

## REFERENCES

- [1] Municipal waste Management: Manual for Local Adminstration . 2004 . Pollution Control Department. Ministry of Natural resources and environment. pp 1, 13
- [2] Solid waste : Assessment , Monitoring and Remediation, 2004 . Irena Twardowska ,Herbert E.Allen, Antonius A.F. Kettrup , William J.Lacy . pp 735-736
- [3] Energy for Environment Foundation. “Anaerobic digestion”. Available online.  
<http://www.efe.or.th/>
- [4] Ying Zhuang, Song-Wei Wu and et al.. 2007. Source separation of household waste: A case study in China. Waste Management, In Press, Corrected Proof.
- [5] Ruihong Zhang, Hamed M. El-Mashad and et al.. 2007 . Characterization of food waste as feedstock for anaerobic digestion. Bioresource Technology. Volume 98. Issue 4. pp. 929-935
- [6] P.J. Shaw and S.J. Maynard. 2007. The potential of financial incentives to enhance householders' kerbside recycling behaviour . Waste Management, In Press, Corrected Proof.
- [7] R.E. Timlett and I.D. Williams. 2008. Public participation and recycling performance in England: A comparison of tools for behavior change. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, Volume 52. Issue 4. pp. 622-634
- [8] Grodzinska-Jurczak, M. and et al.. 2003. Increasing participation in rational municipal waste management,a case study analysis in Jaslo City (Poland). Resources, Conservation and Recycling, Volume 38, Issue 1,pp. 67-88 .
- [9] Thailand State of Pollution. Annual Report 2008. Pollution Control Department . Ministry of Natural resources and environment . pp. 18, 20
- [10] Foster, G. M . 1973 . Tradition Societies and Technological Change. New york: Harper & Row . pp 146-147
- [11] Roger, E. M. 1983 . Diffusion of Innovation. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New york: The free Press. pp.75- 77
- [12] Roger, E. M. and F . F . Shoemaker . 1971 Communication of Innovation: A Cultural Approach, New york: The free Press. pp. 26
- [13] Turner, John .B.1981. Philippe Encyclopedia of Social Work . Washington D.C. : Nation Association of Social Workers .

- [14] Wolman, Benjamin B. 1975. Dictionary of Behavioral Science, London: Linton Educational Publishing. pp. 38
- [15] Bloom, Benjamin S. 1973. Handbook of Formative and Summative of Student Learning. New York: Mc Graw Hill Book Company. pp.271
- [16] Good, Carter V. 1973. Dictionary of Education. New York: Mc Graw Hill Book Company. pp.54
- [17] Breckler, S.W.. 1986. Attitude Structure and Function. Hillsdale. NJ: L. Erlbaum Association.
- [18] Miller G.R. and Burgoon M.. 1973. New Techniques of Persuasion. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- [19] Plantaowat A. 1994. Communication Procedural Techniques for Persuasion. Chulalongkorn Publisher.
- [20] Qaism, S.R. and Walter, C. 1994. Sanitary Landfill Leachate Generation, Control and Treatment, United States of America.
- [21] Tchobanoglous, G., Theisen, H. and Vigil, s. 1993. Integrated Solid Waste Management Issues. McGraw-Hill. Singapore.
- [22] Polprasert , B. 1996. Organic Waste Recycling Second Edition. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- [23] Lens, P., Hamelers, B. and et al. 2004. Resources Recovery and Reuse in Organic Solid Waste Management. IWA Publishing. pp. 101
- [24] Hosmer and Lemeshow. 2000. Applied Logistic Regression Second Edition. New York: A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [25] Montgomery, D.C., Peck, E.A. and Vining, G.G. 2001. Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., London: A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [26] Greene W.H.. 2000. Economic Analysis. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- [27] Thailand State of Pollution Report 2005. Pollution Control Department. Ministry of Natural resources and environment. pp. 59-61
- [28] Department of Highways. Ministry of Transport. Available online: <http://map-server.doh.go.th/>
- [29] Office of Nation Economic and Social Development Board. "Gross regional and Provincial Products 2006". Available online: <http://www.nesdb.go.th/Default.aspx?tabid=96>

- [30] Tourism Authority of Thailand. “Domestic Tourism Statistics 2006”. Available online:  
<http://www2.tat.or.th>
- [31] Information system of province. Ministry of Interior. Available online :  
<http://www.moi.go.th>
- [32] Yamane, Taro. 1967. Statistic: an introductory analysis. 2 nd. New york: Harper & Row,  
1967.
- [33] Office of Nation Economics and Social Development Board. “Nation Income of  
Thailand” Available online: <http://www.nesdb.go.th/Default.aspx?tabid=94>
- [34] Long, J. Scott. Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent variables.  
Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1997.
- [35] Office of Nakornratcha Srima Metropolitan. “Summarize data”. Available online:  
<http://www.koratcity.net/>

## **Appendix A: Questionnaire**

### **Part 1 Personal Information and Socio-economic Data**

#### ***1.1 Personal Factor***

1. Gender ( ) 0. Male ( ) 1. Female
2. Age (years)  
( ) 1. < 19 ( ) 2. 20-29 ( ) 3. 30-39 ( ) 4. 40-49  
( ) 5. 50-59 ( ) 6. 60-69 ( ) 7. 70 up
3. Max-level of Education  
( ) 1. Primary School or under (Grade 0-6) ( ) 2. High School or under (Grade 7-12)  
( ) 3. Bachelor Degree and higher
4. Average income ( Baht/month)  
( ) 1. < 4,500 ( ) 2. 4,501-7,000 ( ) 3. 7,001-10,000  
( ) 4. 10,001 -20,000 ( ) 5. 20,001-30,000 ( ) 6. 30,001-40,000 ( ) 7.  
>40,001
5. Type of major occupation  
( ) 0. Owner/ uncertainly income & time < Agriculture, Business, general labor>  
( ) 1. Employee/Certainly income& time < Government, Company, Student>
6. Second occupation? ( ) 0. No ( ) 1. Yes
7. Social status or member of community group ( Develop community base group)  
( ) 0. No any member and Never been any member ( ) 1. Had been or present member

