ETC CE Working paper

Methodology for the EEA's input to the 'Early warning' Assessment – Municipal Solid Waste Preparing for Reuse and Recycling target

Authors:
Almut Reichel (EEA), Ann Van der Linden (VITO), Tom Duhoux (VITO), Malin zu Castell-Rudenhausen (VTT)

European Environment Agency
European Topic Centre
Circular economy and resource use

Cover design: EEA
Cover photo by Pawel Czerwinski on unsplash.com
Layout: ETC CE

Publication Date
Updated version 2022

EEA activity
Circular Economy and Resource Use

Legal notice
Preparation of this report has been funded by the European Environment Agency as part of a grant with the European Topic Centre on Circular economy and resource use (ETC CE) and expresses the views of the authors. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or opinion of the European Commission or other institutions of the European Union. Neither the European Environment Agency nor the European Topic Centre on Circular economy and resource use is liable for any consequence stemming from the reuse of the information contained in this publication.

ETC CE coordinator: Vlaamse Instelling voor Technologisch Onderzoek (VITO)

ETC CE partners: Banson Editorial and Communications Ltd, česká informační agentura životního prostředí (CENIA), Collaborating Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production (CSCP), Istituto Di Ricerca Sulla Crescita Economica Sostenibile, Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e Ricerca Ambiantale, IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, PlanMiljø, Universita Degli Studi Di Ferrara (SEEDS), Federal Environment Agency (UBA), Teknologian Tutkimuskeskus VTT oy, Wuppertal Institut für Klima, Umwelt, Energie gGmbH, World Resources Forum Association.

Copyright notice
© European Topic Centre on Circular economy and resource use, 2022
Reproduction is authorized provided the source is acknowledged. [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (International)]

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (http://europa.eu).

European Topic Centre on
Circular economy and resource use
eionet.europa.eu/etcs/etc-ce

Abbreviations and explanations

EEA	European Environment Agency
EC	European Commission
EPR	Extended Producer Responsibility
ETC/WMGE	European Topic Center / Waste and Materials in a Green Economy
ETC CE	European Topic Center on Circular Economy and Resource Use
MBT	Mechanical Biological Treatment
MS	(EU) Member States (European Union)
MSW(R)	Municipal Solid Waste (Recycling)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PAYT	Pay-as-you-throw
PET	Polyethylene terephthalate
PS	Polystyrene
QMS	Quality Management System
RR	Recycling Rate
SRF	Success/risk factor
WEEE	Waste Electric and Electronic Equipment
WFD	Waste Framework Directive
Questionnaire	One of the key sources for collecting information mentioned in the methodology is a questionnaire to MS, designed by the EEA and ETC/WMGE to collect information on a volutary basis.

Contents

Introduction

This document describes the methodology for the input of the EEA to the Early warning mechanism according to Art. 11b of the Waste Framework Directive (WFD), with the aim to assess the 27 Member States' prospects of meeting the **target to prepare for reuse and recycle 55 % of municipal waste generated by 2025** as defined in Art. 11(2c).

The methodology uses a set of 'success/risk factors' (SRFs). An SRF is assumed to influence the probability of meeting the target.

The assessment of each SRF is done through threshold values or qualitative assessment categories that categorize each factor into green, amber or red:

on track target reached favorable	additional effort needed medium uncertain	unfavorable highly uncertain no information

The risk assessment should indicate whether a country is at risk of not meeting the target. The 'total risk' categorization is the result of the sum of the individual scores of each SRF, where the assessment of each SRF results in a score of 2 points (green), 1 point (amber) or 0 points (red), depending on the assessment of the SRF. As some SRFs are considered to have a higher impact on meeting the target, the score of the SRF is multiplied by the defined weight of the SRF. This weighting factor is included in the description of the SRF. As some SRFs might not be applicable to all Member States (MS), only the SRFs relevant to the MS are taken into account to define the maximum score. A MS is considered to be 'not at risk' if its score is more than 50 % of this maximum score. A MS is considered to be 'at risk' if its score is less than 50 % of this maximum score.

In addition, a number of contextual parameters is analysed without color-coding. Although these contextual parameters are not 'scored', they are needed to get a deeper insight into the MSW management in the MS. As in some cases SRFs could be too rigid and therefore require expert judgement to properly assess them, the insights from the contextual parameters complemented with the information provided by the MS, help to substantiate this expert judgement.

