



SCREEN

Synergic Circular
Economy across
European regions



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No730313


QUESTIONNAIRE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Martina Chiaraluce, VELTHA ivzw

Fourth Policy Lab – Brussels – 30/05/2018




Your organisation




- Local or Regional Authority/Agency
- Academia
- NGO
- SME
- National Authority/Agency
- Other
- Industry

165 Answers, 43 Comments


1 – Definition of two different categories: your agreement about considering in a separate way projects dealing with an effective waste recycling within a specific process and projects promoting circular economy




2 – Projects dealing with a production process change or upgrading: your agreement about the choice of having four sub-categories with different “circularity impact”




3 – Projects dealing with a production process change or upgrading: your agreement about the clarity of the description of the four sub-categories (Columns 3 and 4 of the table) and their relevance.




4 – CRITERION 5: “Net Energy balance respect to the previous system” or “Amount of energy recovered”: your agreement about the clarity of its description (Columns 3 and 4 of the table) and the relevance of the criterion .




**5 – CRITERION 6 : “Reduction of emissions”:
your agreement about the clarity of its
description (Columns 3 and 4 of the table)
and the relevance of the criterion**




**6 – CRITERION 7: “Net balance of jobs”:
your agreement about the clarity of its
description and the relevance of the
criterion.**




7 – CRITERION 8 : "Increase of economic value": your agreement about the clarity of its description (Columns 3 and 4 of the table) and the relevance of the criterion




**8 – Projects directly addressing waste recycling
(Criteria from 1 to 8): Your agreement about
metrics and assessment indicators adopted
(Columns 5, 6 and 7 in the table) 1=fully disagree;
9=fully agree**




9 – Weight: Your agreement about the weight proposed for the different criteria (column 8 in the table)



10 – Different weights in different regions: each region, according to its own programmes and policies, may assign different weights to the criteria



11 – Your overall opinion about the table of the assessment criteria. 1=poor: its adoption cannot help in any way the assessment of circular economy projects. 9=very good: its adoption may give a relevant contribution to a more harmonized assessment of circular economy projects



Synthesis of the 43 comments received (1)

“ECO design should have more relevance”

“Add design, production, use/reuse and end of life as phases or main categories to the table”

“Product re-use, refurbishing remanufacturing are missing”

Synthesis of the 43 comments received (2)

“Avoidance of the waste generated” should have weight 10.

“You should consider waste reduction/prevention focussed projects as circular projects”

“Net balance of jobs” should have an higher value

Synthesis of the 43 comments received (3)

“carbon savings could be calculated in relation to material savings using an approach such as Scotland's Carbon Metric”

“The term 'economic value' of process is very broad and can be easily manipulated.”

“If you allow regions to assign different weights, you should also define lowest values (e.g. the regions cannot decrease the weight of single criterion by more than 50%) ”

Thank you for your Attention!

Martina Chiaraluce
Veltha i.v.z.w.



Discussion is now open

