



UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

UNECE Working Group on Environmental Monitoring (WGEM)

in collaboration with Ministry of Environment of Georgia



and with the financial assistance of the European Community

Second Workshop on Waste Classifications and Inventories

Tbilisi (Georgia), 3-4 October 2003

1. The second Workshop on Waste Classifications and Inventories under the joint project of UNECE and the European Environmental Agency (EEA) on “Support to the activities of the UNECE Working Group on Environmental Monitoring” took place on 3-4 October 2003 in Tbilisi (Georgia).
2. Participating in the workshop were officials of governmental organizations from the three South Caucasian countries as well as from some countries of Central Asia: Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and experts from the European Environmental Agency (EEA) and UNECE.
3. The main objectives of the Workshop were to:
 - Continue and finalize the discussion of the draft report on the situation with waste classifications and inventories in the countries of the South Caucasus;
 - Prepare general recommendations to the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia for improving waste classifications and inventories.

3 October, Friday

4. Mr. Zaal Lomtadze, the Deputy Minister of Environment of Georgia opened the workshop and welcomed the participants on behalf of Mrs. Nino Chkhobadze, the Minister of Environment of Georgia.

5. Mr. Mikhail Kokine, UNECE also welcomed the participants, presented goals and objectives of the Workshop and introduced the agenda of the morning session.

6. Mr. Yaroslav Bulych, UNECE presented the main results on waste management issues in the UNECE environmental performance reviews of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. In particular he dwelt on the following issues:

- national waste management policy;
- legal and institutional frameworks;
- main problems of management of different waste categories (industrial waste, municipal wastes, healthcare wastes and obsolete pesticides/hazardous chemicals);
- international cooperation;

7. After that Mr. Givi Kalandadze, Ministry of Environment of Georgia presented the draft document on classifications and inventories of wastes in the three Caucasian countries. In particular he highlighted the issues of waste classifications and inventories, legal and institutional frameworks and international cooperation.

8. Then the participants discussed the document on the existing waste classification and inventory systems (data collection and reporting, waste classification and indicators used for reporting).

9. Mr. Matti Viisimaa, EEC introduced the system of data collection and waste classification used in Estonia. He mentioned that in his country two ways of data collection were normally used: statistical data collection and data collection performed by competent authorities. Local bodies of the Ministry of Environment collect primary data and the Statistical Committee collects data through conducting statistical surveys and data extrapolation. The Ministry collects data only on industrial wastes. The full cycle of waste movement is recorded at the level of its source. Inventories include data on waste generation, transportation and disposal/landfilling. Local bodies of the Ministry of Environment prove data reliability. Municipalities are in charge for collection of data on municipal waste.

10. Mr. Fotis Kourmuisis, EEA noted that in Greece there were also two ways of waste data collection. The Ministry of Industry makes the inventory of industrial waste (generation and transportation) using specially designed questionnaires. The second way is the inventory and assessment of waste performed at three-year intervals as a part of a licensing procedure. Small industrial enterprises obtain a license from local authorities, medium-size enterprises – from regional bodies of the Ministry of Environment and large enterprises – directly from the Ministry of Environment. Data on household waste are collected by local authorities and reported to the Ministry of Environment. The Ministry of Environment is also responsible for data on landfill sites. There is a problem with collection of data on agricultural waste, for which the Ministry of Agriculture should be responsible. No state agricultural waste inventory system exists. The assessment of the generated agricultural waste is based only on data on pesticides and agricultural chemicals. In addition the Ministry of Environment has regional inspection bodies responsible for environment-related measures to be taken in accordance with the legislation and decisions of authorities.

11. After the discussion on data collection issues the participant began to discuss indicators used for reporting. In Azerbaijan the following indicators are used: generation, type of use, transfer to other organization, full amount in the beginning and at the end of a year (waste movement). Armenia in addition to the indicators mentioned by Azerbaijan uses financial waste-related

reports, reports on waste movement for each type of waste and physical-chemical characteristics of waste. Georgia has no waste inventory and reporting system. It is expected that such system will be implemented when the relevant Law on waste management is adopted.

12. The discussion covered the following issues:

- weaknesses of indicators used in the Caucasian countries;
- role of indicators: each indicator should response to a specific question, e.g. do raw material resources and waste reduce ? Is waste used adequately? What waste dominates and what is its impact on health and environment?
- data on waste are needed to identify the tendency and progress in the field of waste management. Databases should be updated on a regular basis to demonstrate the changes occurred.
- the Caucasian countries do not have any waste management quantitative goals. The EC countries do have such goals. E.g., 50% of package waste should be recycled.

