

Methodology for the EEA's 'Early warning' assessments – Packaging waste recycling targets



Authors:

ETC CE: Ann Van der Linden (VITO), Tom Duhoux (VITO)

EEA: Almut Reichel, Beatriz Vidal, Sanna Due



Version: 1

Publication Date December 2025

EEA activity Circular Economy and Resource Use

Legal notice

Preparation of this report has been co-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 la Crescita Economica Sostenibile, Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e Ricerca Ambientale, IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Norion Consult, Università Degli Studi Di Ferrara (SEEDS), German 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, 2025

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
<https://www.eionet.europa.eu/etcs/etc-ce>

Contents

Acknowledgements	6
Introduction.....	7
1 Current situation and past trends	9
1.1 SRF P-1.1 Distance to target.....	9
1.1.1 SRF P-1.1.1 Distance to target for paper and cardboard packaging.....	10
1.1.2 SRF P-1.1.2 Distance to target for ferrous metals packaging	10
1.1.3 SRF P-1.1.3 Distance to target for aluminium packaging	11
1.1.4 SRF P-1.1.4 Distance to target for glass packaging.....	11
1.1.5 SRF P-1.1.5 Distance to target for plastics packaging.....	12
1.1.6 SRF P-1.1.6 Distance to target for wooden packaging	12
1.2 SRF P-1.2 Past trend in packaging waste recycling	13
1.2.1 SRF P-1.2.1 Past trend in paper and cardboard packaging recycling	14
1.2.2 SRF P-1.2.2 Past trend in ferrous metals packaging recycling.....	14
1.2.3 SRF P-1.2.3 Past trend in aluminium packaging recycling	14
1.2.4 SRF P-1.2.4 Past trend in glass packaging recycling.....	15
1.2.5 SRF P-1.2.5 Past trend in plastics packaging recycling	15
1.2.6 SRF P-1.2.6 Past trend in wooden packaging recycling	16
2 Implementation mechanisms.....	16
2.1 SRF P-2.1 Responsibilities for meeting the targets, and support and enforcement mechanisms	16
3 Economic and regulatory instruments	17
3.1 SRF P-3.1 Taxes and/or ban for landfilling residual or biodegradable waste	17
3.2 SRF P-3.2 Pay-as-you-throw system.....	18
3.3 SRF P-3.3 Firm plans to introduce or improve the pay-as-you-throw system.....	19
3.4 SRF P-3.4 Deposit-return systems.....	19
3.4.1 SRF P-3.4.1 Deposit-return system for aluminium beverage cans	20
3.4.2 SRF P-3.4.2 Deposit-return system for plastic beverage bottles.....	20
4 Separate collection systems	21
4.1 SRF P-4.1 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for the different packaging waste fractions	21
4.1.1 SRF P-4.1.1 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for paper and cardboard packaging waste.....	23
4.1.2 SRF P-4.1.2 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for ferrous metals packaging waste	23
4.1.3 SRF P-4.1.3 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for aluminium packaging waste	24

4.1.4	SRF P-4.1.4 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for glass packaging waste	24
4.1.5	SRF P-4.1.5 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for plastics packaging waste	25
4.1.6	SRF P-4.1.6 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for wooden packaging waste	25
4.2	SRF P-4.2 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system of the different packaging waste fractions	25
4.2.1	SRF P-4.2.1 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for paper and cardboard packaging waste	26
4.2.2	SRF P-4.2.2 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for ferrous metals packaging waste	26
4.2.3	SRF P-4.2.3 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for aluminium packaging waste	27
4.2.4	SRF P-4.2.4 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for glass packaging waste	28
4.2.5	SRF P-4.2.5 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for plastics packaging waste	28
4.2.6	SRF P-4.2.6 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for wooden packaging waste	29
5	Extended producer responsibility (EPR) schemes	29
5.1	SRF P-5.1 Fee modulation in EPR schemes	29
5.1.1	SRF P-5.1.1 EPR scheme for paper and cardboard packaging	30
5.1.2	SRF P-5.1.2 EPR scheme for ferrous metals packaging	30
5.1.3	SRF P-5.1.3 EPR scheme for aluminium packaging	30
5.1.4	SRF P-5.1.4 EPR scheme for glass packaging	31
5.1.5	SRF P-5.1.5 EPR scheme for plastics packaging	31
5.1.6	SRF P-5.1.6 EPR scheme for wooden packaging	31
6	Other measures or initiatives for advancing packaging waste recycling	31
6.1	SRF P-6.1 Initiatives for advancing packaging waste recycling (bonus success factor)	31
6.1.1	SRF P-6.1.1 Initiatives for advancing paper and cardboard packaging recycling	32
6.1.2	SRF P-6.1.2 Initiatives for advancing ferrous metals packaging recycling	33
6.1.3	SRF P-6.1.3 Initiatives for advancing aluminium packaging recycling	33
6.1.4	SRF P-6.1.4 Initiatives for advancing glass packaging recycling	33
6.1.5	SRF P-6.1.5 Initiatives for advancing plastics packaging recycling	34
6.1.6	SRF P-6.1.6 Initiatives for advancing wooden packaging recycling	34
7	List of abbreviations	35

Acknowledgements

This methodology has been developed by the European Topic Centre on Circular economy and resource use (ETC CE) under the guidance of the European Environment Agency (EEA).

