ETC CE Working paper

Methodology for the EEA's input to the 'Early warning' Assessment – Addendum for the application to the EFTA States

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
2023

EEA activity
Circular Economy and Resource Use

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.

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

Introduction

In 2021-2022, the EEA, with support of the ETC/CE and ETC/WMGE, and in close cooperation with the relevant countries, developed 'early warning' assessments for the 27 EU member states related to the targets on the recycling of municipal and packaging waste laid down in the Waste Framework Directive, Packaging Directive and Landfill Directive. These assessments serve as input to the European Commission's Early warning report as mandated by the directives.

In 2023, the EFTA Surveillance Authority (ESA) has asked the EEA to develop similar early warning assessments for the three EFTA states, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway and the EEA has agreed to accommodate this request.

As some elements of the methodology are time sensitive, the methodology needs a few minor adjustments, which are explained in this addendum. For the aspects that have not changed, we refer to the methodology documents available.

Municipal Solid Waste

1 Current situation and past trends

SRF MSWR-1.1 Distance to target

Assessment
The distance to target used in the assessment is changed by 1 percentage point compared to the original assessment method. This is because the latest data year for which data on municipal waste is available is 2021, compared to 2020 in the methodology used for the EU-27. As a consequence, there is less time left to meet the 2025 target, therefore a country needs to be closer to the target in 2021 than in 2020 to be able to reach it.

Distance to target < 4 percentage points, or target exceeded	Distance to target 4 - 14 percentage points	Distance to target > 14 percentage points or no data reported

Considerations for the assessment
EFTA states need to report data on municipal waste according to the new reporting rules for compliance with the 2025 target on the recycling rate since June 2022 for reference year 2020 and beyond. If this however is not the case, we apply the same assumptions as described in the methodology applied for the EU countries.

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

Assessment
Because the latest data year for which data on municipal waste is available is 2021, compared to 2020 in the assessments done for the EU countries, the recycling rate thresholds used in the assessment are changed by 1 percentage point compared to the methodology applied for the EU countries.

RR > 51% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or RR > 46% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points or RR > 55%	RR > 51% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or RR > 46%, and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or RR < 46% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 46% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points

Considerations for the assessment
In case there is a break in the time for the reporting of the data, a different time period might be used to assess the trend in order to avoid a biased assessment.

Packaging waste

1 Current situation and past trends

SRF P-1.1 Distance to target

Assessment

The distance to target used in the assessment is changed by 1 percentage point compared to the original assessment method. This is because the latest data year for which data on waste generation is available is 2020, compared to 2019 in the previous assessment method. As a consequence, there is less time left to meet the 2025 target and therefore a country needs to be closer to be to the target to be able to reach it. The same approach is applied to the material specific SRFs P-1.1.1 – P-1.1.6.

< 4 percentage points below target, or target exceeded	4 - 14 percentage points below target	> 14 percentage points below target, or no data reported

Considerations for the assessment

Packaging waste data must have been reported according to the new reporting rules as defined in the Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2019/665 for the first time by 30 June 2022 (for reference year 2020). If this however is not the case, we apply the sensitivity analysis as described in the methodology for the EU Member States.

SRF P-1.1.1: Distance to target for Paper and cardboard packaging

Assessment

< 4 percentage points below target, or target exceeded	4 - 14 percentage points below target	> 14 percentage points below target, or no data reported

SRF P-1.1.2: Distance to target for Ferrous metals packaging

Assessment

< 4 percentage points below target, or target exceeded	4 - 14 percentage points below target	> 14 percentage points below target, or no data reported

SRF P-1.1.3: Distance to target for Aluminium packaging

Assessment

< 4 percentage points below target, or target exceeded	4 - 14 percentage points below target	> 14 percentage points below target, or no data reported

SRF P-1.1.4: Distance to target for Glass packaging

Assessment

< 4 percentage points below target, or target exceeded	4 - 14 percentage points below target	> 14 percentage points below target, or no data reported

SRF P-1.1.5: Distance to target for Plastic packaging

Assessment

< 4 percentage points below target, or target exceeded	4 - 14 percentage points below target	> 14 percentage points below target, or no data reported

SRF P-1.1.6: Distance to target for Wooden packaging

Assessment

< 4 percentage points below target, or target exceeded	4 - 14 percentage points below target	> 14 percentage points below target, or no data reported

SRF P-1.2 Past trend in Packaging Waste Recycling

Assessment

The historical trend in the recycling rate indicates previous efforts toward packaging waste recycling. In relation to the recycling rate, it gives a better understanding of the dynamics of the recycling rate. The recycling rate is changed by 1 percentage point, as the latest data year for which information is available is 2021, compared to 2019 in the assessment method applied to the EU Member States. As a consequence, there is less time left to meet the 2025 target and therefore a country needs to be closer to be to the target to be able to reach it. The same approach is applied to the material specific SRFs P-1.2.1 – P-1.2.6.

