IJFANS INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES

ISSN PRINT 2319 1775 Online 2320 7876

Research paper  UGC CARE Listed ( Group -I) Journal Volume 11, Iss 11A, 2022

# Management of Electronic Waste in India: A Geographical Analysis

**Sandeep Beniwal***

*Research Scholar, JNU Delhi

## Abstract

The surge in global electronic waste (e-waste) due to technological advancements is exacerbated by India's increasing contribution. This study explores the geographical dimensions of e-waste in India, analyzing factors influencing its generation, disposal, and associated environmental and social implications. India's growing population, middle-class expansion, and heightened consumerism contribute significantly to the rise in electronic device ownership, amplifying e-waste production. Geographical methods assess e-waste spatial distribution across regions, considering urbanization, economic activities, and technology adoption. The prevalence of informal recycling practices in various regions poses a significant challenge, with the study shedding light on their spatial concentration, economic dynamics, and environmental repercussions. The research also evaluates the regulatory framework for e-waste management in India, assessing its effectiveness in mitigating environmental impact and protecting human health. Socio-economic dimensions, including the impact on vulnerable communities engaged in informal recycling, are considered, emphasizing geographical factors such as proximity to disposal sites. In conclusion, the study contributes to geography by offering a comprehensive analysis of e-waste in India, aiming to inform policymakers, researchers, and the public about sustainable management strategies.

**Keywords** :- E-waste, Geographical dimensions, Regulatory framework

## Introduction

Electronic waste, commonly known as "electronic garbage," refers to electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) that has lost its value to its owners. The definition of electronic waste lacks standardization, as highlighted by Widmer et al. (2005). The European Union WEEE Directive 2002/96 defines EEE as equipment with specific voltage ratings and functionalities, encompassing devices used for generating, transferring, and measuring electric currents and electromagnetic fields. WEEE, categorized as waste under the EU 2002 definition, includes consumables, components, and subassemblies remaining with the product at disposal (Awasthi et al., 2016a).

The term "electronic waste" is commonly used, but its interpretation varies based on regional and national laws. In India, the "e-waste (management and handling) guidelines 2016" recognize two categories, while the EU WEEE identifies ten types, covering a broad spectrum from household appliances to toys and medical equipment (MoEF, 2016). Despite divergent definitions, there is

ISSN PRINT 2319 1775 Online 2320 7876

 UGC CARE Listed ( Group -I) Journal Volume 11, Iss 11A, 2022

consensus that electronic waste is a rapidly expanding waste stream demanding immediate attention.

Electronic waste comprises diverse materials, with glass, plastics, non-ferrous metals, ferrous metals, and contaminants being primary components (Dwivedy et al., 2015). The materials in electronic waste are largely recyclable, with iron and steel constituting approximately half of the total weight, followed by plastics and non-ferrous metals, including valuable materials like copper and precious metals. Approximately 2.7% of contaminants are also present (Dwivedy et al., 2015). More than 60% of the materials are recyclable, including valuable elements like gold, making the international trade in electronic waste from industrialized to underdeveloped nations lucrative.

Despite objections from NGOs, the global trade in electronic waste continues to increase annually, presenting a waste management challenge in underdeveloped nations. Recyclability conflicts with the hazardous nature of substances in electronic waste, mined using environmentally damaging techniques (Kannan et al., 2016). The global volume of potentially harmful e-waste is on the rise, emphasizing the urgency of addressing this environmental issue (Garlapati, 2016).

## Uniqueness of E-waste

Waste management, as highlighted by Ramachandra and Varghese (2004), necessitates an understanding of waste composition. Unlike most solid waste categories with distinct origins, electronic waste (e-waste) has a diverse range of sources, varying from small residential generators to large institutional ones, containing both useful and hazardous components (Van Eygen et al., 2016). In the USA, e-waste is often landfilled alongside municipal solid waste (MSW), contributing to a global issue affecting both developed and developing nations (Awasthi et al., 2016b). MSW management, extensively studied, employs decision support models using methodologies like lifecycle analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and environmental impact analysis (Garlapati, 2016).

