. The only reservations are inadequate clearance (the upside being that the service is used more than was predicted!) and failure of some users to differentiate e-waste from other discarded materials. The proposed education program will presumably take this into account.

*Postcode – 3193*

5. Banning categories of waste is not economically efficient and hard to police. However, it is a good way to make recycling happen. This is especially true in the absence of higher tipping fees generally. Victoria's waste levies are too low. I work in renewable energy and waste to energy plants don't make sense economically because it is just too cheap to bury rubbish in a hole.

*Postcode – 3182*

6. Mend it, Australia is based in Melton and we would appreciate electronics that are currently downcycled by the Transfer Station's contractor to be offered up to the public at this facility's TIP SHOP. Despite what Council says, this is not happening. Let's repair and reuse before we downcycle e-waste that is still fit for purpose. We also want to see parts salvaged that can be reused in the repair process.

Mend It, Australia on Facebook at <https://www.facebook.com/mendaussie/>

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission.

*Postcode – 3337*

7. Australia should follow suite with Sweden... Better yet, they should make an Environmental Deal with them. Look at their country for a prime example!

*Postcode – 3337*

8. Very few E-waste systems worldwide work properly without some kind of deposit-return scheme. Despite the challenges in implementing this in VIC (e.g. the relation with the Commonwealth's heads of powers etc.), the opportunity should be taken to implement this part of a successful product stewardship program.

Moreover a successful E-waste regime focusses not just on the 'Waste' side. Also on the 'E'side: product design, composition etc.

*Postcode – 3000*

#### **9. E-waste definition:**

Ensure the definition of e-waste is widely accepted and used by all stakeholders. E-waste is described here as "waste electrical or electronic equipment, or anything with a power cord or battery at the end of its useful life". However this definition is not used universally at present and is more extensive than what most people would consider e-waste. For example I would not have considered soft fabric toys that have a battery in them to be e-waste. However using the definition included here, they would be considered e-waste.

Frankston City Council defines e-waste as "any item with a power cord or charging cable" and considers batteries separately (both which are accepted at the transfer centre for recycling). They don't consider fabric toys with a battery to be e-waste and don't accept them at the transfer station for recycling.

#### **Access to collection points:**

Transfer stations are not accessible to everyone, such as those without a car. The collection services made available will need to be affordable so that they actually get used. Price is likely to be a barrier to many households that can't get to a transfer station.

#### **Non-rechargeable batteries:**

Any best practice approach to waste will consider the waste minimisation hierarchy (reduce -> reuse -> recycle). Therefore, people should be encouraged to reuse before they recycle wherever possible. Consider adding a levy on all non-rechargeable batteries. Consider also

encouraging people to give preference to rechargeable batteries compared to non-rechargeables in the communications campaign.

**Funding:**

The benefits of good policy are limited by how well compliance is enforced. Sufficient funding will need to be provided to the EPA for enforcement to ensure that the e-waste policies are adhered to. In addition, not all transfer stations have a sufficient set-up to accept e-waste in accordance with the policy requirements as of yet. In these cases, funded support should be provided by the Victorian Government.

**Education:**

The proposed three-year state-wide education and awareness campaign that "builds knowledge about what e-waste is, provides information on what Victorians can do with e-waste, and highlights the environmental benefits of reusing, donating, repairing or recycling e-waste" is essential.

**Hard waste collections:**

Will e-waste still be able to be collected through hard waste collections? This will need to be made clear.

*Postcode – 3910*

10. This is a great step forward for the management of e waste. Once again the government is working at trying to fix a problem with a bandaid solution instead of working at reducing the cheap imports of electronic goods into Australia. Please work on reducing the availability of cheap electronic goods which are one of the largest problems of e-waste. Good quality electronic goods last longer, have parts that are cost effective for fixing the item instead of throwing the item in the rubbish. If only our government would work to reduce the e-waste problem at its inception - consumerism.

*Postcode – 3976*

11. Access to e waste recycle depots essential. Monthly roadside collection? Otherwise our beautiful bushland will see an increase in illegal dumping already far too frequent due to tip fees.