The ETC CE and EEA would like to thank the European Environment Information and Observation Network (Eionet) and the European Commission (DG Environment, DG Sante and the Joint Research Centre) for their valuable comments to a draft version of this document.

Introduction

This document describes the methodology for the input of the EEA to the Early warning mechanism according to Article 52(1) c and d of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation (PPWR) with the aim to assess the 27 Member States' and 3 EEA-EFTA States' prospects of meeting the target to recycle 70 % of packaging waste generated by 2030, as well as the material specific packaging waste recycling targets (55% of plastic; 30% of wood; 80% of ferrous metals; 60% of aluminium; 75% of glass; 85% of paper and cardboard).

The methodology uses a set of 'success and risk factors' (SRFs). An SRF is assumed to influence the probability of meeting the target. For each SRF, the robustness of the underlying data/information will be assessed qualitatively. Regarding numeric reported data, the EEA will rely on Eurostat's quality checking and validation process.

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

on track target reached favourable	additional effort needed medium uncertain	unfavourable highly uncertain no information
--	---	--

The risk assessment should indicate whether a country is at risk of not meeting the target. The 'total score' categorization is the result of the sum of the individual scores of each SRF, where the assessment of each SRF results in 2 points (green), 1 point (orange) or 0 points (red), depending on the assessment of the SRF. Only for the SRF on the distance to target, a gliding allocation of points is used. As some SRFs are considered to have a higher impact on meeting the target, the points of the SRF are multiplied by the defined weight of the SRF, which results in the SRF score. 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 total risk score is 50% or more of this maximum score. A MS is considered to be 'at risk' if its score is less than 50% of this maximum score.

Table 1 illustrates how the final overall risk is calculated.

Table 1: Mock-up of how the final overall risk is calculated (general approach)

Relevant success and risk factors	Assessment result	Points	Weight of the SRF	Score
SRF 1		2	1	2
SRF 2		2	2	4
SRF 3		0	1	0
SRF 4		1	1	1
SRF 5		2	1	2
...
...
Total score (= sum of scores of all relevant SRFs)				9
Maximum score (= highest total possible score of all relevant SRFs)				12
Assessment score (= total score divided by the maximum score)				75%
Final overall risk	Not at risk if assessment score > or = 50% of maximum score			Not at risk
	At risk if assessment score < 50% of maximum score			

Some success and risk factors (SRFs) are only used to assess the overall target, while others are used to assess only material specific targets, as illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2 Success and risk factors for the assessment of the overall and the material specific packaging waste recycling targets

	SRF	Overall packaging	Paper and cardboard	Ferrous metals	Aluminium	Glass	Plastics	Wood
Current situation and past trends	P-1.1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	P-1.2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Implementation mechanisms	P-2.1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Economic and regulatory instruments	P-3.1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	P-3.2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	P-3.3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	P-3.4				x		x	
Separate collection systems	P-4.1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	P-4.2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Extended producer responsibility	P-5.1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Other initiatives	P-6.1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

The early warning methodology is not intended to evaluate compliance with specific legal obligations imposed on economic operators or Member States, nor with voluntary or mandatory commitments outlined in the PPWR. Instead, it focuses on assessing progress toward the recycling targets by examining the presence, absence, and coverage of contributing factors. These factors include dedicated policies and instruments designed to support, enable, or drive both binding and non-binding obligations under the PPWR. Importantly, the assessment does not require exhaustive overviews with details of all existing or planned measures. Member States are instead encouraged to provide, through a questionnaire, sufficient evidence that meaningful efforts—whether mandatory or voluntary—are being made to achieve the packaging waste recycling targets.

1 Current situation and past trends

1.1 SRF P–1.1 Distance to target

Description and relevance

The distance to the target at the most recent data point is a key factor in assessing the likelihood of meeting it. Generally, the closer a Member State is to the target, the higher the probability of achievement, assuming current trends continue. By 2030, MS will have to recycle a minimum of 70% by weight of all packaging waste.

Source

The data source used for the assessment is the dataset ‘Packaging waste by waste management operations’ [*env_waspac*] published by Eurostat, in accordance with European Commission Implementing Decision 2019/665.

Assessment

For this SRF, a gliding allocation of points as indicated in the table above will be used to better account for situations close to the thresholds between the ‘green’ and ‘orange’, and ‘orange’ and ‘red’ assessments. E.g. a MS with a distance to target of 6 percentage points will score 8.35 points (1.67 points x 5) on this SRF.

Distance to target < 5 percentage points OR Target exceeded	Distance to target 5 - 15 percentage points	Distance to target > 15 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
--	--	--

DtT(*)	< 5	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	> 15
Points	2	1.83	1.67	1.50	1.33	1.17	1.00	0.83	0.67	0.50	0.33	0.17	0

(*) Distance to target in percentage points, rounded to the nearest whole number.

Weight

5

With a weight of five, this SRF has a major impact on the total score and outcome of the assessment.

Considerations for the assessment

According to PPWR Article 52(2), MS may postpone the deadlines for attaining the recycling target by 2030 by up to five years, under certain conditions as specified in the PPWR and notifying the Commission at the latest 24 months before the respective deadline. The assessment of this SRF will be done for the target without postponement. However, any postponement of the target will be duly acknowledged in the early warning assessment. Further information on derogations will be included in the Commission’s Early Warning report.

