JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY (JICA) FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL



THE STUDY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED SOLUTION RELATED TO INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL POLE OF MANAUS

> FINAL REPORT DATA BOOK

August 2010

KOKUSAI KOGYO CO., LTD. EX CORPORATION





JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY (JICA) FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL

THE STUDY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED SOLUTION RELATED TO INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL POLE OF MANAUS

FINAL REPORT

August 2010

KOKUSAI KOGYO CO., LTD. EX CORPORATION

THE STUDY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED SOLUTION RELATED TO INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL POLE OF MANAUS

List of Volumes

Volume I Volume II Volume III Volume IV Summary Main Report Supporting Report Data Book

This is the Data Book.

The exchange rate used in this report is as follows. US\$ 1.0 = 89.25 Yen, 1 BRL = 48.784 Yen (March 2010)

Contents

1	١	Waste stream	1-1
	1.1 \$	Simplified Waste stream (2009)	1-2
	1.2 \$	Simplified Waste stream (2015)	1-12
	1.3 I	Detailed Waste stream (2009)	1-22
	1.4 I	Detailed Waste stream (2015)	1-40
2	١	Workshops and Seminar	2-1
	2.1 I	First Workshop	2-1
	2.1.1	Program	2-1
	2.1.2	Presentation Materials	2-2
	2.1.3	Outcomes	2-1 /
	2.2 5	Second Workshop	2-28
	2.2.1	Program Progentation Materials	2-28
	2.2.2	Outcomes	2-29 2-43
	2.2.5		2 13
	2.3	Program	2-47 2_77
	2.3.1	Presentation Materials	
	2.3.3	Outcomes	2-68
	2.4	Waste Inventory Database Seminar	2-75
	2.4.1	Presentation Materials	
	2.5 V	Waste Service Company Seminar	2-77
	2.5.1	Presentation Materials	2-77
	2.6	Seminar	2-79
	2.6.1	Program	2-79
	2.6.2	Presentation Materials	2-80
	2.6.3	Outcomes	2-98
	2.7 \$	Seminar in Brasilia	2-101
	2.7.1	Program	2-101
	2.7.2	Presentation Materials	2-102
	2.7.3	Outcomes	2-109
3	١	Weekly Meetings	3-1
	3.1 V	Weekly Meeting (1)	3-1
	3.1.1	Agenda for Weekly Meeting (1) on March 9, 2009	3-1
	3.1.2	Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (1) on March 9, 2009	3-4
	3.2 V	Weekly Meeting (2)	3-6
	3.2.1	Agenda for Weekly Meeting (2) on March 16, 2009	3-6
	3.2.2	Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (2) on March 16, 2009.	3-9
	3.3 V	Weekly Meeting (3)	3-12
	3.3.1	Agenda for Weekly Meeting (3) on March 23, 2009	3-12

3.3.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (3) on March 23, 2009	3-14
3.4 Weekly Meeting (4)	3-16
3.4.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (4) on March 30, 2009	3-16
3.4.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (4) on March 30, 2009	3-19
3.5 Weekly Meeting (5)	3-22
3 5 1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (5) on April 6 2009	3-22
3.5.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (5) on April 6, 2009	3-25
2.6 Wookly Mosting (6)	2 78
3.6.1 A genda for Weekly Meeting (6) on April 13, 2009	3_28
3.6.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (6) on April 13, 2009	3-31
$2.7 \qquad \text{We share 0.7}$	2 24
3.7 Weekly Meeting (7)	
3.7.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (7) on April 27, 2009	3_38
5.7.2 Winducts of Meeting for Weekry Meeting (7) on April 27, 2007	
3.8 Weekly Meeting (8).	3-42
3.8.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (8) on June 15, 2009	
5.6.2 Winnutes of Meeting for weekly Meeting (8) on June 15, 2009	3-40
3.9 Weekly Meeting (9)	3-49
3.9.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (9) on June 22, 2009	3-49
3.9.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (9) on June 22, 2009	3-51
3.10 Weekly Meeting (10)	3-54
3.10.1 Agenda of Weekly Meeting (10) on August 10, 2009	3-54
3.10.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (10) on August 10, 2009	03-56
3.11 Weekly Meeting (11)	3-58
3.11.1 Agenda of Weekly Meeting (11) on August 17, 2009	3-58
3.11.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (11) on August 17, 2009	03-60
3 12 Weekly Meeting (12)	3-62
3.12.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (12) on August 24, 2009	3-62
3.12.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (12) on August 24, 2009	03-66
3 13 Weekly Meeting (13)	3-71
3 13 1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (13) on August 31 2009	3-71
3 13 2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (13) on August 31, 2009) 3-76
2.14 Weather Meeting (14)	2 70
5.14 Weekly Meeting (14)	
3.14.1 Agenua 101 weekly Meeting (14) on September 8, 2009	<i>3-19</i> N93_80
5.14.2 windles of weekly weekly weekly weekly of september 6, 20	075-00
3.15 Weekly Meeting (15).	3-81
3.15.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (15) on September 14, 2009	
3.15.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (15) on September 14, 2	0093-86
3.16 Weekly Meeting (16)	3-90
3.16.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (16) on November 3, 2009	3-90
3.16.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (16) on November 3, 20	093-91
3.17 Weekly Meeting (17)	3-93
3.17.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (17) on September 10, 2009	3-93
3.17.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (17) on September 10, 2	0093-95
3.18 Weekly Meeting (18)	3-98

	3.18.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (18) on November 16, 2009
	3.19 Weekly Meeting (19) 3-106 3.19.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (19) on November 23, 2009 3-106 3.19.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (19) on November 23, 20093-108
	3.20 Weekly Meeting (20) 3-110 3.20.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (20) on November 30, 2009 3-110 3.20.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (20) on November 30, 20093-112
	3.21 Weekly Meeting (21) 3-114 3.21.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (21) on March 15, 2010 3-114 3.21.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (21) on March 15, 2010.3-117
	3.22 Weekly Meeting (22) 3-120 3.22.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (22) on March 22, 2010 3-120 3.22.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (22) on March 22, 2010.3-124
	3.23 Weekly Meeting (23) 3-128 3.23.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (23) on March 29, 2010 3-128 3.23.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (23) on March 29, 2010.3-131
	3.24 Weekly Meeting (24) 3-134 3.24.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (24) on April 5, 2010 3-134 3.24.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (24) on April 05, 2010 3-135
	3.25 Weekly Meeting (25) 3-136 3.25.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (25) on May 24, 2010 3-136 3.25.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (25) on May 24, 2010 3-138
	3.26 Weekly Meeting (26) 3-140 3.26.1 Agenda for Weekly Meeting (26) on May 26, 2010 3-140 3.26.2 Minutes of Meeting for Weekly Meeting (26) on May 26, 2010 3-142
4	Public Relations4-1
	4.1 Newsletters
	4.1.1 Newsletter Volume 14-1
	4.1.2 Newsletter Volume 2
	4.1.3 Newsletter Volume 3
	4.1.4 Newsletter Volume 4
	4.1.5 Newsletter Volume 5
	4.1.6 Newsletter Volume 6
	4.1.7 Newsletter Volume /
	4.2 JICA Study Team website
5	Minutes of Meeting (M/M) for Steering Committee Meeting5-1
	5.1 Scope of Work
	5.2 Minutes of Meeting by JICA Study Team
	5.2.1 Inception Report (IC/R)
	5.2.2 Interim Report (IT/R)
	5.2.3 Draft Final Report (DF/R)

1. Waste Stream

1 Waste stream

1.1 : Simplified Waste stream	n (2009)
-------------------------------	----------

- 1.2 : Simplified Waste stream (2015)
- 1.3 : Detailed Waste stream (2009)
- 1.4 : Detailed Waste stream (2015)

Remark: Question mark ("?") indicates that the disposal amount for that section is unknown.



a. Industrial Wastes (IW) generated from PIM (2009)









General IW generated from PIM (2009)















d. Construction Waste











General IW generated from PIM (2015)















Construction Waste

1.3 Detailed Waste stream (2009)

a. Industrial Waste (GIW + Health-care waste + Construction waste)

All PIM - All IW (ton/day, ton/year)





















Process - HIW (ton/day, ton/year)

Storage

0.3 0.3%

Disposal





b. General IW












Non Process – Non HIW (ton/day, ton/year)















c. Health-care Waste

All Waste (ton/day, ton/year)







HIW Waste (ton/day, ton/year)



d. Construction Waste

Non HIW (ton/day, ton/year)



1.4 Detailed Waste stream (2015)

a. Industrial waste (GIW + Health-care waste + Construction waste)

All PIM - All IW (ton/day, ton/year)





















b. General IW





























c. Health-care Waste









HIW Waste (ton/day, ton/year)



d. Construction Waste

Non HIW (ton/day, ton/year)



2. Workshops and Seminar

2 Workshops and Seminar

2.1 First Workshop

2.1.1 Program

Program for 1st Workshop: September 9, 2009



 The summary (session 5) at the end of the day will be prepared based on the group presentations in the afternoon.

