EWAsTER | Interreg Euro-MED | Co-funded by the European Union

D.3.4.1 Report on Identified Transnational Solutions and Transfer Package for Upscaling

Transfer Package

https://ewaster.interreg-euro-med.eu/

Document Control Information

Document Title	WEEE REUSE Evaluation and Conclusions
Project Title	Preventing e-waste from polluting MED water by turning waste into a resource.
Project Mission	Strengthening an innovative sustainable economy
Programme Priority	Greener MED
Specific Objective	RSO2.6: Promoting the transition to a circular and resource efficient economy
Document Author	UCPB (Enrico Anghileri)
Partners Involved	PP8 UCPB, LP01 PACT, PP6 Neum, PP10 LINK, PP11 Aradippou
Work Package	Work Package 3 – Deployment of solutions for Transnational e-waste prevention and management
Activity	A3.4 – Proposal for Transfer Package and Identification of Transnational Solutions for Upscaling
Deliverable ID	D.3.4.1 – Report on Identified Transnational Solutions and Transfer Package for Upscaling
Doc. Status	Final
Sensitivity	Public
Date of Production	2026-07-20

Document Approver(s) and Reviewer(s)

NOTE: All Approvers are required. Records of each approver must be maintained. All Reviewers in the list are considered required unless explicitly listed as Optional.

Name	Role	Action	Date
Enrico Anghileri	Document Owner	Deliver Draft	2026-07-27
Ricardo Sobral	Project Manager	Approve	2026-08-18
Majda Penava	Solution Leader	Approve	2026-08-18
Verónica Luna	Solution Leader	Approve	2026-08-18
Andriana Paraskevopoulou	Solution Leader	Approve	2026-08-18

Document History

Versions	Date	Document status	Delivered by
Version 0.1	01/03/2026	Initial skeleton structure	UCPB
Version 0.2	01/04/2026	First draft version	UCPB
Version 1.0	01/06/2026	Draft Final	UCPB
Version 2.0	20/07/2026	Final	UCPB

Table of Contents

Glossary

EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
LAP	Local Action Plan
MED	Mediterranean
MED Methodology	Transnational Methodology for e-waste Prevention and Management
PP	Project Partner
SC	Steering Committee
VW	Validation Workshop
WEEE	Waste from Electrical and Electronic Equipment
WP	Workshop

1. Executive Summary

This deliverable presents the Transfer Package and Strategic Framework developed within WP3 of the eWAsTER project to support future transnational upscaling of e-waste prevention and management solutions tested during the project implementation phase (WP2).

The eWAsTER project addresses a critical Mediterranean challenge: e-waste is growing three times faster than average waste streams, with many MED countries collecting only 20-30% of e-waste placed on the market, far below the EU's 65% target. Informal recycling and abandoned e-waste release hazardous substances into groundwater, threatening water sources, aquifers and coastal waters across the region.

Rather than viewing e-waste solely as environmental damage, eWAsTER positions it as an opportunity to create an innovative sustainable economy through waste valorization. The project has tested three complementary solutions across 11 partner territories in 7 Mediterranean countries:

- **WEEE BEHAVE** (led by ARADIPPOU, Cyprus): Behavioral change campaigns targeting citizens, students and households to improve e-waste awareness and collection rates
- **0WEEE PROCURE** (led by NEUM, Bosnia-Herzegovina): Circular business models including eco-leasing, product-as-service and extended producer responsibility schemes
- **WEEE REUSE** (led by LINK, Bosnia-Herzegovina): Social enterprise models combining repair/refurbishment centers with job creation for vulnerable groups

Following Euro-MED Project Officer recommendations, WP3 was redesigned from direct implementation and scaling during the project timeline to strategic preparation and transfer enablement for future initiatives. This shift recognizes that genuine transnational upscaling requires dedicated resources and time horizons beyond a 33-month pilot project.

This deliverable provides practical tools and strategic guidance for organizations across the Euro-MED area planning to replicate eWAsTER solutions:

1.1. Transfer Package Toolkit components:

1. **Transferability Matrix** - decision support tool comparing solutions across territorial contexts
2. **KPI Dashboard** - interactive performance monitoring and benchmarking tool
3. **Solution Factsheets** - concise executive summaries for dissemination
4. **Upscaling Roadmap** - phase-by-phase implementation timeline template
5. **Lessons Learned Synthesis** - strategic insights and best practices from pilots

Target audiences include regional and local authorities, waste management agencies, business support organizations, social economy networks, and policy makers across Mediterranean territories interested in improving e-waste management while creating circular economy opportunities.

The deliverable closes by outlining possible directions for future capitalization built on the eWAsTER results across wider Euro-MED geographies, ensuring the project's legacy extends

beyond its implementation period and contributes to systemic Mediterranean circular economy transition.

By providing both practical tools and strategic frameworks, this transfer package enables informed decision-making, reduces barriers to adoption, and accelerates the uptake of proven e-waste circular economy solutions throughout the Mediterranean region.

2. Introduction

2.1. Background and Context

2.1.1. The Mediterranean E-waste Challenge

The European Union faces a rapidly growing e-waste crisis, with electronic waste increasing three times faster than average waste streams. According to the European Commission's e-waste monitoring 2020 report, this acceleration represents both a significant environmental threat and an untapped circular economy opportunity.

The Mediterranean region faces particularly acute challenges. EC Decision 2019/2193 established a minimum collection rate of 65% of all e-waste placed on the market in the preceding three years. However, 2019 Eurostat data revealed that from Mediterranean EU member states, only Bulgaria and Croatia achieved this 65% target. Cyprus, Malta, Portugal, Italy, Greece and Slovenia ranked in the bottom six EU countries, collecting only 20-30% of e-waste placed on their markets.

This low collection rate exposes Mediterranean water resources to severe environmental risks. Informal recycling practices and e-waste abandoned in dumping sites release hazardous substances—including heavy metals, persistent organic pollutants, and flame retardants—that leach into groundwater, affecting drinking water sources, aquifers and coastal waters across the region.

2.1.2. The eWAsTER Project Vision

The eWAsTER project ("Preventing e-waste from polluting MED water by turning waste into a resource") was developed to address this dual challenge: reducing environmental pollution while creating innovative sustainable economy opportunities through e-waste valorization.

Funded under the Interreg Euro-MED Programme (Priority: Greener MED, Specific Objective RSO2.6 - Promoting the transition to a circular and resource efficient economy), eWAsTER brings together 10 partners and 14 associated organizations across 7 EU Member States (Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, Slovenia, Cyprus, Bulgaria) and 1 IPA country (Bosnia-Herzegovina).

The project's mission centers on strengthening an innovative sustainable economy by:

- Promoting local and regional policies for improved e-waste management
- Reducing e-waste environmental damage in selected Mediterranean areas
- Fostering new eco-business models based on circular economy principles
- Converting the linear electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) sector into a sustainable circular model

2.1.3. Work Package Structure and WP3 Role

The eWAsTER project is structured around three interconnected work packages:

WP1 - Development of Transnational Methodology and Local Action Plans: Partners conducted market assessments, analyzed legal frameworks, and jointly developed a Mediterranean methodology for e-waste prevention and management. Each partner territory drafted a Local Action Plan (LAP) tailored to local conditions while aligned with transnational best practices.

WP2 - Testing Solutions in Real Conditions: Three complementary pilot solutions were tested at small scale across partner territories to demonstrate feasibility and effectiveness:

- WEEE BEHAVE (behavioral change campaigns)
- 0WEEE PROCURE (circular business models)
- WEEE REUSE (social enterprise reuse centers)

WP3 - Deployment of Solutions for Transnational E-waste Prevention and Management: Originally conceived as the implementation and scaling phase, WP3's role evolved significantly following technical review by the Euro-MED Project Officer (detailed below).

Across all WPs - Communication, Dissemination and Results Amplification: Cross-cutting communication activities to maximize project visibility, stakeholder engagement and long-term impact.

2.1.4. Evolution of WP3: From Implementation to Strategic Preparation

The original WP3 framework included a broader upscaling ambition mainly through Activity A3.4. Following the Project Officer's review in mid-2025, that activity was substantively revised to better align the upscaling ambition with the available resources, timeframe, and Interreg programme requirements.

This redesign required a significant additional effort to reshape the activity and reorient WP3 toward strategic preparation, transfer enablement, and future capitalization.

The deliverable therefore reflects not only the final transfer-oriented outputs, but also the methodological and operational consequences of the redesign.

The Project Officer recommended that WP3 focus on:

- **Strategic preparation** rather than operational implementation
- **Transfer enablement** through practical toolkits and guidelines
- **Identification of transfer opportunities** rather than completed transfers
- **Groundwork for possible follow-up initiatives** beyond the eWAsTER timeline

This redesign shift recognizes that genuine transnational solution scaling requires dedicated funding, longer implementation periods, and partner configurations specifically designed for transfer activities—elements more appropriate for a follow-up capitalization project than the pilot-focused eWAsTER initiative.

2.1.5. Redesigned WP3 Objectives

Following Project Officer guidance, WP3 now focuses on four strategic objectives:

1. **Finalize and endorse Local Action Plans** as strategic blueprints positioning solutions for gradual, context-sensitive adoption beyond the project period
2. **Identify transnational solutions with high transfer potential** through systematic analysis of WP2 pilot results, documenting success factors, barriers and adaptation requirements
3. **Develop a comprehensive Transfer Package** including practical toolkits, guidelines, roadmaps and decision-support frameworks to enable future solution replication
4. **Explore and ideate potential capitalization initiatives** building on the eWAsTER results, to inform future opportunities beyond the project timeline

2.1.6. Link to Programme Priorities

This deliverable directly supports the Interreg Euro-MED Programme's commitment to greener Mediterranean territories and circular economy transition (RSO2.6). By documenting proven solutions and providing practical transfer mechanisms, eWAsTER enables systemic change beyond individual pilot sites, contributing to programme-level goals of transnational cooperation, knowledge exchange and policy influence across the Mediterranean cooperation area.

The shift from implementation to transfer preparation allows the deliverable to capture a more sustainable, realistic and impactful long-term perspective aligned with programme expectations and partner capacities. Importantly, the redesign did not result from weaknesses in the pilot solutions themselves. On the contrary, WP2 generated sufficiently robust evidence to demonstrate the relevance and transfer potential of the three solution families. The Project Officer's observations concerned the feasibility of achieving full transnational deployment within the available project timeframe and resources. The revised WP3 approach therefore reflects a necessary methodological and operational reorientation, ensuring that the deliverable documents both the final transfer-oriented outputs and the implications of the redesign for future uptake.

Final WP2 evidence confirms that the three eWAsTER solution families generated a sufficiently robust knowledge base to support transfer-oriented strategic planning rather than purely conceptual guidance. WEEE REUSE exceeded its main aggregated targets, reaching 24,486 kg of WEEE collected and processed, 24,019 items collected, 20 stakeholders engaged, 18 jobs created for vulnerable groups, and more than EUR 4,400 in revenue generation, while 0WEEE PROCURE demonstrated measurable operational performance through 300 devices assessed for reuse, 160 devices refurbished or exchanged, a 50% average reuse rate, and 40 stakeholders engaged. WEEE BEHAVE also showed very strong mobilisation results, with an aggregate of 4,128 participating students, 2,294 student engagements, 3,150 kg of WEEE collected, 171 participating classes, and 204 teachers involved. The final consolidated project results confirm the effectiveness of the solution in generating educational outreach, stakeholder engagement and measurable WEEE collection outcomes across participating territories. These results justify the redesign of WP3 around transfer preparation, because they provide enough empirical evidence to identify what is replicable, what must be adapted, and what enabling conditions are required before future upscaling can be pursued in a realistic way.

2.2. Objectives of the Transfer Package

2.2.1. Primary Objective

The primary objective of this Transfer Package is to **enable future transnational transfer and upscaling of eWAsTER solutions beyond the project timeline** by providing practical tools, strategic frameworks and evidence-based guidance that reduce barriers to adoption and accelerate solution replication across Mediterranean territories.

2.2.2. Specific Objectives

The Transfer Package pursues five interconnected specific objectives:

1. Identify and document solutions with high transfer potential

Systematically analyze the three eWAsTER pilot solutions (WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, WEEE REUSE) to determine which approaches demonstrate strongest potential for successful replication in diverse Mediterranean contexts. Document core innovation elements, implementation requirements, success factors and adaptation flexibility.

2. Provide practical tools and guidelines for solution replication

Develop user-friendly toolkits that organizations can directly apply when planning solution adoption: decision matrices, implementation roadmaps, capacity assessment checklists, stakeholder engagement templates, and performance monitoring frameworks. Tools must be accessible to users with varying technical expertise and institutional capacity levels.

3. Define upscaling procedures and roadmaps

Establish clear, phased approaches for moving from initial assessment through pilot implementation to full-scale institutionalization. Specify activities, milestones, decision points, resource requirements and timelines for each phase, with adaptation guidance for different territorial contexts (urban vs rural, high vs low-capacity regions).

4. Support evidence-based decision-making for future adopters

Equip potential adopters with comparative analyses, feasibility assessments and lessons learned from eWAsTER pilots to inform strategic choices about which solutions best match their territorial profiles, stakeholder ecosystems and policy priorities. Enable "matching" between solution characteristics and local conditions before committing resources.

5. Facilitate knowledge transfer and capacity building across Euro-MED territories

Create mechanisms for ongoing learning exchange between eWAsTER pilot partners and future adopters through documented best practices, contact networks for peer learning, and synthesis of technical know-how gained during implementation. Position eWAsTER partners as knowledge resources for future transfer initiatives.