Contents

Abbreviations and explanations 3

Introduction 4

2 Current situation and past trends 6

SRF MSWR-1.1 Distance to target 6

SRF MSWR-1.2 Past trend in municipal solid waste recycling rate 6

3 Legal instruments 7

SRF MSWR-2.1 Timely transposition of the revised Waste Framework Directive into national law . 7

SRF MSWR-2.2 Responsibilities for meeting the targets, and support and enforcement mechanisms, e.g. tools, fines etc. 8

4 Economic instruments 9

SRF MSWR-3.1 Taxes and/or ban for landfilling residual or biodegradable waste 9

SRF MSWR-3.2 Taxes on municipal waste incineration 9

SRF MSWR-3.3 Pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system 10

5 Separate collection systems 11

SRF MSWR-4.1 Convenience and coverage of separate collection systems for the different household waste fractions 11

SRF MSWR-4.2 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of separate collection for the different household waste fractions 13

6 EPR and similar schemes 15

SRF MSWR-5.1 Fee modulation in EPR schemes for packaging 15

7 Bio-waste treatment capacity and quality management 16

SRF MSWR-6.1 Capacity for the treatment of bio-waste 16

SRF MSWR-6.2 Legally binding national standards and Quality Management System for compost/digestate 16

8 Context parameters 17

8.1. Evolution of municipal waste generation and treatment 17

8.2. Legal Framework 17

8.3. Implementation of recommendations of the previous Early Warning report (2018) 17

8.4. Waste management plan(s) 17

8.5. Capture rates for recyclables 17

1 Current situation and past trends

SRF MSWR-1.1 Distance to target

Description and relevance
The actual distance to the target for the most recent data point is a key factor determining the likelihood of meeting/not meeting the target. The closer the MS is to the target already, the more likely it becomes that the MS will meet the target.
(MS might already report data according to the new rules in 2020 or 2021, otherwise the final assessment of this SRF will only be possible in autumn 2022.)

Source
In this analysis the recycling rate is calculated by dividing the summed amounts of recycling of materials and of composting and digestion by the total generated amounts. The data source used is the Eurostat data set *Municipal waste by waste management operations [env_wasmun]* (following the OECD/Eurostat Joint Questionnaire); Data reported by Member States according to Article 10.2(a) of the Waste Framework Directive are not used for this assessment as the reporting methods differ by Member State, resulting in a lack of comparability between Member States. The data source used here is assumed to be the best available proxy, given that data in accordance with the rules on the calculation of the attainment of the targets as defined in Article 11a are not yet available at the time of finalization of the assessments.

Assessment

Distance to target < 5 percentage points, or target exceeded	Distance to target 5 - 15 percentage points	Distance to target > 15 percentage points or no data reported

Weight
5

Considerations for the assessment
The impact of the new reporting rules for compliance with the 2025 target on the recycling rate can currently only be estimated as reported data is not yet available for most MS. If a MS has estimated the impact of the reporting rules on the recycling rate, this impact is taken into account for the assessment. If this is not the case, the assessment is done based on the assumption that the new reporting rules will reduce the recycling rate (as calculated based on the Joint Eurostat/OECD questionnaire data) by 5 percentage points. This assumption is an average of the estimated impact provided by some MS to the EEA.
MS may postpone the deadlines for attaining the preparing for reuse and recycling target of 55 % by 2025 by up to five years, under certain conditions as specified in the WFD and notifying the Commission by 2023 at the latest. As this information becomes only available after the finalization of the assessments, the assessment of the distance to target will not take this extension of the deadline into account.