2.1.2 Presentation Materials

Handout for 1st Workshop: September 11, 2009



Opening Presentation for 1 st Workshop	o (Sept 11, 2009): Workshop Objectives
Workshop Objectives September 11, 2009 Susumu SHIMURA JICA Study Team Leader For the Study for the Development of an Integrated Solution Related to Industrial Waste Management in the Industrial Pole of Manaus	Background of the Study MFZ is an economic development model to create a sustainable economic basis in the Amazon forest. Healthy development of PIM/MFZ requires a careful look at any environmental impact. Issues surrounding PIM industrial waste management (IWM) motivated the Brazilian and Japanese cooperation agencies (ABC and JICA) and the SUFRAMA to sign a technical cooperation agreement to have a study to establish appropriate IWM in PIM/MFZ in November 26 th , 2008. This study was established as a result, and began in February 2009.
Objectives and Goals of the Study 1. Objectives Control To identify the current conditions of industrial waste management (IWM) in the PIM/MFZ Control To formulate a master plan for IWM and a guideline for the improvement of IWM 2. Goals Coals Co	Objectives of the Workshop (1) Policy => The M/P shall: be formulated on the initiative of the Brazilian counterpart => Brazilian Initiative be understood by and obtain the cooperation of members of society => Social Understanding and Cooperation be considerate of environmental protection wherever possible => Environmental Consideration be practicable => Practicability To conduct the policy, we will have three workshops and one seminar.
Objectives of the Workshop (2) Mar 2009 Aug 2009 Aug 2009 Baseline Surveys on Waste Generation Sources and Waste Management Companies, etc. Current IWM and Issues Current IWM and Issues Counterts Counterts Counterts Seminar MP Counterts Seminar	Objectives of the Workshop (3) The First Workshop aims to Present findings of the Study on current conditions and issues of IWM in PIM/MFZ to as many as stakeholders; and Discuss with policy for improvement We are expecting your active participation to the workshop
Thank you very much for your attention Please feel free to contact us at any time: E-mail: <u>susumu_shimura@kkc.co.jp</u> Tel: 2231-7281	

Issu	ırrent es on	Condit: On-site	tions a e Indu	nd strial	Agenda
Was	ste Ma	anadem	ent (T	SW)	1. Work Procedure
TTU.		inugen		511)	2. Health waste management
					3 Construction waste management
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		~~		4. Radioactivo waste management
	Septemi	ber 11, 200		T	F. Industrial waste management
	For f of a to Ir in th	the Study fo Integrated Industrial Wa Industrial	or the Deve Solution I aste Manag Pole of M	elopment Related gement anaus	2 2
1. W	ork Pr	ocedure	(1)		1. Work Procedure (2)
	MA Resol	ution 313 re	equires sne	ecified	Reasons: Those wastes have their own
indust	tries to re	port (using	a waste in	ventory)	categorizations and management
on ma	(TW) der	t conditions	s for indus	trial trial	requirements:
activit	ty, includ	ing health, o	constructio	on and	ANVISA, CONAMA Resolution 358
radioa	ctive wa	ste.			2. Construction waste: CONAMA Resolution 307
Howev factor	ver, in JI	CA study wa	istes gener	rated in a	3. Radioactive waste: CNEN-NE-06
. Health	y are cate 1 waste	egonizeu int		willys.	4. Industrial waste other than the above wastes
2. Const	ruction w	aste			CONAMA RESOlUTION 313
3. Radio	active wa	ste			
ti illuus	ullal was	le other tha	ii tile abov	e wastes	4
2. Hea	lth was	te mana	gement	(1):	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical
2. Hea _{Categor}	Ith was	ste manag _{Vaste}	gement	(1):	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic)
2. Heal Categor	Ith was	vaste	gement	(1):	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the
2. Hea Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect	Ith was ry of Health V fectious Waste ious waste	te mana Vaste Rategory of Health Wa	gement asto	(1):	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334
2. Hea Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect A.2 Blood	Ith was ry of Health V fectious Was ious waste I and derivates	vaste Rategory of Health Wa	gement	(1):	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted □ Number of factories in operation in
2. Hea Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect A.2 Blood A.3 Surgi A.4 Pierci	th was y of Health V fectious Wast ious waste I and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting	Vaste ategory of Health Wa te	gement aste	(1):	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present
2. Hea Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect A.2 Blood A.3 Surgi A.4 Pierci A.5 Conta	th was y of Health V fectious Waste and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting minated animal at core	Vaste Rategory of Health Wite Rategory of Angle	gement	(1):	 3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to the factories with a clinic factories were surveyed to the factories were factories were surveyed to the factories were factories with a surveyed to the factories were factor
2. Hea Categor Class A: Inf A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 3 Surgi A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 6 Patier Class B: Sp	th was y of Health V c fectious Waste I and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting iminated animal nt care becial Waste	vaste ategory of Health Wa te ologic and exudates	gement ^{asto}	(1):	 3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste.
2. Hea Categor Class A: Inf A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 3 Surgi A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 6 Patier Class B: Sp B.1 Radio	Ith was y of Health V c fectious Wast ious waste a and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting minated animal nt care becial Waste eactive waste	vaste ategory of Health Wa te ologic and exudates	gement ^{asto}	(1):	 3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health
2. Hea Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect A.2 Blood A.3 Surgi A.4 Pierci A.5 Conta A.6 Patier Class B: Sp B.1 Radio B.2 Pharm B.3 Hazar	Ith was y of Health V cectious Wast ious waste and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting minated animal nt care becial Waste maceutical waste maceutical waste	vaste ategory of Health Wa te ologic and exudates	gement asto	(1):	 3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440
2. Hea Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect A.2 Blood A.3 Surgi A.4 Pierci A.5 Conta A.6 Patier Class B: Sp B.1 Radio B.2 Pharn B.3 Hazar Class C: Co	Ith was y of Health W fectious Wast ious waste I and derivates cal, anatomopat cal, anatomopat ing or cutting miniated animal nt care becial Waste reactive waste naccutical waste dous chemical waste dous chemical waste	Vaste ategory of Health Wa te ologic and exudates waste	gement	(1): 	 3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 _ x 124/334)
2. Heal Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect A.2 Blood A.3 Surgi A.4 Pierci A.5 Conta A.6 Patier Class B: Sp B.1 Radio B.2 Pharm B.3 Hazar Class C: Cc	Ith was y of Health V fectious Waste and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting minated animal at care becial Waste active waste maceutical waste course of the state maceutical waste course of the state course of the state course of the state course of the state state of the state of the state of the state state of the state of the state of the	Vaste stegory of Health Waste cologic and exudates over the steport of the ste	gement	(1): 	 3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334)
2. Heal Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect A.2 Blood A.3 Surgi A.4 Pierci A.5 Conta A.6 Patien Class B: Sp B.1 Radio B.2 Pharn B.3 Hazar Class C: Co	Ith was ty of Health V c fectious Waste I and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting minated animal at care becial Waste bactive waste naceutical waste dous chemical waste dous chemical waste common Waste	vaste ategory of Health Wa te ologic and exudates waste	gement sto	(1):	 3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital
2. Heal Categor Class A: Inf A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 3 Surgi A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 6 Patier Class B: Sp B 1 Radio B 2 Pharn B 3 Hazar Class C: Cc	Ith was y of Health V c fectious Wast ious waste and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting minated animal int care becial Waste becial Waste accuve waste	ete manage	gement ssto	(1): 	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) . 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital Generation
2. Hea Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect A.2 Blood A.3 Surgi A.4 Pierci A.5 Conta A.6 Patier Class B: Sp B.1 Radio B.2 Pharn B.3 Hazar Class C: Co 2. Hea Health	Ith was y of Health V cectious Wast ious waste and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting minated animal int care becial Waste becial Waste common Waste Ith was Waste Gen	eration Rate an	gement asto gement nd Amount	(1): 	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) • 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital Generation Recycling Intermediate Disposal
2. Heal Categor Class A: Inf A.1 Infect A.2 Blood A.4 Pierci A.5 Conta A.6 Patier Class B: Sp B.1 Radio B.2 Pharn B.3 Hazar Class C: Cc 2. Heal Health Generation	Ith was y of Health V rectious Wast ious waste and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting minated animal int care becial Waste becial Waste becial Waste minon Waste Waste Gen Generation Rate	vaste ategory of Health Wate ologic and exudates waste a stemanage eration Rate an Generation Amount of all	gement aste gement nd Amount (Generation Amount of a	(1):	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) c 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital Generation Recycling Itermediate treatment Disposal
2. Heal Categor Class A: Inf A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 6 Patier Class B: Sp B 1 Radio B 2 Pharn B 3 Hazar Class C: Cc 2. Heal Health Generation	Ith was y of Health V cectious Wast ious waste and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting uninated animal in care becial Waste becial Waste becial Waste bommon Waste Waste Gen Generation Rate	Aste manage Aste aste aste aste aste aste aste aste a	gement aste gement Generation Amount of a Generat Hospital	(1):	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) c 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital Generation Recycling Intermediate treatment Disposal
2. Heal Category Class A: Inf A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 3 Surgi A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 6 Patier Class B: Sp B 1 Radio B 2 Pharn B 3 Hazar Class C: Cc 2. Heal Health Generation	th was y of Health V cectious Wast ious waste and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting minated animal int care becial Waste becial Waste becial Waste bommon Waste Waste Gen Generation Rate 0.957	Aste manage Aste aste ategory of Health Wate ategory of Health Wate ategor	gement aste gement ad Amount Generation Amount of a General Hospital 26.2	(1): (3): (3): Unit: kg/day Generation Amount of Whole PIM 182.6	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) 6 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital Generation Recycling Intermediate treatment Disposal
2. Heal Category Class A: Inf A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 4 Pierci A 3 Surgi A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 6 Patier Class B: Sp B 1 Radio B 2 Pharn B 3 Hazar Class C: Cc 2. Heal Health Generation Category Class A	Ith was y of Health V cectious Wast ious waste and derivates cat, anatomopat ing or cutting uninated animal in care becial Waste becial Waste ommon Waste Ith was Waste Gen Generation Rate 0.957 0.271	vaste ategory of Health Wite cologic and exudates waste constraints constraint	gement aste gement nd Amount Generation Amount of a General Hospital 26.2 1.7	(1): (3): (3): Unit: kg/day Generation Amount of Whole PIM 182.6 46.0	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) 6 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital Generation Recycling Intermediate treatment Disposal
2. Heal Categor Class A: Inf A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 3 Surgi A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 6 Patier Class B: Sp B 1 Radio B 2 Pharm B 3 Hazar Class C: Cc 2. Heal Health Generation ategory lass A lass B azardous	Ith was y of Health V fectious Waste and derivates cal, anatomopat ing or cutting miniated animal at care becial Waste dous chemical v bommon Waste Waste Gen Generation Rate 0.957 0.271 1.228	Aste Aste Astegory of Health Wite astegory	gement aste gement nd Amount Generation Amount of a General Hospital 26.2 1.7 27 9	(1): (3): (3): Unit: kg/day Generation Amount of Whole PIM 182.6 46.0 228.6	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) o 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital Generation Recycling Intermediate treatment Disposal (ClearAB (ClearA
2. Heal Categor A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 3 Surgi A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 5 Conta A 6 Patier Class B: Sp B 1 Radio B 2 Pharm B 3 Hazar Class C: Cc 2. Heal Health Generation ategory lass A lass B lazardous Vaste Total	Ith was y of Health V fectious Waste I and derivates cal, anatomopating minated animal at care pecial Waste dous chemical v particular waste maceutical waste dous chemical v particular waste Maste Gen Generation Rate 0.957 0.271 1.228	Aste Aste Astegory of Health Wite astegory	gement aste gement nd Amount Generation Amount of a Generation Amount of a Generation Amoun	(1): (3): (3): Unit: kg/day Generation Amount of Whole PIM 182.6 46.0 228.6	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) o 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital Generation Recycling Intermediate treatment Disposal (as 5) (as 5) (based (construction) (c
2. Heal Categor A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 3 Surgi A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 6 Patier Class B: Sp B 1 Radio B 2 Pharn B 3 Hazar Class C C C 2. Heal Health Generation ategory lass A lass B lazardous Vaste Total lass C	Ith was y of Health V fectious Waste ious waste I and derivates cat, anatomopating minated animal at care becial Waste dous chemical v bommon Waste Waste Gen Generation Rate 0.957 0.271 1.228 1 171	Aste Astes Astes	gement aste gement ad Amount Generation Amount of a General Hospital 26.2 1.7 27.9 94.0	(1): (3): (3): Unit: kg/day Generation Amount of Whole PIM 182.6 46.0 228.6 285.3	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) c 2. Health waste management (3): Waste Flow with Waste from General Hospital Generation Recycling Intermediate treatment Disposal (clinic) (clinic
2. Heal Categor Class A: Inf A 1 Infect A 2 Blood A 3 Surgl A 4 Pierci A 5 Conta A 5 Conta A 5 Conta B 2 Pharn B 3 Hazar Class B 5 Sp B 1 Radio B 2 Pharn B 3 Hazar Class C Cc 2. Heal Health Generation Class A Class B Iazardous Vaste Total Class C Iealth Waste	Ith was y of Health V rectious Waste ious waste Land derivates cat, anatomopating minated animal at care becial Waste catorive waste maceutical waste dous chemical v bommon Waste Uth was Waste Gen Generation Rate 0.957 0.271 1.228 1.171 2.200	ste manage vaste category of Health Wite cologic and exudates waste category of Health Wite cologic and exudates waste category of Health Wite category of Health	gement aste gement ad Amount Amount of a General General Hospital 26.2 1.7 27.9 94.0	(1): (1): (3): (3): Unit: kg/day Generation Amount of Whole PIM 182.6 46.0 228.6 285.3 542.0	3. Health waste management (2): Number of factories which have a medical facility (clinic) The study identified the number of the factories with a clinic => 124 of 334 contacted Number of factories in operation in PIM/MFZ => 440 at present Nine (9) factories were surveyed to know generation rate (GR) of health waste. Generation amount (GA) of health waste is calculated => GA = GR (440 x 124/334) contacted Generation Recycling Intermediate Teatment Disposal Teatment Disposal Teatment Disposal Teatment Contacted Teatment Disposal Teatment Disposal Teatment Disposal Teatment Disposal Teatment Disposal Teatment Disposal