2.2.3. Target Users and Beneficiaries

The Transfer Package is intended for regional and local authorities, waste management agencies, business support organizations, social economy actors, and policy makers that are considering the adoption or adaptation of eWAsTER solutions. Secondary beneficiaries include SMEs, educational institutions, citizens, and vulnerable groups that may gain from improved circular economy services, reuse pathways, and awareness actions.

2.2.4. Value Proposition

The Transfer Package reduces the uncertainty of replication by combining evidence from pilot implementation with ready-to-use tools for selection, adaptation, monitoring, and planning. It helps adopters identify the most suitable solution for their context, estimate the required effort, and avoid common implementation errors. In this way, it shortens preparation time and improves the likelihood of successful transfer.

2.2.4.1. Alignment between Transfer Package Objectives and Outputs

Transfer Package Objective	How the Objective is Addressed	Main Outputs / Sections
Identify and document solutions with high transfer potential	The three eWAsTER solutions were analysed through a structured assessment of pilot results, transferability factors, barriers, enabling conditions and implementation requirements.	Solution analysis sections; Transferability Matrix; Solution Factsheets
Provide practical tools and guidelines for solution replication	The Transfer Package includes operational tools designed to support future adopters in assessing feasibility, selecting solutions, monitoring performance and planning implementation pathways.	Transferability Matrix; KPI Dashboard; Solution Factsheets; Upscaling Roadmap
Define upscaling procedures and roadmaps	A structured roadmap methodology was developed to guide future adopters through preparation, adaptation, pilot deployment, scaling and long-term sustainability phases.	Upscaling Roadmap; Transfer Procedures Framework
Support evidence-based decision-making for future adopters	Pilot results, KPI performance and lessons learned were consolidated into comparative tools that help organisations assess which solutions best fit their territorial and institutional context.	KPI Dashboard; Comparative Analysis; Lessons Learned Synthesis
Facilitate knowledge transfer and capacity building across Euro-MED territories	The deliverable consolidates implementation experience, validated practices, transfer conditions and strategic recommendations into a reusable knowledge package designed for future transfer and capitalization initiatives.	Entire Transfer Package Toolkit; Lessons Learned Synthesis; Future Capitalisation Proposal

Table 0: Alignment between Transfer Package Objectives and Deliverable Outputs

2.3. Methodology and Approach

The development of this Transfer Package followed a collaborative and evidence-based process that combined the analysis of WP2 pilot results with the structured input of the three Solution Leaders and the wider partnership. The aim was not to produce a theoretical framework, but to convert the operational experience of the pilots into a practical package for future transfer and upscaling.

2.3.1. Co-creation with Solution Leaders

The Transfer Package was developed through intensive collaboration with the three Solution Leaders who coordinated pilot testing in WP2:

- **ARADIPPOU Municipality (PP11, Cyprus)** - WEEE BEHAVE Solution Leader: Provided behavioral change campaign insights, citizen engagement strategies, and awareness-raising best practices
- **Municipality of NEUM (PP6, Bosnia-Herzegovina)** - 0WEEE PROCURE Solution Leader: Contributed business model innovation knowledge, procurement framework requirements, and public-private partnership structures
- **Association LINK Entrepreneurial Center (PP10, Bosnia-Herzegovina)** - WEEE REUSE Solution Leader: Shared social enterprise development expertise, repair/refurbishment technical protocols, and vulnerable group employment models

Regular coordination meetings (monthly video conferences and bilateral consultations) ensured Solution Leaders' practical implementation experience directly informed tool development and strategic recommendations.

2.3.2. Analytical approach

The analytical work was guided by four steps. First, each solution was assessed in terms of feasibility, territorial fit, institutional requirements, and operational logic. Second, the results were compared across different territorial contexts to identify which solution elements are core and which can be adapted. Third, cross-cutting barriers and enabling conditions were extracted from the pilot experience. Fourth, the key success factors were synthesized into transfer-oriented guidance for future adopters.

This approach made it possible to move beyond descriptive reporting and to build a comparative framework across solutions, even though the three pilots differ substantially in operational logic, institutional setting, and maturity level.

2.3.3. Development process

The toolkit was developed iteratively. UCPB first drafted the main analytical structure and the initial versions of the Transferability Matrix, the KPI Dashboard framework, the Solution Factsheet templates, and the Upscaling Roadmap. These drafts were then reviewed by the Solution Leaders and pilot implementing partners, who validated the usability, completeness, and practical relevance of the tools.

Following this validation phase, the tools were refined, populated with final WP2 results, and translated into user-friendly formats for inclusion in the deliverable. The Coordination Office ensured consistency with the Euro-MED Programme requirements and clarified the deliverable's contribution to the programme's Results Amplification Strategy.

2.3.4. Timeline overview

The work was carried out between December 2025 and June 2026, following a sequence that moved from data synthesis and prototyping to validation, final refinement, and submission. The early months focused on evidence consolidation and tool design, the middle phase on testing and adaptation, and the final phase on integration and quality assurance.

2.3.5. Data Sources

The Transfer Package integrates multiple evidence streams:

WP2 Pilot Results: Performance data, KPI achievement rates, implementation timelines, resource consumption and stakeholder feedback from pilot testing across all partner territories (M12-M24).

Solution Sheets: Comprehensive documentation prepared by Solution Leaders describing each solution's objectives, implementation approach, target groups, success factors, barriers encountered, and transferability conditions.

The analytical core of this deliverable is based on the three finalized Solution Sheets prepared for WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE and WEEE REUSE, which were specifically structured to feed the Transferability Matrix, the adaptation roadmap, the factsheets, the lessons learned synthesis, and the future capitalization concept. The sheets provide standardized evidence on five essential dimensions: executive summary and problem framing, WP2 quantified results, critical success factors and mistakes avoided, transferability assessment, and governance and monitoring implications for replication. This common structure made it possible to move beyond descriptive reporting and to build a comparative framework across solutions, even though the three pilots differ substantially in operational logic, institutional setting, and maturity level. In methodological terms, the Solution Sheets functioned as the bridge between pilot implementation evidence and transfer-oriented synthesis, enabling UCPB to populate this deliverable with comparable and decision-relevant content rather than isolated territorial narratives.

Local Action Plans (LAPs): Eight territorial LAPs developed in WP1 and updated in WP3 based on pilot learnings, providing context-specific adaptation insights and stakeholder endorsement outcomes.

Partner Feedback: Structured input collected through WP3 coordination meetings, progress reports, and partner questionnaires on implementation challenges, capacity requirements and transfer potential assessments.

Stakeholder Consultations: Feedback from 2-3 consultation meetings per partner territory (WP3 Phase 5, M26-M30) engaging local authorities, businesses, NGOs and citizen groups on LAP content and solution adoption readiness.

External References: Best practices from related EU initiatives and academic literature on circular economy transition.

2.3.6. Structure of the document

This deliverable is organized into seven interconnected chapters that together constitute the comprehensive Transfer Package and Strategic Framework:

Chapter 1 - Introduction provides project background, explains the Transfer Package objectives, describes the collaborative methodology used for development, and orients readers to the document structure.

Chapter 2 - Mapping of eWAsTER Solutions presents detailed profiles of the three tested solutions (WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, WEEE REUSE), including their core innovations, pilot results, KPI achievements, and initial transferability assessments. This chapter establishes the evidence base for all subsequent analysis.

Chapter 3 - Identification of Transfer Opportunities analyzes where and how solutions can be successfully replicated across Mediterranean territories. It introduces the Transferability Matrix decision-support tool, maps target geographies and sectors, and synthesizes barriers and enabling conditions encountered during pilots.

Chapter 4 - Upscaling Procedures Framework provides step-by-step guidance for organizations planning solution adoption, defining four implementation phases (Assessment, Adaptation, Pilot, Institutionalization) with activities, milestones, timelines and checklists. It includes the customizable Upscaling Roadmap tool.

Chapter 5 - Transfer Package Toolkit compiles all five practical tools into an integrated resource: Transferability Matrix, KPI Dashboard (interactive monitoring), Solution Factsheets (dissemination materials), Upscaling Roadmap (timeline template), and Lessons Learned Synthesis.

Chapter 6 - Proposal for Possible Follow-up Initiatives outlines a preliminary concept for a dedicated follow-up project to implement transnational solution transfer at scale across Euro-MED territories, including objectives, activities, partnership scope, funding opportunities and timeline.

Chapter 7 - Conclusions and Recommendations synthesizes key findings, presents the comprehensive Lessons Learned Synthesis (Tool #5), provides policy recommendations for local, regional and Mediterranean-level actors, and articulates eWAsTER's contribution to Euro-MED circular economy transition.

References document all sources cited throughout the deliverable, including eWAsTER project documents, EU policy frameworks, partner reports, and external circular economy initiatives.

Annexes provide supplementary materials including Solution Factsheets (print-ready PDFs), KPI Dashboard user guide, Upscaling Roadmap editable templates, interested partner list for future transfer projects, and glossary of terms.

Each chapter builds upon preceding content, creating a coherent narrative from solution documentation through transfer opportunity analysis to practical implementation guidance and

future project planning. Readers may navigate directly to specific tools (Chapter 5) or implementation guidance (Chapter 4) if already familiar with solution profiles, or proceed sequentially for comprehensive understanding of the Transfer Package rationale, evidence base and application framework.

3. Mapping of eWAsTER Solutions

3.1. Overview of Tested Solutions

The three eWAsTER solutions tested in WP2 address complementary stages of the e-waste prevention and circular management chain and should therefore be understood as mutually reinforcing rather than competing models. WEEE BEHAVE focuses on the behavioural and educational front end of the system by activating schools, households, and local communities around correct WEEE prevention and disposal practices. 0WEEE PROCURE intervenes upstream in institutional purchasing and asset management by extending the life of public ICT equipment through selective assessment, certified data wiping, refurbishment, and exchange models adapted to local legal conditions. WEEE REUSE operates further along the circular value chain by introducing preparation-for-reuse, refurbishment, repurposing, and social inclusion into systems that are otherwise dominated by collection and recycling only.

From a territorial perspective, the pilots also generated a diversified evidence base across different governance and implementation conditions, including a distinct education and outreach offshoot developed in PACT, which complemented the three main solution families described in the Application Form. WEEE BEHAVE was tested in five territories, involving Greece, Bulgaria, Italy, Spain, and Cyprus, and therefore offers the broadest transnational evidence on behavioural activation through schools and local authorities. 0WEEE PROCURE generated its main consolidated operational evidence from Italy and Bulgaria, while NEUM acted as solution leader and strategic coordinator during the development process. In parallel, NEUM also implemented a small-scale local pilot focused on the collection, technical assessment and school redistribution of reusable IT equipment. Given the municipality's very limited territorial scale and consequently limited critical mass, this experience is presented in the deliverable as a complementary territorial contribution and does not alter the consolidated comparative framework of the solution. WEEE REUSE was tested in Slovenia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, providing a particularly useful comparison between a more mature reuse context and a more emerging one. Together, the three pilots offer a portfolio of solutions that cover awareness and mobilisation, circular asset management, and socially embedded reuse, making them suitable for both standalone replication and integrated territorial strategies.

3.2. WEEE BEHAVE Solution

3.2.1. Executive Summary

WEEE BEHAVE addresses a recurrent challenge in Mediterranean territories: low e-waste collection rates are often caused less by the absence of collection systems than by weak citizen activation, low awareness, and limited integration between educational actors and formal waste management channels. The solution responds to this gap by using schools as the main entry point for behaviour change, combining educational content with competitions, games, workshops, school campaigns, and family-oriented outreach. Its added value lies in transforming pupils from passive recipients of information into active messengers who influence household practices and help connect awareness-raising with real collection behaviour. In this sense, the

solution is not simply a communication campaign but a structured mobilisation model designed to convert awareness into participation and, where possible, measurable WEEE collection.

The pilot evidence shows that WEEE BEHAVE is flexible in format but stable in logic. Different territories used different mixes of educational activities, municipal visibility, games, and public-facing actions, yet all relied on the same core architecture: school-based engagement, coordination with public authorities, and a link to authorized WEEE channels. The aggregate indicates strong performance, with 4,128 participating students, 2,295 student engagements, 3,150 kg of WEEE collected, 171 participating classes, and 204 teachers involved. These results confirm that the solution performs particularly well in terms of educational reach, territorial mobilisation and citizen engagement, demonstrating its suitability for replication in a wide range of Mediterranean contexts. The pilot therefore demonstrates strong relevance for municipalities and intermediary public bodies seeking low-infrastructure but high-engagement actions that can be repeated over time and embedded in local awareness planning.

3.2.2. Key Performance Indicators and Results

The available aggregated evidence suggests that WEEE BEHAVE exceeded the common target values by a wide margin in relation to student mobilisation, school participation, and teacher involvement. This confirms that the model is particularly effective as a school-based engagement mechanism and that its strongest contribution may lie in awareness generation, participation dynamics, and behavioural activation rather than in kilograms collected alone. At the same time, the Solution Sheet explicitly notes that territorial counting logics were not fully homogeneous, especially for WEEE collected and some school-related indicators, so the aggregate should be treated as a consolidated project value rather than as a perfectly standardized comparison across all territories. For transfer purposes, this means that future adopters should preserve the KPI families used in the pilot, but adapt monitoring logic carefully and distinguish between educational reach, behavioural engagement, and operational collection outputs.