SRF MSWR-1.2 Past trend in municipal solid waste recycling rate

Description and relevance
The development of the historical trend in the recycling rate (RR, calculated as the amount of material recycled plus composted/digested divided by generated municipal waste) indicates previous progress

towards recycling in the MS. Has the recycling performance of the MS over the past five years been stagnating or increasing, and how does it relate to the current recycling rate? The closer the MS is to the target, the lower the pace toward the target will probably be. This SRF will help to better understand the dynamics of the recycling rate. Also, MS with a large increase in recycling rate give valuable insights into the effectiveness of implemented measures resulting in this increase.
The trend in the recycling rate is calculated based on regularly reported data to Eurostat according to the Joint Eurostat/OECD questionnaire, whereas the actual recycling rate in 2020 is the same as the recycling rate used in SRF MSWR-1.1 distance to target. is

Source
Historical trend: Municipal waste generation, recycling and composting/digestion reported to Eurostat (dataset env_wasmun)
Current situation (RR): Same recycling rate as used for SRF MSWR-1.1 distance to target

Assessment

RR > 50% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or RR > 45% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points or RR > 55%	RR > 50% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or RR > 45%, and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or RR < 45% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 45% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points

Weight
1

2 Legal instruments

SRF MSWR-2.1 Timely transposition of the revised Waste Framework Directive into national law

Description and relevance
Timely transposition of the Waste Framework Directive as amended by Directive 2018/851 into national law within the foreseen period is key for a waste management system in line with EU requirements.

Source
European Commission, and information provided by Member States during the review of the draft assessments.

Assessment

Transposition without delay	Transposition with a delay of less than 12 months	Transposition with delay of > 12 months, or no full transposition yet

Weight
1

SRF MSWR-2.2 Responsibilities for meeting the targets, and support and enforcement mechanisms, e.g. tools, fines etc.

Description and relevance

Clearly defined responsibilities, enforcement and support mechanisms for meeting the targets across different entities and governance levels are important for achieving high rates for preparing for reuse and recycling. The relevant questions to be analyzed by this SRF are: Is it clearly defined how responsibilities for meeting national preparing for reuse and recycling targets are shared across all governance levels that take decisions influencing the preparing for reuse and recycling rate? What are the consequences if the responsible entities do not take (enough and effective) action (e.g. fines or support mechanisms)? Is there a system at national level that provides technical support coupled with sharing of good practices that can improve efficiency and improvement in performance for the responsible entities? Is a monitoring and reporting system in place that tracks performance at the responsible governance level? Is co-operation on infrastructure planning and/or service procurement encouraged to ensure scale efficiency and sharing of financial burdens? The clearer the responsibilities for meeting the targets and accountability for failing the targets are, the higher the chance that the targets will be met.

Source

Questionnaire

Assessment

Clearly defined responsibilities, enforcement and good set of support mechanisms for meeting the recycling targets	Clearly defined responsibilities and good set of support tools but weak/no enforcement mechanisms for meeting the recycling targets OR Unclear responsibilities but clearly defined enforcement mechanisms and a good set of support tools for meeting the recycling targets OR Clearly defined responsibilities and enforcement mechanisms but no/weak support tools for meeting the recycling targets	Unclear responsibilities and weak/no enforcement mechanisms for meeting the recycling targets, but good set of support tools. OR Unclear responsibilities and no/weak support tools for meeting the recycling targets, but clearly defined enforcement mechanisms. OR Clearly defined responsibilities but weak/no enforcement mechanisms for meeting the recycling targets, and no/weak support tools. OR Unclear responsibilities, weak/no enforcement mechanisms and lack of support tools for meeting the recycling targets.

Weight

1

3 Economic instruments

SRF MSWR-3.1 Taxes and/or ban for landfilling residual or biodegradable waste

Description and relevance
Bans or taxes on the landfilling of residual municipal waste or biodegradable municipal waste and sorting residues or MBT outputs discourage landfilling and thereby create economic incentives for diversion from landfill towards recycling. Taxes can be more effective if the tax level is increasing over time (escalator), especially when starting from a low level, giving operators certainty for planning. Application of an escalator is therefore rated positively.

Source
EEA Country profiles (last update 2016), CEWEP 'Landfill taxes and bans overview'. Update through questionnaire and Member State review of draft assessments.

Assessment

Ban, or landfill tax > 30 EUR/t* with escalator, or landfill tax > 45 EUR/t	Landfill taxe > 30 EUR/t*	No landfill taxes or low tax (< 30 EUR/t*)

*rescaled based on purchasing power parities

Weight
1

Considerations for the assessment
To allow meaningful comparison of landfill taxes across MS and assessing against a common threshold, taking into account different average income levels, the tax is rescaled to the EU27 average using the 'comparative price levels' from Eurostat (TEC000120). This is done by dividing the tax by the comparative price level per MS for the year for which the tax is available and multiplying by 100 (EU27 average).