#### ***1.2 Household data***

1. Do you have Housekeeper or Unemployed Mom in household?  
( ) 1. No ( ) 2. Yes
2. Household's number (include answer).....
4. Household Domicile (Living period in area)  
( ) 1.<2 yr. ( ) 2. 3-5 yr ( ) 3. 6-10 yr. ( ) 4. 11 -20 yr. ( ) 5. 21-30 yr. ( ) 6. >31 yr.
- 5 .Please identify your house's type.  
( ) 1. Apartment/ Condominium/ Room  
( ) 2. Town house  
( ) 3. Commercial building  
( ) 4. Detached house
6. Residential status  
( ) 0. Renter ( ) 1. Owner
7. Do you have an idea of move house's location within next two years or short period?  
( ) 1. No ( ) 2. Uncertain/Maybe ( ) 3 Yes

## **Part 2 Knowledge and waste Management Behavior**

### **2.1 Knowledge and waste Management Data**

1. Did you get any information and knowledge of Household's waste management? If you get, please specific issue, source, and frequency (Answer 1 item or more)

( ) 1. No      ( ) 2. Yes (Please specify data type)

Please specify information sources and frequency

( ) .1 Neighborhood or closed person ( ) .2 Internet ( ) .3 Radio/community's radio

( ) .4 Television ( ) .5 Document media or books, leaflet ( ) .6 Government agencies

( ) .7 Private agencies ( ) .8 Others.....

2. Please identify waste type, re-used method, and disposal method. (Max score = 50 point)

Categories	Type( 1 point/ item)			Re-use, specific ( 2 point/ item)		Disposal ( 2 point/ item)		
	Wet	Dry	Hazardous	Yes	No	Burning	Landfill	Others
1. Food scraps								
2. Paper								
3. Glass								
4. Ceramic								
5. Dry battery								
6. Light tube								
7. Plastic bottle								
8. Remnant of iron/Metal								
9. Manure								
10. Dry bio-mass								

### **2.2 Waste Disposal Behavior**

1. Waste volume in Household ..... Kg/day

2. Frequency of waste discharge ..... time/week

3. Did you ever separate Recyclable from other before disposal?  
(Answer in level of frequency)

Never, 1 < Sometime, 2 < Often, 3 < Regularly, 4

4 Did you ever separate Bio-waste < organic, yard) from other before disposal?  
(Answer in level of frequency)

Never, 1 < Sometime, 2 < Often, 3 < Regularly, 4

5. What is your waste minimization behavior?

Level of frequency: Never, 1 < Sometime, 2 < Often, 3 < Regularly, 4

Comment	1	2	3	4
1. Reject, canceled of unnecessary i.e. plastic bag & bottle, paper etc.				
2. Repair, fix and develop i.e. clothes, television, computer, chair etc.				
3. Re-use, used of goods in second time i.e. paper, glass bottle etc				

6. What is your opinion for Bio-waste separation?

Level of attitude:

- 1 = strongly disagree
- 2 = disagree
- 3 = uncertain
- 4 = agree
- 5 = strongly agree

Comment	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Group 1: Attitude on awareness</b>					
1. The separation is good for environmental i.e. global warming, pollution.					
2. The separation can reduce area of landfill method.					
3. The separation can reduce cost of community's waste management.					
<b>Group 2: Attitude on economic incentive</b>					
1. The separation can't increase income to your family in explicitly					
2. Price value is not significantly influence for your separation practice					
3. You will perform separation, although unclearly foresee a benefit					
<b>Group 3: Satisfaction of management and service system</b>					
1. The number of separated bin and Bio-waste discharged point					
2. The frequency of waste collection by municipality office.					
3. A campaign of knowledge enhancement and information dissemination of Bio-waste separation.					
<b>Group 4: Obstacle</b>					
1. Household which generated less volume is unnecessary to separation					
2. The separation is a wasting time, because collector mixed together in transportation process.					
3. The waste separation is the role of curbsides men					

### Part 3 A Creation of Cooperation of Prototype Community Network on Bio-waste Separation for Generating Energy Project

1. Attitude to acceptance and participation in Cooperation of Prototype Community Network on Bio-waste Separation for Generating Energy Project.

Level of attitude:

- 1 = strongly disagree
- 2 = disagree
- 3 = uncertain
- 4 = agree
- 5 = strongly agree



Factors	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Project acceptance : Perception stage</b>					
1. Bio-waste separation is necessary and importance practice					
2. Family is the first key unit for Bio-waste separation.					
3. Bio-waste separation can increase efficiency of Bio-waste to energy.					
4. Cooperation of Bio-waste separation from community's member can increase project productivity and reduce project cost.					
5. You know the problem on environment, global warming, and energy					
<b>Project acceptance : Incentive Stage</b>					
1. You will get a benefit of re-use bio-waste such as manure, Bio-gas, including electricity generating and sale.					
2. You will indirectly contribute in reducing of environment problem and global warming as well as energy shortage by Bio-waste separation.					
3. You frequently obtain information of environment problem, global warming, and energy shortage.					
4. You know waste separation especially Bio-waste will reduce environment problem, global warming, and energy shortage.					
5. You will perform the Bio-waste separation, if can get benefit directly.					
<b>Project acceptance : Decision making stage</b>					
1. You are willing to participate in training course and campaign program for your capacity building and increasing efficiency of Bio-waste separation					
2. You will try to find information of generating energy from Bio-waste.					
3. You will discuss among you family's member about Bio-waste separation and Bio-waste Separation for Generating Energy Project.					
4. You are willing to try to separate Bio-waste or others waste on daily life.					
5. You are willing to participate in public hearing or making comment, if community network on Bio-waste separation is established.					
<b>Project acceptance : Application stage</b>					
1. After this, you will separate waste before each putting in each type of bin.					
2. You will realize on Bio-waste and try to separate it from others waste for increasing efficiency of converting Bio-waste to energy.					
3. You will separate Bio-waste in daily life basis for increasing efficiency of converting Bio-waste to generating energy project.					
4. You are willing to participate in project and community network of Bio-waste separation for generating energy project.					
5. You will develop your knowledge on Bio-waste separation and monitoring this useful project.					
<b>Project acceptance : Insistency stage</b>					
1. You will introduce benefit from waste separation specialty Bio-waste to neighbors or closed person.					
2. If you have to spend more time and cost, you will be willing to separated					
3. If the direct benefit is less to you, you will be willing to separation.					
4. You will try to find other ways for using separated waste beyond project.					
5. If there is no direct benefit to you in future, you will continuous separate					

