



COLLECTORS

WASTE COLLECTION SYSTEMS ASSESSED AND GOOD PRACTICES IDENTIFIED

Webinar, 30 April 2020

Twan van Leeuwen (PNO)



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 776745





The costs of PPW collection system: A cross-analysis of five European cities

Twan van Leeuwen, PNO Consultants





- 1. Short introduction on COLLECTORS
- 2. Five PPW cases
- 3. CBA methodology and scope
- 4. Shift in costs
- 5. Costs and benefits
- 6. Conclusions on good financial practices









Identify good practices in waste collection and increase knowledge sharing; to ensure that good performing regions and cities can serve as examples for regions with similar local contexts







242 waste collection systems identified and described on ~30 parameters (depending on available information); covering 25 European countries







Cases	Population [inh]	Population density [inh/km	2]	ANG 1 1 15 1
1. Tubbergen (NL)	21,142	144	;	ANTER JUST
2. Gent (BE)	256,262	1,641	S	
3. Rennes (FR)	438,865	617	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	A. I Francis
4. Berlin (DE)	3,537,100	3,965	Entry wy	and the second
5. Parma (IT)	196,475	754	the start and	

Household packaging waste

- Paper and cardboard
- Glass
- Plastics
- Metals
- Drinking cartons







Economic assessment

- Identify relevant actors
- Identify financial and material flows
- Quantifying costs and benefits (CBA)
- Mapping financial incentives and levers
- From the municipality point of view





















Parameters

Scope

- Investment costs
- (infrastructure, bins, chips,..)
- Operational costs
- Revenues

- (collection, sorting, street cleaning, taxes)
 - (sold materials, incineration revenues, EPR fees, tax savings, citizens waste fees)

Rationale

Assessment to see if good practices can be achieved by maintaining acceptable fees for citizens.



Costs [Euro/ton]



Achievements PPW

Mapped in detail the effect of shifting from

comingled collection to separate collection

Findings:

1. With **dropping volumes**, *residual waste*

- 1. collection cost increases
- 2. treatment cost decreases

2. With increasing volumes, recyclables

- 1. collection cost decreases
- 2. treatment cost increases





Overview of financial shifts in the Parma case

Collected quantities [kilo tons]











Parma - overview of costs and benefits 2012 - 2017

Achievements:

Mapped in detail the relevant costs of the

PPW collection system

Findings:

- Highest cost: residual waste collection
- Highest revenue: waste fees
- Costs have stabilized despite increasing recycling
- Revenues have increased
- ➔ Better recycling can be done without net increasing costs!
- → With acceptable fees for citizens!







€ 800 000 € 600 000 € 400 000 € 200 000 €-2016 2017 2018 2013 2014 2015 -€ 200 000 -€ 400 000 -€ 600 000 -€ 800 000 PMD collection and processing Paper and cardboard collection and processing Glass collection and processing Residual waste (PPW) - collection Residual waste (PPW) - processing Waste inceneration tax Opportunity costs missed incineration Streetcleaning Waste fees

Tax savings from incineration

Incineration benefits

Tubbergen - overview of costs and benefits 2013 - 2018

Findings:

- Highest cost: PMD collection
- Highest revenue: waste fees/EPR fee
- Both cost and revenues increase

Similar conclusions for all cases: Better recycling can be done without net -€ 20 increasing costs and with maintaining acceptable fees for citizens. -€ 40

Total EPR fees





Case	Average waste fee	Waste fee part of total revenues	Trend	
	[€/hh]	[%]		
Parma	243	54%	Steady	
Ghent	61	23%	Steady	
Berlin	126	38%	No data	
Tubbergen	140	42%	Dropping	
Rennes	133	57%	Dropping	

Case	EPR fee/ of total revenues [%]
Parma	10 %
Ghent	22 %
Berlin	52 %
Tubbergen	40 %
Rennes	23 %

ightarrow Collected quantities and qualities

→ Different responsibilities per EPR scheme





Case	Waste fee [%]	Recovered materials [%]	EPR fees [%]	Incineration revenues [%]
Parma	56 → 49	18 → 26	8 → 12	$16 \rightarrow 6$
Ghent	26 > 21	30 → 24	15 → 30	26 > 21
Berlin	-	-	47 → 52	14 → 10
Tubbergen	60 → 32	-	26 → 53	$_{13} \rightarrow _{3}$
Rennes	58 → 55	19 → 18	19 → 25	-

% of total revenues





	Parma	Ghent	Berlin	Tubbergen	Rennes
Landfill ban	×	~	\checkmark	>	\checkmark
Landfill tax	\checkmark	~	×	 	\checkmark
Incineration tax	~	>	×	>	\checkmark
EPR scheme	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	 Image: A set of the set of the	\checkmark





1. Would you assume that improving selective collection performances means increasing the cost borne by the municipality and the citizens?

With good practices in place, NO. An increasing share is covered by EPR fees, therefore paid by producers (and indirectly by consumers).

2. Are waste collection systems using PAYT more expensive than waste collection system not using it?

Based on the case studies, the overall operational cost seem to increase, however, the revenues increase accordingly.







Thank you!

Twan van Leeuwen PNO Consultants twan.vanleeuwen@pnoconsultants.com

www.collectors2020.eu