Furthermore, a Member State may decide to achieve an adjusted level of the targets by taking into account reusable sales packaging placed on the market for the first time and re-used within a re-use system, which will affect both the recycling target for all packaging and the material specific recycling targets. These adjustments will be taken into account if the data is published by Eurostat.

Specific for the EEA-EFTA States: Due to delays inherent in the EEA Agreement, the new reporting rules enter into force later in time for the EEA EFTA States than for the EU Member States. The EEA

EFTA States will therefore be assessed based on the reporting rules legally in force at the time of the assessment, or upcoming reporting rules in case of voluntary reporting.

1.1.1 SRF P-1.1.1 Distance to target for paper and cardboard packaging

Description and relevance

This SRF assesses the distance to the target to recycle at least 85% of paper and cardboard packaging waste by weight by 2030.

Assessment

Distance to target < 5 percentage points OR Target exceeded	Distance to target 5 - 15 percentage points	Distance to target > 15 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
--	--	--

DtT(*)	< 5	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	> 15
Points	2	1.83	1.67	1.50	1.33	1.17	1.00	0.83	0.67	0.50	0.33	0.17	0

(*) Distance to target in percentage points, rounded to the nearest whole number.

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

5

1.1.2 SRF P-1.1.2 Distance to target for ferrous metals packaging

Description and relevance

This SRF assesses the distance to the target to recycle at least 80% of ferrous metals packaging waste by weight by 2030.

Assessment

Distance to target < 5 percentage points OR Target exceeded	Distance to target 5 - 15 percentage points	Distance to target > 15 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
--	--	--

DtT(*)	< 5	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	> 15
Points	2	1.83	1.67	1.50	1.33	1.17	1.00	0.83	0.67	0.50	0.33	0.17	0

(*) Distance to target in percentage points, rounded to the nearest whole number.

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

5

1.1.3 SRF P-1.1.3 Distance to target for aluminium packaging

Description and relevance

This SRF assesses the distance to the target to recycle at least 60% of aluminium packaging waste by weight by 2030.

Assessment

Distance to target < 5 percentage points OR Target exceeded	Distance to target 5 - 15 percentage points	Distance to target > 15 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
--	--	--

DtT(*)	< 5	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	> 15
Points	2	1.83	1.67	1.50	1.33	1.17	1.00	0.83	0.67	0.50	0.33	0.17	0

(*) Distance to target in percentage points, rounded to the nearest whole number.

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

5

1.1.4 SRF P-1.1.4 Distance to target for glass packaging

Description and relevance

This SRF assesses the distance to the target to recycle at least 75% of glass packaging waste by weight by 2030.

Assessment

Distance to target < 5 percentage points OR Target exceeded	Distance to target 5 - 15 percentage points	Distance to target > 15 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
--	--	--

DtT(*)	< 5	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	> 15
Points	2	1.83	1.67	1.50	1.33	1.17	1.00	0.83	0.67	0.50	0.33	0.17	0

(*) Distance to target in percentage points, rounded to the nearest whole number.

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

5

1.1.5 SRF P-1.1.5 Distance to target for plastics packaging

Description and relevance

This SRF assesses the distance to the target to recycle at least 55% of plastics packaging waste by weight by 2030.

Assessment

Distance to target < 5 percentage points OR Target exceeded	Distance to target 5 - 15 percentage points	Distance to target > 15 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
--	--	--

DtT(*)	< 5	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	> 15
Points	2	1.83	1.67	1.50	1.33	1.17	1.00	0.83	0.67	0.50	0.33	0.17	0

(*) Distance to target in percentage points, rounded to the nearest whole number.

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

5

1.1.6 SRF P-1.1.6 Distance to target for wooden packaging

Description and relevance

This SRF assesses the distance to the target to recycle at least 30% of wooden packaging waste by weight by 2030.

Assessment

Distance to target < 5 percentage points OR Target exceeded	Distance to target 5 - 15 percentage points	Distance to target > 15 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
--	--	--

DtT(*)	< 5	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	> 15
Points	2	1.83	1.67	1.50	1.33	1.17	1.00	0.83	0.67	0.50	0.33	0.17	0

(*) Distance to target in percentage points, rounded to the nearest whole number.

Weight

5

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

In addition, for wooden packaging it is specified in Article 54(2) that the amounts of wooden packaging that are repaired for reuse may be taken into account in the calculation of the targets laid down in Article 52(1), point (c) (recycling target of 70% of all packaging waste by 31 December 2030) and Article 52(1), point (d)(ii) (recycling target of 30% of wood packaging waste by 31 December 2030). The recycling rate used for the assessment will therefore include the repair of wooden packaging in case such data is published by Eurostat.

1.2 SRF P-1.2 Past trend in packaging waste recycling

Description and relevance

The development of the historical trend in the recycling rate indicates previous efforts towards recycling in the MS. Has the recycling performance of the MS over the past five years been stagnating or declining, and how does it relate to the current recycling rate? The closer the country 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 in a MS. Also, MS with a large increase in the recycling rate give valuable insights into the effectiveness of implemented measures resulting in such an increase. The past trends will be assessed based on data for reference years 2020-2024.

Source

The data source used is the Eurostat dataset 'Packaging waste by waste management operations' [*env_waspac*], which is in accordance with European Commission Implementing Decision 2019/665. The actual recycling rate (RR) is the same as the recycling rate used in SRF P-1.1 Distance to target.