Presentation 1 for 1st Workshop (11 Sept., 2009): Onsite Waste Management

I. ESU	ablishment of he	alth wast	e manage	ement	Issues (2)
sys	tem in PIM				
More	e than 1/3 of the fa	ctories in P	IM have a c	clinic.	2. Un-site nealth waste management
Fact	tories and a hospita	l in PIM gei	nerate cons	iderable	On-site health waste management has been established
amo	ount of hazardous h	ealth waste	s, 228.6 kg	/day.	at almost acceptable level. It of the general hospital seems to be well-established.
	s is due to over 100	000 people	working in	PIM/MFZ.	However, the following issues were observed in the
Coun	ntry/City Study Year	Population	Generation	Unit Generation	clinics of the factories:
		· opulation /	Amount (kg/day)	(g/person/day)	a. Standard containers set in the ABNT NBR 12809 are no
Chile / Santi	1995	5,642,000	20,000	3.54	used in more than half of clinics.
Turkey / Mor	ana 1996 arsin 1998	643 850	4,401	2 39	b. Although hazardous health wastes (HHWs) are
Azerbaijan /	/ Baku 2000	2.051.200	12,892	6.28	separately stored according to the class and type of th
Cambodia /	Phnom Penh 2003	1,199,414	961	0.80	HHWs, some clinics (2/8) discharged them mixed
Sri Lanka / K	Kandy 2002	110,049	530	4.81	together for collection service.
Mongol / Ula	aanbaatar 2005	866,591	1,600	1.85	
PIM in Mana	aus 2009	117,253*1	229	1.95	10
*1: Total	I number of employees	n 440 factorie	s operating in	PIM/MFZ	
				_	3. Construction waste management (1):
. Hea	lith waste mai	nagemer	nt (5): C	urrent	Number of factories which had construction
Teer	ues (3)				
1350	ues (5)				work in past year
3. Ide	entification of off	-site heal	th waste		a. CONAMA Resolution 307 categorized
□ The site	medical institution health waste mana	survey cou gement due	ld not ident to insuffic	ify the off- ient	b. However, the Study categorized into
man	nifest system and la ss C wastes are mar	ck of discha	rger's resp inicipal was	onsibilities. ste	44 items.
the f	ection service. But (following aspects:	off-site HHV	the off-cite	ioned on	which had construction work in past
a. Som	hod of HHW they di	scharged.	the on-site	uisposai	year (from June 2008 to May 2009).
h. Som	ne of the HHW are d	isposed of a	at special pi	it at the	=> Number of factories in operation
land	ifill.	isposed of t	at special p	it ut the	in PIM/MFZ x Nos. of factories had
	v HHWs are treated	by the inci	nerators. B	ut	construction work /Nos of factories
c. Man		,			CONSTRUCTION WORK/ NOS. OF IACTORES
c. Man whe	ther the incineration	n is proper	ly operated	or not is	interviewed = 440 x 123/334
c. Man whe ques	other the incineration	n is proper	ly operated	or not is	interviewed = 440 x 123/334
c. Man whe ques	ther the incinerationstion.	n is proper	ly operated	or not is	interviewed = 440 x 123/334
c. Man whe ques	ther the incinerationstion.	n is proper	ly operated	or not is	interviewed = 440 x 123/334
c. Man whe ques 3. Con Const	other the incinerations stion. Instruction waste fruction Waste Gene	n is proper managen eration in Pi	nent (2):	or not is	interviewed = 440 x 123/334
c. Man whe ques 3. Con Const	ther the incinerations in the incineration struction waste for the incident of the incident struction waste for the incident struction waste for the incident struction waste for the incident struction waste structions and the incident struction waste structions and the incident structions and the incident struction waste structions and the incident structions and the incident structions and the incident struction structions and the incident str	managen eration in P	nent (2): M/MFZ (1)	Or not is	interviewed = 440 x 123/334
c. Man whe ques 3. Con Const	ther the incinerationstion. Instruction waste Instruction Waste Gene Description of Waste	managen managen eration in Pi GR (kg/day)	Iy operated nent (2): IM/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day)	Portion (%)	3. Construction waste management (3):
C. Man whe ques 3. Con Const Waste No 1	other the incineration stion. Instruction waste truction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil	managen managen eration in Pl GR (kg/day)	nent (2): IM/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day)	Portion (%) 46 4.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2)
C. Man whe ques 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2	ther the incineration struction waste truction Waste Geno Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris	managen eration in Pl GR (kg/day) 9.1 14.	TGA (ton/day) 04 1. 75 2.	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2)
C. Man whe ques 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2 3 3	ther the incineration struction waste truction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Prick debris	m is proper managem eration in PJ GR (kg/day) 9. 14. 17.	TGA (ton/day) 04 1. 75 2. 12 2.	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2)
C. Man whe ques 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 6	ether the incineration stion. struction Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Brick debris	managen eration in Pl GR (kg/day) 14. 17. 0.0	TGA (ton/day) 04 1. 75 2. 12 2. 83 0. 03 0.	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307
c. Man whe ques 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 6 11	ther the incineration struction waste cruction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Brick debris Tille and ceramic Plastic/virus/seet	GR (kg/day) GR (kg/day) GR (sg/day) 14. 14. 0. 0.00	nent (2): M/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day) 04 1. 75 2. 12 2. 83 0. 03 0. 12 0.	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate
C. Man whe ques 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 11 12	ther the incineratic stion. struction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials	mis proper	ty operated tent (2): TGA (ton/day) 04 1. 75 2. 12 2. 83 0. 03 0. 12 0. 07 0. 07 0.	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day
C. Man whe ques 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13	ther the incineration struction waste truction Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Brick debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste	managen eration in P GR (kg/day) GR (kg/day) 14: 14: 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	tion (2): TGA (1) TGA	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Benuslable as non-accordance)
C. Man whe ques 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 17	ther the incineration struction waste cruction Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster Poards	managem eration in P2 GR (kg/day) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	Test (2): IM/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day) 04 12 03 03 04 12 03 04 05 06 07	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate):
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const ^{Waste} No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 17 20	ther the incineration struction waste cruction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyi sheet Tron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris	m is proper managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) 9. 114. 17. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	rent (2): (M/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day) 04 1. 155 2. 12 2. 83 0. 13 0. 13 0. 14 0. 15 0. 10 0. 15 0. 10 0. 10 0. 17 0. 10 0	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.0 00 0.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day
C. Man whee quest 3. Con Const No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 17 20 21	ther the incineration struction waste truction Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Brick debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form	managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) GR (kg/day) GR (kg/day) 0.0.0 0.0.0 0.0.0 0.0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	rent (2): M/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day) 04 1. 75 2. 2. 2. 3. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 01 0.0	3. Construction work/Nos. of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables):
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const Waste 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 17 20 21 22	ther the incineration struction waste truction Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Tille and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material	managen eration in P3 GR (kg/day) GR (kg/day) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	TGA (ton/day) 75 12 03 04 057 03 04 057 03 04 057 053 06 06 034	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee quest 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 6 6 11 12 13 17 20 21 17 20 21 22 23	ther the incineratic stion.	m is proper managem eration in P2 GR (kg/day) 9. 144. 127. 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.	Team Team Team Team Transmission Team Team Team Team <td< td=""><td>Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.0 0 0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0 0 0 0.0 0 0 0</td><td>3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day</td></td<>	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.0 0 0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0 0 0 0.0 0 0 0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee quest 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 3 4 6 11 12 12 20 21 22 22 23 24	Struction waste struction waste cruction Waste Gend Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet I ron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard)	m is proper managem eration in P GR (kg/day) 9., 14. 14. 14. 0.0 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0	nent (2): M/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day) 04 1. T5 2. 12 2. 13 0. 14 0. 15 0. 12 0. 10 0. 12 0. 10 0. 13 0. 14 0. 15 0. 16 0. 10 0. 13 0. 10 0. 13 0. 14 0. 15 0. 15 0. 16 0. 16 0. 16 0. 17 0. 18 0. 19 0. 19 0. 19 0. 19 0. 19 0. 19 0. 10 0.	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1	interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee quest 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 2 3 4 6 11 11 12 2 13 17 20 21 22 23 22 24 29	struction waste struction waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil	m is proper managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) 94 144 177 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0	TGA (ton/day) TGA (ton/day) <	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 09 0.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee quest Const Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 4 6 1 11 12 13 3 7 20 21 22 23 24 22 23 24 29 33 34	ther the incineration struction waste cruction Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Briaster Joury Sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaaster Joury Sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaaster Joury Sheet Inther form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash	m is proper managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) 9. 3. 4. 144: 177. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	TGA (ton/day) 75 12 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 00 01 02 03 04 05 06 02 03 04 05 05	Portion (%) (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 00 0.0 00000000	interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee quest 3. Const Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 17 20 21 22 23 24 29 33 44	ther the incineratic stion. Description of Waste Genu Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Brick debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total	m is proper managem eration in P GR (kg/day) 9., 14. 14. 17. 0., 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.0 0. 0.	Toperated Toperated <td< td=""><td>Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 00 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 00 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 000 0.1 00 0.0 000 0.0 0000000000</td><td>interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day</td></td<>	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 00 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 00 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.1 00 0.1 000 0.1 00 0.0 000 0.0 0000000000	interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 17 20 21 22 23 24 29 33 44	struction waste struction waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphait debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total	managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) 9.1 14.4 117. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	nent (2): M/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day) 04 1. 75 2. 12 2. 13 0. 14 0. 15 0. 10 0.	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 01 0.0 02 0.1 00 0.0 01 0.0 01 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee quest Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 4 6 11 12 13 17 20 21 17 20 21 22 23 24 24 29 33 44	ther the incineration struction Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Irile and ceramic Plaatic/vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaater Jourds Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total	managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) 9. GR (kg/day) 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.	TGA (ton/day) 75 22 83 0.0 12 0.3 0.12 0.3 0.14 0.15 0.16 0.0 0.32 0.0 0.34 0.26 0.05 0.66 2.9. 36.9.7	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 05 0.1 00 0.0 05 0.1 00 0.0 00 0.0 000 0.0 00 0.0 000 0.0 00 0.0 00000000	interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 17 20 21 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 44 33 6 . Con 12 17 20 21 23 24 23 24 23 24 29 33 44	Struction waste struction waste Generation Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster bornyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster borns Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total	managen eration in P GR (kg/day) GR (kg/day) GR (kg/day) 14. 14. 17. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.	rent (2): (M/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day) 04 1. 75 2. 12 2. 83 0. 13 0. 14 0. 15 0. 10 0. 16 0. 17 0. 10 0.	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 00 0.0 092 80.9 100.0	interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee quest 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 1 2 2 3 4 6 11 12 12 12 20 21 22 23 24 29 33 44 44	struction waste truction waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphat debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Tron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total	managem eration in P2 GR (kg/day) GR (kg/d	Toperated Toperated Toperation Tope	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 04 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.0 92 80.9 100.0 100.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day