## Appendix B: Result of analysis

B-1: Descriptive analysis of variable in all study area

Code	Definition	Characteristic	All Entries (n=1,600)	Type of City (n = 400/type)		
				*AGR	*IND	*TOU
ED	Level of education	Bachelor or more	16.69%	9.50%	16.50%	22.50%
IC	Personal income	Over nation average	40.06%	21.00%	38.00%	57.00%
MO	Major occupation	Employee	41.44%	29.50%	60.75%	34.25%
MS	Member of community group	Ever or present	44.75%	49.50%	31.75%	46.50%
LP	Living period in area	Old comer,>10 yrs	52.44%	83.00%	34.25%	44.75%
HS	Space of house	High space	53.69%	78.00%	38.75%	45.25%
FZ	Family size (Number of person)	Average number	4.30	4.81	3.85	4.25
KW	Knowledge of waste separation	Average score	32.72	31.64	32.75	33.73
MP	Minimization practice	Regularly or often	80.69%	86.50%	76.75%	79.50%
RP	Recyclable separation practice	Regularly or often	39.69%	29.25%	32.50%	55.75%
A1	Awareness for separate	Concern or good	58.81%	61.00%	48.75%	67.00%
A2	Economic incentive for separate	Ignore	62.56%	77.75%	46.00%	64.00%
A3	Management and service system	Satisfaction	46.19%	51.75%	37.50%	47.25%
A4	Attitude on obstacle for separate	Agree	52.63%	62.25%	75.50%	22.50%
SEP_B	Bio-waste separation practice	Regular or often	35.44%	38.50%	36.00%	32.00%
ACCEPT	Acceptance with B2E	Acceptable	63.25%	61.25%	39.00%	85.50%

\*AGR = Agriculture City, IND= Industrial City, TOU= Tourist City and COM= Commercial City

## B-2: Result of Binary logistic analysis of SEP\_B on agriculture city

Dependent Variable: SEP\_B

Method: ML - Binary Logit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Date: 12/08/10 Time: 11:13

Sample: 1 400

Included observations: 400

Convergence achieved after 4 iterations

Covariance matrix computed using second derivatives

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	-2.072011	0.827957	-2.502558	0.0123
ED	-0.607331	0.409872	-1.481758	0.1384
IC	0.630885	0.277437	2.273974	0.0230
MO	0.622523	0.262242	2.373848	0.0176
MS	-0.412023	0.235748	-1.747726	0.0805
LP	-0.448508	0.316057	-1.419074	0.1559
HS	-0.396944	0.272100	-1.458817	0.1446
FZ	-0.016778	0.077002	-0.217887	0.8275
KW	0.045651	0.015320	2.979798	0.0029
MP	1.119638	0.373080	3.001065	0.0027
RP	0.733865	0.244987	2.995528	0.0027
A1	-0.065051	0.252616	-0.257508	0.7968
A2	0.191704	0.315386	0.607839	0.5433
A3	-0.544558	0.246184	-2.211999	0.0270
A4	-0.308913	0.249336	-1.238944	0.2154
Mean dependent var	0.385000	S.D. dependent var	0.487205	
S.E. of regression	0.471512	Akaike info criterion	1.309831	
Sum squared resid	85.59462	Schwarz criterion	1.459511	
Log likelihood	-246.9663	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.369107	
Restr. log likelihood	-266.5836	Avg. log likelihood	-0.617416	
LR statistic (14 df)	39.23459	McFadden R-squared	0.073588	
Probability(LR stat)	0.000335			
Obs with Dep=0	246	Total obs	400	
Obs with Dep=1	154			

### B-3: Result of Binary logistic analysis of ACEPT on agriculture city

Dependent Variable: ACEPT

Method: ML - Binary Logit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Date: 12/08/10 Time: 11:14

Sample: 1 400

Included observations: 400

Convergence achieved after 4 iterations

Covariance matrix computed using second derivatives

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	5.790923	0.983993	5.885124	0.0000
ED	0.432957	0.436806	0.991188	0.3216
IC	0.067885	0.297159	0.228445	0.8193
MO	0.099218	0.278314	0.356495	0.7215
MS	-0.005819	0.244442	-0.023805	0.9810
LP	-0.720357	0.343516	-2.097009	0.0360
HS	-0.563505	0.290701	-1.938434	0.0526
FZ	0.070737	0.081638	0.866470	0.3862
KW	-0.063826	0.016240	-3.930071	0.0001
MP	-1.933113	0.477383	-4.049394	0.0001
RP	-0.137299	0.256432	-0.535421	0.5924
A1	-0.694073	0.267993	-2.589891	0.0096
A2	0.004028	0.330293	0.012194	0.9903
A3	-0.219448	0.254287	-0.862990	0.3881
A4	-0.526728	0.259265	-2.031621	0.0422
Mean dependent var	0.612500	S.D. dependent var	0.487790	
S.E. of regression	0.451357	Akaike info criterion	1.218638	
Sum squared resid	78.43344	Schwarz criterion	1.368318	
Log likelihood	-228.7277	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.277913	
Restr. log likelihood	-267.0467	Avg. log likelihood	-0.571819	
LR statistic (14 df)	76.63802	McFadden R-squared	0.143492	
Probability(LR stat)	1.18E-10			
Obs with Dep=0	155	Total obs	400	
Obs with Dep=1	245			

#### B-4: Result of Binary logistic analysis of SEP\_B on industrial city

Dependent Variable: SEP\_B

Method: ML - Binary Logit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Date: 12/08/10 Time: 11:16

Sample: 1 400

Included observations: 400

Convergence achieved after 4 iterations

Covariance matrix computed using second derivatives

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	-0.371316	0.680168	-0.545917	0.5851
ED	0.176812	0.369739	0.478209	0.6325
IC	-0.307888	0.284596	-1.081841	0.2793
MO	0.087832	0.234587	0.374412	0.7081
MS	-0.019446	0.244029	-0.079689	0.9365
LP	-0.048871	0.240121	-0.203525	0.8387
HS	-0.928695	0.248125	-3.742856	0.0002
FZ	0.010801	0.073764	0.146432	0.8836
KW	-0.007211	0.014294	-0.504495	0.6139
MP	-0.017744	0.265205	-0.066908	0.9467
RP	0.278192	0.249740	1.113928	0.0456
A1	1.027006	0.234682	4.376157	0.0000
A2	-0.302601	0.232971	-1.298879	0.5780
A3	0.194767	0.228710	0.851590	0.0876
A4	-0.225218	0.258614	-0.870868	0.3838
Mean dependent var	0.360000	S.D. dependent var	0.480601	
S.E. of regression	0.465580	Akaike info criterion	1.282501	
Sum squared resid	83.45434	Schwarz criterion	1.432181	
Log likelihood	-241.5002	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.341776	
Restr. log likelihood	-261.3673	Avg. log likelihood	-0.603751	
LR statistic (14 df)	39.73412	McFadden R-squared	0.076012	
Probability(LR stat)	0.000281			
Obs with Dep=0	256	Total obs	400	
Obs with Dep=1	144			