KPI	Target (all territories)	Final consolidated project results	Notes
Participating students	500	4,218	Official aggregate value
Student engagements	250	2,294	Official aggregate value
WEEE collected	1,000	3,150 kg	Use of aggregate official value
Participating classes	50	171	Official aggregate value
Teacher involvement	50	204	Official aggregate value

Table 1: WEEE BEHAVE - Key Performance Indicators Summary

3.2.3. Transferability Profile

WEEE BEHAVE is best suited to territories that have accessible school infrastructure, at least one coordinating public or intermediary actor, and a functioning or potentially connectable WEEE management route. Compared with the other eWAsTER solutions, it has relatively low infrastructure needs, but it is coordination-intensive and depends heavily on the quality of stakeholder alignment between schools, municipalities, educators, and waste actors. The strongest enabling conditions identified in the Solution Sheet are school participation, municipal or regional support, dedicated coordination capacity, cultural fit, and a credible link to a legal WEEE collection route. These factors explain why the solution can travel well across Mediterranean territories when adapted in language, governance model, and outreach format instead of being copied as a fixed campaign design.

Transfer feasibility is highest in territories similar to the pilot sites and remains medium in rural-dominant settings, where more distributed coordination and lighter reporting arrangements are needed. Feasibility becomes weaker in restrictive regulatory environments if legal conditions limit which WEEE streams can be collected or how school-based actions can connect to formal waste systems. The main barriers observed include organizational and scheduling constraints, ambiguity over accepted streams such as batteries or small devices, and institutional or political fragility. For this reason, future replication should combine age-appropriate educational design with formalized agreements, clear collection rules, and simple but stable governance arrangements such as a steering mechanism involving schools, municipal actors, and authorized waste operators.

3.2.4. Territorial Adaptation: Education through VR (PACT, Portugal)

PACT should present its case as a separate territorial adaptation within the eWAsTER transfer package, not as a WEEE REUSE implementation pathway. The original reuse option was not legally feasible in Portugal because WEEE handling is restricted to certified entities, which means that collection, dismantling, and reuse activities cannot be carried out by PACT without the required licensing and infrastructure. In response, PACT developed a VR-based educational tool designed to support citizen science, circular economy awareness, and vocational and school-based learning, turning the pilot into a reusable knowledge asset rather than a direct waste-handling operation with a social basis.

The solution can be deployed in PACT laboratories, schools, fairs, and outreach events, and it is especially relevant in a territory such as Alentejo, where low population density, dispersed settlements, and limited public awareness make continuous educational engagement difficult, but also more effective than punctual collection campaigns. The case is therefore framed as a distinct transfer outcome aligned with the WEEE BEHAVE logic, while remaining clearly identified as PACT's adaptation to the Alentejo region in Portugal.

Testing occurred between 23 June and 5 July, 2026, across 55 respondents. These were distributed between children, their legal guardians, and young adults. The survey averaged a 3.81/4 score, with 45 respondents submitting a 4/4 score. Of the 55 participants, 43 stated the experience was easy to use, while 21 evaluated there were some challenges, of which the main

ones were controls and movement (17 respondents), clarity and instructions (8), and user experience in navigating menus (2).

Out of 55 respondents, 89.1% considered they had learned at least "some things" during the experience, while the remaining presented no learning opportunities, though half of these claimed to already consistently recycle WEEE. The main requests for improvements were the addition of further interactive experiences for hands-on learning, with a smaller portion requesting further information concerning WEEE. The overwhelming majority of respondents claimed that they would recommend the experience for WEEE education (94.5%), that it would be useful in a school setting or training environment (96.4%), and that they would start to recycle WEEE (50.9%) or strengthen their practice (43.6%) after the experience. Considering recycling profiles, over half the respondents (54.5%) claim to recycle WEEE, though only 34.5% recycle consistently. The main motives for not recycling were not knowing where to deliver WEEE (34.5%), while a smaller percentage stated they did not know the importance of recycling WEEE (14.5%) or the inconvenience of directly depositing in purpose-made places (5.5%). Overall, the experience was overwhelmingly seen as positive, with a majority of respondents emphasising the benefits a VR-based experience can bring to WEEE and environmental education and awareness-raising.

Just like the detailed WEEE BEHAVE solution, this VR-based adaptation is best suited to regions with accessible school infrastructure and flexibility in implementing additional educational activities beyond the ones foreseen in the classroom. These actions are best deployed through one coordinating public or intermediary actor, most commonly a Municipality or a Municipal or Intermunicipal Utilities Company, such as a waste management institution with competences in education.

Compared with the standard BEHAVE solution, this VR-based adaptation has higher equipment requirements and costs associated with the necessary VR glasses and computers capable of running the program. When compared with the REUSE and PROCURE solutions, this adaptation has lesser coordination and infrastructure needs, though still necessitating heavy alignment between schools, municipalities, educators, and waste actors.

The same enabling conditions are identified as with the BEHAVE methodology: school participation, municipal or regional support, a dedicated coordination capacity, a cultural fit, and a credible link to a legal WEEE collection route are all required, with the addition of minimal technical expertise to assist in understanding and deploying the VR-based experience.

The solution was designed with adaptability in mind; adopters need only change or add national, regional, or local data as they see fit, and may freely translate the application into other languages used in Mediterranean countries. Given its transferability-first design, the experience can travel well across the Mediterranean when combined with place-based activities and combined with an outreach format that matches each territory.

Thus, transfer feasibility is highest in territories in rural-dominant settings with more distributed coordination, and where digital outreach and technology-based learning may work against challenges created by low population density and regional asymmetry in population distribution.

Similarly to the standard BEHAVE methodology, key barriers observed related to organisational and scheduling constraints, reaching target audiences without school and municipal support, and linking the deployment to a collection campaign in coordination with legitimate entities.

Future replication should evaluate long-term deployment through the monitoring of WEEE collection over time, as well as the medium- to long-term effects on education outcomes and recycling motivation. Formalised linked campaigns should have clear collection rules and stable governance arrangements between the aforementioned stakeholders.

3.3. 0WEEE PROCURE Solution

3.3.1. Executive Summary

0WEEE PROCURE addresses the structural limitations of traditional public procurement and asset management systems, where ICT equipment typically follows a linear purchase-use-dispose logic and where reuse pathways are weak, fragmented, or institutionally unsupported. The pilot identified three recurrent barriers: rigid public accounting systems, legal constraints affecting circular procurement or leasing models, and institutional concerns related to secure data sanitisation and liability. In response, the solution developed a context-adapted circular transition model that does not rely on one single operational format. Instead, it tested two main operational pathways: a Circular Ownership model in Italy, where technical schools act as refurbishment hubs for decommissioned public ICT assets, and a Digital Exchange Platform model in Bulgaria, where municipalities and users can exchange or redirect equipment through a structured digital environment.

This dual structure is one of the main strengths of the solution because it shows how circular procurement goals can still be pursued when the original eco-renting concept is not legally feasible. The pilot delivered 300 devices assessed for reuse, 160 devices refurbished or exchanged, a 50% average reuse rate, 40 engaged stakeholders, 1,500 kg of WEEE reduction, EUR 5,000 in cost savings, and 2.5 tons of avoided CO2 emissions. A further complementary contribution was developed by NEUM through a small-scale local experience focused on the collection, technical assessment and school redistribution of reusable IT equipment. Given the municipality's very limited territorial scale and consequently limited critical mass, this experience is acknowledged as a context-specific proof of concept that supports the overall logic of the solution, without altering the consolidated comparative framework derived from the main operational evidence.

In this context-specific contribution, NEUM also documented a small-scale local experience based on the collection, technical screening and school redistribution of reusable IT equipment, involving 55 respondents and generating useful educational and engagement evidence at territorial level; given its very limited scale, these results are best treated as complementary rather than as a fully comparable operational pathway.

3.3.2. Key Performance Indicators and Results

The aggregated KPI pattern suggests a solution that did not fully reach all quantitative targets, but nevertheless generated strong proof of concept and high strategic value. The most significant result is not only the number of devices processed, but the confirmation that a 50%

reuse rate can be maintained across the two main operational models tested in Italy and Bulgaria and under two very different institutional conditions. The lower-than-target values for screened devices, stakeholder network size, and WEEE reduction should therefore be interpreted in light of the legal and administrative constraints encountered during implementation, especially the impossibility of pursuing eco-renting as originally conceived. From a transfer perspective, this makes the pilot especially valuable: it shows that the solution is viable not because conditions were easy, but because the model successfully adapted to rigid procurement laws, accounting systems, and data-security concerns without losing its circular objective.

In parallel, NEUM contributed a small-scale local pilot based on donation, technical screening and redistribution to schools. Because this experience was developed in a very small municipal context with limited territorial scale and limited critical mass, it is best read as a complementary territorial contribution rather than as a fully comparable operational pathway within the consolidated KPI framework. For this reason, the comparative interpretation presented below remains anchored primarily in the evidence generated by Italy and Bulgaria, while NEUM is acknowledged qualitatively as a relevant context-specific addition to the overall solution trajectory.

KPI	**Target (All T.)**	**Achieved (All T.)**	**% Achievement**	**Range (Low-High Territory)**	**Data Source**
Devices assessed for reuse	400 units	300	75%	Italy: 250 units/year Bulgaria: 50 listings	WP2 Final Report, Sec 5.1
Devices refurbished or exchanged	200 units	160	80%	Italy: 60–150 units Bulgaria: 10 units	WP2 Final Report, Sec 5.1
Average Reuse Rate (%)	50%	50%	100%	Italy: 25%–60% Bulgaria: 60%	WP2 Final Report, Sec 5.1
Stakeholders / Partners engaged	60 entities	40	67%	Italy: 20 repairers Bulgaria: 20 partners	WP2 Final Report, Sec 5.1
Estimated WEEE reduction	2.250 kg	1,500 kg	67%	High Bulgaria	WP2 Final Report, Bulgaria KPI

Cost savings for users	€7.500	€5,000	67%	Bulgaria specific target	WP2 Final Report, Bulgaria KPI
CO2 emissions avoided	3.75 tons	2.5 tons	67%	Bulgaria specific target	WP2 Final Report, Bulgaria KPI

Table 2: 0WEEE PROCURE - Key Performance Indicators Summary

3.3.3. Transferability Profile

0WEEE PROCURE works best in territories with a significant stock of public ICT equipment, some form of technical or vocational school infrastructure, supportive or at least navigable regulations, and a coordinating authority able to connect public asset providers with refurbishers and end users. The ideal target profile identified in the Solution Sheet is therefore predominantly urban or institutionally dense, where public administrations can mobilize decommissioned hardware flows and where technical schools or similar hubs can host diagnostics and refurbishment. At the same time, the Bulgarian pilot demonstrates that the solution can also be adapted to more decentralized or mixed territorial settings through a digital exchange model, provided that stakeholder engagement is strong and logistics are redesigned. The main enabling conditions are a regional tracking system, formal agreements between authorities and schools or other implementing actors, and dedicated resources for refurbishment inputs such as SSD upgrades.

The major barriers are administrative complexity in public accounting, logistical challenges in device collection, and limited institutional experience with circular procurement. The solution's transferability therefore depends less on copying a single pilot format and more on preserving the core model while adapting the operational pathway to legal, territorial, and organizational conditions. In this respect, the small-scale experience developed by NEUM usefully illustrates that in very small territories with limited critical mass, a lighter relationship-based donation and redistribution model may be more appropriate than a larger structured comparative pilot. For new territories, the key lesson is that legal feasibility assessment must happen early and that data security, selective technical filtering, governance architecture, and realistic scale assumptions are all preconditions for credible replication.

3.4. WEEE REUSE Solution

3.4.1. Executive Summary

WEEE REUSE addresses a structural gap in many e-waste systems, namely the weak development of preparation-for-reuse as compared with collection, recycling, and treatment. In the pilot territories, reuse remained underdeveloped even where WEEE management systems were already functioning, and this was especially visible in emerging contexts where reuse was not yet fully integrated into policy and operational frameworks. The solution responds to this challenge by combining circular economy practices with social inclusion. Rather than treating

reuse only as a technical activity, it connects collection, assessment, refurbishment, repurposing, and simpler reuse pathways with employment opportunities for vulnerable groups and with the involvement of social enterprises, SMEs, NGOs, and utilities. This creates a broader ecosystem in which reuse is not an isolated niche activity but a regional development instrument with environmental, social, and economic value.

The pilot results confirm the relevance of this model across two very different system contexts, while also showing that the type and intensity of preparatory support required differ substantially. WEEE REUSE reached 24,486 kg of e-waste collected and processed, 24,019 items collected, 20 organizations involved, 18 jobs created for vulnerable groups, and more than EUR 4,400 in revenue generation. Slovenia showed that significant volumes can be handled within existing infrastructure and with limited additional cost, while Bosnia and Herzegovina showed that even in a less mature context reuse models can generate revenue, stakeholder participation, and capacity-building momentum when adequate mentoring is provided. The main strategic significance of the pilot is therefore its adaptability: the same core logic can support optimization in mature systems and capacity-building in emerging ones, making REUSE one of the strongest candidates for broad Euro-MED transfer.