RR > 61% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or RR > 56% and increase in last 5 years > 10 %, or RR > 65%	RR > 61% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or RR > 56%, and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or RR < 56% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 56% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points

Considerations for the assessment

In case there is a break in the series for the reporting of the data, a different time period might be used to assess the trend in order to avoid a biased assessment.

SRF P-1.2.1: Paper and cardboard packaging

Assessment

RR > 71% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or RR > 66% and increase in last 5 years > 10 %, or RR > 75%	RR > 71% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or RR > 66%, and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or RR < 66% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 66% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points

Considerations for the assessment

In case there is a break in the series for the reporting of the data, a different time period might be used to assess the trend in order to avoid a biased assessment.

SRF P-1.2.2: Ferrous metals packaging

Assessment

RR > 66% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or RR > 61% and increase in last 5 years > 10 %, or RR > 70%	RR > 66% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or RR > 61%, and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or RR < 61% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 61% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points

Considerations for the assessment

In case there is a break in the series for the reporting of the data, a different time period might be used to assess the trend in order to avoid a biased assessment.

SRF P-1.2.3: Aluminium packaging

Assessment

RR > 46% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or RR > 41% and increase in last 5 years > 10 %, or RR > 50%	RR > 46% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or RR > 41%, and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or RR < 41% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 41% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points

Considerations for the assessment

In case there is a break in the series for the reporting of the data, a different time period might be used to assess the trend in order to avoid a biased assessment.

SRF P-1.2.4: Glass packaging

Assessment

RR > 66% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or RR > 61% and increase in last 5 years > 10 %, or RR > 70%	RR > 66% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or RR > 61%, and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or RR < 61% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 61% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points

Considerations for the assessment

In case there is a break in the series for the reporting of the data, a different time period might be used to assess the trend in order to avoid a biased assessment.

SRF P-1.2.5: Plastic packaging

Assessment

RR > 46% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or RR > 41% and increase in last 5 years > 10 %, or RR > 50%	RR > 46% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or RR > 41%, and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or RR < 41% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 41% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points

Considerations for the assessment

In case there is a break in the series for the reporting of the data, a different time period might be used to assess the trend in order to avoid a biased assessment.

SRF P-1.2.6: Wooden packaging

Assessment

RR > 21% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or RR > 16% and increase in last 5 years > 10 %, or RR > 25%	RR > 21% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or RR > 16%, and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or RR < 16% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 16% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points

Considerations for the assessment

In case there is a break in the series for the reporting of the data, a different time period might be used to assess the trend in order to avoid a biased assessment.

Landfilling of municipal waste

1 Current situation and past trends

SRF LF-1.1 Distance to target

Assessment
The distance to target used in the assessment is changed by 1 percentage point compared to the methodology applied for the EU countries. This is because the latest data year for which data on municipal waste is available is 2021, compared to 2020 for the assessments applied for the EU countries. As a consequence, there is less time left to meet the 2035 target, therefore a country needs to be closer to the target to be able to reach the target.

Distance to target < 9 percentage points, or target exceeded	Distance to target 9 – 19 percentage points	Distance to target > 19 percentage points, or no data reported

SRF LF-1.2 Past trend in municipal solid waste landfill rate

Assessment
Because the latest data year for which data on municipal waste data is available is 2021, compared to 2020 in the assessments done for the EU countries, the landfill rate used in the assessment is changed by 1 percentage point compared to the assessments applied for the EU countries.

Landfill rate in 2021 < 19% and decrease in last 5 years > 5 percentage points, or Landfill rate in 2021 < 24% and decrease in last 5 years > 10 percentage points or Landfill rate in 2021 < or = 10%	Landfill rate in 2021 < 19% and decrease in last 5 years < 5 percentage points, or Landfill rate in 2021 < 24%, and decrease in last 5 years < 10 percentage points, or Landfill rate in 2021 > 24% and decrease in last 5 years > 15 percentage points	Landfill rate in 2021 > 24% and decrease in last 5 years < 15 percentage points

SRF LF-1.3 Diversion of biodegradable municipal waste from landfill

Description and relevance

Delay in meeting previous targets generally increases the risk for not meeting future targets.

This SRF therefore assesses compliance with the target laid down in Art. 5(2)(c) of the EU Landfill Directive to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste landfilled to 35 % of biodegradable municipal waste generated in 1995. The target had to be met in 2016. However, if an EFTA state has been granted a derogation for the target date, this will be taken into account in the assessment.

Assessment

Target for reducing the amount of biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) landfilled to 35% of BMW generated in 1995 has been achieved in 2016 or in the year specified in the derogation where applicable		Target for reducing the amount of biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) landfilled to 35% of BMW generated in 1995 has not been achieved in 2016 or in the year specified in the derogation where applicable, or data not reported.