Assessment

RR > 65% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points OR RR > 60% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points OR RR > 70%	RR > 65% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points OR RR > 60% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR RR < 60% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 60% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
---	---	---

RR = recycling rate

Weight

1

Considerations for the assessment

This SRFs assumes an availability of five data points (2020-2024) in accordance with Commission Implementing Decision 2019/665. However, in case less such data points are available at the time of the early warning assessment, the threshold values in the assessment can be adjusted taking into account the number of available data points, with a minimum of three consecutive years without a break in time series.

For example, in case data for only 3 consecutive years without a break in time series are available, the threshold values in the assessment will be adjusted as follows:

RR > 65% and increase in last 3 years > 3 percentage points OR RR > 60% and increase in last 3 years > 6 percentage points OR RR > 70%	RR > 65% and increase in last 3 years < 3 percentage points OR RR > 60% and increase in last 3 years < 6 percentage points OR RR < 60% and increase in last 3 years > 6 percentage points	RR < 60% and increase in last 3 years < 6 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
--	---	--

1.2.1 SRF P-1.2.1 Past trend in paper and cardboard packaging recycling

Assessment

RR > 80% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points OR RR > 75% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points OR RR > 85%	RR > 80% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points OR RR > 75% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR RR < 75% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 75% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
---	---	---

RR = recycling rate

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

1

1.2.2 SRF P-1.2.2 Past trend in ferrous metals packaging recycling

Assessment

RR > 75% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points OR RR > 70% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points OR RR > 80%	RR > 75% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points OR RR > 70% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR RR < 70% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 70% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
---	---	---

RR = recycling rate

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

1

1.2.3 SRF P-1.2.3 Past trend in aluminium packaging recycling

Assessment

RR > 55% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points OR RR > 50% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points OR RR > 60%	RR > 55% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points OR RR > 50% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR RR < 50% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 50% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
---	---	---

RR = recycling rate

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

1

1.2.4 SRF P1.2.4 Past trend in glass packaging recycling**Assessment**

RR > 70% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points OR RR > 65% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points OR RR > 75%	RR > 70% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points OR RR > 65% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR RR < 65% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 65% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
---	---	---

RR = recycling rate

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

1

1.2.5 SRF P-1.2.5 Past trend in plastics packaging recycling**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 OR Data according to reporting rules not available
---	---	---

RR = recycling rate

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

Weight

1

1.2.6 SRF P-1.2.6 Past trend in wooden packaging recycling

Assessment

RR > 25% and increase in last 5 years > 5 percentage points OR RR > 20% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points OR RR > 30%	RR > 25% and increase in last 5 years < 5 percentage points OR RR > 20% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR RR < 20% and increase in last 5 years > 10 percentage points	RR < 20% and increase in last 5 years < 10 percentage points OR Data according to reporting rules not available
---	---	---

RR = recycling rate

Considerations for the assessment

The same considerations apply as for the assessment of total packaging waste.

In addition, the recycling rate used for the assessment will include the repair of wooden packaging in case such data is published by Eurostat for the time series assessed.

Weight

1

2 Implementation mechanisms

2.1 SRF P-2.1 Responsibilities for meeting the targets, and support and enforcement mechanisms

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 recycling rates. 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. The relevant questions to be analysed by this SRF are:

- Is it clearly defined how responsibilities for meeting national recycling targets are shared across all governance levels that take decisions influencing the recycling rates?
- What are the consequences if the responsible entities do not take (enough and effective) action (e.g. fines)?
- 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?

Source

Questionnaire

Assessment

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

Weight

1

3 Economic and regulatory instruments

3.1 SRF P-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 as well as on the landfilling of sorting residues or mechanical biological treatment (MBT) outputs discourage landfilling. This creates 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. This SRF evaluates current landfill bans and landfill taxes. The latter are evaluated against the average landfill tax applied across the EU.

Source

[EEA Country profiles](#) (last update 2025).

Assessment

<p>Ban</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Landfill tax* > 43 EUR/t with escalator</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Landfill tax* > 55 EUR/t</p>	Landfill tax* > 43 EUR/t	<p>Landfill tax* < 43 EUR/t</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No landfill tax</p>
---	--------------------------	---

*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). The landfill tax or ban applied to mixed municipal waste or MBT output will be used for the assessment.

3.2 SRF P-3.2 Pay-as-you-throw system

Description and relevance

A pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system is a charging system for residual municipal waste collection that is based on the polluter pays principle. This means that a household must pay a fee for the collection and treatment of its residual waste based on the generated amount, which is designed to provide an incentive to reduce the amount of residual waste produced. 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. 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. The assessment makes a difference between basic and advanced PAYT designs where advanced systems are assumed to provide stronger incentives for households to reduce residual waste than basic systems:

- Basic PAYT: Volume-based systems, where fees mainly depend on the size of the receptacle used to collect waste, sometimes also taking into account the collection frequency when determining the collection fee.
- Advanced PAYT: A system that provides a direct and visible economic incentive at the time the waste is generated. These systems are often weight-based. Examples of such systems include weighting the waste containers on pick-up, or sack-based systems where the citizens buy waste sacks from the municipality or service provider.

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 basic system that does not fully cover the MS territory are likely to have more difficulties in meeting the target.