SRF MSWR-3.2 Taxes on municipal waste incineration

Description and relevance
Taxes on incineration of **residual** waste can help to discourage strong reliance on incineration and thus support recycling. Are there taxes for incinerating of residual MSW? The assessment relates to the tax to be paid for domestic MSW (i.e. not for incineration), as only this is relevant as an incentive to divert domestic waste from incineration and influencing the preparing for reuse and recycling rate, although exemptions from the tax on exported MSW is considered on a case-by-case basis. Taxes can be more effective if the tax level is increasing over time (escalator), especially when starting from a low level, giving operators certainty for planning. Application of an escalator is therefore rated positively.

Source
Questionnaire, and Member State review of draft assessments.

Assessment

Taxes > 7 EUR/t* with escalator, or tax > 18 EUR/t	Taxes > 7 EUR/t*, but without escalator	No incineration taxes or taxes < 7 EUR/t*	N/A

			(for countries without capacities for incineration)

*rescaled based on purchasing power parities

Weight
1

Considerations for the assessment
To allow meaningful comparison of incineration taxes across MS, taking into account different average income levels and assessing against a common threshold, the tax is rescaled to the EU27 average using the 'comparative price levels' from Eurostat (TEC000120). This is done by dividing the tax by the comparative price level per MS for the year for which the tax is available and multiplying by 100 (EU27 average).

SRF MSWR-3.3 Pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system

Description and relevance
Is there a pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system in place? A PAYT[1] system is a charging system for residual municipal waste management that is based on the polluter pays principle. This means that a household has to pay a fee for the collection and treatment of its residual waste based on the generated amount which is intended to provide an incentive to reduce the amount of residual waste produced. This fee can be designed in various ways, taking into account variable elements like container size, volume of sacks, frequency of collection, weight or a combination of these elements. When PAYT is applied, the fee for the residual waste per collected amount is higher than the fee(s) for the separately collected waste fractions, or these other fractions are collected free of charge. A well-designed and well-implemented PAYT system that covers the entire territory of the MS gives strong incentives to increase the preparing for reuse and recycling rate. MS without a PAYT system or with a system that does not fully cover the MS territory are likely to have more difficulties in meeting the target.

Source
Questionnaire and Member State review of the draft assessment

Assessment

PAYT scheme fully rolled out (to at least 80% of the population) OR Implemented in some regions/ municipalities (50-80% of population covered) and firm plans for rolling out to at least 80 % of the population	PAYT scheme implemented in some regions/ municipalities (50-80% of population covered) OR No or less than 50% of the population covered by PAYT but firm plans for rolling out	No or less than 50% of the population covered by PAYT

Weight
1

[1] Definition of PAYT is based on (BIPRO, *Assessment of separate collection schemes in the 28 capitals of the EU*, 2015), (EY, *Guidance for separate collection of municipal waste*, 2020), (ACR+, *Cross-analysis of 'Pay-As-You-Throw' schemes in selected EU municipalities*, 2016) and (JRC, *Best Environmental Management Practice for the Waste Management Sector*, 2018)

4 Separate collection systems

SRF MSWR-4.1 Convenience and coverage of separate collection systems for the different household waste fractions

Description and relevance

Which waste fractions are already collected separately, in which way (convenience for citizens) and what part of the population is covered by separate collection? How does the convenience relate to the convenience of the collection of residual waste?

Separate collection is the collection where a waste stream is kept separately by type and nature so as to facilitate recovery operations, including preparation prior to recovery. Commingled collection of different waste fractions, in such a way that it does not hamper separation and recovery afterwards, can be regarded as separate collection in this assessment if it is in line with the conditions described in Art. 10(3) WFD. Fractions that are currently often collected commingled in Europe include plastic packaging, metal packaging and beverage cartons, with or without including paper and cardboard; the commingled collection of paper and cardboard with beverage cartons; or other combinations including the already mentioned fractions.

The convenience of a separate collection system for citizens will have an influence on the amounts and quality of waste collected through that system. A study conducted by ACR+ (2019) states that "door-to-door" systems and "bring bank" systems present on average comparable performances, and it seems that both types of collection enable very high performances. It does not necessarily mean that both collection modes would give the same performance in one given territory.