## B-5: Result of Binary logistic analysis of ACEPT on industrial city

Dependent Variable: ACEPT

Method: ML - Binary Logit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Date: 12/08/10 Time: 11:16

Sample: 1 400

Included observations: 400

Convergence achieved after 4 iterations

Covariance matrix computed using second derivatives

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.314036	0.658464	0.476923	0.6334
ED	-0.144874	0.351158	-0.412560	0.6799
IC	-0.013558	0.267983	-0.050594	0.9596
MO	0.406153	0.225910	1.797851	0.0722
MS	0.049029	0.231033	0.212215	0.8319
LP	0.338865	0.226915	1.493361	0.1353
HS	-0.245252	0.228769	-1.072049	0.2837
FZ	0.006929	0.070691	0.098017	0.9219
KW	-0.012143	0.013756	-0.882757	0.3774
MP	-0.339012	0.248886	-1.362118	0.1732
RP	-0.261252	0.238453	-1.095613	0.2732
A1	-0.089035	0.220697	-0.403425	0.6866
A2	-0.440782	0.221607	-1.989024	0.0467
A3	-0.257757	0.222222	-1.159909	0.2461
.A4	0.027299	0.252178	0.108251	0.9138
Mean dependent var	0.390000	S.D. dependent var	0.488361	
S.E. of regression	0.486439	Akaike info criterion	1.367975	
Sum squared resid	91.09980	Schwarz criterion	1.517655	
Log likelihood	-258.5949	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.427250	
Restr. log likelihood	-267.4992	Avg. log likelihood	-0.646487	
LR statistic (14 df)	17.80858	McFadden R-squared	0.033287	
Probability(LR stat)	0.215639			
Obs with Dep=0	244	Total obs	400	
Obs with Dep=1	156			

**B-6:** Result of Binary logistic analysis of SEP\_B on tourist city

Dependent Variable: SEP\_B

Method: ML - Binary Logit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Date: 12/08/10 Time: 11:17

Sample: 1 400

Included observations: 400

Convergence achieved after 4 iterations

Covariance matrix computed using second derivatives

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.026227	0.783954	0.033455	0.9733
ED	-0.105318	0.276162	-0.381362	0.7029
IC	0.399378	0.231794	1.722990	0.0849
MO	0.251354	0.237347	1.059014	0.2896
MS	-0.270096	0.229104	-1.178921	0.2384
LP	-0.044860	0.233598	-0.192038	0.8477
HS	-0.951773	0.236528	-4.023939	0.0001
FZ	-0.062198	0.081181	-0.766163	0.4436
KW	-0.000596	0.015843	-0.037637	0.9700
MP	-0.371427	0.273851	-1.356311	0.1000
RP	0.201022	0.231056	0.870016	0.0832
A1	0.129332	0.244016	0.530016	0.5961
A2	-0.211193	0.235757	-0.895809	0.3704
A3	-0.237498	0.231613	-1.025410	0.3052
A4	0.284288	0.266946	1.064965	0.2869
Mean dependent var	0.320000	S.D. dependent var	0.467060	
S.E. of regression	0.455833	Akaike info criterion	1.246549	
Sum squared resid	79.99673	Schwarz criterion	1.396229	
Log likelihood	-234.3098	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.305824	
Restr. log likelihood	-250.7478	Avg. log likelihood	-0.585774	
LR statistic (14 df)	32.87602	McFadden R-squared	0.065556	
Probability(LR stat)	0.003002			
Obs with Dep=0	272	Total obs	400	
Obs with Dep=1	128			

## B-7: Result of Binary logistic analysis of ACEPT on tourist city

Dependent Variable: ACEPT

Method: ML - Binary Logit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Date: 12/08/10 Time: 11:18

Sample: 1 400

Included observations: 400

Convergence achieved after 4 iterations

Covariance matrix computed using second derivatives

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	3.042442	1.061427	2.866369	0.0042
ED	-0.978996	0.323090	-3.030108	0.0024
IC	0.453809	0.295545	1.535498	0.7632
MO	-0.279468	0.305886	-0.913637	0.3609
MS	0.084053	0.298101	0.281961	0.7780
LP	-0.083024	0.309915	-0.267891	0.7888
HS	0.120690	0.299349	0.403176	0.6868
FZ	-0.037976	0.104420	-0.363680	0.7161
KW	-0.027655	0.021788	-1.269312	0.2043
MP	0.314566	0.348640	0.902266	0.3669
RP	-0.184315	0.302066	-0.610182	0.5417
A1	-0.362797	0.325110	-1.115923	0.0876
A2	0.079557	0.307491	0.258729	0.7958
A3	0.110355	0.303948	0.363072	0.7166
A4	-0.287445	0.345442	-0.832106	0.1287
Mean dependent var	0.855000	S.D. dependent var	0.352542	
S.E. of regression	0.351199	Akaike info criterion	0.861508	
Sum squared resid	47.48614	Schwarz criterion	1.011188	
Log likelihood	-157.3016	Hannan-Quinn criter.	0.920783	
Restr. log likelihood	-165.5749	Avg. log likelihood	-0.393254	
LR statistic (14 df)	16.54657	McFadden R-squared	0.049967	
Probability(LR stat)	0.281147			
Obs with Dep=0	58	Total obs	400	
Obs with Dep=1	342			

**B-8:** Result of Binary logistic analysis of SEP\_B on commercial city

Dependent Variable: SEP\_B

Method: ML - Binary Logit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Date: 12/08/10 Time: 11:21