In wealthier nations, the significant waste from automobile shredders, known as Automotive Shredder Residue (ASR), competes for landfill space and is deemed hazardous. The EU members, along with the US and Japan, are major sources of end-of-life vehicles (ELV), with national and international laws addressing ELV waste under the extended producer responsibility (EPR) principle (Garlapati, 2016). ELV, highly recyclable, faces challenges due to the shifting composition of vehicles and the resultant growth in non-recyclable materials (Kannan et al., 2016).

Comparatively, e-waste and ELV share potential for recycling, but e-waste, with a shorter lifespan, experiences a higher creation rate due to rapid technological turnover (Needhidasan et al., 2014; Zeng and Li, 2016). While both developed and developing nations follow EPR principles for e-waste management, the extensive variety of electronic and electrical equipment

ISSN PRINT 2319 1775 Online 2320 7876

Research paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, UGC CARE Listed ( Group -I) Journal Volume 11, Iss 11A, 2022

(EEE) poses challenges in tracking and managing its disposal compared to the more identifiable automotive sector (Needhidasan et al., 2014). The unique characteristics of e-waste reveal the limitations of conventional waste management techniques in addressing its complexity.

## Environmental Impact and Electronic Waste

Electronic waste continues to contain precious metals, with copper composing up to 0.2 tonnes per ton of electronic waste (Widmer et al., 2005). E-waste surpasses ground ore in precious metal richness, presenting deposits 40–50 times more concentrated (GeSI, 2012). Developed nations like Japan, Australia, and the EU employ systematic and scientific procedures for ecologically acceptable e-waste extraction, offering environmental benefits such as reducing greenhouse gas emissions and immediate carbon emission reductions (Van Eygen et al., 2016). The presence of precious minerals in e-waste has attracted attention in the informal sector of waste management in underdeveloped nations, recognizing economic opportunities (Ramachandra and Varghese, 2004).

In contrast to affluent nations' complex resource recovery methods, the informal sector in underdeveloped countries uses simple procedures for resource extraction, posing environmental harm and health risks due to potentially harmful contaminants (Sinha-Khetriwal et al., 2005). These contaminants, including cadmium, mercury, and lead, led to e-waste restrictions in cross-border travel since 1992 under the Basel Convention.

Research on harmful chemical emissions from e-waste processing reveals burning and disassembly procedures as primary exposure sources. Reusing e-waste results in the production of lead, polychlorinated dibenzodioxins, and polybrominated diphenylethers, contaminating water, land, and air (Pandey and Govind, 2014). Guiyu, China, a hub for illicit recycling, exhibits significant dioxin levels, raising concerns about potential lead seepage into soil (Borthakur, 2014). Incorrect e-waste reuse releases trace amounts of mercury and cadmium, harming soil, air, and human health alongside dioxin exposure and release (Awasthi et al., 2016b).

Dioxins, identified as carcinogens, impact reproductive and endocrine systems, linked to major health issues such as hepatic sclerosis and increased mortality (Pandey and Govind, 2014). Lead poisoning results in severe harm to humans and animals, affecting the central nervous system and cognitive development in children (Van Eygen et al., 2016). Cadmium poisoning affects the kidneys, while chronic mercury exposure harms the kidneys and central nervous system (Widmer R et.al, 2005). The toxic consequences of lead, cadmium, mercury, and dioxins in e-waste underscore potential harm from inappropriate processing, presenting a challenging issue in electronic waste management due to environmental risks alongside lucrative commercial opportunities (Ramachandra and Varghese, 2004).

ISSN PRINT 2319 1775 Online 2320 7876

 **UGC CARE Listed ( Group -I) Journal Volume 11, Iss 11A, 2022**

## E-Waste Regulations and Management

Global governance has responded to growing concerns about electronic waste by implementing regulations to protect and mitigate its consequences on nations. Various studies emphasize the necessity of enacting laws to ensure proper electronic waste treatment (Needhidasan et al., 2014). The Basel Convention of 1992 was the initial international law addressing the transboundary movement of electronic waste, subsequently updated in 1995 through the Basel Ban amendment to impose limits on e-waste movement under the guise of recycling.