3.4.2. Key Performance Indicators and Results

The WEEE REUSE pilot exceeded most of its core targets and produced particularly strong results in relation to social impact and operational volume. The figures show that reuse-based activities can achieve more than symbolic value: they can process significant WEEE flows, generate measurable economic returns, and create or preserve jobs for vulnerable groups. This is important because reuse is often treated as secondary to recycling, whereas the pilot demonstrates that it can become a concrete implementation layer within regional circular economy systems. For transfer purposes, the KPI pattern also highlights an additional strength: the model performed across both an emerging and a more mature system context, which supports the claim that REUSE is not dependent on one specific territorial maturity profile, even though the type of preparatory support required differs substantially.

KPI	Target (All Territories)	Achieved (All Territories)	% Achievement	Range (Low-High Territory)	Data Source
WEEE collected (kg)	20,000 kg	24,486 kg	122%	Bosnia and Herzegovina: 1,004 kg; Slovenia: 23,482 kg	WP2 Final Report WEEE REUSE
Number of devices collected	20,000 items	24,019 items	120%	Bosnia and Herzegovina: 1,449 items; Slovenia: 22,570 items	WP2 Final Report WEEE REUSE
Stakeholders engaged	20	20	100%	Bosnia and Herzegovina:	WP2 Final Report WEEE REUSE

				9; Slovenia: 11	
Jobs created (vulnerable groups)	10	18	180%	Bosnia and Herzegovina: 4; Slovenia: 14	WP2 Final Report WEEE REUSE
Revenue generated (EUR)	3,500	4,400	125%	Bosnia and Herzegovina only	WP2 Final Report WEEE REUSE

Table 3: WEEE REUSE - Key Performance Indicators Summary

3.4.3. Transferability Profile

WEEE REUSE is particularly suitable for territories that already have some access to WEEE streams, a minimum base of stakeholder cooperation, and at least partial policy openness toward reuse. Its strongest comparative advantage is that it builds on existing infrastructure and human resources rather than requiring large new capital investments. The ideal target profile therefore includes urban or semi-urban areas with waste management structures, social economy actors, and institutional willingness to connect reuse with social objectives. However, the pilot also shows that the model remains feasible in lower-capacity contexts if stronger mentoring, stakeholder activation, and preparatory support are built into the implementation process. This makes REUSE more adaptable than many technical waste solutions, but not entirely automatic to transfer.

The main enabling conditions are stakeholder cooperation across public, private, and social sectors; access to WEEE streams; basic reuse knowledge and operational capacity; and at least partial policy support for reuse. The major barriers concern regulatory uncertainty, limited access to quality WEEE streams, and weak awareness or market demand for reused products. The pilot experience suggests that these barriers can be mitigated through advocacy, partnerships with collection actors and recycling yards, targeted mentoring for small businesses and social actors, and a deliberate effort to communicate the environmental and social value of reused products. For future adopters, the key implication is that the core model should remain fixed around collection, assessment for reuse, reuse or repurposing, and social inclusion, while logistics, processing depth, and stakeholder composition can be adjusted to local territorial conditions.

3.4.4. Complementarity and Synergies Between Solutions

The three eWAsTER solutions are most effective when interpreted as parts of an integrated circular transition pathway rather than as isolated pilots. WEEE BEHAVE works on the demand-side and cultural foundations of the system by changing awareness, attitudes, and participation behaviour among pupils, families, and communities. 0WEEE PROCURE acts upstream at the level of public asset management and institutional procurement, intercepting still-usable equipment before it becomes waste and redirecting it into circular channels. WEEE REUSE adds a socially embedded operational layer that extends product lifecycles, activates reuse actors, and links circular economy objectives with labour-market inclusion. Together, the three solutions cover

behavioural activation, institutional interception of reusable assets, and practical reuse implementation, which means they can reinforce one another across different stages of the e-waste value chain.

This complementarity has direct strategic value for territories planning future transfer. A municipality or region could use WEEE BEHAVE to build public awareness and educational legitimacy, 0WEEE PROCURE to redesign how public ICT equipment is screened and redirected, and WEEE REUSE to create a downstream ecosystem for repair, repurposing, and socially beneficial redistribution. The pilots also show that all three solutions depend on some common foundations: stakeholder coordination, legal clarity, trusted implementation partners, and monitoring frameworks that capture both operational and strategic outcomes. For this reason, the most promising transfer perspective is not only the replication of single pilots, but the design of integrated territorial packages in which one solution strengthens the enabling conditions of the others. In practical terms, WEEE BEHAVE can increase visibility and community acceptance, 0WEEE PROCURE can generate quality equipment flows, and WEEE REUSE can absorb and valorise part of those flows within a socially inclusive circular system.

4. Identification of Transfer Opportunities

4.1. Transfer Opportunity Analysis Framework

The transfer opportunity analysis developed in this deliverable is based on the assumption that successful replication depends not only on the intrinsic quality of a solution, but on the match between solution characteristics and territorial conditions. For this reason, transfer potential was assessed through a multi-dimensional framework combining five analytical lenses: territorial profile, institutional capacity, policy and regulatory environment, stakeholder ecosystem, and operational feasibility. Territorial profile captures variables such as urban density, rural dispersion, tourism pressure, and the presence of schools or public asset stocks. Institutional capacity concerns the ability of a municipality, region, utility, or intermediary body to coordinate actors, manage procedures, and sustain implementation over time. Policy and regulatory environment evaluates whether legal conditions support or constrain collection routes, procurement formats, reuse recognition, data security procedures, or asset transfer mechanisms. Stakeholder ecosystem examines whether the necessary mix of schools, public bodies, repair actors, social enterprises, NGOs, and collection actors exists or can be activated. Operational feasibility focuses on logistics, infrastructure, skills, funding, and monitoring requirements.

The assessment draws on several evidence sources that were intentionally combined rather than treated in isolation. The core evidence comes from the three Solution Sheets, which provide structured information on target profiles, success factors, barriers, adaptation elements, timelines, governance arrangements, and key indicators. This is complemented by the design of the Transfer Package itself, where Chapter 3 is explicitly intended to convert pilot evidence into a practical decision-support framework. High-potential transfer opportunities were therefore identified where three conditions converge: first, the pilot generated credible results or proof of concept; second, the enabling conditions required are reasonably common or developable in other Euro-MED territories; and third, the solution shows adaptation flexibility without losing its core model. Tool 1, the Transferability Matrix, operationalizes this framework by helping future adopters compare the three solutions against territorial and institutional profiles before selecting a transfer pathway.

4.2. Geographic and Sectoral Transfer Opportunities

4.2.1. Target Territories in Euro-MED Area

The most promising target territories for future transfer are not defined only by geography, but by typologies of capacity, governance, and infrastructure that recur across the Euro-MED area. Urban high-capacity territories are particularly suitable for integrated transfer because they usually combine dense public service networks, stronger municipal or regional coordination capacity, larger school systems, and better access to technical and social economy actors. In these contexts, WEEE BEHAVE can scale through larger educational networks, 0WEEE PROCURE can rely on concentrated public ICT stock and technical institutes, and WEEE REUSE can connect to existing waste systems and reuse-oriented organizations. Urban low-capacity territories can also offer important opportunities, especially where equipment needs and citizen engagement

needs are high, but they typically require lighter governance models, more external facilitation, and stronger support in legal, technical, or monitoring design.

Rural and peri-urban territories require a more differentiated approach. In high-capacity rural or peri-urban systems, transfer is viable when regional coordination structures compensate for lower density and when logistics are organized at area-wide scale. In low-capacity rural territories, transfer remains possible but must be simplified: WEEE BEHAVE needs lighter coordination and clustered school outreach; 0WEEE PROCURE may work better through decentralized digital exchange models than through school-lab hubs; and WEEE REUSE requires community-based collection channels, practical mentoring, and realistic tracking frequency. Island and coastal territories deserve specific attention because seasonal tourism pressure can intensify WEEE generation while also complicating logistics and continuity of stakeholder engagement. These territories may benefit especially from WEEE BEHAVE as a visibility and awareness tool and from WEEE REUSE or PROCURE models where a stable coordinating authority can compensate for seasonal variation. The most strategic future transfer pathway across Euro-MED is therefore not a single geographic cluster, but a portfolio approach that matches each solution to the territorial conditions under which it is most feasible.

4.2.2. Target Sectors and Stakeholder Groups

Future transfer opportunities are distributed across public, private, and third-sector ecosystems, and each of the three solutions activates a different core entry point into that ecosystem. In the public sector, the main target actors are municipalities, regional governments, waste management authorities, municipal unions, and public utilities. These actors are especially relevant because all three solutions require at least one coordinating or legitimizing body able to convene stakeholders, connect actions to formal waste or education systems, and support continuity beyond pilot logic. WEEE BEHAVE is particularly relevant for school systems, education departments, and local authorities able to organize recurring awareness campaigns. 0WEEE PROCURE is most relevant for public administrations, purchasing offices, regional authorities, and technical school systems that can mobilize decommissioned ICT stock and manage compliance issues. WEEE REUSE is highly suitable for municipal waste operators and public utilities willing to integrate reuse into local or regional waste strategies.

The private and third sectors are equally important because they provide implementation capacity, market channels, and innovation flexibility that public actors alone often lack. For 0WEEE PROCURE, repair businesses, circular economy networks, vocational schools, and Producer Responsibility Organizations can support asset screening, refurbishment, redistribution, and logistics. For WEEE REUSE, social enterprises, SMEs, NGOs, and civil society organizations are not peripheral partners but central operators of inclusive reuse ecosystems. For WEEE BEHAVE, environmental NGOs, education organizations, and EPR or authorized collection actors can reinforce campaign quality and legal credibility. The strongest transfer opportunities therefore lie in cross-sector configurations rather than in single-institution replication. Proposals for a future project should prioritize territories where public bodies, educational actors, technical or repair capacities, and social economy organizations can be connected into a workable governance structure around one or more eWAsTER solutions.

4.3. Transferability Matrix

The Transferability Matrix is designed as a practical decision-support tool that helps future adopters compare the three eWAsTER solutions against key territorial and institutional conditions before launching replication activities. Its purpose is not to rank solutions in the abstract, but to clarify which solution is more suitable under which circumstances, what enabling conditions must be secured first, and what level of adaptation is likely to be required. The matrix therefore combines three types of information: profile descriptors, feasibility scoring across territorial types, and strategic notes on barriers, enabling conditions, capacity requirements, adaptation flexibility, timeline, and resource intensity. This structure allows regional and local actors to move from general interest in circular e-waste solutions to a more grounded selection logic based on actual implementation preconditions.

Dimension	WEEE BEHAVE	0WEEE PROCURE	WEEE REUSE
Ideal target profile	Territories with accessible schools, coordinating public actors, and a functioning or connectable legal WEEE route.	Territories with public ICT stock, technical/vocational school infrastructure or digital platform capacity, and a coordinating authority.	Territories with access to WEEE streams, stakeholder cooperation, and at least partial policy openness to reuse.
Feasibility – Urban high capacity	High; strong school systems and public coordination favour large-scale mobilisation.	High; concentrated ICT stock, technical institutes, and administrative capacity support school-hub or mixed models.	High; existing infrastructure and social economy actors can absorb reuse activities effectively.
Feasibility – Urban low capacity	Medium; feasible with external facilitation and simplified coordination.	Medium; possible, but legal and technical support are often needed early.	Medium; workable if mentoring and stakeholder activation compensate for lower system maturity.
Feasibility – Rural high capacity	Medium; needs clustered school outreach and adapted coordination.	Medium; more suitable through decentralized exchange models than centralized hubs.	Medium; feasible if logistics and stakeholder roles are clearly adapted.

Feasibility – Rural low capacity	Medium to low; requires lighter reporting, simple formats, and strong local facilitators.	Medium to low; logistics, lack of hubs, and legal complexity can reduce feasibility unless the model is simplified.	Medium; transfer remains possible, but logistics and awareness-building become more demanding.
Main barriers	Scheduling constraints, ambiguity on accepted streams, political or institutional fragility.	Public accounting rigidity, collection logistics, low institutional experience with circular procurement.	Regulatory uncertainty, limited access to quality WEEE, low awareness and market demand.
Enabling conditions	School participation, municipal support, coordination capacity, legal collection route.	Tracking systems, formal institutional agreements, refurbishment resources, data security protocols.	Multi-actor cooperation, access to WEEE streams, reuse know-how, policy support.
Minimum capacity requirements	Coordinator, school focal points, educator support, waste operator contact.	Regional coordinator, technical hub or platform manager, legal and technical support capacity.	Public/NGO coordinator, technical staff, trainers or mentors, working groups.
Adaptation flexibility	High in communication format, medium in governance design, low in core school-based logic.	High in operational format, but low in relation to data security and legal compliance requirements.	High in logistics and processing depth, medium in governance composition, low in core reuse-plus-social inclusion logic.
Implementation timeline	Short to medium; first deployment feasible in about 4–6 months.	Medium; replication pathway indicated at about 8 months to first operational deployment.	Medium; first replication cycle generally 6–12 months depending on maturity and support needs.

Resource intensity	Low to medium; low infrastructure needs, but high coordination needs.	Medium; legal, technical, and refurbishment inputs create moderate resource intensity.	Medium; low infrastructure costs but significant mentoring and ecosystem-building needs.

Table 4: Transferability Matrix - Comparative Analysis of eWAsTER Solutions

The matrix should be used as a first-screening tool, helping potential adopters assess the solution's resource needs and core characteristics before moving to a more detailed territorial review. In the next step, territories should also consider their concrete challenges, institutional constraints, and cross-sector problems to be addressed, in order to verify whether the solution is a good fit for their specific context. The Tool 1 package should include the empty Solution Sheet template and the completed Solution Sheets for WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE, so that users can both understand the input structure and consult the benchmark values used to populate the Transferability Matrix.