C. Man whee ques Const Mon 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 4 6 11 12 13 24 29 33 24 29 33 34 44 44 29 33 6 6 0 21 22 23 24 29 33 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	ther the incineratic stion. struction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphait debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/viny isheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster ourdebris Small metal waste Plaster ourdebris Staffolding material Interform Scaffolding material Interform Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total struction Waste FI heration Recy	managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) 9. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3.	TGA (ton/day) TGA (ton/day) <	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.1 00 0.0 01 0.0 01 0.0 01 0.0 02 80.9 2 80.9 2 80.9	interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 3. Construction waste management (5): Tesues (1)
C. Man whee quest 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 4 6 11 12 13 3 4 4 6 11 11 12 20 21 22 23 24 29 33 44 3. Con Scon Constr Constr	ther the incineration stion. Excution Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Tille and ceramic Plaatic/vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaaterial Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total Struction Waste FI neration Recy	managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) 9. GR (kg/day) 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.	Toperated Toperated <td< td=""><td>Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 05 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 01 0.0 02 80.9 100.0</td><td>interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 14 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1)</td></td<>	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 05 0.1 05 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 01 0.0 02 80.9 100.0	interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 14 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1)
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 2 3 4 4 6 11 12 20 21 22 23 24 23 24 23 24 29 33 44 44 5. Con Scon Scon Scon Scon Scon Scon Scon Sc	ther the incineration struction waste truction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total Struction Waste FI neration Recy	managem eration in P GR (kg/day) 9.1 14. 14. 14. 14. 0.0 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0	Image: Non-Ample Arrows Toperated Toperated Toperation Manaus city Disposal	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 02 0.1 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 09 0.0 92 80.9 1000.0 1	interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1) 1 1 1
C. Man whee quest 3. Con Constr No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 17 20 21 22 23 24 29 33 44 44 3. Con Constr Constr	struction waste struction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphait debris Brick debris Discription of Waste Concrete debris Discription of Waste Itile and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total struction Waste Fl eration Recy	managem eration in P2 GR (kg/day) 94 144 147 177 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	Image: symplex operated tent (2): TGA <	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 06 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 00 0.0 92 80.9 100.0	3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 3. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1) 1. Results: 60% of
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Constr Vaste No 1 2 3 4 4 6 11 12 13 3 4 4 6 11 11 12 22 23 24 29 33 44 4 3. Con Constr Constr	struction waste truction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphat debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/viryl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Function Waste FI heration Recy	managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) 9. 14. 17. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.	Image: Non-Stress Image: Non-Stress Image: Non-Stres Image: Non-Stres	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 05 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.1 00 0.0 01 0.0 01 0.0 01 0.0 02 80.9 2 80.9	Construction work/Nos. of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 14 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1) 1. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction work got a
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 3 4 6 11 12 20 21 22 23 24 4 3. Con 12 10 21 20 21 23 24 4 3. Constr Genstr Constr C	ther the incineratic stion. struction waste cruction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/ vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total struction Waste FI neration Recy stanownt of stanownt of	managen eration in P GR (kg/day) 9.1 14. 17. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	Image: Provide state Teal Teal <t< td=""><td>Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1</td><td>interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 14 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1) 1. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction license.</td></t<>	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 02 0.1 01 0.0 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1	interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 14 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1) 1. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction license.
C. Man whee ques 3. Const Const No 1 2 3 4 6 11 1 2 2 3 4 4 6 11 1 2 2 2 3 2 4 2 9 3 3 2 4 4 3 5. Con Scon Scon Scon Scon Scon Scon Scon Sc	ther the incineratic stion. struction waste cruction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphat debris Brick debris Tite and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Tron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total struction Waste FI neration Recy	mis proper managem eration in P GR (kg/day) 9.1 14. 14. 14. 17. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	Private Disposal site 2.83 0.02 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 04 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 01 0.0 92 80.9 100.0 0.0	Construction work/Nos. of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 14 14 14
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 4 6 11 12 13 17 20 21 22 23 24 29 33 24 29 33 34 44 5. Con Constr Constr Constr Constr Catal Con Con Con Con Con Con Con Con Con Con	tel amount of Mixed construction waste struction waste Gener Description of Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphait debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/viryl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total	managem eration in P1 GR (kg/day) 9.1 GR (kg/day) 9.1 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	Private (2): (M/MFZ (1) TGA (ton/day) 04 1. T5 2. 12 2. 13 0. 14 0. 15 0. 12 0. 12 0. 12 0. 12 0. 12 0. 13 0. 14 0. 15 0. 15 0. 16 0. 10 0. 16 0. 10 0. 16 0. 10 0. 17 0. 16 0. 10	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 07 0.1 08 0.1 09 0.0 100 0.0 01 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 04 0.1 09 0.0 100.0 0.0	Construction work/Nos. of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 14 14 2. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction license. 2. Results: 50% of
Constructure Co	ther the incineratic stion. Estruction Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Brick debris Tille and ceramic Plastic/vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Function Waste Fl retation Recy Ital amount of Istancount of	m is proper managem eration in P GR (kg/day) 9.1 14. 17. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	Private Disposal Private P	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 04 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.0 92 80.9 100.0 0	Interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 14 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1) 1. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction license. 2. Results: 50% of construction work got a construction work got a
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 4 6 11 12 20 21 22 3 24 29 33 44 3. Con 21 22 23 24 29 33 44 44 5. Constr	ther the incineration there incineration truction waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphat debris Brick debris Title and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Tron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (carboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total Struction Waste Fil Peration Recy	managem eration in P GR (kg/day) GR (kg/da	Image: symbol of the	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 04 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.0 92 80.9	Construction work / Nos. Of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 1. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction license. 2. Results: 50% of construction work made o construction work made
C. Man whee ques Const Waste No 1 2 3 4 6 1 1 1 2 3 3 4 6 1 1 1 2 2 3 3 2 4 4 6 1 1 1 2 2 3 3 2 4 4 6 6 1 1 1 2 2 3 3 2 4 5 6 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5	ther the incineratic stion. struction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphait debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Brick debris Mathematic Plastic / unyl sheet Iron-Dar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Futuation Estruction Waste FI heration Recy	mis proper managem eration in Pl GR (kg/day) 9.1 14.4 117. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	Prvate Prvate 027 conday 04 1. 154 155 12 2. 13 0. 12 2. 13 0. 12 0. 12 0. 12 0. 13 0. 12 0. 14 0. 15 0. 15 0. 16 0. 10 0. 16 0. 10 0.	Portion (%) 11 20 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 06 0.0 07 0.0 08 0.1 09 0.0 01 0.0 02 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 01 0.0 02 0.0	Construction work/Nos. of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 1. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction license. 2. Results: 50% of construction work made a construction work made a construction work made
C. Man whee quest 3. Con Constr 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 3 4 6 11 12 13 3 7 20 21 22 23 24 4 4 5 . Con 1 2 13 3 . Con 1 2	ther the incineratic stion. Instruction Waste Gener Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Brick debris Brick debris Tille and ceramic Plastic/vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Fluction Waste Fl neration Recy tal amount of struction wate softwards softwards Saffolding material Interior timber Packing (cardboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Fl neration Recy	managem eration in P3 GR (kg/day) 9. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3.	Private Disposal site 0.83 (0.7%)	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 00 0.0 06 0.2 01 0.0 06 0.1 07 0.0 08 0.1 09 0.0 00 0.0 01 0.0 02 0.0 03 0.1 04 0.1 05 100.0	Construction work/Nos. Of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste management (3): Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 14 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1) 1. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction license. 2. Results: 50% of construction work made a construction work made a construction work made a construction waste management plan
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 6 11 12 13 17 20 21 22 23 24 29 33 44 3. Con Secon Constr Gen	ther the incineration there incineration truction waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphat debris Brick debris Title and ceramic Plastic/vinyl sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (carboard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total Ash Mixed construction waste Flaetruction Waste Fl eration Recy tal amount of System System System Concentry	m is proper managem eration in P GR (kg/day) 9.1 14. 14. 14. 17. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	Approximate Top Top </td <td>Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.0 05 0.0 01 0.0 02 80.9 100.0 0.0</td> <td>Construction work/Nos. Of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 1. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction license. 2. Results: 50% of construction work made a construction to construction work made a construction work mad</td>	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.0 05 0.0 01 0.0 02 80.9 100.0 0.0	Construction work/Nos. Of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction Waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 1. Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 1. Results: 60% of construction work got a construction license. 2. Results: 50% of construction work made a construction to construction work made a construction work mad
C. Man whee ques 3. Con Const Vaste No 1 2 3 4 6 1 1 1 2 3 4 6 1 1 1 2 2 3 3 4 4 6 1 1 1 2 2 3 3 4 4 6 6 1 1 1 2 2 3 3 4 4 6 6 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5	ther the incineration there the incineration there incineration truction Waste Gene Description of Waste Excavated soil Concrete debris Asphalt debris Brick debris Tile and ceramic Plastic/vinyi sheet Iron-bar, steel materials Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Small metal waste Plaster boards Wood debris Timber form Scaffolding material Interior timber Packing (candobard) Machine oil Ash Mixed construction waste Total	mis proper managem eration in Pl GR (kg/day) 9.1 14.4 117. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	Private (2): (M/MF2 (1) TGA (ton/day) 04 1. TGA (ton/day) 04 2. TGA 12 2. 03 0. 03 0. 03 0. 04 0. 04 1. TGA 13 0. 03 0. 04 0. 05 0	Portion (%) 46 4.0 39 6.5 77 7.5 13 0.4 00 0.0 02 0.1 03 0.1 06 0.2 01 0.0 05 0.1 04 0.1 05 0.1 04 0.1 02 80.9 100.0 0.0	Construction work/Nos. of factories interviewed = 440 x 123/334 12 3. Construction waste Generation in PIM/MFZ (2) Waste Generation in accordance with CONAM Resolution 307 Class A (Reusable or recyclable as aggregate 36.8 tons/day 2. Class B (Recyclable as non-aggregate): 0.2 tons/day 3. Class C (Uneconomical recyclables): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 4. Class D (Hazardous waste): 0.0 tons/day 3. Construction waste management (5): Issues (1) 1. Results: 60% of construction license. 2. Results: 50% of construction work made a construc

