

CA vs AB vs BC Deposit Systems

Program Element	California	Alberta	British Columbia
Goal			
Mandatory recovery target	None overall - If a container type failed to reach a 65% recycling rate by 1992, the deposit for that type would double.	None overall - Provincial Government has set 85% as the desired goal	Yes - 85%
Deadline	n/a	n/a	2 years after implementation
Allocation of Responsibility			
Program design	Government (state)	Industry Stakeholders	Industry Stakeholders
Program administration	Government (state)	Delegated Administrative Organization (DAO) empowered by the regulation and comprised of Stakeholders and Public	Brand owner-designated Producer Responsibility Organization (PRO)
Funding	Central fund: Wasting consumers pay via unredeemed deposits; Brand owners pay processing fees; processors receive material revenues	Central fund: Wasting consumers pay via unredeemed deposits; Brand owners pay recycling ('ecology') fees	Central fund: Wasting consumers pay via unredeemed deposits; Brand owners pay recycling fees
Collection	Certified oldline recyclers, convenience zone recyclers and curbside programs	Bottle Depots	Brand-owner/PRO contracts with depots/retailers
Processing/Recycling	Certified processors	Common Collection Agent (CCA) (appointed by Mfr, approved by DAO)	Brand owner/PRO contracts with recyclers
Monitoring/Oversight	Government	DAO	Government + Beverage Container Management Board
Incentives			
For consumer to participate -financial	refund deposit	refund deposit	refund deposit
For consumer to participate - convenience	depot or curbside return	province-wide depot network	retail or depot return
For Brand-owner to meet goal	law	none	law
For Brand-owner to use refillables	none	none	PRO's recycling fee
For Brand-owner to design-for-recycling	processing fee	ecology charge	PRO's recycling fee
For Brand-owner to innovate	processing fee	none	PRO's recycling fee
For Brand-owner to reduce costs when no sort by	no sort by brand: processing fees	material sort - only refillables are currently sorted by brand	PRO's recycling fee
Cross-subsidization			
Allowed for containers covered?	prevented by govt.	prevented by system design	prevented by PRO's recycling fee
Containers not covered	wine & liquor; aseptic; milk and milk substitutes	milk	milk and milk substitutes
Enforcement			
Mandated by legislation	Yes	Yes	Yes

CA vs AB vs BC Deposit Systems

Program Element	California	Alberta	British Columbia
Consequences			
Of not reaching goal / high R rate	government may require increased deposit if container type fails to reach 65%	government may require increased deposit, more advertising, more depots, longer hours, new services	government may require increased deposit, more advertising, more depots, longer hours, new services
Deposits			
Amount	\$0.025; 0.05 based on size (>24oz)	\$0.05/\$0.20 based on size except beer - \$0.10	\$0.05, 0.10, 0.20 based on size
How established	by law	regulation (minimums)	by law
Amount redeemable	full	full	full
Allocation of Revenues			
Sale of material	to recycler	pays down material stream costs	to Brand-owner/PRO
Processing/Recycling fees	to recycler	to CCA	to PRO
Unclaimed deposits	to govt (used for administration and payments to recyclers)	pays down material stream costs	to PRO
Handling fees	to convenience zone recyclers	Bottle Depots	PRO to depots
Container Returns			
Depot	yes	yes	yes
Retailers	none	none	24/person/day
Curbside collection	Yes - \$ for deposits, processing fees and supplemental curbside payments	Curbside Contractor free to sort out and return to depot for deposit	no refund unless returned to depot
Cost Saving re Traditional BB Systems			
Sort by brand?	No	No	No
Use existing recycling processors	Yes	DAO permits depot operators	No?
Alternative to retail returns?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Results			
Recovery rate (soda): before / expanded	74% (1999) / 61% (2000)	Pop Can - 83% (2000) Over 1 Litre PET - 91% (2000) All Regulated - 78% (2000)	/ 75% (1999)
Political Support Inducements			
For industry/ brand-owner	(govt. manages for industry)	Industry self-manages	Industry self-manages
For retailers	no responsibility	no responsibility	mechanism for depot system
For local govt	\$ from deposits, processing fees and supplemental curbside payments	local employment at depots diversion reduces costs Not-for-Profit fundraising mechanism	fewer containers / lower costs
Recorder			
	Rick Best	Jeff Linton	Helen Spiegelman