4.4. Cross-Cutting Barriers and Enabling Conditions

4.4.1. Common Barriers Across Solutions

Although the three pilots differ substantially in operational logic, the Solution Sheets reveal a number of barriers that recur across all solutions and that should therefore be treated as cross-cutting transfer risks. The first is institutional complexity. In WEEE BEHAVE this appears in the form of school scheduling, coordination burdens, and political fragility; in 0WEEE PROCURE it appears through rigid accounting systems, procurement rules, and limited administrative familiarity with circular models; and in WEEE REUSE, the most distinctive barriers concern policy recognition of reuse, access to reusable-quality WEEE streams, and the still-limited market demand or confidence surrounding reused electronics. Across all three cases, this means that transfer is rarely blocked by lack of interest alone; it is often slowed or distorted by weak procedural fit between innovation and existing governance routines.

A second common barrier concerns operational chain integrity. Each solution depends on a sequence of actors and decisions that must align correctly: schools and collection routes in WEEE BEHAVE; legal and administrative coordination across public bodies, including the challenge of reaching all units within public administration or involving several public authorities, in 0WEEE PROCURE; and access to reusable-quality WEEE plus downstream reuse capacities in WEEE REUSE. When one link is weak, the whole model loses effectiveness. When one link is weak, the whole model loses effectiveness. A third recurrent barrier concerns awareness, trust, and stakeholder readiness. WEEE BEHAVE requires buy-in from schools and households, 0WEEE PROCURE depends on trust in data security and legal compliance, and WEEE REUSE depends on market confidence in reused products and on the willingness of social and institutional actors to collaborate. These common barriers suggest that future transfer projects should

systematically include early legal review, stakeholder mapping, coordination design, and realistic operational filtering as part of the preparatory phase.

4.4.2. Solution-Specific Barriers

Beyond common risks, each solution also presents solution-specific barriers that shape its transfer logic. For WEEE BEHAVE, a specific barrier is the risk that campaigns remain too generic or disconnected from authorized WEEE routes, reducing the credibility of the behavioural message and weakening measurable outcomes. Another specific challenge is the treatment of certain streams, such as batteries or small devices, which can create confusion if collection rules are not clearly communicated. For 0WEEE PROCURE, the most specific barrier is the legal and administrative difficulty of shifting from linear procurement logic toward circular management of institutional hardware, especially where eco-renting, CAPEX/OPEX rules, or data-liability issues create uncertainty. The pilot showed that these are not peripheral issues but central determinants of whether the model takes the form of school-hub refurbishment, circular ownership, or digital exchange.

For WEEE REUSE, the most distinctive barriers concern policy recognition of reuse, access to reusable-quality WEEE streams, the still-limited market demand or confidence surrounding reused electronics, and the need to ensure appropriate legal coverage for the actors handling WEEE, especially where future uptakes may be NGOs rather than certified public authorities.

4.4.3. Enabling Conditions and Success Factors

The cross-solution analysis also shows that successful transfer is driven by a combination of technical, institutional, and relational enabling conditions rather than by any single factor. One common success factor is the presence of a credible coordinating actor. In WEEE BEHAVE this can be a municipality, municipal union, or regional intermediary body; in 0WEEE PROCURE it often takes the form of a regional coordinator connecting public offices, schools, and refurbishers; and in WEEE REUSE it can be a public authority, NGO, utility, or mixed working group. In all three cases, transfer is more credible when one actor has the mandate and capacity to convene stakeholders, keep the process coherent, and maintain continuity over time. A second common success factor is the use of existing structures rather than the creation of entirely new ones. Schools, public inventories, technical labs, utilities, social enterprises, and existing WEEE channels are all examples of institutional assets that make transfer more realistic and cost-efficient.

The pilots also highlight more solution-specific but still widely relevant enabling conditions. WEEE BEHAVE shows the importance of age-appropriate educational design, gamification, and the multiplier effect from pupils to households. 0WEEE PROCURE demonstrates the value of selective census, certified data wiping, technical filtering, and the strategic flexibility to pivot from eco-renting toward circular ownership or digital exchange when local laws require it. WEEE REUSE highlights the importance of integrating reuse with social inclusion, relying on existing infrastructure, and providing continuous mentoring instead of one-off support. Taken together, these lessons suggest that future transfer should be designed around three principles: preserve the non-negotiable core logic of each solution, adapt the operational form to local legal and territorial realities, and invest early in governance, stakeholder trust, and implementation

readiness. That combination, rather than scale alone, is what turned WP2 pilots into transferable strategic assets for WP3.

5. Upscaling Procedures Framework

5.1. Introduction to the Upscaling Framework

This chapter translates the three pilot solutions into a practical sequence for future adoption. Its purpose is to help regional and local authorities, waste agencies, business support organizations, and social economy actors move from interest to implementation with a clear, realistic process. The framework is not a generic replication manual; it is a solution-matching and context-adaptation pathway built on the evidence produced by WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE.

The framework complements the Transferability Matrix by turning strategic suitability into an operational route. The matrix helps identify which solution fits a given territory; the upscaling framework explains how to prepare, adapt, pilot, and institutionalize that solution. Across the three pilots, the strongest common lesson is that transfer succeeds when governance, capacity, and legal fit are addressed early rather than after implementation starts.

5.2. Phased approach

The upscaling process is organized into four phases: assessment and engagement, adaptation and planning, pilot implementation, and institutionalization. This structure reflects the different maturity levels observed across the solutions: WEEE BEHAVE requires strong school and municipal coordination, 0WEEE PROCURE requires legal and procurement alignment, and WEEE REUSE requires infrastructure, mentoring, and social inclusion links.

Phase 1 focuses on territorial analysis, stakeholder mapping, and solution selection. Phase 2 translates the selected solution into a local implementation design, including governance, resources, and compliance. Phase 3 tests the adapted model at small scale, while Phase 4 embeds it in ordinary institutional practice or in a follow-up project. This sequence is consistent with the lessons from all three solution sheets, which show that adaptation is more important than direct copying.

5.3. Phase 1: Assessment and Engagement

The first phase should begin with a fast but structured diagnosis of the territory. For WEEE BEHAVE, this means checking the presence of schools, municipal support, official collection agents, legal collection channels, and any existing initiatives or campaigns that can reinforce outreach and make the behavioural message credible; for 0WEEE PROCURE, it means reviewing procurement rules, asset flows, and technical school capacity; for WEEE REUSE, it means assessing reuse streams, existing facilities, and potential social economy partners. The goal is to define whether the territory is ready, conditionally ready, or not yet ready.

Stakeholder engagement should happen before technical design is finalized. The pilots show that early involvement of schools, municipalities, technical institutes, repair actors, and waste operators reduces resistance and improves feasibility. A short feasibility memo should end the phase and identify the preferred solution or combination of solutions.

5.4. Phase 2: Adaptation and planning

The second phase converts the chosen solution into a locally workable model. WEEE BEHAVE must be adapted to local school calendars, language, and collection logistics; 0WEEE PROCURE must be adjusted to legal constraints and public accounting logic; WEEE REUSE must be aligned with available refurbishment capacity, data security needs, and employment pathways. In all cases, adaptation should preserve the core logic while changing the operational form.

This phase should produce a local implementation plan, partnership agreements, a risk register, and a monitoring plan. The plan should also clarify who coordinates, who delivers, who records data, and who validates results. The solution sheets show that this type of role clarity is a decisive factor for success, especially where several organizations must work together.

5.5. Phase 3: Pilot implementation

Pilot implementation should remain small enough to manage, but large enough to generate meaningful evidence. For WEEE BEHAVE, the pilot should include schools and a clear engagement mechanism; for 0WEEE PROCURE, it should include a limited but functional asset flow and at least one legal reuse route; for WEEE REUSE, it should include a realistic stock of reusable devices and a working refurbishment or redistribution channel.

The pilot should be monitored from the start using simple indicators already tested by the solutions: students engaged, WEEE collected, devices screened, devices reused, jobs created, and stakeholder participation. The core rule is to measure what matters for the solution logic, not only what is easiest to count. This is particularly important for WEEE BEHAVE, where behavioral results and educational reach matter as much as collection volumes.

5.6. Phase 4: Institutionalization

The fourth phase embeds the solution in routine practice. This can mean annual school campaigns for WEEE BEHAVE, formal procurement guidance for 0WEEE PROCURE, or an ongoing reuse network for WEEE REUSE. Institutionalization is the point at which the solution stops being a project activity and becomes part of normal service delivery or policy implementation.

The pilots suggest that institutionalization is most likely when a solution is linked to an official plan, a steering mechanism, or a recognized operational owner. WEEE BEHAVE benefits from municipal or school coordination structures, 0WEEE PROCURE from policy and procurement integration, and WEEE REUSE from reuse-centre partnerships and social enterprise arrangements. Where these anchors exist, the solution can move beyond one-off experimentation.

5.7. Timeline and decision points

A realistic upscaling cycle can be completed in around 6 to 12 months, depending on the solution and the territory. WEEE BEHAVE can often move faster because it relies on existing schools and awareness structures; 0WEEE PROCURE may need more time for legal and institutional alignment; WEEE REUSE may need the longest preparation because it combines operational, technical, and social requirements.

The key decision points are whether the territory is ready to proceed, whether the adapted design is legally and operationally sound, and whether the pilot shows enough value to justify scaling. If the answer is negative at any stage, the framework recommends redesign rather than forced implementation. That is one of the most important lessons from the project overall.

5.8. Minimum Capacity Requirements by Solution

Solution	Minimum capacity	Training needs	Tools / support
WEEE BEHAVE	Coordinator 0.2–0.5 FTE for 4–6 months; one school focal point per participating school; educator/trainer support during implementation; one logistics contact for collection operations; light authority support for access and approvals.	About 1–2 days total per role category, with shorter sessions for school liaison and logistics functions.	Guidelines, KPI sheet, reporting templates, campaign toolkit, educational materials, collection instructions.
0WEEE PROCURE	Coordinator 0.2–0.5 FTE for 6–9 months; one technical focal point per territory; one inventory/platform manager for monthly oversight.	About 2–3 days total, focused on coordination, technical screening, and platform use.	Pilot guidelines, technical checklists, reporting templates, hardware diagnostics tools, SSD kits, data wiping software, platform admin panel.
WEEE REUSE	Coordinator 1 FTE; technical staff with complementary expertise and at least 10 years of experience; trainer/mentor with business and waste-management experience.	About 3–5 days total, with the heaviest training load for technical staff.	Guidelines, REUSE materials, legal information, operational guidance, business plan tools.

*Caption: Table 5. Minimum Capacity Requirements by Solution**

Note: The figures are harmonised from the three Solution Sheets and should be read as indicative minimum requirements for transfer planning, not as fixed staffing standards. Because the three solutions have different operational logics, the role profiles and capacity needs are not directly comparable across solutions.

6. Transfer Package Toolkit

6.1. Toolkit overview

The toolkit converts the project's results into usable operational tools. It brings together five elements: the Transferability Matrix, the KPI Dashboard, the Solution Factsheets, the Upscaling Roadmap, and the Lessons Learned Synthesis. Together, these tools support decision-making, implementation planning, communication, and future capitalization.

The toolkit is intentionally modular. A territory may use only one tool, such as the Transferability Matrix, or it may use the full set in sequence. This makes the package suitable for different audience types, from technical officers to political decision-makers and project developers.

Tool #	Tool Name	Purpose	Included files / format
1	Transferability Matrix	Decision-support tool for selecting the most suitable solution for a territory, comparing territorial conditions, institutional capacity, regulatory context, stakeholder ecosystem, and operational feasibility.	Empty template + completed matrix populated from the final Solution Sheets; included as PDF/table in the report and as annexed output.
2	KPI Dashboard	Comparative monitoring tool for reading and benchmarking WP2 results across the three solutions, preserving each solution's KPI logic.	Excel workbook for data entry and calculation + HTML interactive dashboard for consultation and reporting; both included as annexed outputs.
3	Solution Factsheets	Concise transfer-oriented summaries for dissemination and first-level decision-making, presenting problem, innovation, results, KPI performance, transferability, barriers, and readiness.	Excel template for compilation + completed Excel file + HTML interactive consultation version; all three files included as annexed outputs.
4	Upscaling Roadmap	Implementation planning tool to translate a selected solution into a structured sequence of preparation, adaptation, pilot,	Empty Excel template + three completed example files for WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE

Tool #	Tool Name	Purpose	Included files / format
		monitoring, and sustainability actions.	PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE; included as annexed outputs.
5	Lessons Learned Synthesis	Strategic tool that consolidates cross-cutting and solution-specific lessons, governance insights, capacity lessons, and forward-looking recommendations for future transfer.	Final narrative chapter in the main report + annexed summary file if needed; the content should remain aligned with the conclusions and recommendations section.

Table 6: Transfer Package Toolkit Components

6.2. Tool 1 - Transferability Matrix

Tool 1 is a decision-support instrument designed to help future implementers select the most suitable eWAsTER solution for their territory. It compares territorial conditions, institutional capacity, regulatory context, stakeholder ecosystem, and operational feasibility against the specific requirements of WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE. The tool is provided in two formats: an empty template for future implementers and a completed version populated with evidence-based values drawn from the final Solution Sheets. Its purpose is to support informed solution matching and prevent copy-paste replication by showing which solution fits which territorial context and what adaptation effort is needed.