 3. Construction waste manage (6): Issues (2) 3. Results: Recycling rate is very little only 0.1% because over 80% of mixed wastes are discharged and disposed of at Manaus City Landfill. Almost all (96.9%) of the waste were disposed of at Manaus City Landfill. 	ement	 3. Construction (7): Issues 4. 22.9% (11 in a manifest f waste. 	on waste manage s (3) items of 48 in total) for discharge of the s = 22.9 %	ement use
	17			18
 4. Radioactive waste survey (1) 8 institutions of 14 ones in MFZ, w radioactive materials and have a li CNEN, were surveyed. No radioactive waste are generate 	hich use cense of d.	 4. Radioactive materials mar All 7 factories i the use of radio The purpose of process and co Details are as f 	waste survey (2 nagement in PIM (1 in DI surveyed have oactive materials. f the use is to contru- ntrol of the product follows:): Radioactive) license of ol production (s.
Purpose of use (Type)	Number of	S	pecify	Answer
Nuclear measurers - control of nuclear measuring	target 5	Filling level inspect	ion/ measurement	4
processes in DI Analytical Techniques in DI	2	process	e PVC saliciotii ili tile	•
Nuclear medicine outside DI	2	Products dimension	ontrol	1
		Verification of the s	older	1
 4. Radioactive waste survey (3) Radioactive materials manager PIM (2) Radioactive materials management factories in DI is well established. Those are used in the controlled and Storage of radiation sources is as factorial stored inside of the controlled area with special container. It is stored inside of the controlled area and installed inside of the X-ray equipment. It is installed in a level measurement device It is installed in a device within the controlled area Total 	: gement in t of 7 rea. follows: 2 28.6 3 42.8 1 14.3 7 100.0 21	5. IWM (1): Category of 134 Factories Surveyed 134 factories surveyed shares 30.5% in Total number of those operation in PIM/MFZ.	Sample Sequention - 124 Value of Junco of Junc	Figs of the sector of the sector of
 5. IWM (2): Feature of 134 fac surveyed (1) 67.5% (83/123 Fac.) is established after 1991. Average compound (121 Fac.) and building (116 Fac.) areas are 51,000m² and 12,200 m² respectively. Total number of employees is 34,395 persons (125 factories) and Average number of employees is 276 persons. 	Ctories	 IWM (3): F surveyed (Installation rate industrial and domestic waste treatment facili 26.6 % and 54. respectively. Rate of installat storage space of dangerous sub on the ground i 60.6 % (21/10) 	tion of of stances is 7 Fac.)	ctories

	n Contro	I Facilities		surveyed (4)
D II 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		0/	6	5. Waste Inventory (WI)
Pollution control facilities	124	<i>*</i> 0		All factories in PIM shall
a. Boller	12.4 %	///////////////////////////////////////		26.9% (35/130 Fac.)
b. Incinerator	125%			replied no need to No Obligation = 26.9 %
d Air Control facilities	12.5 %			submit its WI.
a. Air Control faciliries	13.5 %	<u> </u>		111.6 % (11/95 Fac.)
e, Plating process	2.4 %	·/////////////////////////////////////		its WI" do not submit WI
g Weter paining process	142%			In total 35.4% (46/130
h. Metal coating process	7.8 %	///////////////////////////////////////		Fac.) do not submit WI. No Submit WI = 35.4 %
5. IWM (6): Featur surveyed (5)	re of 134	factories		5. IWM (7): Feature of 134 factories surveyed (6)
7. Separate Discha	arge of		_	so socialization 11
Non-Production	and		Ba	We don't know the difference between Non-HIW and HIW. 00%
Production Proc Waste => Vec	cess 87.7%		2	The volume of waste is too small to separate. 81.8 %
(114/130 Fac.)	, No:		3. HIV	The production process makes it difficult to separate Non- 27.3 %
12.3% (16/130) Fac.)	Separate = 87.7 9	% 4. HN	The collection service does not require to separate Non- 182 %
 Separate Discha Non-HIW and H 	arge of IIW =>		5. and	It is troublesome and waste of time to separate Non-HIW 9.1 %
Yes (100% + P	artly):		6.1	It seems unnecessary to separate Non-HIW and HIW. 0.0 %
91.3% (116/12 No: 8 7% (11/1	27 Fac.), 127	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		It is difficult to separate Non-HIW and HIW.
Fac.)		Separate = 91.3 S	% <u>no</u>	ways to unitize them.
5. IWM (8): Fea	ture of	134 factories	27	5. IWM (9): Future Management of IV
 IWM (8): Fea surveyed (7) Health service in factory => Yes: 4 (52/128 Fac.) <= 37.1% (124/334 by Medical institu survey Generation of rad wastes => No: 10 (126 Fac.) <= No (8 Fac.) by radioa waste survey 	the 40.6% = Yes: Fac.) ttion dioactive 00% : 100% active	Health service = 40.	6 % 1 1 %	5. IWM (9): Future Management of IV (1) 1. Generation of IW => No change: 28.0% (35/125 Fac.), Increase: 36.8% (46/125 Fac.), Decrease: 22.4% (28/125 Fac.). Increase = 36.8 %
 IWM (8): Fea surveyed (7) Health service in factory => Yes: 4 (52/128 Fac.) <= 37.1% (124/34 by Medical institu survey Generation of rad wastes => No: 10 (126 Fac.) <= No (8 Fac.) by radioa waste survey Fac.) by radioa to be a survey 	the the the. the. the. Fac.) ution tioactive 00% 100% active	Health service = 40.	27 6 % 1.1 %	 5. IWM (9): Future Management of IV (1) 1. Generation of IW => No change: 28.0% (35/125 Fac.), Increase: 36.8% (46/125 Fac.), Decrease = 12.8% No chan set in the set in the
 IWM (8): Fea surveyed (7) Health service in factory => Yes: 4 (52/128 Fac.) <= 37.1% (124/334 by Medical institu survey Generation of rad wastes => No: 10 (126 Fac.) <= No (8 Fac.) by radioa waste survey IWM (10): Fu IW (2) 	the the tho.6% = Yes: Fac.) ution fioactive 00% : 100% active	Health service = 40.	27	 5. IWM (9): Future Management of IV (1) 1. Generation of IW => No change: 28.0% (35/125 Fac.), Increase: 36.8% (46/125 Fac.), Decrease: 22.4% (28/125 Fac.). 5. IWM (11): Waste Exchange (WE) (1)
 IWM (8): Fea surveyed (7) Health service in factory => Yes: 4 (52/128 Fac.) <= 37.1% (124/334 by Medical institu survey Generation of rad wastes => No: 10 (126 Fac.) <= No (8 Fac.) by radioz waste survey SIWM (10): Fu IW (2) 3Rs plan for IW => No: 67.2% (84/125 Fac.), Yes: 32.8% (41/125 Fac.) 	ture of the to.6% Yes: Fac.) ution ioactive 00% 100% active	Health service = 40.	27	 5. IWM (9): Future Management of IV (1) Generation of IW
5. IWM (12): Waste Exchange (WE) (2) 3. Involvement of WE at present => Yes: 35.7% (45/126 Fac.), No: 57.2% (72/126 Fac.), No answer: 7.1% (9/126 Fac.) No answer = 7.1% No answer = 7.1% No answer = 7.1% No = 57.2%	 5. IWM (13): Financial Matters and Evaluation of Current IW System (1) 1. Payment to transportation company => 188,400 R\$/year (Average of 44 Fac.) 2. Expenditure of on-site (in the factory) IWM => 138,500 R\$/year (Average of 17 Fac.) 			
---	--	--		
 5. IWM (14): Financial Matters and Evaluation of Current IW System (2) 3. Current IW System => No Problems: 29.3% (36/123 Fac.), Some Problems: 70.7% (87/123 Fac.) 	5. IWM (15): Financial Matters and Evaluation of Current IW System (2) 8ese: Population = 87 1. We do not know the difference between hazardous and non-hazardous industrial waste. 2. We do not segregate hazardous from non-hazardous 5.7 % 2. We do not segregate hazardous from non-hazardous 3. There are no or only limited services available for industrial waste treatment. 5.2 %			
5. IWM (16): Industrial Waste Generation Amount in PIM (440 Factories) Health and construction waste and wastewater are excluded. IW generation amount: 696.4 ton/day Non-HIW: 557.0 ton/day 1. Non-process: 192.4 ton/day 1.2 Process: 364.6 ton/day 2. HIW: 139.4 ton/day 2.1 Non-process: 21.0 ton/day 2.2 Process: 118.4 ton/day	Treatment and/or disposed service, in Manaus. Out of the service 30			
 5. IWM (18): All Industrial Waste Flow in PIM (2) Rate of on-site management waste is very low. => 2.7% (19.1ton/day of 696.4) Rate of on-site reuse/recycling is low. => 0.9% (6.1ton/day of 696.4) Most of IW are collected by WMCs. => 87.1% (606.8ton/day of 696.4) 10.1%(70.5ton/day of 696.4) of IW transported by factories by themselves. Only 14.9% (103.6ton/day of 696.4) of IW are disposed of at landfill. Majority of IW go to Treatment (54.2%: 377.6ton/day), followed by Recycle (28.2%: 196.1ton/day). 	5. IWM (19): All Industrial Waste Flow in PIM (3) Residues amount from Treatment & Recycle (573.7ton/day in total) is not informed by factories. It might be disposed of at landfills. It will be checked by WMCs survey results.			