Source

Questionnaire

Assessment

A combination of an advanced and basic PAYT (or advanced only) system rolled out to > 80% of the population	A combination of an advanced and basic PAYT system rolled out to 50-80% of the population OR A basic PAYT system rolled out to > 80% of the population	A basic PAYT system rolled out to < 80% of population OR No PAYT in place
---	--	---

Weight

2

This SRF gets a weighting factor of 2 for the overall risk assessment as PAYT systems are considered to have a strong influence on the separate collection behaviour for packaging waste.

3.3 SRF P-3.3 Firm plans to introduce or improve the pay-as-you-throw system

Description and relevance

Are there concrete plans to introduce or improve the type and coverage of a PAYT system within the next two years? This SRF is only relevant for MS that do not have a 'green' assessment in SRF P-3.2, unless these MS have firm plans to even further improve their PAYT system. 'Firm plans' are plans with legislative proposals in place and a publicly announced start date (within the next two years). See P-3.2 for explanation of the different PAYT systems.

Source

Questionnaire

Assessment

Firm plans in place to roll out a combination of an advanced and a basic PAYT system to >80% of the population OR Firm plans to further improve the PAYT system by increasing the share of advanced PAYT systems and/or population coverage	Firm plans in place to roll out a combination of an advanced and basic PAYT system to 50-80% of the population OR Firm plans to roll out a basic PAYT system to > 80% of the population	No firm plans in place to roll out a basic PAYT system to a at least 80% of the population OR No firm plans in place to introduce or improve the type or coverage of the PAYT system.	N/A (for MS in which a combination of an advanced and basic PAYT (or advanced only) system is already rolled out to > 80% of the population, and with no firm plans for further improvement)
---	---	---	--

Weight

1

3.4 SRF P-3.4 Deposit-return systems

Description and relevance

Deposit-return systems (DRS) generate high capture rates for packaging covered by the system and thus contribute to increase recycling rates, especially for plastic bottles and aluminium cans. For instance, data from the first reporting under Directive 2019/904 ("Single Use Plastics Directive") shows that 9 out of the 10 countries with separate collection rates for single-use plastic beverage bottles above the 2026-target have DRS in place for this fraction.

The PPWR requires MS to introduce DRS for single-use aluminium cans and single-use plastic beverage bottles, or to achieve separate collection rates of at least 80% in 2026 and 90% in 2029 by other means than the use of DRS. The presence or planned introduction of such DRS or high separate collection rates achieved through other means can be expected to contribute to meeting the recycling targets for plastics and aluminium.

As implementing a DRS and observing its impact on recycling rates involves several stages (planning, infrastructure development, public awareness raising) and can take a few years before the system delivers its full effect, MS that already have an operational DRS in place are expected to perform better than MS that are still in the implementation process. This SRF assesses whether DRS or other measures are in place or firmly planned to achieve high collection rates for single-use aluminium cans and single-use plastic beverage bottles.

Source

[Reloop platform](#), and questionnaire

Assessment

The assessment is done only for specific packaging materials with a focus on increasing the recycling rates and not used in the assessment of other materials nor for the total packaging recycling rate. 'Firm plans' are plans with legislative proposals in place and a publicly announced start date (within the next two years).

3.4.1 SRF P-3.4.1 Deposit-return system for aluminium beverage cans**Assessment**

DRS in place for aluminium beverage cans OR Separate collection of aluminium beverage cans > 70% of the weight put on the market	Firm plans to roll out DRS for aluminium beverage cans OR Firm plans for achieving a separate collection rate of 90% using other measures than DRS	No DRS system for aluminium beverage cans in place and no firm plans within the next two years to roll out a DRS system or other measures to achieve a 90% collection rate
--	--	--

Weight

1

3.4.2 SRF P-3.4.2 Deposit-return system for plastic beverage bottles**Assessment**

DRS in place for plastic beverage bottles OR Separate collection of plastic beverage bottles > 70% of the weight put on the market	Firm plans to roll out DRS for plastic beverage bottles OR Firm plans for achieving a separate collection rate of 90% using other measures than DRS	No DRS system for plastic beverage bottles in place, and no firm plans within the next two years to roll out a DRS system or other measures to achieve a 90% collection rate
--	---	--

Weight

1

4 Separate collection systems

4.1 SRF P-4.1 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for the different packaging waste fractions

Description and relevance

This SRF assesses which packaging waste fractions are collected separately, how convenient the collection system is for citizens and how large the share of the population is that is served with high-convenience separate collection services.

Separate collection is the collection where a waste stream is kept separate 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 plastics 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 high performances. It does not necessarily mean that both collection modes would give the same performance in one given territory.

The convenience and coverage of separate collection systems can also be different depending on the character of an area, especially population density. A remote bring point (e.g. at a 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 urbanization¹: cities; towns and suburbs; and rural areas.

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 the population covered by high convenience collection services. Member States will therefore be asked to indicate in the questionnaire, which collection system for each packaging waste material 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. For example, if there are three different systems used in cities, and none of them is the dominant system, it is assumed that each system serves one third of that city’s population.

The following categorization is used here to assess the degree of convenience, depending on the degree of urbanization and the type of material. The assessment is done based on the prevailing type of system per type of urbanization. The population coverage by high convenience separate collection will be determined, for each packaging waste fraction, using the amount of people living in the different types of urbanized areas.

¹ 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).