The Tool 1 package includes the empty Solution Sheet template and the completed Solution Sheets for WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE, so that users can both understand the input structure and consult the benchmark values used to populate the Transferability Matrix.

6.3. Tool 2 - KPI Dashboard

The KPI Dashboard is a comparative monitoring tool designed to translate the WP2 results of the three eWAsTER solutions into a single, easy-to-read framework. Its purpose is to help future adopters, project partners, and decision-makers compare performance across WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE using a common set of indicators, while still preserving the specific logic of each solution. The dashboard does not replace the Solution Sheets; rather, it converts their quantified evidence into a visual and analytical format that supports benchmarking, communication, and transfer-oriented decision-making.

For WEEE BEHAVE, the most relevant indicators are participating students, students engaged, participating classes, teachers involved, and WEEE collected. For 0WEEE PROCURE, the key indicators are devices assessed for reuse, devices refurbished or exchanged, stakeholder participation, estimated WEEE reduction, and cost savings for users. For WEEE REUSE, the dashboard focuses on kilograms of WEEE collected, number of devices collected, stakeholders engaged, jobs created for vulnerable groups, and revenue generated. These indicator families

reflect the different operational logics of the three solutions and make it possible to assess not only output levels, but also the type of impact generated in each case.

The dashboard is available in two complementary formats. The Excel workbook is the working file used for data entry, automatic calculation, and internal verification, while the HTML version is the presentation format used for quick consultation, visual comparison, and integration into the deliverable. The completed Excel file contains the final input data and the comparative analysis sheet, while the HTML dashboard provides a ready-to-use output generated from the same values. In practical terms, this means that users can either work directly in Excel or consult the generated HTML version depending on whether they need to edit, verify, or present the data.

The dashboard is intended to support both technical and strategic use. From a technical perspective, it helps identify performance gaps, territorial variation, and the level of achievement of each KPI. From a strategic perspective, it helps indicate which solution is more mature, which one shows stronger transfer potential, and which one requires more support before replication. This makes the tool especially useful for territories that are deciding whether to adopt one solution, combine several, or prepare an exploratory outline for future opportunities.

6.3.1. Dashboard Structure and Features

The KPI Dashboard should be structured around three core sections: input data, comparative analysis, and export report. The input section contains the KPI values extracted from the final Solution Sheets and entered into the Excel workbook. The comparative section automatically calculates percentage achievement, identifies best performers, and displays the performance gap between solutions. The export section prepares a table and narrative layout suitable for direct insertion into D.3.4.1 or for further communication use.

The dashboard is delivered as an interactive HTML page and as an Excel workbook. The HTML version is useful for rapid reading and visual navigation, while the Excel version allows controlled editing, calculation, and export. This dual format ensures that the tool remains both accessible and analytically robust, especially for users with different levels of technical familiarity.

6.3.2. KPI Framework for eWAsTER Solutions

The KPI framework used in the dashboard combines six families of indicators: collection performance, behavioural impact, circular economy performance, social impact, business model performance, and policy impact. Not every family is equally relevant to each solution, but together they provide a common structure for performance comparison across the eWAsTER portfolio. The framework therefore allows comparison without flattening the specific identity of each solution.

WEEE BEHAVE is primarily associated with behavioural impact and collection performance, because its main objective is to mobilise schools, students, teachers, and households around correct WEEE disposal. 0WEEE PROCURE is mainly linked to circular economy performance and business model performance, because its logic depends on reuse through institutional asset management and procurement reform. WEEE REUSE combines circular economy, social impact, and business model dimensions, because it creates value through reuse, jobs, and revenue

generation. This differentiated structure should be preserved in the dashboard so that the comparison remains meaningful.

The dashboard also includes territorial range information for each KPI, which makes it possible to see variation across pilot sites and to understand where performance was stronger or weaker. This is important because the solutions were implemented in different territorial and institutional contexts, and the transfer potential of each solution depends not only on absolute results but also on the conditions under which those results were achieved.

KPI Family	WEEE BEHAVE	0WEEE PROCURE	WEEE REUSE
Collection performance	WEEE collected, collection participation	Devices assessed for reuse, devices diverted	Kg of WEEE collected, number of devices collected
Behavioural impact	Students engaged, classes involved, teachers involved	Stakeholder engagement in procurement and asset management	Stakeholder engagement, awareness of reuse
Circular economy performance	Connection between awareness and collection	Devices refurbished or exchanged, reuse rate	Refurbishment and reuse volumes, material recovery
Social impact	School and community participation	Institutional engagement and local collaboration	Jobs created, vulnerable groups involved
Business model performance	Support to awareness-based local action	Cost savings, circular procurement logic	Revenue generated, economic value from reuse
Policy impact	Support to local action plans and collection routes	Procurement reform and institutional adoption	Reuse recognition and policy integration

Table 7: KPI Categories for Performance Monitoring

6.3.3. Using the KPI Dashboard

To use the KPI Dashboard, the user should first open the Excel template and insert the KPI values taken from the final Solution Sheets into the input sheet. The workbook then automatically generates the comparative analysis in the dashboard sheet, including achievement percentages, best performer identification, and performance gaps. The export report sheet can then be used

either to copy the final table into D.3.4.1 or to prepare a concise reporting output for meetings, presentations, or dissemination materials.

For users who only need a visual consultation, the HTML version provides a ready-made output generated from the Excel data. For users who need to update or verify figures, the Excel version remains the master file. In this sense, the HTML file is the presentation layer and the Excel file is the calculation layer.

The KPI Dashboard should therefore be read not only as a reporting tool, but as a transfer support tool. By showing how each solution performed in the pilot phase, it helps future adopters understand what level of ambition is realistic, what type of support may be required, and which solution is most suitable for their territorial context.

The KPI Dashboard is provided as an Excel workbook for data entry and calculation, together with an HTML version for visual consultation and reporting. Both files are included as annexed outputs to the Transfer Package.

6.3.4. Materials and output files

The Tool 2 package includes three files: the HTML template, the Excel workbook completed with the final KPI data from the Solution Sheets, and the generated HTML dashboard based on those data. Together, these files provide a full sequence from template to input to output. The empty template supports future implementation, the Excel workbook supports calculation and verification, and the HTML output supports presentation and integration into the deliverable.

6.4. Tool 3 - Solution Factsheets

The Solution Factsheets are concise transfer-oriented tools designed to present each eWAsTER solution in a standard and immediately usable format. They translate the analytical content of the Solution Sheets into short communication products that can support dissemination, stakeholder engagement, and first-level decision-making by potential adopters.

Each factsheet provides a compact but complete overview of the solution, including the problem addressed, the core innovation, key results, KPI performance, target adopters, transferability factors, barriers and mitigation measures, and transfer readiness. This structure makes it easier to compare the three solutions while keeping their specific operational logic visible.

The factsheets are especially useful for readers who do not need the full analytical depth of the Solution Sheets but still need reliable evidence before considering replication. They are therefore intended as a bridge between technical reporting and practical uptake.

6.4.1. Factsheet Structure

Each factsheet is organized into five sections. Section 1 summarizes the problem addressed, the core innovation, and the main results from WP2. Section 2 presents KPI performance in a compact comparative format. Section 3 identifies target adopters and the most suitable territorial profiles. Section 4 captures transfer factors, including what worked best, enabling conditions, and barriers with mitigation measures. Section 5 summarizes transfer readiness and the indicative timeline for adoption.

The structure is intentionally standardized so that all three factsheets can be read side by side. This standardization allows the reader to compare WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE through the same analytical lens, while still preserving solution-specific differences in scope, governance, and implementation logic.

6.4.2. How to use the factsheets

To use the factsheets, the user should begin with Section 1 to understand the context and the main innovation of the solution. Section 2 should then be reviewed to assess the quantitative results and the overall level of performance achieved during WP2.

Section 3 is useful for identifying the types of organizations and territories that are most likely to benefit from the solution. Section 4 should be used to understand what made the solution work, which barriers were encountered, and what conditions are required for replication. Section 5 provides a practical indication of transfer readiness and the approximate timeline needed to move from preparation to implementation.

For the purposes of this Transfer Package, the factsheets are provided as annexed outputs and form an integral component of the Transfer Package Toolkit. They are also suitable for dissemination in PDF format, for circulation among potential adopters, public authorities, and partner networks.

6.4.3. File set included in Tool 3

Tool 3 includes three complementary files. The Excel template is the editable base file used to structure the factsheets and insert solution-specific data. The completed Excel file contains the populated factsheets for all three solutions, while the HTML version provides a ready-to-consult presentation format for easy browsing and verification.

The three files are listed in the deliverable as annexed outputs of Tool 3. In this way, the reader immediately understands that the factsheets are available both as working material and as final presentation material.

6.4.4. Instructions for preparation

When preparing the factsheets, the data in Section 2 should be copied from the relevant Solution Sheet, ensuring consistency with the WP2 final reports. Section 4 should only include transfer factors explicitly supported by the Solution Leader and should not be expanded with generic project statements. The readiness score in Section 5 should be kept aligned with the criteria used in the other tools, so that the three solutions remain comparable.

The final output should remain concise, visually readable, and suitable for direct reuse in meetings or dissemination activities. For this reason, the factsheets should avoid excessive narrative and should rely on short, evidence-based entries.

6.5. Tool 4 - Upscaling Roadmap

The Upscaling Roadmap is a practical planning tool designed to help potential adopters translate an eWAsTER solution into a structured implementation plan. It shows how a chosen solution can move from preparation to adaptation, pilot testing, rollout, monitoring, and sustainability within a

realistic time sequence. Unlike the Solution Factsheets, which summarize evidence, the Roadmap is forward-looking and operational: it is meant to guide implementation choices, sequence activities, and allocate responsibilities.

The tool is built around a Gantt-style timeline and includes the main phases, key activities, start and end months, indicative duration, budget allocation, and responsible partner or implementing actor. It also integrates a budget calculator, a KPI tracker, a risk matrix, partner roles, and a minimum capacity checklist, so that the user can assess not only what to do, but also what resources, skills, and safeguards are needed to do it. This makes the Roadmap suitable for both technical planning and strategic decision-making.

The empty Excel template should be used as the base file for new adaptation exercises. The three example files illustrate how the same structure can be filled for WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE, showing different implementation logics, budgets, risk profiles, and capacity requirements depending on the selected solution. In this way, the examples serve as reference models rather than fixed prescriptions.

6.5.1. Structure of the roadmap

The Roadmap is organized into five main phases: Preparation, Adaptation, Implementation, Monitoring, and Sustainability. Each phase contains a sequence of activities that can be tailored to the selected solution and the target territory. The structure is flexible enough to accommodate different territorial contexts, while remaining comparable across the three eWAsTER solutions.

The template also includes a budget distribution table, a KPI tracking section, a risk assessment matrix, a partner roles table, and a capacity checklist. These components ensure that the Roadmap is not only a visual timeline, but also a planning instrument that supports feasibility, resource allocation, and implementation readiness.

6.5.2. How to use the roadmap

To use the Roadmap, the user should first select the solution to be transferred and define the target territory. The next step is to fill in the main phases and activities, assigning realistic timelines, budgets, and implementing partners. The KPI tracker should then be completed using the most relevant performance indicators for the selected solution, and the risk matrix should be populated with the main implementation risks and mitigation measures.

The capacity checklist is used to verify whether the target territory has the minimum skills and organizational resources needed for implementation. If gaps are identified, the Roadmap should be adjusted before execution begins. This is particularly important because the examples show that each solution requires a different balance between coordination, technical capacity, stakeholder engagement, and local institutional support.

For deliverable purposes, the Roadmap can be used as an annexed tool or as an editable working file for future adopters. The empty template provides the base structure, while the three example files illustrate how the Roadmap can be customized for each solution and adapted to different territorial settings.

6.5.3. File set included in Tool 4

Tool 4 should include four complementary files: the empty Excel template and the three completed example versions for WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE. Together, these files show the common structure of the Roadmap and the solution-specific adaptations required in each case.

The examples are especially useful for users who need a concrete reference when preparing their own upscaling plan. They show how different solutions can be translated into distinct timelines, budgets, risk profiles, and partner roles while keeping the same overall template logic.

6.5.4. Instructions for preparation

When preparing a new Roadmap, the user should begin from the empty template and adapt it to the selected solution and territory. Activities, budgets, and responsible partners should be adjusted to local conditions, and example values should be treated only as illustrative references. The KPI section should be aligned with the indicators used in the Solution Factsheets and the Solution Sheet, so that the Roadmap remains consistent with the rest of the Transfer Package.

The roadmap should remain practical, readable, and realistic. Its main purpose is to help implementers understand what resources and sequence of actions are needed to move from transfer intention to actual implementation

6.6. Tool 5 - Lessons Learned Synthesis

The Lessons Learned Synthesis is the final strategic tool in the eWAsTER Transfer Package. It consolidates the main implementation insights from the three pilot solutions and translates them into practical guidance for future adopters, project designers, and policy actors working on e-waste prevention, circular procurement, and reuse-based social economy models. Unlike the Solution Factsheets or the Upscaling Roadmap, this tool does not focus on a single solution or on a single implementation sequence; instead, it brings together the most important cross-cutting lessons from WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE.

The purpose of the synthesis is to help future implementers understand not only what the pilots achieved, but also why they worked, where they encountered limits, and which conditions are necessary for transfer. It highlights the importance of adaptation over imitation, stakeholder coordination over isolated action, and legal and institutional fit over generic replication. In this sense, the synthesis acts as the bridge between pilot evidence and strategic capitalization.