Presentation 3 for 1st Workshop (11 Sept., 2009): PROSAMIM Study Report



Presentation 4 for 1st Workshop (11 Sept., 2009): Domestic and Health Waste Management



The Study for the Development of an Integrated Solution Related to Industrial Waste Management in the Industrial Pole of Manaus 2.1 First Workshop





2.1.3 Outcomes

Question and Answer Session for 1st Workshop: September 11, 2009

Questions:

1. Professor, presentation focused mainly on the health wastes, even showing very efficient ideas comparing to the second one. How do you think the treatment of industrial wastes will be in PIM, the State and the Municipality, once those wastes many times end up becoming domestic waste?

2. What should be done to solve the problem of lack of control and on-site destination?

3. What about the education and the accomplishment of the selective collection? How could the current situation be changed? Especially because it was clearly shown to be worse for the construction wastes?

4. Your presentation shows evidence of the lack of expert and reliable companies to carry out the treatment/recycling of wastes. So, how can that be solved? What is the forecast for that?

5. Which Non-HIW surveyed can be used by the cooperative enterprises (or others) for the production of new products?

6. For Stroski (IPAAM). Why is it so difficult to get the list of the approved companied in IPAAM?

7. For Stroski (IPAAM). How are the final destination companies monitored?

8. It has been noticed the population lacks further clarifications and availability of means so the collection of the domestic wastes may be correctly carried out and consequently educate them for a future selective collection, otherwise we will have to do just as we did with igarapé do 40 (quarenta), where the waterway is dumped with waste, so a governmental plan to educate, instruct or provide means so the population may initiate such activity, thus avoiding decreasing the possibility the calamities of the rain seasons, as well as generating income for the poorest families, besides reducing the expenses of the municipality on domestic waste collection. Are ther plans in that sense? If so, when would they be brought into practice?

9. As for the initiatives towards environmental education actions and programs, the Science and Technology Secretariat of the State of Amazonas and through the Amazonas State Federal University – UFAM and UEA are willing to contribute with partnerships which may provide the foundations for such programs?

10. The final off-site disposal of hazardous industrial wastes (landfill) is, according to an operation adjustment agreement between the City Hall and the Public Ministry, forbidden. So what is the legal framework like? Is the final disposal of such wastes correct or not?

11. As for the percentage of pollution control plants, characteristics of the 134 (a hundred thirty four) surveyed factories, is it highly important to have a chemist in the facilities as demanded by Law n. 2,800, from 06/18/1956, as the technician in charge of the area in the company?

12. In case I segregate wastes in my house, how will the collection be done by the municipality? Once today, a small part of the population does such segregation, but during the collection the wastes end up being mixed due to the lack of a more adequate structure to facilitate the segregation of the wastes in the landfill.

13. What were the criteria for the selection of the local consultants to survey the initial data of the study

14. It is known the health wastes should undergo a previous treatment before their final disposal in order to avoid they get in touch with vectors and possible human contact. In that sense, is the final disposal in a specific gutter in the landfill considered as legal?

15. Although your presentation aims for presenting information it also emphasizes the lack of a better monitoring of the wastes collection and destination companies by IPAAM, how could that be solved in short or medium-term?

16. What is wastes exchange?

17. Your presentation was based on statements, but without mentioning any actions, so it left doubts and/or lacked clarifications, which I mention below:

In the general extent there is a clear demonstration of the lack of habit for the destination/routine/transport, once the manifest is not mandatory, although it should be, so what to do? How to do it? And how long would the companies have to comply with it?

Suggestions:

- Treatment / final destination of hazardous wastes Juvino S.R. Júnior
- Disposal / destination of hazardous wastes, such as glasses, glass and plastics in general Juvino S.R. Júnior
- Transportation of hazardous wastes
- The participation of the Local Accounting Council would be really important to deal with the issues concerning the Environmental Accounting and the Social Balance.

Answers to the Questions for 1st Workshop: September 11, 2009

Gracilene Belota: Now let's go on to the last part with questions of the audience, and I would like the count on the comprehension of the audience because some questions do not have to do with the scope of the study. But not that their opinions are not interesting, so I would like those to be here for the afternoon session because we will need your opinion so we may accomplish all we have to. So I will start reading the questions and once more I pledge the afternoon groups to provide further clarifications about them. The first question is for SUFRAMA.

 1^{st} Question: What were the criteria for the selection of the local consultants to survey the initial data of the study?

Gracilene Belota: The criteria was aleatory, we picked the companies with projects approved by SUFRAMA by sector, which is the objective of the study. I would like to make it very clear we have the involvement of all stakeholders in the environmental aspects, but the Study aims for Manaus Industrial Pole. As the Study foreseen the categories of wastes to be studied, we provided the consultants with the list of the companies comprehended by the Study so they selected the ones they believed to be important, taking into account the size, the number of employees, and a series of other criteria adopted by them, such as the productive process, so they focused on their own methodology, SUFRAMA, IPAAM and the other organization which are assisting the consultants were not involved in that process. After selecting the companies they wrote the questionnaires, which were then delivered to the local consultants Who carried out the survey. So it is very important people join the group discussions in the afternoon so the incomplete data may be completed, because maybe the questionnaire was to blame for the us not to get all the information we expected.

 2^{nd} Question: Although your presentation aims for presenting information it also emphasizes the lack of a better monitoring of the wastes collection and destination companies by IPAAM, how could that be solved in short or medium-term?

Stroski: the monitoring system of IPAAM is not efficient and that is a fact, what we have done internally in IPAAM, which is a concern of the current administration, is that in that sense we have even ran into covenants and partnerships with Prosamim in order to be prepared to better carry out those monitoring activities, and all we long for is to stimulate the environmental legality of all companies so they may become more competitive, and for that we are already developing our computer system so we may do the annual wastes inventory, and we are also defining the wastes manifest tracking procedure as part of the licensing procedures management of the industries set in Manaus Industrial Pole. We also have the monitoring procedure which takes place every time a license is renewed, so the problems do exist but we have been trying to correct them.

3rd Question: What is wastes exchange?

Kadota: The concept brought by JICA to Manaus is you would access a website in which you would inform you have a certain amount of a certain material you want to negotiate. So anyone interested in that material would have direct and clear information about business opportunities in buying and selling wastes, and anyone interested in your waste would get in touch with you and make an offer. On the other hand, the companies which treat wastes would be there making their services available for PIM: what type of services they have and the advantages of hiring them. The companies interested in environmental services would use the website to check and get those data, what would facilitate the proposals for tenders so they could solve their waste issues and improve their management, so it would in fact work a wastes Exchange because you would be there in a single site where both supply and demand would be informed.

4th **Question**: It is known the health wastes should undergo a previous treatment before their final disposal in order to avoid they get in touch with vectors and possible human contact. In that sense, is the final disposal in a specific gutter in the landfill considered as legal?

Professor Ladislau: In the current scenery, the way the health wastes have been managed and taking into account the type of final disposal we still have, i.e., the municipal landfill. So the way the health waste generation sources operate and send their wastes to the final destination area requires a fast solution because there may be problems, but if we consider the scenery of the generator accepting what the legislation states, once in their health wastes management plan they already know which wastes they will generate and what they will do to them, we would have nothing to worry about if next those wastes are sent to a landfill in fact, what the city actually has never had.

