

1.

## Uncontrolled WEEE recycling threat to children's health !

## 未经控制的WEEE循环处理会威胁儿童健康！

- Limit the total quantity of waste going to landfill!
- If the recycling is not carried out safely then there is a significant risk to human health and the environment!



- 限制被丢弃废物的总体重量！
- 如果循环处理过程没有得到安全控制会给人类的健康和环境安全带来重大危害！

According to the DG Environment News Alert Service (issue 105) the current EU policy on WEEE boosts the need for greater recycling of EEE to limit the total quantity of waste going to landfill. But if the recycling is not carried out safely then there is a significant risk to human health and the environment.

A Chinese study analysed Guiyu, a village in southeast China, which has a significant electronic circuit board recycling industry. Villagers melt solder from the circuit boards and sort electrical components, which they sell to electrical appliance factories. Circuit boards contain many toxic metals. The researchers tested dust from the recycling workshops, and also from the nearby road, food market and schoolyard. They found high levels of dangerous heavy metals which would have an impact on the health of the recycling workers and would pose a high risk to children.

The researchers tested for the metals cadmium, cobalt, chromium, copper, nickel, lead and zinc. These metals can cause both acute and long-term toxicity. Of these metals, high levels of lead and copper were the greatest cause for concern. High lead levels are associated with lower IQ in children. Other research has shown that both workers and children in Guiyu have a high incidence of bone disease, as well as digestive, neurological and respiratory problems, which may be linked to metal toxicity. The metals get into the body through the skin or when dust is inadvertently eaten or breathed in. The health risk to children at all locations around the village was around eight times greater than that to adults.

# 物盡其用 人盡其才



As the amount of WEEE generated in the European Community is growing rapidly policy makers should find a solution to make WEEE recycling in China and developing countries more safely.

To read the whole article please go to:

<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/research/newsalert/pdf/105na2.pdf>

Source: KERP-Consulting GmbH

2.

## Data decision prompts WEEE evidence trading !

### 数据决定促进了WEEE 证券交易 !

- The main reason for this is to ensure that producers meet the costs of collecting, treating etc!
- There is unlikely to be any surplus evidence and there should be demand for all the evidence with schemes all buying their share!
- 主要目的是保证生产商承担回收，循环处理等费用！
- 不大可以有任何证券盈余而且对证券的需求应该占到所有的份额！



Swapping and purchasing of evidence for WEEE recycling in earnest is getting underway in the wake of data decisions by the Department for Business (BERR).

Compliance schemes, representing producers of electrical and electronic equipment, now know how much

evidence they need to buy in each of the 13 categories of WEEE such as large domestic appliances and toys.

The figures come after a decision by the Department to switch its data method for calculating the final obligation figures for Compliance Period 1 (July to December 2007) to the amount of evidence issued, rather than schemes' quarterly return data as was previously intended.

#### Producer responsibility

By adopting this approach, BERR believes it has imposed true producer responsibility as all evidence will have to be bought and there will be no surplus. A spokeswoman for BERR said "the main reason for this is to ensure that producers meet the costs of collecting, treating etc all the household WEEE for which evidence has been issued in the compliance period."

As a consequence, there is unlikely to be any surplus evidence and there should be demand for all the evidence with schemes all buying their share. A shortage of some evidence is seen as a possibility for some categories of WEEE - there are 13 under the system.

Attention is also expected to focus on the market situation concerning compliance schemes Repic and Electrolink where the latter has a lot of evidence while Repic needs a substantial amount because it has a lot of members.

The two sides, according to WEEE experts, should now be talking - much may depend though on whether costs for the evidence can be agreed. BERR has been at pains to say that the charges should only cover costs, although there is still some dispute over exactly what costs are, with its advice applying to both schemes and local authorities.

#### Local authorities

As a consequence of switching the method for calculating the final collection it now appears as though all evidence will have to be sold which means that local authorities will not be out of pocket.

Several compliance schemes for WEEE had argued that the approach now adopted by BERR would have been an easier one to choose in the first place. In short, it means that the obligation is based on the evidence of recycling issued by reprocessors rather than on the amount of WEEE collected for schemes from designated collection facilities, usually civic amenity sites. If the system had remained based on the

物盡其用 人盡其才



material collected, because there was potentially more evidence of recycling issued there might have been a surplus of evidence meaning some councils could find their evidence unsold.

In order to try and resolve the difference between the two sets of data (CA site material sent for recycling and material recycled) which should have been almost identical - BERR instigated a data review earlier this month (see [letsrecycle.com](http://letsrecycle.com) story). This week the Department said that 10 schemes amended their data which led to an overall increase in the amount of separately collected.

The spokeswoman said: "The outcome of the exercise is that the gap between the two data sets has narrowed from around 3% to under 1%."

#### Rejig

The rejig of data has had some implications for schemes in that some now need to buy more fridge recycling evidence than expected, or less lamps or more toys. Generally the picture is described as one of "swings and roundabouts" although schemes needing evidence of recycling of smaller materials could find this more expensive as it is harder to come by.

The Settlement Centre in Glasgow will also be playing a role now as more evidence is traded although schemes will be talking directly with each other. Local authorities selling evidence via the Centre have been told by BERR that trading can now take place via the Settlement Centre until close of play on 15 June. The 16 June is the revised data for schemes to show they have complied.

Source: [www.letsrecycle.com](http://www.letsrecycle.com)