Sample: 1 400

Included observations: 400

Convergence achieved after 3 iterations

Covariance matrix computed using second derivatives

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.036143	0.647537	0.055816	0.9555
ED	-0.200140	0.294420	-0.679777	0.4966
IC	-0.177234	0.228162	-0.776787	0.4373
MO	0.287094	0.230980	1.242940	0.2139
MS	0.037786	0.220060	0.171706	0.8637
LP	-0.289172	0.226318	-1.277725	0.2013
HS	-0.789058	0.223169	-3.535693	0.0004
FZ	-0.057440	0.070834	-0.810908	0.4174
KW	-0.006784	0.013780	-0.492308	0.6225
MP	0.198261	0.284304	0.697356	0.4856
RP	-0.028499	0.230053	-0.123880	0.9014
A1	0.407605	0.234655	1.737037	0.0824
A2	-0.125174	0.232381	-0.538658	0.0680
A3	-0.029586	0.220497	-0.134180	0.8933
A4	0.040180	0.230113	0.174608	0.8614
Mean dependent var	0.352500	S.D. dependent var	0.478347	
S.E. of regression	0.469809	Akaike info criterion	1.306302	
Sum squared resid	84.97747	Schwarz criterion	1.455982	
Log likelihood	-246.2604	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.365577	
Restr. log likelihood	-259.5922	Avg. log likelihood	-0.615651	
LR statistic (14 df)	26.66370	McFadden R-squared	0.051357	
Probability(LR stat)	0.021285			
Obs with Dep=0	259	Total obs	400	
Obs with Dep=1	141			

**B-9:** Result of Binary logistic analysis of ACEPT on commercial city

Dependent Variable: ACEPT

Method: ML - Binary Logit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Date: 12/08/10 Time: 11:21

Sample: 1 400

Included observations: 400

Convergence achieved after 4 iterations

Covariance matrix computed using second derivatives

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	2.797613	0.737757	3.792054	0.0001
ED	-0.053993	0.315333	-0.171226	0.8640
IC	0.863517	0.254024	3.399350	0.0007
MO	-0.714335	0.246009	-2.903698	0.0037
MS	-0.112893	0.238885	-0.472585	0.6365
LP	-0.054899	0.243562	-0.225402	0.8217
HS	-0.269352	0.244425	-1.101982	0.2705
FZ	0.108355	0.077178	1.403958	0.5498
KW	-0.019454	0.015304	-1.271235	0.2036
MP	-0.377644	0.315060	-1.198640	0.2307
RP	0.211470	0.252349	0.838008	0.4020
A1	-0.705205	0.256788	-2.746252	0.0060
A2	-0.193727	0.253273	-0.764891	0.0444
A3	-0.689749	0.238860	-2.887668	0.0039
A4	-1.056899	0.251793	-4.197488	0.0000
Mean dependent var	0.672500	S.D. dependent var	0.469889	
S.E. of regression	0.436934	Akaike info criterion	1.166837	
Sum squared resid	73.50096	Schwarz criterion	1.316517	
Log likelihood	-218.3675	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.226113	
Restr. log likelihood	-252.9576	Avg. log likelihood	-0.545919	
LR statistic (14 df)	69.18027	McFadden R-squared	0.136743	
Probability(LR stat)	2.72E-09			
Obs with Dep=0	131	Total obs	400	
Obs with Dep=1	269			

## **Appendix C: Detail of incentive mechanism**

Normally, Bio-waste has not value in the recycling market. From the metropolitan's evaluation, has calculated the cost of separation of Bio-waste prior to disposal system is 450 baht per ton with a thought as well as from collection, transportation, including separation by machines and workers. Therefore, the potential for separation at source activity can help reduce costs and the system can continue to be sustainable. In this research, the concept that the cost must be paid in the application of the separation by incentive mechanism for the networking community is 200 baht per ton. This is acceptable as a standard of prototype.

### **- Reward Mechanism**

Awards will be determined by the potential of each community work. The reward is that communities will receive prize money, which will provide the Board of community for utility with activities. The time trial will take a total of 30 days criteria of rewards as following.

1. Based on Volume of Bio-waste and calculation as volume per household per day. The awards criteria are divided into 5 levels as follows.

- Communities that can separate Bio-waste in the average level between 0.41-0.50 kg / day / household that will receive the Level 1 prize money is 2,500 baht and 500 baht to award any additional average 0.1 kg / day / household, increased from 0.51 kg / day / family.

- Communities that can separate Bio-waste in the average level between 0.31-0.40 kg / day / household that will receive the Level 2 prize money is 2,000 baht

- Communities that can separate Bio-waste in the average level between 0.21-0.30 kg / day / household that will receive the Level 3 prize money is 1,500 baht

- Communities that can separate Bio-waste in the average level between 0.11-0.20 kg / day / household that will receive the Level 4 prize money is 1,000 baht

- Communities that can separate Bio-waste in the average level between 0.05-0.10 kg / day / household that will receive the Level 5 prize money is 500 baht

\*\* The community can separate Bio-waste in the average levels of most will receive a special award additional 500 baht.

2. Based on the percentage of Bio-waste in normal trash. The awards criteria are divided into 5 levels as follows.

- Communities can reduce the proportion of trash between 4.1-5.0% during the first phase (Voluntary Mechanism) will receive awards at level 1 is 2,000 baht and 100 baht to award every 1% increase can be reduced by 5.0% from the level.

- Communities can reduce the proportion of trash between 3.1-4.0% during the first phase (Voluntary Mechanism) will receive awards at level 2 is 1,500 baht

- Communities can reduce the proportion of trash between 2.1-3.0% during the first phase (Voluntary Mechanism) will receive awards at level 3 is 1,000 baht

- Communities can reduce the proportion of trash between 1.1-2.0% during the first phase (Voluntary Mechanism) will receive awards at level 4 is 500 baht

- Communities can reduce the proportion of trash between 0.5-1.0% during the first phase (Voluntary Mechanism) will receive awards at level 5 is 200 baht

\*\* The community can reduce percentage of Bio-waste in the average levels of most will receive a special award additional 500 baht.

#### **- Community Business Mechanism**

The purchase will be calculated from the total weight of each community to be separated in 1 month and purchased at a price of 200 baht per ton.