 5^{th} Question: In case I segregate wastes at home house, how will the collection be done in Manaus? And today, few people make that separation, but when the wastes are collected they ended up being mixed due to the lack of a more appropriate structure, facilitating the separation of the wastes in the landfills.

Answer by Jane Crespo: the separation should be done in the whole master plan, because in the end, one of its proposals is the selective collection, how it can be done and structured, what is necessary for that to happen indeed, however, taking advantage of our brilliant secretary being here, I thing he can provide us with further information on that.

Secretary Paulo César Cavaletti: Good morning, I am the Secretary of SEMULSP, my name is Cavalleti, the intention of the study is to provide us with information about the wastes management either than pointing out who is right or wrong, after all, there is no way we can separate domestic wastes from industrial wastes in Manaus. We have the Industrial District with a geographic area and we have Manaus Industrial Pole with industries scattered all over, and the industries we have here are clean ones, we have no chimneys, and I think we pay a very high price for the industrial wastes: people say we will have kids who will be born with no heads, no brains and many other stuff, and we have to abandon the idea that we do not have a landfill, and I would like to disagree about Professor Ladislau, although I have been your student, but I emphasize that we do have a landfill, we have been working for over four years on that, we sealed the old landfill and now the disposal is done on an area covered with sheets of PAD, with lagoons, we have a complete monitoring work of the superficial and underground waters, and Manaus has today a rare and efficient final disposal process in the landfill, after all a landfill is nothing but a legal dump site, if legalization is an issue of course. And we will hold a meeting at the Environment Jurisdiction to define the actions to be taken in Manaus and the State of Amazonas by IBAMA, IPAAM and SEMMA about the extremely competent monitoring of the Public Ministry. On that note I dare to say Manaus has one of the five best wastes treatment of the largest cities of Brazil, and that is a fact about the issue of the collection and separation, the City Hall is not supposed to do that, the population should worry about that, make the generator conscious about that, no matter if its is an industry or a citizen in his house, we all generate wastes. What the municipal government is doing is making collection points available, and we started by the people living in PROSAMIM target area: all the wastes removed are sent to an association of waste pickers who used to work in the landfill. Unfortunately, as Manaus is far from the great consuming centers and the local industries have limitations to receive or use such material due to the economic conditions, the price paid for such material is always dropping, so not many people are picking wastes as their main income activity. Take the cardboard and the aluminum as examples: we have all the production chain in the State of Amazonas, we have two voluntary deliver points called PEVES, which were implemented by the Public Ministry and the Environment Jurisdiction: one of them is in the suburb of Dom Pedro and the other one in São Francisco, behind SEFAZ. So getting involved in recycling activities we should first learn how to reduce the quantity of wastes we generate by reusing them for example. And if you need any further clarifications we have a phone number for the population in SEMULSP, the number is 3214-8115. We have selective collection incentive programs, if you live in a vertical or horizontal condominium, get in touch with us and we will help you implement those actions, we need the help of the population because the government cannot do anything alone, so we will have a better and more beautiful city.

Professor Ladislau: Mr. Secretary I do remember you from the environmental engineering course, but about the issue of the controlled landfill, I would like to say once for all that I do not agree about what you said but I respect your right to say whatever you want and I am at your entire disposal as a citizen, technician and public worker to help clarify why our landfill is or is not a landfill indeed, this is the contribution the city needs in a very respectful way, I am at your entire disposal to tell you the reasons why we do not have a landfill

 6^{th} Question: As for the percentage of pollution control plants, characteristics of the 134 surveyed factories, it is fundamentally important to hire a chemist as demanded by Law n. 2.800, from 18/06/1956, to be the technician in charge of the companies?

Answer Kadota: I agree, but the objective of the survey did not focus on the issue of the professionals, if they are duly registered in the associations or not. All the survey did was verify what kind and quantity of equipment there were, so I agree with you that the same way there must be a chemist in charge, there must also be someone in charge of the safety, an engineer, etc. All companies know their obligations and we are not questioning the companies about that, the intention of the survey was to check the environmental controls, if they had the equipment they claimed to have.

Gracilene: As a representative of Suframa I would like to make an observation: the target of the study is Manaus Industrial Pole as one of the goals the Public Ministry set for Suframa, although it is not being done for that alone.

7th **Question:** The off-site final disposal of hazardous industrial wastes (landfill) is, according to a behavior adjustment agreement signed between the Municipality and the Public Ministry, forbidden. So, how is the legality of this process? Is the final disposal of such wastes correct or not?

Answer Stroski: The Public Ministry is right, by the way, both IPAAM and the Public Ministry have established very useful procedures in the industrial sector and in the inland municipalities: the industrial landfill for Class 1 wastes and a constructive model of the Brazilian rules which are more restrictive for its construction, operation and monitoring. So the destination of hazardous wastes towards the municipal landfill is in full agreement with the intervention or prohibition of the Public. There is also an initiative of the municipality trying to restrict much more, so it is difficult to monitor the Class 1 wastes and keep the its complete control when entering the landfill. So the Public Ministry is right in not allowing the disposal if there is not a properly built landfill, as well as licensed by IPAAM.

8th Question: As for the initiatives of environmental education actions and programs, the Amazonas State Science and Technology Secretariat through the Amazonas State University, are willing to contribute to the partnerships intended for those programs.

Answer Jane Crespo: Such contribution is really welcome. Prosamim is a program formed by partners, so the more partners we have the best. And we also work with some people from

several sorts of know-how and the higher their knowledge the best for the program to be better consolidated. UEA is one of our partners, there are many master and doctor degree students writing their essays with us and we provide them with all information needed, so we are at the entire disposal of the whole academia, not only UEA, we also have UFAM, INPA and private universities. Prosamim is promoting Water Contamination Control Plan for igarapé do 40, which is today the drainage system of several companies from the Industrial District. The company which won the tender is starting to develop the diagnosis work. Igarapé do 40 is our main intervention axle, so this Water Contamination Control Plan for igarapé do 40 immediately involves the major objective. The peculiarity is he industrial contamination, so this one of the responsibilities and the major interface of Prosamim towards JICA's study.

Dr Ronaldo. We have been involved in those discussions from the very beginning within our entities, in CIEAM and the Chamber for over ten years discussing exactly a solution for Manaus Industrial Pole, and once none of our chairmen are here I would like to emphasize that is not because they do not care: Mr. Antonio Silva is abroad, Mr. Maurício is injured and the people from the chamber are travelling, but we are here, Mr. Kadota is the representative all those entities. I would like to comment on the issue raised by Mr. Stroski that we as class entities and many of the companies in the audience are our members, we have been from the very beginning been looking forward to a solution for the problem, which is a problem of the city, the Industrial District and a problem which we as citizens long for solving. So it is important the companies may answer in a very clear way, otherwise the solutions will not be satisfactory either, that must be stated in a very transparent way and we assure we only got into such issue because we know that will be dealt institutionally.

Gracilene: Ronaldo, you do not have to worry about that because we know how important the entities are, the Industrial Pole has a huge environmental responsibility, because of the technological issue we have to be ahead of the future, so we must optimize these issues. When that demand came from the industries to Suframa, we embraced it immediately, although monitoring may not be our main activity we have the obligation to care for this pole even in order to preserve and have some coherence with our speech that the state of Amazonas is 92% preserved, in that sense this study will be one more tool without any contestation for the preservation of the State of Amazonas due to the establishment of Manaus Industrial Pole and its industries, which although being clean, need to know about the technologies, train, give a proper destination to their industrial wastes. So I can assure you by the end of this study that will be made available to all organizations working in the study and which hold the competence to be carrying out activities in such sector.

Group 1, On-Site Management, Discussion Summary for 1st Workshop: 11 Sept., 2009

GROUP 1 – ON-SITE MANAGEMENT: CURRENT CONDITIONS AND ISSUES

- Classification of health wastes: the used legislation is not up-to-date;
- ABNT 12.808 was enforced only for 03 months (it does not fulfill the national legislation), the study team followed a regulation which was not up-to-date;

- Currently the resolution N. 358/2005 of CONAMA, and Resolution 306/2004 of ANVISA, which deal with OFF-SITE and ON-SITE health wastes, respectively (available in the respective websites);
- Clarifications about the concept of wastes exchange in the focus to be developed for the study;
- Information on the difficulties related to the destination of cardboard scraps due to the respective excess for the local market;
- Request of information about the use of cardboard scraps in brick factories ovens;
- The brick factories have an adequate infrastructure to burn cardboard, as for the ash and the smoke, it is still being studied;
- Clarification about the obligation to fulfill the issues contained in the forms sent to the companies;
- There is no legal obligation, nevertheless, it was highlighted the social obligation as for the fulfillment of the issues;
- Some inputs are not recyclable, such as waxed paper, reason why they go to the municipal landfill;
- Statement of the representative of the Environment Ministry about the need, after the final remarks of the study, of pointing out the several extents of the government for the necessity to incentive/subsidize projects which aim for investments in recycling companies, taking into account the high cost of such activity;
- It was also added the economic unfeasibility in the recycling of glass, unless it is subsidized;
- So the study may translate the actual scenery, it is necessary the surveyed companies may make the requested information available;
- Such observation was raised due to the difficulties in obtaining data about the quantity of wastes generated by;
- Foundry companies recycle the waste of the burned sand and reuse in the process;
- The segregation of the oil and the soot after the process with the reuse of the oil;
- Suggestion for the generation company to reuse the wastes, just like the foundry company;
- The use of oil-water separator decreases the emission of wastes, once the oil is reused;
- Energetic reuse by means of burning wastes, according to prior studies, is not environmentally feasible, as informed by the representative of the Environment Ministry;
- Hazardous wastes besides the small surveyed amount, it will also be taken into account for the study of JICA;

- The Environment Ministry developed hazardous wastes studies for 03 States based on the State inventory of industrial wastes;
- Questions if there are consulting companies in Manaus to provide guidelines on wastes treatment;
- The companies should use their own personnel to look for improvements in their environmental performance. They should think not only of the efficiency increase of the production processes, but also of the environmental quality improvement;
- The companies may check with the class entities (FIEAM, CIEAM, CCINB) in their environment coordination to exchange information and benchmarking.