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) principles form the basis for policies controlling e-waste, making product manufacturers accountable for the entire product life cycle (Pandey and Govind, 2014). Lindhqvist pioneered the EPR-based electronic waste management system, identifying five crucial considerations: statutory regulations, system financing, system coverage, compliance, and producer responsibility. EPR shifts the financial and infrastructure burden of waste treatment from municipalities to producers, encouraging better product design and recycling efforts (Tojo, 2005).

Researchers advocate for EPR-based laws in developing nations, emphasizing the need to consider local contexts and imposing financial and collecting obligations on producers to ensure effective e-waste disposal (Kannan et al., 2016). Market-based tools like deposit return programs and tax credits are proposed to incentivize stakeholder engagement in e-waste treatment in developing nations, recognizing the significant role of the informal sector, particularly in resource extraction through substandard backyard recycling (Dwivedy et al., 2015; Awasthi et al., 2016b).

Integration of the informal sector with professional recyclers is recommended, especially in developing nations like China, where informal recycling of electronic waste is prevalent (Awasthi et al., 2016). Despite extensive research on electronic waste management strategies and procedures in both industrialized and developing countries, the global challenge of effectively managing e-waste persists, underscoring the need for further investigation.

## Summary

This article explores the scope and composition of electronic waste, shedding light on the urgent need to manage this rapidly expanding global waste stream. It brings attention to the unique characteristics of electronic waste, distinguishing it from other waste management streams like MSW and medical waste, emphasizing the requirement for specialized processing. The environmental repercussions of improper electronic waste treatment are discussed, underscoring the distinctive challenges posed by this waste category. Additionally, the article examines how electronic waste is currently managed in both industrialized and developing nations. To comprehend the context of electronic waste management in India and glean insights from the

ISSN PRINT 2319 1775 Online 2320 7876



study, a foundational understanding of the global electronic waste problem is essential, a goal achieved through this article.

## REFERENCES

Agarwal, R. (2009), Time to tackle e-waste, *Civil Society*, November, [Online] Available:http://www.civilsocietyonline.com/Archive/nov09/nov0910.asp.

Awasthi AK, Zeng XL, Li JH (2016a) Comparative examining and analysis of E-wasterecycling in typical developing and developed countries. Procedia Environ Sci 35:676–680

Borthakur A (2014) Generation and management of electronic waste in the city of Pune,India. Bull Sci Technol Soc 34(1–2):43–52

Dwivedy M, Suchde P, Mittal RK (2015) Modeling and assessment of e-waste take-backstrategies in India. Resour Conserv Recycl 96:11–18

Kannan D, Govindan K, Shankar M (2016) Formalize recycling of electronic waste.Nature 530(7590):281–281

Jain, A. (2006), E-waste management in India: Current status and needs: Creation of Optimum Knowledge Bank for Efficient e-Waste Management in India, In *Workshop on Efficient E-waste Management*, 8-9 May 2006, New Delhi.

Greenpeace (2020) The e-waste problem, Greenpeace International, [Online] Available: http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/campaign/electronics/the-e-waste-problem.

Garlapati VK (2016) E-waste in India and developed countries: management, recycling,business and biotechnological initiatives. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 54:874–881

Needhidasan S, Samuel M, Chidambaram R (2014) Electronic waste—an emerging threat to the environment of urban India. J Environ Health Sci Eng

Ramachandra TV, Varghese SK (2004) Environmentally sound options for e-wastes management. Envis Journal of Human Settlement. Retrieved from http://wgbis.ces.iisc.ernet.in/energy/ewaste/ewaste.html.

ISSN PRINT 2319 1775 Online 2320 7876

 UGC CARE Listed ( Group -I) Journal Volume 11, Iss 11A, 2022

Van Eygen E, De Meester S, Tran HP, Dewulf J (2016) Resource savings by urban mining: the case of desktop and laptop computers in Belgium. Resour Conserv Recycl 107:53–64

UNEP & UNU (2009), Recycling - from e-waste to resources, *Sustainable Innovation and Technology Transfer Industrial Sector Studies*, Berlin, Germany.

Upadhyay, V.K. (2007), India's IT industry: the SME story, paper presented at *OECD conference on Enhancing the Role of SMEs in Global Value Chains*, Tokyo.