Packaging waste fraction	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 km ²)	Bring point (<5 per km ²)	Civic amenity site	Door-to-door - separate	Door-to-door - co-mingled	Bring point (>5 per km ²)	Bring point (<5 per km ²)	Civic amenity site	Door-to-door - separate	Door-to-door - co-mingled	Bring point	Civic amenity site
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	
Plastics	H	H	H			H	H	H			H	H	H	

Notes:

H = high convenience

Collection at civic amenity sites is not considered as high-convenience to citizen if it is the prevailing collection system but it can complement a system of high-convenience collection.

Source

Questionnaire

Eurostat: Household characteristics by degree of urbanization ([HBS CAR T315](#))

Weight

2

This SRF gets a total weighting factor of 2 for the overall risk assessment, as separation at source is considered as one of the most important enabling factors for high recycling rates. The assessment of household waste stands for a weighting factor of 1 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for a weighting factor of 1, giving the factor of 2 in total. The assessment is done for the specific packaging materials and summing up the points of the different materials according to their EU share² in packaging waste in order to assess this SRF for total packaging:

Packaging fraction	Share	Weight
Paper and cardboard	41%	0.82
Ferrous	4%	0.08
Aluminium	1%	0.02
Glass	19%	0.38
Plastic	19%	0.38
Wood	16%	0.32
Total	100%	2

² Calculated based on Eurostat, Packaging waste by waste management operations [env_waspac], for reference year 2022

4.1.1 SRF P-4.1.1 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for paper and cardboard packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

≥80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	50-80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	<50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
---	---	---

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Separation at source is mandatory for non-household paper and cardboard packaging waste		Separation at source is not mandatory for non-household paper and cardboard packaging waste
---	--	---

Weight

- 2 for the assessment of the target on paper and cardboard packaging waste. The assessment of household waste is weighted with factor 1 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources is also weighted with a factor 1, giving the factor of 2 in total.
- 0.82 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for a weighting factor of 0.41 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for a weighting factor of 0.41, giving the factor of 0.82 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.1.2 SRF P-4.1.2 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for ferrous metals packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

≥80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	50-80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	<50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
---	---	---

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Separation at source is mandatory for non-household ferrous metals packaging waste		Separation at source is not mandatory for non-household ferrous metals packaging waste
--	--	--

Weight

- 2 for the assessment of the target on ferrous metals packaging waste. The assessment of household waste is weighted with factor 1 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources is also weighted with a factor 1, giving the factor of 2 in total.
- 0.08 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste is weighted with factor 0.04 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources is also weighted with a factor 0.04, giving the factor of 0.08 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.1.3 SRF P-4.1.3 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for aluminium packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

≥80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	50-80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	<50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
---	---	---

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Separation at source is mandatory for non-household aluminium packaging waste		Separation at source is not mandatory for non-household aluminium packaging waste
---	--	---

Weight

- 2 for the assessment of the target on aluminium packaging waste. The assessment of household waste is weighted with factor 1 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources is also weighted with a factor 1, giving the factor of 2 in total.
- 0.02 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for a weighting factor of 0.01 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for a weighting factor of 0.01, giving the factor of 0.02 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.1.4 SRF P-4.1.4 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for glass packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

≥80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	50-80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	<50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
---	---	---

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Separation at source is mandatory for non-household glass packaging waste		Separation at source is not mandatory for non-household glass packaging waste
---	--	---

Weight

- 2 for the assessment of the target on glass packaging waste. The assessment of household waste is weighted with factor 1 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources is also weighted with a factor 1, giving the factor of 2 in total.
- 0.38 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for a weighting factor of 0.19 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for a weighting factor of 0.19, giving the factor of 0.38 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.1.5 SRF P-4.1.5 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for plastics packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

≥80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	50-80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services	<50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection services
---	---	---

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Separation at source is mandatory for non-household plastics packaging waste		Separation at source is not mandatory for non-household plastics packaging waste
--	--	--

Weight

- 2 for the assessment of the target on glass packaging waste. The assessment of household waste is weighted with factor 1 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources is also weighted with a factor 1, giving the factor of 2 in total.
- 0.38 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for a weighting factor of 0.19 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for a weighting factor of 0.19, giving the factor of 0.38 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.1.6 SRF P-4.1.6 Convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for wooden packaging waste

Assessment

Separation at source is mandatory for non-household wooden packaging waste		Separation at source is not mandatory for non-household wooden packaging waste
--	--	--

Weight

- 2 for the assessment of the target on glass packaging waste. The assessment of household waste is weighted with factor 1 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources is also weighted with a factor 1, giving the factor of 2 in total.
- 0.32 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The main source for wooden packaging waste are sources other than households; therefore, the assessment does not consider wooden packaging from households in the assessment.

4.2 SRF P-4.2 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system of the different packaging waste fractions

Description and relevance

Are there firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of separate collection for the different packaging waste fractions within the next two years? This SRF is only relevant for MS that have not been assessed as 'green' in SRF P-4.1, unless these MS have firm plans to even further improve their

high convenience collection system. 'Firm plans' are plans with legislative proposals in place and a publicly announced start date (within the next two years).

Source

Questionnaire

Assessment

The material specific assessment considers packaging waste from both household and non-household sources. It is assumed that these sources are of similar size (except for wooden packaging), but if the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors. The assessment is done for the specific packaging materials and summing up the points of the different materials according to their average share in packaging waste in order to assess this SRF for total packaging, in the same way as done in SRF P-4.1.