**Appendix D: Detail of data collection** (Bold and italic front is weekend day)

**D-1: Volume of Bio-waste in Bio-waste collector tank (Vbs)**

Day	Voluntary Mechanism				
	Community				
	HCC	LCC	MCC	NCC	Amount
1	372	276	260	112	1,020
2	219	240	286	117	862
3	237	266	207	91	801
<b>4</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>1,001</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>838</b>
6	148	196	266	141	751
7	298	280	316	126	1,020
8	189	205	391	151	936
9	229	286	279	132	926
10	264	383	371	112	1,130
<b>11</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>1,168</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1,053</b>
13	259	402	608	179	1,448
14	251	431	195	73	950
15	226	259	286	111	882
16	172	256	329	159	916
17	216	381	292	119	1,008
<b>18</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1,146</b>
<b>19</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>1,170</b>
20	233	356	280	116	985
21	190	399	249	141	979
22	280	401	331	118	1,130
23	374	509	365	112	1,360
24	287	613	496	137	1,533
<b>25</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1,197</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>1,462</b>
27	298	279	350	133	1,060
28	280	828	672	124	1,904

Day	Reward Mechanism				
	Community				
	HCC	LCC	MCC	NCC	Amount
1	<b>230</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>1,433</b>
2	<b>245</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>1,225</b>
3	290	480	387	108	1,265
4	230	450	476	125	1,281
5	555	380	425	140	1,500
6	280	475	520	211	1,486
7	290	398	448	179	1,315
8	<b>312</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>1,163</b>
9	<b>226</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>1,492</b>
10	287	670	530	153	1,640
11	260	548	587	118	1,513
12	314	640	587	165	1,706
13	216	585	464	106	1,371
14	254	465	532	165	1,416
15	<b>441</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>894</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>2,260</b>
16	<b>244</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>1,962</b>
17	324	570	635	237	1,766
18	364	630	592	187	1,773
19	308	720	696	106	1,830
20	238	660	638	108	1,644
21	396	587	670	209	1,862
22	<b>423</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>1,781</b>
23	<b>293</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>1,463</b>
24	555	450	520	126	1,651
25	314	398	531	146	1,389
26	258	576	587	118	1,539
27	387	720	543	174	1,824
28	396	587	687	183	1,853

Day	Community Business Mechanism				
	Community				
	HCC	LCC	MCC	NCC	Amount
1	280	575	670	250	1,775
2	455	640	580	220	1,895
3	357	567	530	190	1,644
4	311	760	674	270	2,015
5	<b>299</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>1,790</b>
6	<b>370</b>	<b>740</b>	<b>685</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>2,075</b>
7	394	635	623	250	1,902
8	285	694	572	210	1,761
9	380	646	595	195	1,816
10	396	540	530	220	1,686
11	420	672	694	280	2,066
12	<b>387</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>1,878</b>
13	<b>348</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>1,510</b>
14	385	594	566	210	1,755
15	327	573	620	240	1,760
16	323	653	674	290	1,940
17	239	680	630	206	1,755
18	354	570	570	190	1,684
19	<b>559</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>1,899</b>
20	<b>610</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>2,050</b>
21	240	635	610	200	1,685
22	213	590	550	185	1,538
23	230	650	610	198	1,688
24	270	670	650	211	1,801
25	280	630	630	243	1,783
26	<b>260</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>1,750</b>
27	<b>240</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>1,803</b>
28	210	580	621	243	1,654

D-2: Proportion of waste components in Bio-waste collector tank (CBs)

Voluntary Mechanism (High Complex Community)																	
No.	Date	Time	Bin 1			Bin 2			Bin 3			Bin 4			Bin 5		
			Sample	Food	Yard												
1	1/7/2009	13.30	6.5	6.3	0.2	5.2	5.2	0.0	8.4	8.4	0.0	2.7	2.7	0.0	4.9	4.7	0.2
2	3/7/2009	15.00	7.8	7.2	0.6	5.1	5.1	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0	8.6	6.8	1.8	5.8	4.9	0.9
3	5/7/2009	12.00	5.6	5.2	0.4	3.2	3.1	0.1	5.6	5.0	0.6	5.8	5.8	0.0	3.9	3.9	0.0
4	14/7/2009	12.00	5.6	5.6	0.0	3.9	3.9	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	7.2	6.0	1.2	8.4	5.8	2.6
5	16/7/2009	13.30	3.2	2.8	0.4	8.4	8.4	0.0	4.5	3.5	1.0	5.2	4.5	0.7	3.4	2.6	0.8
6	19/7/2009	16.30	3.9	3.9	0.0	3.4	3.2	0.2	5.1	3.5	1.6	5.6	4.9	0.7	5.6	4.3	1.3
7	26/7/2009	15.00	8.4	8.4	0.0	5.6	5.2	0.4	5.2	4.7	0.5	7.4	7.4	0.0	5.8	4.7	1.1
8	28/7/2009	16.30	3.4	2.3	1.1	3.0	2.8	0.2	7.5	7.5	0.0	5.8	5.8	0.0	2.3	1.5	0.8
9	29/7/2009	13.30	10.6	9.3	1.3	5.0	5.0	0.0	3.4	3.0	0.4	4.8	4.3	0.5	4.5	4.5	0.0
Amount / Bin			55.0	51.0	4.0	42.8	41.9	0.9	46.1	42.0	4.1	53.1	48.2	4.9	44.6	36.9	7.7
Overall			241.6	220	21.6												
Percentage			91.06	8.94													

## Voluntary Mechanism (Moderate Complex Community)

## Voluntary Mechanism (Non Complex Community)

Summary Mechanism (on Complex Community)																	
No.	Date	Time	Bin 1			Bin 2			Bin 3			Bin 4			Bin 5		
			Food	Sample	Yard	Food	Sample										
1	1/7/2009	15.00	5.6	0.6	7.4	7.4	0.0	4.5	4.3	0.2	10.9	9.7	1.2	3.9	3.9	0.0	
2	3/7/2009	16.30	2.9	0.0	8.4	8.4	0.0	7.4	7.4	0.0	7.7	7.7	0.0	7.5	7.2	0.3	
3	<b>5/7/2009</b>	<b>13.30</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	
4	14/7/2009	13.30	4.5	0.0	8.4	5.6	2.8	5.7	4.4	1.3	5.1	4.8	0.3	5.6	5.6	0.0	
5	16/7/2009	15.00	5.0	4.5	0.5	11.5	0.0	7.9	7.9	0.0	5.2	5.2	0.0	5.6	5.0	0.6	
6	<b>19/7/2009</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>		
7	<b>26/7/2009</b>	<b>16.30</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	
8	28/7/2009	12.00	6.7	0.0	7.8	7.0	0.8	7.5	6.8	0.7	4.8	4.8	0.0	8.6	7.7	0.9	
9	29/7/2009	15.00	8.4	8.4	0.0	12.4	0.0	3.2	2.6	0.6	7.4	7.4	0.0	4.3	4.3	0.0	
<b>Amount / Bin</b>			52.8	51.1	1.7	72.6	68.5	4.1	54.9	52.1	2.8	54.8	52.3	2.5	50.5	48.7	1.8
<b>Overall</b>			285.6	272.7	12.9												
															95.48	4.52	