The synthesis is structured around three layers of learning. The first layer captures solution-specific lessons, showing what worked best, what barriers appeared, and which enabling conditions were most relevant for each pilot. The second layer identifies common lessons across the three solutions, such as the importance of a credible coordinating actor, the use of existing structures, and the need for realistic capacity planning. The third layer turns these findings into forward-looking recommendations for local authorities, regional bodies, and future transfer projects.

6.6.1. Structure of the synthesis

The synthesis should include the following elements:

- Main success factors by solution.
- Critical challenges and how they were addressed.
- Governance and partnership best practices.
- Capacity requirements and capacity-building lessons.
- Cross-cutting recommendations for transfer and upscaling.
- Final strategic messages for future capitalization.

This structure ensures that the tool remains usable both as an analytical summary and as a practical reference for future projects. It also makes the synthesis consistent with the logic used in the other tools, where evidence, transferability, and implementation guidance are always linked together.

6.6.2. How to use the synthesis

The synthesis should be read after the other tools, because it works best when the user already understands the comparative framework of the Transferability Matrix, the KPI logic of the Dashboard, the dissemination format of the Factsheets, and the implementation sequence of the Roadmap. It is especially useful for project developers, managing authorities, and territorial institutions that are preparing a potential capitalization pathway or designing a transfer-oriented cooperation project.

Users can also extract individual messages from the synthesis for policy briefs, presentation decks, stakeholder meetings, and future funding proposals. In this way, the tool is not only a summary chapter, but also a reusable knowledge base for strategic communication and project design.

6.6.3. File set included in Tool 5

For the purposes of the deliverable, the Lessons Learned Synthesis can be included as a dedicated chapter of the report and as an annexed summary file if needed. The content should be directly aligned with the final wording used in the conclusions and recommendations section, so that the document remains internally consistent.

If the toolkit is to remain fully modular, the synthesis may also be presented as a separate PDF annex, while the core content should remain in the main report because it closes the logic of the entire Transfer Package.

6.6.4. Instructions for preparation

When preparing the synthesis, the first rule is to avoid repeating the solution sheets verbatim. The text should select only the most transferable insights and present them in a way that is useful for future adopters. The second rule is to keep the tone strategic rather than descriptive, focusing on lessons, implications, and recommendations rather than on narrative reporting. The third rule is to maintain consistency with the terminology and indicator logic already used in the previous tools.

The synthesis should therefore function as the final interpretive layer of the package: concise, strategic, evidence-based, and clearly connected to future transfer planning.

Tool 5 should be annexed in two formats: an empty template for future reuse and a completed version populated with the real data extracted from the Solution Sheets. This combination ensures both methodological continuity and immediate usability for the final deliverable.

7. Proposal for Possible Follow-up Initiative

7.1. Rationale

The project demonstrates that the three solutions are ready for a wider capitalization phase, but not through simple automatic scaling. Future transfer needs dedicated time, a broader partnership base, and a project design built around adoption rather than pilot testing. The capitalization concept should therefore focus on translating project results into multi-territorial implementation support.

A follow-up project would be particularly useful for territories that already show interest but need structured assistance. This is especially true for school-based WEEE campaigns, circular procurement reforms, and reuse ecosystems that require a mix of policy support, technical guidance, and local coordination.

7.2. Suggested project logic

A possible follow-up initiative should have three operational strands. The first strand would support behavioural change and collection campaigns based on WEEE BEHAVE. The second would support procurement and circular ownership reforms based on 0WEEE PROCURE. The third would support reuse and social inclusion networks based on WEEE REUSE.

This structure makes it possible to work with different territories at different starting points. Some may begin with awareness and engagement, others with procurement reform, and others with reuse infrastructure. The key is that the future project should be modular enough to accommodate different levels of readiness while still preserving the project's overall circular economy logic.

7.3. Partnership and governance

A possible follow-up initiative should keep the solution leaders as knowledge anchors, but expand the operational partnership to include territories that are ready to transfer. Regional authorities, municipalities, schools, reuse actors, and policy bodies should be involved from the start. The governance model should be light enough to manage, but strong enough to support real transfer.

The project should also include a clear technical assistance function. That function would help new adopters interpret the solution sheets, use the toolkit, and adjust the model to local legal and institutional conditions. This is the best way to turn pilot learning into practical upscaling.

7.4. Expected outputs

A capitalization project should produce transferred solutions in new territories, updated toolkits, new case studies, and stronger policy uptake. It should also generate a wider network of adopters capable of sharing results with one another. In other words, it should build both implementation and community.

If properly designed, the project could also feed future MED-wide policy discussions on e-waste prevention, circular procurement, and reuse-based social economy. That would extend the legacy of eWAsTER beyond the pilot phase and make the transfer package a living platform rather than a one-time report.

7.5. Proposed Activities and Approach

The proposed capitalization project should be structured as a transfer-oriented initiative that combines knowledge transfer, territorial adaptation, and pilot replication in new Mediterranean contexts. The project logic should not replicate the eWAsTER pilots mechanically but should instead use the existing Transfer Package to guide the selection of suitable territories, adapt each solution to local conditions, and accompany new adopters through mentoring and implementation support.

The activities should follow five phases. First, the consortium should identify and engage new partner territories using the Transferability Matrix and a light capacity assessment. Second, the selected solutions should be adapted to the legal, institutional, and operational conditions of each new territory, with close support from eWAsTER partners that already tested the solutions. Third, the project should deliver small-scale transfer pilots in new sites, combining practical implementation with peer learning and technical assistance. Fourth, it should support capacity building, documentation, and policy uptake so that the new experiences can be consolidated and communicated. Fifth, it should monitor results through a shared KPI framework and disseminate the lessons learned to the wider Euro-MED community.

Within this structure, some of the current eWAsTER partners can play a particularly useful role as reference partners for transfer and mentoring. PACT can contribute with leadership and educational innovation and awareness-based transfer; UCPB can provide overall coordination and methodological continuity; LINK can support reuse, social inclusion, and operational mentoring; ORZ can offer territorial adaptation experience and technical contribution on reuse-oriented approaches; and UBBSLA can strengthen local engagement, dissemination, and regional networking. Their participation would not be necessary in every future configuration, but it would be highly valuable for ensuring continuity of expertise and for pairing experienced partners with new territories and new stakeholders.

7.6. Interested Partners and Geographic Scope

The possible follow-up initiative should combine a core group of partners with proven implementation experience and a set of new territories ready to adopt and adapt eWAsTER solutions. A balanced consortium would help ensure both continuity of expertise and real transfer to new contexts. For this reason, the involvement of current core knowledge partners would be strategically valuable, as these organizations can bring complementary strengths in coordination, educational outreach, reuse and social economy, territorial adaptation, and local networking.

The geographic scope should remain open enough to include both territories already familiar with eWAsTER and new Mediterranean areas where the solutions can be tested in different institutional and territorial settings. Priority may be given to urban and peri-urban areas with identifiable implementation capacity, but the project should also consider rural, island, and mixed territories where adaptation needs are high and the transfer value is significant. The aim should be to build a multi-territorial partnership in which experienced eWAsTER partners work alongside new actors, facilitating direct knowledge transfer and practical learning-by-doing.

7.7. Funding Opportunities and Budget Estimation

The most relevant funding opportunity for a possible follow-up initiative would be the next Interreg Euro-MED call for transfer or capitalization-oriented cooperation, as the project logic is fully aligned with the programme's objectives on circular economy, territorial cooperation, and sustainable transition. Complementary opportunities may also be explored under LIFE, Horizon Europe, national or regional circular economy programmes, and, where appropriate, the European Social Fund Plus for the social inclusion components linked to WEEE REUSE.

As a purely indicative strategic assumption, intended to illustrate the potential scale of a future capitalization initiative rather than to provide a formal financial forecast, a project of this type could require a budget in the range of EUR 1.5 to 2.5 million over 30 to 36 months, depending on the number of territories, pilot sites, and support activities included. The budget should prioritize transfer activities rather than heavy infrastructure spending. A plausible distribution would allocate around 15% to coordination and management, 40% to solution adaptation and implementation in new territories, 20% to capacity building and knowledge transfer, 15% to policy influence and dissemination, and 10% to monitoring and evaluation.

This estimation should be regarded solely as a strategic planning reference. The actual budget, duration, partnership composition and activity structure of any possible follow-up initiative would need to be defined during a dedicated project development phase and would ultimately depend on programme rules, partnership composition, territorial coverage and the scope of replication activities selected.

7.8. Timeline and Next Steps

The preparation of a potential capitalization pathway should start immediately after the finalization of the eWAsTER Transfer Package. In the short term, the consortium should consolidate the list of interested partners, identify suitable target territories, monitor relevant funding calls, and prepare a shared outline for a future proposal. In the medium term, the selected partnership should agree on roles, co-financing, and pilot sites, and then submit a full application when the appropriate call opens.

If funded, the project could begin with a preparatory phase focused on partnership formalization, territory selection, and adaptation planning, followed by transfer pilots, capacity building, and dissemination. The timeline should remain flexible enough to accommodate different readiness levels among territories, while still ensuring a clear sequence from selection to implementation and consolidation.

Within this process, current eWAsTER reference partners for transfer and mentoring, could serve as continuity anchors and reference points for newer partners, helping to accelerate onboarding and reduce the learning curve in territories that are less familiar with the solutions.

7.9. Link to eWAsTER Results Amplification Strategy

The capitalization project would represent a natural continuation of the eWAsTER Results Amplification Strategy, as it would transform the project's outputs from documented knowledge into extended territorial application. Rather than treating the Transfer Package as a final product,

the future project would use it as an operational bridge between pilot learning and wider Mediterranean uptake. In this sense, capitalization would maximize the return on the investment already made under eWAsTER by ensuring that the solutions, tools, and expertise developed during the project continue to generate value beyond the original implementation period.

The role of experienced eWAsTER partners in this process would be especially important. Their participation would help preserve methodological continuity, support peer learning, and ensure that new partners benefit from tested approaches rather than starting from scratch. This would strengthen the legacy of eWAsTER and improve the chances that its results contribute to long-term Mediterranean circular economy transition.

8. Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1. Main findings

The three pilots show that e-waste prevention and management can be advanced through three distinct but complementary pathways. WEEE BEHAVE proves the value of education and behavioral change. 0WEEE PROCURE proves that procurement systems can be redesigned to support reuse and circular ownership. WEEE REUSE proves that repair and reuse can generate both environmental and social value.

Taken together, the pilots show that transfer is possible when the model is aligned with territorial conditions. The project's main lesson is not that one solution fits everywhere, but that each solution becomes transferable when its core logic is preserved and its operational form is adapted.

8.2. Lessons Learned Synthesis (Tool #5)

The Lessons Learned Synthesis consolidates the main implementation insights generated by the three eWAsTER pilots and translates them into guidance for future adopters. Its purpose is not to repeat the solution descriptions already provided in earlier chapters, but to identify the conditions that made the pilots work, the barriers that slowed them down, and the governance and capacity factors that future transfer projects should address from the outset. The synthesis therefore combines solution-specific lessons with cross-cutting messages that are relevant to all three models.

8.2.1. Top Success Factors by Solution

WEEE BEHAVE performed best where schools, municipalities, and waste actors worked through a simple and visible coordination model. Its strongest success factors were the use of schools as the main engagement channel, the involvement of teachers as trusted intermediaries, and the ability to connect educational activities to a credible WEEE collection route. The pilot also showed that behavioural messaging works better when it is practical, age-appropriate, and supported by local visibility actions rather than being limited to information alone.

0WEEE PROCURE was most successful where the solution could adapt to legal and institutional constraints without losing its circular objective. Its key success factors were the existence of a technical or operational hub, the ability to screen and redirect public ICT assets, and the flexibility to move from the original eco-renting idea toward workable models such as circular ownership or digital exchange. The pilot demonstrated that legal adaptation is not a weakness but a necessary part of transfer when procurement rules are restrictive.

WEEE REUSE generated the strongest results where reuse was linked to social value and supported by stable partnerships. Its main success factors were the availability of reusable WEEE streams, the presence of technical and social actors able to carry out assessment and refurbishment, and the integration of reuse with job creation and inclusion pathways. The pilot also confirmed that reuse becomes more credible when it is framed not only as waste management, but as a local development opportunity.

Across all three solutions, three common success factors emerged. First, the presence of a credible coordinating actor was essential. Second, transfer worked better when existing structures were used rather than creating entirely new ones. Third, success depended on the ability to preserve the core logic of each solution while adapting its operational form to local conditions.

8.2.2. Critical Challenges and How They Were Addressed

The main implementation challenges were not technical alone, but institutional and organisational. In WEEE BEHAVE, the most significant difficulties concerned school scheduling, coordination across territories, and the need to maintain a clear link between awareness activities and authorised collection routes. These issues were managed through simplified campaign formats, local focal points, and stronger coordination with municipalities and waste operators.

In 0WEEE PROCURE, the main challenge was legal and administrative rigidity. Public accounting rules, procurement procedures, and data security concerns limited the original model and required a more flexible solution design. The pilot addressed this by shifting from a single eco-renting approach to multiple context-adapted pathways, including circular ownership and digital exchange. This adaptive move was essential to preserve the purpose of the solution while making it operationally viable.