4.2.1 SRF P-4.2.1 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for paper and cardboard packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

Firm plans to improve the separate collection system	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)
--	---	---	---

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Firms plans to introduce mandatory separation at source or to improve separate collection for non-household paper and cardboard packaging waste	No firm plans to introduce mandatory separation at source for non-household paper and cardboard packaging waste	N/A (for countries already having mandatory sorting at source)
---	---	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on paper and cardboard packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.5 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.5, giving the factor of 1 in total.
- 0.41 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.205 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.205, giving the factor of 0.41 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.2.2 SRF P-4.2.2 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for ferrous metals packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

Firm plans to improve the separate collection system	There are plans to improve the collection service but unclear	No firm plans to improve the	N/A (for MS in which a high share of the population is
--	---	------------------------------	--

	plan for implementation	convenience and coverage	already covered by high convenience collection services)
--	-------------------------	--------------------------	--

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Firms plans to introduce mandatory separation at source or to improve separate collection for non-household ferrous metals packaging waste	No firm plans to introduce mandatory separation at source for non-household ferrous metals packaging waste	N/A (for countries already having mandatory sorting at source)
--	--	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on ferrous metals packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.5 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.5, giving the factor of 1 in total.
- 0.04 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.02 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.02, giving the factor of 0.04 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.2.3 SRF P-4.2.3 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for aluminium packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

Firm plans to improve the separate collection system	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)
--	---	---	---

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Firms plans to introduce mandatory separation at source or to improve separate collection for non-household aluminium packaging waste	No firm plans to introduce mandatory separation at source for non-household aluminium packaging waste	N/A (for countries already having mandatory sorting at source)
---	---	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on aluminium packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.5 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.5, giving the factor of 1 in total.
- 0.01 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.005 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.005, giving the factor of 0.01 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.2.4 SRF P-4.2.4 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for glass packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

Firm plans to improve the separate collection system	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)
--	---	---	---

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Firms plans to introduce mandatory separation at source or to improve separate collection for non-household glass packaging waste	No firm plans to introduce mandatory separation at source for non-household glass packaging waste	N/A (for countries already having mandatory sorting at source)
---	---	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on glass packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.5 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.5, giving the factor of 1 in total.
- 0.19 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.095 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.095, giving the factor of 0.19 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.2.5 SRF P-4.2.5 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for plastics packaging waste

Assessment

1. Packaging waste from household sources

Firm plans to improve the separate collection system	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)
--	---	---	---

2. Packaging waste from non-household sources

Firms plans to introduce mandatory separation at source or to improve separate collection for non-household plastics packaging waste	No firm plans to introduce mandatory separation at source for non-household plastics packaging waste	N/A (for countries already having mandatory sorting at source)
--	--	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on plastics packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.5 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.5, giving the factor of 1 in total.

- 0.19 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste. The assessment of household waste stands for 0.095 and the assessment of waste from non-household sources stands for 0.095, giving the factor of 0.19 in total.

If the MS provides information on the shares of household/non-household waste generation, this can be used to modify the weighting factors.

4.2.6 SRF P-4.2.6 Firm plans to improve the convenience and coverage of the separate collection system for wooden packaging waste

Assessment

Firms plans to introduce mandatory separation at source or to improve separate collection for non-household wooden packaging waste	No firm plans to introduce mandatory separation at source for non-household wooden packaging waste	N/A (for countries already having mandatory sorting at source)
--	--	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on wooden packaging waste.
- 0.16 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste.

The main source for wooden packaging waste is non-households, therefore the assessment will not consider household sources in the assessment.

5 Extended producer responsibility (EPR) schemes

5.1 SRF P-5.1 Fee modulation in EPR schemes

Description and relevance

Extended producer responsibility (EPR) schemes aim to apply the polluter-pays principle to waste management so that the costs of waste management are borne by the original waste producer. According to the Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation, producers shall have extended producer responsibility under the schemes established under Chapter 8 section 3 and in accordance with Articles 8 and 8a of the WFD 2008/98/EC. EPR schemes are an important means to finance and create infrastructure for collection and management of packaging waste, and their functioning and design influences the recycling rates of packaging materials.

The modulation of fees to be paid by the producers can support meeting the recycling targets. The PPWR aims to harmonise fee modulation based on recyclability of the packaging, and the European Commission shall develop a framework for this by January 2028 (Art. 6(4)d), which Member States will have to apply.

However, Member States may modulate the fees to be paid by the producers based on other criteria, such as recycled content, reusability, presence of hazardous substances or other criteria in accordance with Directive 2008/98/EC (recital 129). For plastic packaging, the Commission shall develop implementing acts establishing the methodology for the calculation and verification of the percentage of recycled content related to the recycled content targets laid down in Art. 7(1) and 7(2) PPWR.

This SRF therefore assesses if Member States make use or have firm plans to make use of EPR modulating fees. As the delegated/implementing acts on recyclability are not yet available at the time of this assessment, the assessment focusses on other criteria than recyclability, for example recycled content, reusability or other sustainability criteria.

Source

Questionnaire

Weight

The assessment is done for the specific packaging materials and summing up the points of the different materials according to their EU share in packaging waste in order to assess this SRF for total packaging.