Group 2, Off-site Management, Discussion Summary for 1st Workshop, Sept. 11, 2009

Group 2 - Off-site Management: Current Conditions and Issues General Topics:

- Incineration should be the last stage of the wastes.
- The State Treasury Department should attend to these discussions.
- Almost 50% of the recycling cost is due to the expenses on electricity, which is why many companies have illegal electrical wiring.
- It is very hard to implement a multinational company. Rechargeable batteries are still a huge problem and we should create rules and conditions so their recycling could be feasible.
- There is not much about wastes treatment; the whole cycle has to be developed. The example of Italy was mentioned, where the generator is responsible for the wastes and the companies get together by means of consortiums to recycle the wastes.
- There is much information available in the internet about loans and investments for small businessmen. The strengthening of conglomerates can be seen in the website of APEX, such as the case of the Brazilian Association of Incentives.

Local Market:

- Drop in cardboard price, about R\$ 30 per ton;
- Banks, governments and industries should be responsible for the recycling cost, which cannot be avoided to happen. In Manaus we can see that willingness, IBAM should not only help the city hall, but also the companies and gather the responsible parties with feasible proposals and suggestions.
- In Manaus we have experienced the bankruptcy and joint-venture of waste management companies, thus causing insecurity in the generators which seek for reliable companies. The suggestion is IPAAM should gather management companies, environmental organizations and people in general to form partnerships, exchange information, ideas and suggestions.
- IPAAM should be a better representative of the State of Amazonas in the issues of the Brazilian Foundry Committee. That is a chance the state has to show what it has been doing, once the MFZ model and IPAAM are very well in terms of legislation, and that should be stated in national extent.
- Just like there are departments in SUFRAMA for the incentives, there should be incentives for management companies, because the bureaucracy ends up disheartening the opening of new companies.
- It is necessary to seek for new companies which may treat the wastes generated in PIM.
- The PIM does not have a large generation of wastes comparing to other Industrial Poles.
- Today, five IPAAM licenses are needed so a company may operate. It should be only one.
- Lack of professionals and companies with the necessary skills to carry out the correct destination of the wastes.

- Companies of PIM have generated wastes which are not being treated and are disposed in the municipal landfill. It is necessary to dispose the wastes in a correct way and have a stricter monitoring of IPAAM.
- The system used today does not fulfill the needs and IPAAM was questioned on IPAAM if as an institute it could solve such issue. New companies have been opened and it is essential they should be licensed and monitored by IPAAM, because that would have the reliability of an environmental organization. The prices charged by the waste management companies are high so an adequate final destination may be accomplished.
- The companies have no one to complain about their problems and needs related to the environment.
- IPAAM started demanding a manifest from the companies informing the destination of their wastes, but there is no defined model, Resolution 313 of CONAMA should be followed. There is a lack of follow up by IPAAM from the generation to the treatment of the wastes. There are companies which have the license of IPAAM but have no conditions to be in operation.
- There is no traceable manifest.
- It is important to create a wastes exchange.
- The regulation, infrastructure, incentives and the transport should be improved.

Final destination /incineration:

• The costs are very high, sometimes even impossible. People want to make a profit out of the wastes, but they hold no technical nor environmental knowledge. Either well-structured reliable companies are hired (high costs) or governmental support is needed (Public-Private Partnership), where reliable companies would keep the operations running. The public service still has too many bad habits, we should seek for something more efficient in order to fulfill our needs.

Construction wastes:

- There was a huge growth of the construction companies and few wastes are being recycled.
- It is necessary to restart working the awareness of the people and companies which receive and recycle those wastes to put them back to the market, once they are a great business opportunity for management companies;
- It is necessary a further professional qualification, there are way too many amateurs in that area, we must bring highly expert companies.
- If the study shows there is a higher demand for the construction waste management companies, the companies will demand new investments.
- Recycling Center:
- Objective: Market monitoring by means of notices informing on legislations and updating, working as a class entity. It should provide constant support and have a website as a means of communication among the management companies. The objective of the center would be to protect the recyclers, it would be an independent organization, and FIESP, which defends the interest of the industries in the State of São Paulo was mentioned as an example.
- Creation of a group with the recycling companies;
- Define how a service provider could join that group and how it will be managed.
- Verify what the governmental participation will be, mainly as for the taxes and energy costs.
- Count on the support of IBAM, CONAMA, SUFRAMA, IPAAM and experts.
- Monitoring and database:
- The monitoring should still be improved, aiming for stimulating the licensing of the companies.
- The data base to be shared between JICA and SUFRAMA will help with the surveillance and monitoring.
- The stability of the market happens through information; it is a very dynamic market.

- We should construct a data base in which information may be constantly input.
- PROSAMIM and IPAAM joint-venture:
- Research vehicle.
- Environmental Education:
- Every productive activity generates wastes, for that we need to develop an environmental education, such as campaigns.
- The environmental actions should start at home, such as the awareness and the segregation of the domestic waste, education. The domestic recyclables may be mixed with the industrial ones, for the recycling companies do not accept materials in small quantities.
- The waste picker may change his paradigm and become an environmental agent, provided he undergoes some training and education for such.

Group 3, IWM Improvement Policies, Discussion Summary for 1st Workshop, Sept. 11, 2009

Group 3: Industrial Wastes Management Improvement Policies

Debate topics suggestions:

- Creation of the Wastes Inventory Data Base by Suframa
- Joint-work with IPAAM
- Resources necessary for the implementation of the Data Base
- Need of improvement in the operation licenses issuance system for the waste management companies
- Advantages of the Data Base for the factories of PIM
- Economic support for the waste management companies
- Partnerships with other environmental entities
- Suggestions for the Data Base

Advantages of the Data Base:

- Demand for information concerning the waste management requested by the Federal Government to the Municipal Government (SEMSA) health waste, water and soil quality (WATS) due to the computerization (own data base).
- The solid wastes Data Base will be under the responsibility of SUFRAMA, IPAAM and FIEAM/CIEAM/CCNB, and will focus in the industries of PIM, whose Access may be extended to several areas in the municipal, state and federal extents.
- The Data Base may be constructed by SUFRAMA, due to its better infrastructure.
- Wastes disposal from the accounting viewpoint: mensuration of the social balance (in relation to donations and/or undoing) and development of the environmental accounting (indexes: gases emission control, wastewater quality monitoring).
- Optimization of the business resources by means of reduction, reuse and recycling; decreasing of expenses on soil and water decontamination; information speed: capability of agglutinating more people towards an environmental awareness.
- Selection of the waste management companies: the Data Base should contain information to enable the service providers in the market.
- State Law n. 2826/2003 (modified by Law 3426/2009): modification of criteria for the concession of fiscal incentives related to optimization efforts of the solid wastes

management by the industries which hold ISO 9000 and 14000 Certifications (the ICMS charged by the State).

- Those incentives are exclusive for the industries which have an economic project presented to SEPLAN, and its consequent implementation.
- Suggestion of a tender for the exploration of industrial wastes management (in the sense of leveling such service provision, which holds public interest registration updating).
- About the validity of an imposing instrument for the supply of periodically updated information, concerning the generation and management of wastes, to be input in the Data Base: possibly, the regular input of information will be demanded from the factories, for the means of maintenance of the Registration in SUFRAMA and the enjoyment of the tax incentives (to be defined); or a covenant will be signed between SUFRAMA and IPAAM in the sense of granting SUFRAMA with the monitoring power.
- There should also be some reinforcement for requesting the registration updating.
- The factories may be granted with a deadline to fulfill such demand from the implementation of the Master Plan on, in 2011.
- At first the inputs in the Data Base will depend on the information provided by monitoring organizations. Afterwards, they should come straight from the companies.
- Need to create a financial mechanism (percentage meant for R&D, for example) in order to afford for the wastes management improvements existing in PIM today.
- So, many suggestions depend on political good-will and even on modifications of the pertinent legislation.

2.2 Second Workshop

2.2.1 Program

Program for 2nd Workshop: November 27, 2009



2nd Workshop: Framework of IWM Master Plan

The second workshop invites the study steering committee and technical support committee members to meet with other government institutions, waste dischargers, waste management companies, environmental NGOs, local consultants and others in discuss and gather opinions on the framework for the Master Plan based on results from the first stage of the project, discussion between the HCA Study Team and Brazilian counterparts, as well as feedback from participants in the first workshop.

Venue			Date	Time
Comfort Hotel Convention Rooms			27 November (2009)	2pm to 6:30pm
Session	Time*	Title	Presenter	
1	2:00:2:15	Opening Address	Mrs. Flavia Grosso - Superintendant of SUFRAMA Mr, Katsuhiko Haga - Chief Representative of JICA Brazil Office	
2	2:15-2:30	Workshop Objectives and Overview	Mrs. Maria Gracilene Belata - SUFRAMA	
3	2:30-3:15	Industrial Waste Management In Japan: Eco-town concept, Zero emission, etc.	Mr. Susumu Shimura - JICA Study Team	
4	3:15-3:45	Concept of Industrial Waste Management Master Plan	Mr. Alexandre Kadota - FIEAM/CIEAM/CCINB	
5	3:45-4:15	Administration of Industrial Waste by INEA/RJ	Mrs. Erika Cantanhede Wuillaume - State Institute of Environment / far Ris de Janeiro (INEA/RJ)	
б	4:15-4:45	Questions and Answers	Participants and Speakers	
7	4:45-5:00	Colline break	Ail Participants	
8	5:00-5:45	Concept of Industrial Waster Management Master Plan (Workshop)	All Participients (divided into three or four groups, each with its own leader)	
9	5:45-6:15	Group Summaries	Leaders of the groups	
10	5:15-5:30	Closing Remarks	Mrs. Marie Gracilene Belota - SUFRAMA Mr. Jiro Shibasaki - Consul General of the Consulate-General of Japan In Mangus Mr. Susumu Shimura - JICA Study Team	

 During sessions 3, 4 and 5, participants are asked to prepare any questions or suggestions which will be addressed during a question and answer session, or during discussions in three or four groups. Please deposit questions in a collection box, which will be made available.

 The stremmy (session 9) at the end of the day will be prepared based on the group presentations in the attenuom.