## Community Business Mechanism (High Complex Community)

Community Business Mechanism (Low Complex Community)



D-3: Percentage of Bio-waste in normal trash (BWs)

Pre-Project								
High Complex Community								
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg.)	Non-Recycle (Kg.)	Organic (Kg.)		
1	6/5/2009	13.30	20.8	5.3	4.3	11.2		
2	8/5/2009	15.00	18.6	4.2	4.2	10.2		
<b>3</b>	<b>10/5/2009</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>20.1</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>10.4</b>		
4	14/5/2009	12.00	18.4	4.4	3.8	10.2		
<b>5</b>	<b>17/5/2009</b>	<b>13.30</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>11.7</b>		
6	19/5/2009	16.30	19.1	4.2	4.1	10.8		
7	21/5/2009	15.00	20.1	4.1	3.9	12.1		
<b>8</b>	<b>24/5/2009</b>	<b>16.30</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>12.3</b>		
9	28/5/2009	13.30	18.0	4.2	4.4	9.4		
<b>Amount</b>			174.2	40.3	35.6	98.3		
<b>Percentage</b>			23.13	20.44	20.44	<b>56.43</b>		
Low Complex Community								
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg.)	Non-Recycle (Kg.)	Organic (Kg.)		
1	6/5/2009	16.30	17.6	3.2	3.5	10.9		
2	8/5/2009	12.00	19.1	3.8	4.3	11.0		
<b>3</b>	<b>10/5/2009</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>12.9</b>		
4	14/5/2009	15.00	20.7	3.4	4.6	12.7		
<b>5</b>	<b>17/5/2009</b>	<b>16.30</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>13.6</b>		
6	19/5/2009	13.30	18.4	3.5	4.5	10.4		
7	21/5/2009	12.00	18.5	3.3	4.5	10.7		
<b>8</b>	<b>24/5/2009</b>	<b>13.30</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>12.7</b>		
9	28/5/2009	16.30	19.4	3.1	4.6	11.7		
<b>Amount</b>			172.4	29.7	36.1	106.6		
<b>Percentage</b>			17.23	20.94	20.94	<b>61.83</b>		

Pre-Project						
Moderate Complex Community						
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg)	Recyclable (Kg)	Non-Recycle (Kg)	Organic (Kg)
1	6/5/2009	12.00	19.1	3.4	3.6	12.1
2	8/5/2009	13.30	19.0	4.2	3.9	10.9
<b>3</b>	<b>10/5/2009</b>	<b>16.30</b>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>12.9</b>
4	14/5/2009	16.30	19.4	3.6	3.1	12.7
<b>5</b>	<b>17/5/2009</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>13.6</b>
6	19/5/2009	15.00	17.9	3.7	3.1	11.1
7	21/5/2009	13.30	17.9	3.7	3.3	10.9
<b>8</b>	<b>24/5/2009</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>12.9</b>
9	28/5/2009	12.00	18.7	3.6	2.9	12.2
<b>Amount</b>			172.3	32.2	30.8	109.3
<b>Percentage</b>			18.69	17.88	17.88	<b>63.44</b>
Non Complex Community						
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg)	Non-Recycle (Kg)	Organic (Kg)
1	6/5/2009	15.00	19.9	4.3	5.3	10.3
2	8/5/2009	16.30	17.9	4.2	4.2	9.5
<b>3</b>	<b>10/5/2009</b>	<b>13.30</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>10.2</b>
4	14/5/2009	13.30	18.7	3.8	4.7	10.2
<b>5</b>	<b>17/5/2009</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>10.6</b>
6	19/5/2009	12.00	18.7	3.8	4.7	10.2
7	21/5/2009	16.30	19.3	3.6	5.2	10.5
<b>8</b>	<b>24/5/2009</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>11.4</b>
9	28/5/2009	15.00	17.7	4.1	4.2	9.4
<b>Amount</b>			168.8	34.1	42.4	92.3
<b>Percentage</b>			20.20	25.12	25.12	<b>54.68</b>

Voluntary Mechanism						
High Complex Community						
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg)	Non-Recycle (Kg)	Organic (Kg)
1	1/7/2009	13.30	19.3	5.3	4.3	9.7
2	3/7/2009	15.00	18.6	4.2	4.2	10.2
<b>3</b>	<b>5/7/2009</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>10.7</b>
4	14/7/2009	12.00	19.3	4.2	5.3	9.8
5	16/7/2009	13.30	19.3	4.4	5.3	9.6
<b>6</b>	<b>19/7/2009</b>	<b>16.30</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>10.8</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>26/7/2009</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>12.1</b>
8	28/7/2009	16.30	18.9	4.1	4.6	10.2
9	29/7/2009	13.30	17.4	4.4	4.4	8.6
<b>Amount</b>			172.3	40.8	39.8	91.7
<b>Percentage</b>				23.68	23.10	<b>53.22</b>
Low Complex Community						
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg)	Non-Recycle (Kg)	Organic (Kg)
1	1/7/2009	16.30	19.3	3.1	5.3	10.9
2	3/7/2009	12.00	18.6	4.4	4.4	9.8
<b>3</b>	<b>5/7/2009</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>10.3</b>
4	14/7/2009	15.00	19.9	4.4	5.7	9.8
5	16/7/2009	16.30	19.3	4.2	5.3	9.8
<b>6</b>	<b>19/7/2009</b>	<b>13.30</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>10.8</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>26/7/2009</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>12.2</b>
8	28/7/2009	13.30	19.0	3.9	4.9	10.2
9	29/7/2009	16.30	18.8	3.7	3.9	11.2
<b>Amount</b>			173.5	35.2	43.3	95.0
<b>Percentage</b>				20.29	24.96	<b>54.76</b>