5.1.1 SRF P-5.1.1 EPR scheme for paper and cardboard packaging**Assessment**

EPR fee modulation is applied using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	There are firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	No fee modulation and no firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria
--	---	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on paper and cardboard packaging waste
- 0.41 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste

5.1.2 SRF P-5.1.2 EPR scheme for ferrous metals packaging**Assessment**

EPR fee modulation is applied using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	There are firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	No fee modulation and no firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria
--	---	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on ferrous metals packaging waste
- 0.04 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste

5.1.3 SRF P-5.1.3 EPR scheme for aluminium packaging**Assessment**

EPR fee modulation is applied using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	There are firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	No fee modulation and no firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria
--	---	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on aluminium packaging waste
- 0.01 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste

5.1.4 SRF P-5.1.4 EPR scheme for glass packaging

Assessment

EPR fee modulation is applied using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	There are firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	No fee modulation and no firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria
--	---	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on glass packaging waste
- 0.19 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste

5.1.5 SRF P-5.1.5 EPR scheme for plastics packaging

Assessment

EPR fee modulation is applied using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	There are firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	No fee modulation and no firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria
--	---	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on plastics packaging waste
- 0.19 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste

5.1.6 SRF P-5.1.6 EPR scheme for wooden packaging

Assessment

EPR fee modulation is applied using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	There are firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria	No fee modulation and no firm plans to introduce EPR fee modulation using reusability, recycled content or other sustainability criteria
--	---	--

Weight

- 1 for the assessment of the target on wooden packaging waste
- 0.16 for the assessment of the target on total packaging waste

6 Other measures or initiatives for advancing packaging waste recycling

6.1 SRF P-6.1 Initiatives for advancing packaging waste recycling (bonus success factor)

Description and relevance

This SRF awards MS that have implemented national initiatives that contribute significantly to increasing packaging waste recycling performances and that are not yet covered under any of the previous SRFs. These initiatives may include (but are not restricted to): innovative pilot projects to increase recycling of packaging waste; national awareness campaigns to support separate collection with measurable impact; digital platforms for citizen engagement in packaging waste sorting; or advanced data monitoring systems for packaging waste flows.

The assessment is based on the following criteria:

- The measure/initiative is coordinated at national or (multi-)regional level and its findings, methodologies and lessons learnt are actively shared – ensuring broad applicability and scaling potential. Or, if the measure/initiative is a pilot project on local or regional level and its findings, methodologies and lessons learnt are actively shared to enable scaling across the whole country.
- The measure/initiative has a documented quantitative or qualitative impact on the packaging recycling rate, either measurable or supported by expert judgement.

Source

Questionnaire

Considerations for the assessment

This SRF provides an opportunity to gain additional points in the overall assessment. Importantly, MS that do not have such initiatives will not be penalized, as this SRF will simply not be taken into account in their scoring.

SRF P-6.1 Initiatives for advancing total packaging waste recycling

Assessment

MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the total packaging recycling rate that meets all criteria.	MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the total packaging recycling rate that meets one of the two criteria.	N/A
---	--	-----

Weight

1

6.1.1 SRF P-6.1.1 Initiatives for advancing paper and cardboard packaging waste recycling

Assessment

MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the paper and cardboard packaging recycling rate that meets all criteria.	MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the paper and cardboard packaging recycling rate that meets one of the two criteria.	N/A
---	--	-----

Weight

1

6.1.2 SRF P-6.1.2 Initiatives for advancing ferrous metals packaging waste recycling

Assessment

MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the ferrous metals packaging recycling rate that meets all criteria.	MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the ferrous metals packaging recycling rate that meets one of the two criteria.	N/A
--	---	-----

Weight

1

6.1.3 SRF P-6.1.3 Initiatives for advancing aluminium packaging waste recycling

Assessment

MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the aluminium packaging recycling rate that meets all criteria.	MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the aluminium packaging recycling rate that meets one of the two criteria.	N/A
---	--	-----

Weight

1

6.1.4 SRF P-6.1.4 Initiatives for advancing glass packaging waste recycling

Assessment

MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the glass packaging recycling rate that meets all criteria.	MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the glass packaging recycling rate that meets one of the two criteria.	N/A
---	--	-----

Weight

1

6.1.5 SRF P-6.1.5 Initiatives for advancing plastics packaging waste recycling

Assessment

MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the plastics packaging recycling rate that meets all criteria.	MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the plastics packaging recycling rate that meets one of the two criteria.	N/A
--	---	-----

Weight

1

6.1.6 SRF P-6.1.6 Initiatives for advancing wooden packaging waste recycling

Assessment

MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the wooden packaging recycling rate that meets all criteria.	MS has implemented at least one measure or initiative to increase the wooden packaging recycling rate that meets one of the two criteria.	N/A
--	---	-----

Weight

1

7 List of abbreviations

EEA	European Environment Agency
EC	European Commission
EPR	Extended producer responsibility
ETC CE	European Topic Centre on Circular Economy and Resource Use
DRS	Deposit-return system
MBT	Mechanical biological treatment
MS	(EU) Member States (European Union)
PAYT	Pay-as-you-throw (system)
PPWR	Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation
SRF	Success/risk factor
Questionnaire	One of the key sources for collecting information mentioned in the methodology is a questionnaire to MS, designed by the EEA and ETC CE to collect information on a voluntary basis.
WFD	Waste Framework Directive

European Topic Centre on
Circular economy and resource use
<https://www.eionet.europa.eu/etcs/etc-ce>

The European Topic Centre on Circular economy and
resource use (ETC CE) is a consortium of European
institutes under contract of the European
Environment Agency.