In WEEE REUSE, the most relevant challenge was the uneven maturity of reuse ecosystems across territories. Some contexts had strong technical capacity but weaker policy recognition, while others had social interest but limited access to reusable-quality WEEE streams. These barriers were addressed through mentoring, stakeholder activation, and close collaboration between technical, social, and public actors.

A cross-cutting lesson is that implementation problems are best solved early, during the planning and adaptation stage, rather than after the pilot starts. The project showed that legal checks, stakeholder mapping, and role clarification are not optional preparatory tasks, but decisive conditions for success.

8.2.3. Governance and Partnership Best Practices

The pilots showed that governance quality is one of the main determinants of transferability. Solutions worked best when responsibilities were clearly distributed, coordination was light but stable, and one actor had the mandate to keep the process moving. This was particularly important in multi-stakeholder settings where schools, municipalities, technical actors, and waste operators had to cooperate without a rigid hierarchy.

A second best practice was the use of flexible partnership models. The project confirmed that not every partner needs to be involved in the same way or at the same level in future transfer initiatives. What matters is having the right mix of experience, coordination capacity, and territorial legitimacy. Experienced partners can serve as reference points for mentoring and method transfer, while new partners can bring the territorial diversity needed for real upscaling.

A third best practice was regular knowledge exchange. Monthly coordination, bilateral consultations, and continuous feedback from Solution Leaders helped the partnership refine

tools and interpret results in real time. This made it possible to improve the Transfer Package while the project was still evolving, rather than waiting until the end of implementation.

For future projects, the main governance lesson is that transfer should be organised as a guided learning process, not as a simple replication exercise. Partnerships need a clear division between those who provide methodological continuity and those who test transfer in new territories.

8.2.4. Capacity Requirements and Capacity Building Insights

The pilots made clear that capacity requirements differ significantly across solutions. WEEE BEHAVE requires relatively light infrastructure but strong coordination and communication capacity. 0WEEE PROCURE requires technical, legal, and administrative expertise. WEEE REUSE requires the heaviest operational and mentoring capacity because it combines technical processing, social inclusion, and business viability.

One important lesson is that initial capacity estimates are often too optimistic. In practice, implementation required more time for coordination, more support for local actors, and more intensive mentoring than originally expected. This means that future adopters should plan for realistic staffing, training, and technical assistance from the beginning.

Capacity building worked best when it combined short practical training, peer learning, and ongoing support. In other words, one-off workshops were not enough on their own. The most effective model was a mix of tool-based guidance, direct mentoring from experienced partners, and repeated opportunities to solve implementation problems together.

For future transfer projects, the implication is clear: capacity building should not be treated as a side activity. It should be built into the core design of the intervention, with enough time, budget, and staff continuity to support learning over the full implementation cycle.

8.3. Policy recommendations

The strongest policy message is that transfer needs institutional support. WEEE BEHAVE should be integrated into school and municipal planning; 0WEEE PROCURE needs procurement and accounting clarification; WEEE REUSE needs reuse recognition, stream access, and enabling frameworks for social enterprises and reuse actors.

At a broader level, territories should formalize cooperation between public authorities, schools, waste actors, and social economy organizations. The project shows that informal enthusiasm is not enough for transfer; durable results require rules, roles, and coordination structures.

8.3.1. Recommendations for Local and Regional Authorities

Local and regional authorities are the most immediate enablers of eWAsTER transfer, because they control the policy, operational, and stakeholder conditions under which the three solutions can move from pilot experience to routine practice. Their role is not limited to financing; it also includes coordination, convening, regulatory adaptation, and the integration of circular economy actions into existing waste, education, and procurement strategies.

At local and regional level, the first recommendation is to embed e-waste prevention and reuse actions into municipal waste prevention plans, school cooperation frameworks, and regional

circular economy strategies. WEEE BEHAVE should be supported through school-based programmes, municipal awareness campaigns, and formal links with authorised WEEE collection routes. 0WEEE PROCURE should be enabled through practical procurement guidance, public asset screening procedures, and legal clarification for circular use of ICT equipment. WEEE REUSE should be supported through access to WEEE streams, cooperation with social economy actors, and the creation of local or regional reuse pathways that can combine environmental and social objectives.

A second recommendation is to establish clear governance arrangements. Local and regional authorities should designate a coordination body or lead officer, formalise roles among schools, waste operators, and implementation partners, and ensure that transfer activities are monitored through simple indicators linked to real operational outputs. This is particularly important because the pilots showed that informal interest is not enough: durable implementation requires stable rules, clear responsibilities, and continuity over time.

A third recommendation is to create enabling financial conditions. This can include small grants for pilot replication, support for training and mentoring, and budget lines dedicated to circular economy experimentation. Where possible, authorities should also use public procurement, awareness budgets, and local partnerships to create demand for reuse-oriented and prevention-oriented actions.

In policy terms, authorities should avoid treating the three solutions as isolated projects. Instead, they should see them as complementary instruments: WEEE BEHAVE for awareness and mobilisation, 0WEEE PROCURE for institutional circularity, and WEEE REUSE for practical valorisation and social inclusion. The strongest impact will come from combining them within a coherent territorial strategy rather than applying them separately.

From this perspective, the most useful authorities for future transfer are those that can act both as coordinators and as facilitators of stakeholder alignment. Intermediate territorial authorities can play a valuable role by connecting municipalities, schools, and technical partners, as illustrated by partners such as UCPB, Malaga, and UBBSLA. Similar roles exist in other regions through unions of municipalities, regional agencies, and waste-management consortia. Their involvement can significantly increase the likelihood of successful transfer because they provide the institutional glue that many pilot solutions need in order to become stable public practice.

8.3.2. Recommendations for National and Euro-MED Level

At national and Euro-MED level, the main need is to create the policy and programme conditions that allow local solutions to be transferred, adapted, and multiplied across territories. While local and regional actors are essential for implementation, national authorities and Euro-MED institutions are needed to reduce fragmentation, improve legal clarity, and support transnational learning.

The first recommendation is to improve regulatory coherence for e-waste prevention, reuse, and circular procurement. National frameworks should clarify how public institutions can safely screen, transfer, refurbish, and reuse equipment, while also recognising the role of social economy actors and reuse operators within circular value chains. At Euro-MED level, programme

priorities should continue to support transfer-oriented cooperation by encouraging projects that combine pilot replication, capacity building, and policy uptake.

The second recommendation is to strengthen funding pathways for scaling and transfer. National and regional programmes should create dedicated instruments for circular economy innovation, while Euro-MED and other EU mechanisms should support cross-border exchange of expertise, mentoring, and multi-territorial implementation. Such support is particularly important for solutions like WEEE REUSE, which require ecosystem building, and 0WEEE PROCURE, which require legal and procedural adaptation.

The third recommendation is to improve data collection, benchmarking, and knowledge exchange. A common challenge in e-waste cooperation is the lack of harmonised indicators, which makes comparison and scaling difficult. National and Euro-MED actors should therefore promote shared monitoring standards, comparable KPI frameworks, and better mechanisms for sharing lessons from pilot projects. This would help move from isolated local success stories to a wider evidence base for policy development.

The fourth recommendation is to support transnational capacity building and peer learning. Euro-MED cooperation is particularly valuable when it allows experienced territories to mentor less advanced ones, and when solutions are transferred through guided adaptation rather than formal imitation. This is where eWAsTER offers a useful model: it shows that knowledge transfer is most effective when experienced partners, such as those that led the pilots, can support new adopters in other territories with similar needs.

Finally, national and Euro-MED actors should treat e-waste circularity as part of a broader green transition agenda. The relevance of eWAsTER goes beyond waste management, because it links environmental protection, public procurement reform, education, reuse, and social inclusion. For this reason, the project's lessons can inform not only circular economy policy, but also regional development, innovation, and cohesion strategies across the Mediterranean area.

8.4. Final recommendation for adopters

Potential adopters should start by matching the solution to their real starting point. If the main need is awareness and citizen mobilization, WEEE BEHAVE is the best entry point. If the main need is to reduce waste from public assets, 0WEEE PROCURE is the most relevant. If the main need is to extend product life and create social value, WEEE REUSE is the most suitable.

The most effective adoption strategy is therefore progressive rather than maximalist. Start with the solution that fits the territory best, secure institutional backing, and then expand only when the first cycle is stable. That is the most realistic path to sustained transnational upscaling.

8.5. Contribution to Euro-MED Circular Economy Transition

eWAsTER contributes directly to the Euro-MED circular economy transition by translating pilot-level innovation into transferable methods, tools, and partnership models that can be reused in other Mediterranean territories. The project supports the objectives of RSO2.6 by addressing e-waste prevention, resource efficiency, reuse, and behavioural change through a combination of local experimentation and transnational learning. Its added value lies in showing that circular economy

transition is not only a matter of technology or regulation, but also of governance, stakeholder cooperation, and context-sensitive adaptation.

The three solutions tested under eWAsTER cover complementary dimensions of this transition. WEEE BEHAVE strengthens awareness and participation, helping territories improve the social foundations of collection and prevention. 0WEEE PROCURE demonstrates how public institutions can reduce waste generation by extending the life of ICT equipment and embedding circular thinking in procurement and asset management. WEEE REUSE shows that reuse can generate both environmental and social benefits, including employment opportunities and local value creation. Together, these approaches offer a practical pathway for territories seeking to move beyond isolated waste management actions toward more integrated circular systems.

The project also contributes to the Euro-MED transition by providing a Transfer Package that reduces the barriers to replication. Instead of leaving each territory to reinvent its own model, eWAsTER offers decision-support tools, implementation guidance, and lessons learned that can accelerate adoption and improve quality of implementation. This makes the project relevant not only for e-waste policy, but also for broader circular economy governance, where the ability to transfer tested solutions is often a decisive factor for impact.

More broadly, eWAsTER illustrates the value of transnational cooperation in a field where local innovation alone is rarely enough. The project shows that Mediterranean territories can learn from one another, adapt proven approaches to different legal and institutional settings, and build a shared evidence base for future policy development. In this sense, eWAsTER is not only a set of pilots, but also a demonstration of how Interreg cooperation can help convert local experimentation into systemic regional transition.

8.6. Final Remarks

eWAsTER has demonstrated that practical, transferable solutions for e-waste prevention and circular management can be developed through structured pilot work and transnational cooperation. The project leaves behind not only tested approaches, but also a Transfer Package designed to support future adopters in selecting, adapting, and implementing the most suitable solution for their territory.

The transfer analysis confirms that the three eWAsTER solutions are complementary rather than competing approaches to improving e-waste prevention and management across Mediterranean territories.

WEEE BEHAVE emerged as the most immediately transferable solution, requiring relatively limited infrastructure while demonstrating strong performance in awareness raising, educational outreach and citizen mobilisation. Its success depends primarily on stakeholder coordination, school participation and access to authorised collection channels.

0WEEE PROCURE demonstrated significant potential for institutional replication, particularly in territories with substantial public ICT assets and sufficient administrative capacity to support circular procurement and asset management practices. While more demanding from a regulatory and organisational perspective, it offers substantial opportunities for systemic change within public administrations.

WEEE REUSE generated the strongest social and circular economy impacts, combining waste prevention, refurbishment and social inclusion objectives. Its successful replication requires stronger ecosystem conditions, including access to reusable equipment, technical expertise and cooperation between public authorities, social economy actors and specialised operators.

Taken together, the three solutions provide a scalable portfolio of interventions that can be adopted individually or combined within integrated territorial strategies. The experience gained through eWAsTER demonstrates that effective e-waste management requires not only technical solutions, but also behavioural change, institutional innovation and social engagement.

The Transfer Package therefore represents not the end of the eWAsTER process, but the foundation for future transfer, replication and capitalization activities. By transforming pilot experience into practical tools, strategic guidance and transferable knowledge, the project creates the conditions for broader uptake of circular e-waste solutions across the Euro-MED area and beyond.

9. Annexes

- **Annex 1**: Transferability Matrix template and completed comparative matrix.
- **Annex 2**: KPI Dashboard Excel workbook and HTML interactive dashboard.
- **Annex 3**: Solution Factsheets package, including the Excel template, the completed Excel file, and the HTML interactive version for the three solutions.
- **Annex 4**: Upscaling Roadmap package, including the empty Excel template and the three completed example files for WEEE BEHAVE, 0WEEE PROCURE, and WEEE REUSE.
- **Annex 5**: Lessons Learned Synthesis, included both as the final strategic chapter of the deliverable and as a separate annexed summary file.
- **Annex 6**: Supporting references and document cross-links for the Transfer Package Toolkit (Solution sheets)
- **Annex 7**: Glossary of terms.

10. Key terms and definitions

- **Circular Economy**: An economic system aimed at eliminating waste and enabling the continual use of resources through strategies like reuse, repair, refurbishment, remanufacturing, and recycling.
- **E-waste / WEEE**: Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment, including discarded electronic devices and components.
- **LAP (Local Action Plan)**: Strategic planning document developed by eWAsTER partners to address e-waste prevention and management at local/regional level.
- **Solution Leader**: Project partner responsible for coordinating the development and testing of one of the three eWAsTER solutions.
- **Transfer Package**: Comprehensive set of tools, guidelines, and strategic frameworks to support replication and upscaling of eWAsTER solutions.
- **Transferability**: The degree to which a solution can be successfully adapted and implemented in contexts different from the original pilot area.
- **Upscaling**: The process of expanding a pilot solution to full-scale implementation across a wider geographic area or larger population.

EWAsTER

Interreg
Euro-MED

Co-funded by
the European Union