

e-Stewards Sanctioned Interpretations to #1 of the “e-Stewards Standard for Responsible Recycling and Reuse of Electronic Equipment, Version 2.0”

August 1st, 2014

BASEL ACTION NETWORK

Purpose: This document and communication system has been developed to provide a single focal point for all questions related to the e-Stewards Standard Version 2.0 and the certification process. This document only applies to Version 2.0 of the Standard, but not to Version 1.0, which has a separate Sanctioned Interpretations document that can be found at www.e-stewards.org

Use in audits: Interpretations published in this document shall be referenced for any audits of an e-Stewards organization or candidate against the e-Stewards Standard. In other words, all Sanctioned Interpretations published here are requirements for certification, effective the date of publication.

Transition from Version 1.0 to Version 2.0 of the Standard: As of May 1st, 2014, all audits performed must be against Version 2.0 of the e-Stewards Standard and its Sanctioned Interpretations. Organizations will have until May 1st, 2015 to become fully certified to Version 2.0, and in the meantime, they must maintain conformity to Version 1.0 and its Sanctioned Interpretations. On May 1st, 2015, Version 1.0 of the Standard and its Sanctioned Interpretations will be cancelled and entirely replaced by Version 2.0 of the Standard and its Sanctioned Interpretations.

Format of this Sanctioned Interpretation: The most recent updates to these Sanctioned Interpretations appear below in ***bold, italic*** font in this document.

Access: This system is intended mainly for accreditation bodies, certification bodies, and e-Stewards Organizations who are working with the e-Stewards Standard, but questions from all sources will be considered and responded to as appropriate. Send inquiries to info@e-stewards.org.

This document is available in the Certification section at www.e-Stewards.org.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.4.6 OPERATIONAL CONTROL

4.4.6.6 - Materials Recovery and Final Disposition.....3

4.4.6.6 - Materials Recovery and Final Disposition

4.4.6.6 f) Table 3

Q: Can you please clarify the practical application of the concept of “last resort” in Row 6 of Section 4.4.6.6 f) Table 3 regarding the placement of cleaned, leaded display glass into or on solid waste landfills, for any purpose?

A: Yes. In order to utilize the ‘last resort’ management option for cleaned, treated, leaded CRT glass, an Organization shall determine and document that all other options in Row 6 are ‘not viable’, and therefore this ‘last resort’ option can be made available to the Organization, unless prohibited by law or disposal facility. To claim this, the Organization shall provide objective evidence to e-Stewards auditors and program administrator of why and how this determination was made, utilizing the following definitions for these terms:

‘Last Resort’

The final recourse or least acceptable option for types of facilities available to the e-Stewards Organization for Materials Recovery and/or Final Disposition, which cannot be utilized unless each and all of the other options available in the marketplace and acceptable in the Standard [i.e. in 4.4.6.6.e) and f) Row 6] have first been determined and documented to be ‘not viable’.

‘Not Viable’

Preferred options are considered ‘not viable’ in the following cases:

- a. Access to known disposition channels is denied¹ by prospective customer/receiver, or**
- b. Legal or logistical barriers² in transporting or exporting materials to a preferred channel are insurmountable.**

NOTE: This ‘last resort’ option for allowing cleaned and treated CRT glass into solid waste landfills applies regardless of whether the material is used as alternative daily cover or otherwise placed into a landfill for any reason. This option is not seen as recycling but as disposal. BAN can be contacted for a non-definitive, unendorsed list of CRT glass processors and end-processors that are likely to be acceptable in the context of the e-Stewards Final Disposition requirements.

¹ Financial considerations shall not qualify as denial or as a logistical barrier unless the Organization can demonstrate cost (e.g. predatory pricing) that is at least triple the price of the most costly preferential option.

² See previous footnote