*Postcode – 3450*

12. The costs of waste disposal are unnecessarily high. This is due to the costs of compliance. To stop ewaste to landfill is a step that is not required. Landfills that are well managed are completely safe and a necessary need for our modern society. The current trends driven by over zealous regulation and ideological rather than technical matters need to be tempered and in some cases even reversed.

*Postcode – 3636*

13. I am very pleased that the Andrews Labor Government is committed to banning e-waste from landfill in Victoria and is developing an approach to achieve this policy objective that will include:
- increase e-waste resource recovery;
  - reduce harm to the environment and human health associated with its disposal; and
  - support jobs and investment in the recycling industry.

The amount spent on educating Victorians about this is well worth it.

It is important to note intergenerational equity - and how overdue it is that we realise what a harmful legacy is being left for our future generations.

*Postcode – 3030*

14. Considering many Melbourne residents rely on public transport and the low likelihood that someone will carry a flatscreen tv or desktop computer on public transport, a kerbside collection or on-demand pick-up service will be required to ensure compliance. You need to make it convenient for people to comply or it won't happen. Expecting people to drop off large items at collection points is not reasonable.

*Postcode – 3003*

15. There must be a clear solution for disposing of these items. If not land fill then where? Having the solution on Page 129 or whatever of a 226 document will not prepare us. Tell us clearly and precisely. Are there places prepared to leave them? Places must be prepared before landfill closed. People will work with new places to leave these items if they are set up prior to the closing of landfill.

*Postcode – 3824*

16. Our council appreciates ban on e-waste to landfill. But appropriate guidelines need to be developed to enforce them. Council's current infrastructures are not adequate enough to tackle the complexity of the whole process. Council would require funding to upgrade its existing facilities. Also, product stewardships like NTCR should be extended to other electronic gadgets. Community should be educated in a plain language about what can or can't go to landfill. At the moment no one has the clear answer about the definition/explanation of e-waste.

Landfill levy should be re-funded to the landfill operators to improve their infrastructures. Also, it is not clear how small electronic items will be identified in a large landfill waste load. Appropriate guidelines should clarify/specify these issues.

*Postcode – 3631*

17. Please make it easier (and perhaps free!) to dispose of e-waste.

*Postcode – 3805*

18. I fully support the ban on e-waste disposal as rubbish. Every effort should be made to make collection from the public as easy as possible and that as much of the components recycled as possible.

*Postcode – 3101*

19. Given that the policy impact assessment for the different e-waste ban proposals concludes that the option with the largest net benefit is a comprehensive landfill ban coupled with medium-level access to collection services, please focus on pushing this option through the amendments.

In addition, the importance of recycling e-waste can not be stressed enough. Please ensure that the amendments incorporate an increase in recycling e-waste capabilities as well as practical educational tools for the community to ensure they understand they can recycle their e-waste and how to do so.

*Postcode – 3072*

20. Provide more public bins - not just at Council

*Postcode – 3011*

21. Any resources that can be reclaimed ought to be. Plenty of the metal in these items comes from our mines already. Perhaps a public 'buy back' scheme would assist in encouraging members of the public to recycle these products.

My thinking behind this is that we have already paid for these items several times over and people tend to be aware of that. If you incentivise it, you could create new jobs in the landfill/recycling sector, potentially new jobs in base industries that would utilise the reclaimed resources and encourage people to dispose of it correctly.

If done properly, you could see a boom similar to post WW2 Australia (plenty of adequate paying jobs and the ability to refine and process our own resources to meet our own needs). This would not only benefit the private citizen and possibly the public and private sector, but also the environment as a whole, reducing the footprint of our landfills and removing potentially harmful components from degrading in an uncontrolled fashion.

This stuff is really useful. This is a completely untapped market. The gold in these electronics alone is reason enough to justify looking into this.

*Postcode – 3028*

22. Thanks for sharing the draft documents with me. I have recognised that some parts of the Draft Waste Management Policy (E-waste) 2018 might be missing as I could not find sub-clauses 7(3) and 7(4) referred in the section 6 (6). It seems that more sub-sections are missing from Section 7 as there are only 7(1) and the table. Please correct me if I am wrong or share the updated document with me.

*Postcode – N/A*