The convenience or service level and coverage of separate collection systems can also be different depending on the character of an area. A remote bring point (e.g. grocery store) could be considered convenient for people living in rural areas as it is part of a regular travel routine, where for people living in cities a bring point would have to be at walking distance in order to have the same level of convenience. In order to assess the convenience of separate collection systems in a MS, a distinction is made between various types of urbanization[2]: cities; towns and suburbs; and rural areas.

The following categorization is used here to assess the degree of convenience, depending on the degree of urbanization and type of material:

	Cities (densely populated areas)					**Towns and suburbs** (intermediate density areas)					**Rural areas** (thinly populated areas)			
	Door-to-door - separate	Door-to-door - co-mingled	Bring point (>5 per km²)	Bring point (<5 per km²)	Civic amenity site	Door-to-door - separate	Door-to-door - co-mingled	Bring point (>5 per km²)	Bring point (<5 per km²)	Civic amenity site	Door-to-door - separate	Door-to-door - co-mingled	Bring point	Civic amenity site
Residual waste	H		H			H		H			H		H	

[2] The degree of urbanization classifies local administrative units (LAUs) as cities, towns and suburbs or rural areas based on a combination of geographical contiguity and population density, measured by minimum population thresholds applied to 1 km² population grid cells; each LAU belongs exclusively to one of these three classes (Eurostat Glossary).

Paper and Cardboard	H	H	H			H	H	H			H	H	H	
Ferrous metals	H	H	H			H	H	H			H	H	H	
Aluminium	H	H	H			H	H	H			H	H	H	
Glass	H	H	H	H		H	H	H	H		H	H	H	
Plastic	H	H	H			H	H	H			H	H	H	
Bio-waste	H					H					H			
food	H					H					H			
garden	H					H					H			
Textiles	H		H			H		H			H		H	
Wood	H		H			H		H			H		H	
WEEE	H		H			H		H			H		H	

H = high convenience

The population coverage is determined using the amount of people living in the different types of urbanized areas (Eurostat).

Source
Questionnaire and additional information provided by MS during review of the draft assessments.
Eurostat: Household characteristics by degree of urbanization (HBS_CAR_T315)

Assessment
The assessment is done on a material basis, and summing up the scores of the different materials according to their weighted average share in municipal waste, based on data from the European Reference Model on Municipal Waste, recalculated to 100 % to account for the undefined 'other' fraction.
Ideally, the assessment would be based on the shares of the population served by each type of collection system. However, this information is usually not available, and a proxy methodology is therefore used for assessing the share of population covered by high convenience collection services. Member States are therefore asked to indicate in the table above, which collection system is dominant in cities, in towns and suburbs, and in rural areas. If a certain system is dominant e.g. in cities and 40 % of the population lives in cities, the methodology assumes that 40 % of the population is served by this system, and so on. If no dominant system is indicated, it is assumed that the population coverage of each system in place is evenly distributed.
>= 80 % of the population is characterized as 'high share of the population'
50-80 % is characterized as 'medium share of the population'
< 50 % is characterized as 'low share of the population'.
If additional information is available next to the table with the crosses, this is taken into account, for example if there is data about how far separate collection of bio-waste is rolled out.

For WEEE, a slightly different approach is followed with regard to determining the coverage and convenience level, as under the WEEE Regulations, EEE retailers have an obligation to take back WEEE free of charge from end users. Therefore collection via bring points is considered to be the default situation and is assessed as 'medium convenience'. Regular or occasional door-to-door collection or any other additional collection service or initiatives to improve the collection of WEEE could be assessed as 'high to medium convenience'.

Paper and cardboard Share: 23%	A high share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A medium share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A low share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
Metals Share: 4%	A high share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A medium share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A low share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
Plastics Share: 14%	A high share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A medium share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A low share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
Glass Share: 9%	A high share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A medium share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A low share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
Bio-waste Share: 42%	A high share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A medium share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A low share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
Wood Share: 3%	A high share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A medium share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A low share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
Textiles Share: 3%	A high share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A medium share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	A low share of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
WEEE Share: 2%	High to medium convenience collection services dominate	Medium convenience collection services dominate	Not all population is covered by collection services

Weight
2
This SRF gets a weighting factor of 2 for the overall risk assessment, as separate collection is considered as the most important single enabling factor for high recycling rates.

