

Extended Producer Responsibility in the Yukon:

What We Heard during public engagement between November 1, 2022 and February 17, 2023



The Government of Yukon committed to developing an Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) regulation by 2025 under [Our Clean Future: A Yukon strategy for climate change, energy and a green economy](#).

What is EPR?

EPR is a new to the Yukon framework for end-of-life management of materials in the territory. Producers that supply products and packaging into the territory will be responsible for collection and recycling of these items.

Goals of EPR

The primary goals for bringing this program to the Yukon are to:

- provide financial stability for recycling;
- reduce the costs of waste management for taxpayers;
- increase waste diversion;
- help reach targets under *Our Clean Future*; and
- encourage a circular economy.

Products overview

The three priority categories of products that will be managed under EPR framework are:

- printed and packaging products, such as blue box type items (excluding beverage containers);
- household hazardous waste, such as waste paints, fuels and solvents; and
- automotive wastes, such as waste oil, waste antifreeze and their containers.

How did we consult?

The engagement launched on November 1, 2022, at the Yukon Recycling Summit in Whitehorse. The public was invited to attend a public open house during the Recycling Summit and three info sessions. An online public survey was also available. Stakeholders participated in twelve, group engagement sessions and learned about EPR through email and phone conversations. Stakeholders submitted written responses to the questions posed in the Discussion Paper.

Who responded?

The on-line survey was completed by 278 people, 44 businesses and 8 organizations. 78% of individual respondents and 71% of businesses and organizations respondents were from Whitehorse.

Twenty-two stakeholders submitted formal responses to the Discussion Paper or indicated they have no comments. An additional 10 stakeholders provided input into the engagement through email.

The first engagement session at the Yukon Recycling Summit was attended by approximately 55 people in person and online. Over 75 people attended other scheduled engagement sessions for stakeholders, and some stakeholders participated more than once.



Executive summary: What We Heard

Summary of EPR framework engagement

Products

1. Adopting the definition of **printed paper and packaging (PPP)** category from BC was generally supported and would include paper products, packaging, packaging-like items and single-use items.

The public indicated strong preference for bringing back recycling of styrofoam and glass. Stakeholders recommended setting separate targets for these materials in recognition of the high cost and difficulty of recycling these materials in the Yukon.

About two thirds of respondents, mostly from out of territory, did not support inclusion of any waste generated by the industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) sector in the Yukon's EPR program due to concerns regarding cost, non-inclusion of these materials in most other Canadian EPR programs, and not wanting to disrupt current commercial arrangements with waste collection service providers.

The rest of the stakeholders supported inclusion of most or all of industrial, commercial and institutional sources of waste due the current set up of the recycling in the Yukon, desire for the economy of scale, and desire to divert materials from the landfill based on their type (e.g., cardboard) rather than origin.

2. The proposal included the following products and associated containers in the **household hazardous waste (HHW)** category: solvent and flammable liquids, domestic pesticides, paint, and household batteries. Stakeholders provided feedback on additional products under consideration.

The public indicated that it was very important or somewhat important to manage all proposed products as well as additional products including non-fillable pressurized containers, lights and light fixtures and alarms. It was also suggested that corrosive and toxic materials be included in this EPR program.

3. In the **automotive products** category, most stakeholders supported addition of diesel exhaust fuel (DEF) to the waste oil and antifreeze products list. It was also suggested to assign a different name to this category to reflect that oil and antifreeze from non-automotive sources will also be included in the EPR program.



Producer definitions & exemptions

The proposed hierarchical approach to the producer definition was widely supported. Importance of strong and clear hierarchy was emphasized by many stakeholders. The top rung of the hierarchy was recommended to be brand owners resident in Canada, rather than in the Yukon.

While some stakeholders expressed preference for not exempting any producers from the EPR obligations, the following feedback on exemptions for small producers of printed paper and packaging (PPP) was received:

- No consensus on the annual revenue threshold value. Businesses below \$1M, \$2M or \$5M were proposed to be exempt.
- Support to exempt businesses supplying less than 1 tonne of PPP to the Yukon market per year.
- Support to exempt registered charities.

Respondents agreed that exempt producers should keep records confirming they meet the exemption criteria.

Waste Management Hierarchy

Alignment of the waste management hierarchy with BC was widely supported.

Fees

In general, stakeholders expressed the position that the costs will be passed down to the consumer regardless of the rules on the fee visibility. The majority of respondents supported the proposed rules on the fees to allow the producers to decide whether the fee is visible or incorporated into the price of the product. Several stakeholders felt strongly that no visible fees should be allowed for any products as they allow producers to externalize waste management costs and can increase program complexity and costs

Stewardship plans and target setting

The majority of stakeholders supported the proposed approach to develop EPR programs and set targets through stewardship plans.

Stakeholders expressed concerns regarding availability of data prior to the start of program operations to inform appropriate waste diversion targets in the regulation and unknown impacts on program costs if targets are set prior to stewardship plan development. The majority of respondents preferred not to set minimum targets in the regulation; however, one stakeholder considered that targets set in the regulation would lead to the strongest environmental outcomes.

Reporting

Most respondents supported proposed reporting submission rules and general timelines. In particular, support was expressed for:

- regular reporting on the program's performance, in particular as outlined in the approved stewardship plan;
- PROs being allowed to report and provide performance audits on behalf of the producers they represent;
- harmonization of reporting requirements with other provinces, such as BC; and
- reports to be freely available to the public.

Oversight and Compliance

The majority of the respondents supported the proposed in-house oversight model by the Government of Yukon.