Reward Mechanism						
High Complex Community						
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg)	Non-Recycle (Kg)	Organic (Kg)
1	2/8/2009	13.30	20.2	5.3	6.1	8.8
2	5/8/2009	15.00	18.0	4.2	4.2	9.6
3	7/8/2009	12.00	19.7	4.3	4.8	10.6
4	16/8/2009	12.00	18.7	4.2	4.2	10.3
5	18/8/2009	13.30	18.6	4.1	4.3	10.2
6	20/8/2009	16.30	19.5	4.7	5.2	9.6
7	23/8/2009	15.00	16.8	3.3	3.8	9.7
8	25/8/2009	16.30	18.4	4.1	4.1	10.2
9	28/8/2009	13.30	18.3	4.4	4.8	9.1
<b>Amount</b>			168.2	38.6	41.5	88.1
<b>Percentage</b>			22.95	24.67	52.38	
Low Complex Community						
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg)	Non-Recycle (Kg)	Organic (Kg)
1	2/8/2009	16.30	19.8	5.1	5.3	9.4
2	5/8/2009	12.00	19.7	4.2	6.2	9.3
3	7/8/2009	15.00	19.4	4.2	4.7	10.5
4	16/8/2009	15.00	18.6	4.7	4.2	9.7
5	18/8/2009	16.30	16.7	3.9	4.1	8.7
6	20/8/2009	13.30	17.4	3.3	4.7	9.4
7	23/8/2009	12.00	19.3	3.3	6.3	9.7
8	25/8/2009	13.30	17.3	3.2	5.7	8.4
9	28/8/2009	16.30	19.6	4.5	5.9	9.2
<b>Amount</b>			167.8	36.4	47.1	84.3
<b>Percentage</b>			21.69	28.07	50.24	

Reward Mechanism								
Moderate Complex Community								
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg.)	Non-Recycle (Kg.)	Organic (Kg)		
1	2/8/2009	12.00	19.3	4.4	4.6	10.3		
2	5/8/2009	13.30	19.9	5.3	5.2	9.4		
3	7/8/2009	16.30	18.2	4.2	4.4	9.6		
4	16/8/2009	16.30	18.6	4.7	4.2	9.7		
5	18/8/2009	12.00	18.1	4.6	4.8	8.7		
6	20/8/2009	15.00	18.5	4.8	5.2	8.5		
7	23/8/2009	13.30	18.5	3.3	6.3	8.9		
8	25/8/2009	15.00	19.2	5.3	5.2	8.7		
9	28/8/2009	12.00	20.0	5.7	6.1	8.2		
<b>Amount</b>			170.3	42.3	46.0	82.0		
<b>Percentage</b>			24.84	27.01	48.15			
Non Complex Community								
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg.)	Non-Recycle (Kg.)	Organic (Kg)		
1	2/8/2009	15.00	18.0	4.1	4.6	9.3		
2	5/8/2009	16.30	19.5	5.1	5.2	9.2		
3	7/8/2009	13.30	20.3	4.2	5.9	10.2		
4	16/8/2009	13.30	19.2	4.2	4.8	10.2		
5	18/8/2009	15.00	18.1	3.9	4.8	9.4		
6	20/8/2009	12.00	18.6	4.1	5.2	9.3		
7	23/8/2009	16.30	18.8	3.3	6.3	9.2		
8	25/8/2009	12.00	19.3	4.4	6.2	8.7		
9	28/8/2009	15.00	19.7	4.5	6.1	9.1		
<b>Amount</b>			171.5	37.8	49.1	84.6		
<b>Percentage</b>			22.04	28.63	49.33			

Community Business Mechanism						
High Complex Community						
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg)	Non-Recycle (Kg)	Organic (Kg)
1	4/9/2009	13.30	19.9	4.8	5.2	9.9
<b>2</b>	<b>6/9/2009</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>9.4</b>
3	8/9/2009	12.00	20.2	4.3	4.7	11.2
4	10/9/2009	12.00	19.1	4.6	4.8	9.7
<b>5</b>	<b>19/9/2009</b>	<b>13.30</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>9.8</b>
6	22/9/2009	16.30	20.4	4.3	4.7	11.4
7	24/9/2009	15.00	19.0	4.2	5.2	9.6
<b>8</b>	<b>27/9/2009</b>	<b>16.30</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>10.5</b>
9	29/9/2009	13.30	19.7	4.7	4.3	10.7
<b>Amount</b>			177.4	39.9	45.3	92.2
<b>Percentage</b>			22.49	25.54	51.97	
Low Complex Community						
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg)	Non-Recycle (Kg)	Organic (Kg)
1	4/9/2009	16.30	19.0	4.4	6.2	8.4
<b>2</b>	<b>6/9/2009</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>18.7</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>9.4</b>
3	8/9/2009	15.00	20.7	4.7	6.4	9.6
4	10/9/2009	15.00	19.7	3.7	5.9	10.1
<b>5</b>	<b>19/9/2009</b>	<b>16.30</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>9.7</b>
6	22/9/2009	13.30	20.4	4.7	6.3	9.4
7	24/9/2009	12.00	19.7	4.7	5.8	9.2
<b>8</b>	<b>27/9/2009</b>	<b>13.30</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>8.9</b>
9	29/9/2009	16.30	19.1	3.7	6.8	8.6
<b>Amount</b>			176.4	37.1	56.0	83.3
<b>Percentage</b>			21.03	31.75	47.22	

Community Business Mechanism					
Moderate Complex Community					
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg.)	Non-Recycle Organic (Kg.)
1	4/9/2009	12.00	17.1	4.4	5.4
2	<b>6/9/2009</b>	<b>13.30</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>5.9</b>
3	8/9/2009	16.30	19.9	4.6	6.4
4	10/9/2009	16.30	19.3	4.9	6.2
5	<b>19/9/2009</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>6.8</b>
6	22/9/2009	15.00	19.6	4.9	6.8
7	24/9/2009	13.30	18.8	5.2	5.8
8	<b>27/9/2009</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>5.9</b>
9	29/9/2009	12.00	19.2	4.9	6.2
<b>Amount</b>			171.1	40.5	55.4
<b>Percentage</b>			23.67	75.2	43.95
Non Complex Community					
No.	Date	Time	Sample Volume (Kg.)	Recyclable (Kg.)	Non-Recycle Organic (Kg.)
1	4/9/2009	15.00	19.4	4.1	6.7
2	<b>6/9/2009</b>	<b>16.30</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>7.2</b>
3	8/9/2009	13.30	19.3	4.2	6.9
4	10/9/2009	13.30	20.0	4.2	6.3
5	<b>19/9/2009</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>6.1</b>
6	22/9/2009	12.00	20.2	4.3	7.1
7	24/9/2009	16.30	19.6	3.9	6.8
8	<b>27/9/2009</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>6.8</b>
9	29/9/2009	15.00	18.8	4.5	6.2
<b>Amount</b>			175.1	35.8	60.1
<b>Percentage</b>			20.45	34.32	45.23