SRF MSWR-4.2 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of separate collection for the different household waste fractions

Description and relevance
Are there concrete plans to improve the convenience and coverage of separate collection for the different household waste fractions within the next three years? This SRF is only relevant for MS that do not score 'green' in SRF MSWR-4.1, unless these MS have firm plans to even further improve their high convenience collection system 'Firm plans' are plans that have clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline.

Source
Questionnaire information provided by MS during review of draft assessments.

Assessment

The assessment is done on a material basis, and summing up the scores of the different materials according to their average share in municipal waste.

Paper and cardboard Share: 23%	Firm plans to improve the separate collection system, with clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline	There are plans to improve the collection service but unclear plan for implementation	No firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage	N/A (for MS in which a high share of the population is already covered by high convenience collection services)
Metals Share: 4%	Firm plans to improve the separate collection system, with clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline	There are plans to improve the collection service but unclear plan for implementation	No firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage	N/A (for MS in which a high share of the population is already covered by high convenience collection services)
Plastics Share: 14%	Firm plans to improve the separate collection system, with clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline	There are plans to improve the collection service but unclear plan for implementation	No firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage	N/A (for MS in which a high share of the population is already covered by high convenience collection services)
Glass Share: 9%	Firm plans to improve the separate collection system, with clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline	There are plans to improve the collection service but unclear plan for implementation	No firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage	N/A (for MS in which a high share of the population is already covered by high convenience collection services)
Bio-waste Share: 42%	Firm plans to improve the separate collection system, with clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline	There are plans to improve the collection service but unclear plan for implementation	No firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage	N/A (for MS in which a high share of the population is already covered by high convenience collection services)
Wood Share: 3%	Firm plans to improve the separate collection system, with clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline	There are plans to improve the collection service but unclear plan for implementation	No firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage	N/A (for MS in which a high share of the population is already covered by high convenience collection services)
Textiles Share: 3%	Firm plans to improve the separate collection system, with clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline	There are plans to improve the collection service but unclear plan for implementation	No firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage	N/A (for MS in which a high share of the population is already covered by high convenience collection services)
WEEE Share: 2%	Firm plans to improve the separate collection system, with clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline	There are plans to improve the collection service but unclear plan for implementation	No firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage	N/A (for MS in which a high share of the population is already covered by high convenience collection services)

Weight

1

The weight of each material reflects the average share of this material in the composition of municipal waste in the EU.

5 EPR and similar schemes

SRF MSWR-5.1 Fee modulation in EPR schemes for packaging

Description and relevance
Fee modulation is a system with different fees for different packaging, based on e.g. recyclability and choice of material (metals, glass, plastics,…); but also within the material group, such as different fees for different polymers. EPR fees that depend on the recyclability of the packaging create incentives for design for recycling and thus create favourable conditions for higher recycling rates.

Does the EPR system in place apply fees that depend on the recyclability of the packaging in order to create incentives for design for recycling and choice of easily recyclable packaging, and thus create favourable conditions for higher recycling rates (fee modulation)? How far do the fees differentiate between material choices and packaging design within the broad packaging material categories (i.e. different types of plastics or discouraging difficult to recycle designs), and/or is recycled content incentivized through the fees?

Waste Framework Directive, Art 8a 4.b) fee modulation
Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that the financial contributions paid by the producer of the product to comply with its extended producer responsibility obligations: (…) in the case of collective fulfilment of extended producer responsibility obligations, are modulated, where possible, for individual products or groups of similar products, notably by taking into account their durability, reparability, re-usability and recyclability and the presence of hazardous substances, thereby taking a life- cycle approach and aligned with the requirements set by relevant Union law, and where available, based on harmonised criteria in order to ensure a smooth functioning of the internal market.

Sources
Questionnaire and information provided by MS during the review of the draft assessments.