13. As for the draft report on waste classifications and inventories, representatives from the Caucasian countries noted that they had enough time to take a look at the document. It was therefore proposed to address the document later and to submit written comments after the workshop. The participants from Armenia and Azerbaijan also noted that despite the fact that many problems are common for the three Caucasian countries, the situation in Armenia and Azerbaijan differs from that in Georgia. Unlike Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan have already implemented national waste inventory systems used for routine data collection and reporting. These differences should be clearly demonstrated in the document. Besides more emphasis should be placed on waste indicators.

14. The afternoon session was entirely dedicated to the presentations made by participant from the countries of Central Asia (CA). Officials from Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan made presentations. Representatives from Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan did not attend the workshop despite the relevant invitations and financial support.

15. The presentations made by participants from Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan showed that these countries encounter similar waste management problems including those related to waste classifications and inventories. However, Uzbekistan is much in advance as compared with the other CA countries. Whereas Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan face the problem of primary data on waste, Uzbekistan makes the national inventory of waste use and disposal sites and develops the national waste register. Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan make the national inventory of toxic waste only.

16. In all the three CA countries industrial enterprises are responsible for industrial waste inventories. Local authorities collect primary data and submit them to the competent environmental bodies. Statistical Committees compile and publish national waste data bulletins

17. Of the three CA countries only Uzbekistan has the Law on Wastes (adopted on 5 April 2002). At present the country implements the National Environmental Program (1995-2005), which includes measures on improving the existing and building new landfill sites, designing a garbage furnace and building a toxic waste disposal ground near Tashkent. Due to measures taken under the National Plan most of existing landfill sites meets the sanitary requirements.

18. Contrastingly most of legal landfill sites in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan do not meet even minimum sanitary requirements. There are also many unauthorized landfill sites in these countries. No new toxic waste disposal grounds are available. Besides the problem is aggravated

by the fact that there are toxic industrial waste disposal grounds where non-ferrous metals and radioactive waste have been accumulated since the time of the former Soviet Union.

19. Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan have waste classification systems based on Soviet time approach (5 classes based on toxicity). Uzbekistan has developed a very complicated multi-level waste classification system, which is applied to all types of waste, except for medical and radioactive waste. The system does not meet the requirements of Basel Convention. It is based on physical-chemical parameters of waste, types of treatment, classes of hazards, etc.

20. All the three CA countries collect waste taxes and about 25-40% of revenues resulted from these taxes go to the state environmental funds and later return to the economy sectors to be used for waste treatment or other environmental measures. In Tajikistan taxes are used only for waste, which is not recycled. In case waste originators/owners exceed waste accumulation limits a tax rate is increased five-fold. The economy sectors involved in waste treatment have some tax privileges.

21. The presentations of participants from the CA countries were followed by discussions. It was emphasized that the countries should not have complicated waste classification systems. On the contrary waste classification systems should be straightforward, operational and compatible with international classification systems.

22. Mr. Kokine opened the Saturday's session and briefly informed the participants on the agenda and the goals.

23. After that Mr. Bulych presented the main recommendations on waste management in the UNECE environmental performance reviews of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia.

24. Then Mr. Kalandadze introduced the draft of the following recommendations to Governments of the South Caucasian countries on waste classifications and inventories. They are invited to:

- Develop and set up the agreed system of classifications and provide waste definitions in accordance with the requirements of Basel Convention;
- Adjust the legislation on waste management in accordance with Basel Convention;
- Develop a more straightforward document on waste classifications in accordance with Basel Convention;
- Develop more clear definitions of "waste" and "hazardous waste";
- Establish national waste registers and make waste inventory based on European methodologies;
- Make waste inventory using a uniform format;
- Develop a common reporting system for waste generation, removal and disposal;
- Consider the EC documents on regulation and guidance (waste catalogue, information exchange strategies) to compare with national laws, instructions, guidelines and methodologies;
- Develop integrated waste indicators for data collection and analysis and for making decisions.

25. Mr. Kokine introduced the guidelines to be used for preparation of recommendations on waste classifications and inventories to the Caucasian countries and to other EECCA countries. In particular he proposed to develop recommendation on each of the following items:

1. Policy and legal-institutional frameworks;
2. Waste classifications;
3. Waste inventories (landfill sites and waste movement);
4. Inventory and reporting by waste originators/owners;
5. Indicators;
6. Improving capacities;
7. International cooperation/

26. During the following discussions the draft of general recommendations to the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia for improving waste classifications and inventories was prepared.