Assessment
The assessment of advanced fee modulation is based on four criteria:

1. Is recyclability taken into account in fee modulation?
   Since different types of material and characteristics of packaging have different recyclability, in practice this could be separation between different materials and qualities, such as
   - for plastics between PET and PS, but also for different colors of PET
   - for paper and cardboard between 100% cardboard boxes and laminated drink cartoons
2. Is recycled material content taken into account in fee modulation?
3. Are sortability and disruptors for separation considered in fee modulation?
   In practice this could be a malus for disruptors, such as for
   - labels and caps of other materials, which are not fitted for the recycling technologies of the main packaging
   - a surface print, which disturbs the separation process
   - a sleeve made of another material than the packaging itself

4. Is there a transparent compliance check by the PRO that producers report correctly?

There is fee modulation for at least two of the main packaging fractions* AND fee modulation for one packaging fraction meets three assessment criteria	At least one packaging fraction* has an advanced fee modulation that meets at least two assessment criteria	No advanced fee modulation OR fee modulation meets less than two assessment criteria

*Paper and cardboard, Ferrous metals, Aluminium, Glass, Plastic, Wood

Weight
1

6 Bio-waste treatment capacity and quality management

SRF MSWR-6.1 Capacity for the treatment of bio-waste

Description and relevance
Bio-waste is the largest single waste fraction in municipal waste, and a lack of treatment capacity would indicate limitations for extending separate collection of bio-waste. It is assumed that not all bio-waste can be captured, therefore a threshold of 80% of generated bio-waste is applied for the assessment. Firm plans to extend treatment capacity improves the rating.

Source
Questionnaire and additional information provided by the MS during the review of the assessments.

Assessment

Enough bio-waste treatment capacity for 80% of generated municipal bio-waste	Bio-waste capacity below 80% of generated municipal bio-waste but firm plans to close the gap	Bio-waste treatment capacity below 80% of generated municipal bio-waste and no plans to extend capacity, or no capacity information available

Weight
1

Considerations for the assessment
This assessment needs to take into account if the treatment capacity is available for bio-waste from municipal waste (e.g. if anaerobic digestion plants for manure also can take in bio-waste from households and if they are in the proximity of where the waste is produced).

SRF MSWR-6.2 Legally binding national standards and Quality Management System for compost/digestate

Description and relevance
Are there legally binding national quality standards available for compost/digestate, and is there a quality management system (QMS) in place to ensure a good quality compost/digestate produced from bio-waste from households and similar sources? A quality management system aims at addressing different elements of a production process to ensure a stable and high-quality output (product). The elements that are most likely to be covered relate to the input of the process,

operational aspects and composition of the output. If all production-aspects are covered, this is seen as a QMS. To create a market for compost and digestate, compost should be of a good quality for use as a soil improver or fertilizer. National standards and a quality management system aim at building trust in the products by providing guarantees regarding the quality of these end products.

Source
EEA report 'Biowaste in Europe'; questionnaire for countries not covered in EEA report.

Assessment

Legally binding national standards for compost/digestate quality in place, and quality management system in place	Legally binding national standards for compost/digestate quality but no quality management system	No national standards or quality management system, or still under development

Weight
1

7 Context parameters

These parameters are not considered to be success and risk factors and are not color coded, but are used as context creating indicators in the overall assessment.

7.1. Evolution of municipal waste generation and treatment

An increase in municipal waste generation puts additional pressure on the waste management system, and might require extension of the waste management infrastructure. The trend in municipal waste generation is analysed as a context parameter.

7.2. Legal Framework

An overview of the most relevant waste related legislation (on national and/or regional level) that impacts waste management performance.

7.3. Implementation of recommendations of the previous Early Warning report (2018)

14 MS were identified in 2018 of being at risk to not meet the 2020 preparing for reuse and recycling target for household and similar waste as defined in the 2008 Waste Framework Directive, and received a number of policy recommendations. MS that properly followed up on the recommended priority actions are more likely to meet the municipal waste preparing for reuse and recycling target.

7.4. Waste management plan(s)

A waste management plan is one of the key tools for authorities to convert the requirements of EU waste legislation to the national, regional and local level within the MS. Delays or non-compliance with the mandatory requirements or not covering all optional requirements of Article 28 WFD, signals a risk for not meeting the targets.

7.5. Capture rates for recyclables

The capture rate is a good performance indicator of the effectiveness of the separate collection system. The capture rate is calculated by dividing the separately collected weight of a certain material for recycling by the weight of the same material in total municipal waste.