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

08/01/2021

European Environment Agency
European Topic Centre on Waste and Materials in a Green Economy

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

ETC/WMGE consortium partners: Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), CENIA, Collaborating Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production (CSCP), Research Institute on Sustainable Economic Growth of National Research Council (IRCrES), The Public Waste Agency of Flanders (OVAM), Sustainability, Environmental Economics and Dynamic Studies (SEEDS), VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, Banson Communications Ireland (BCI), The Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment, Energy (WI), Slovak Environment Agency (SEA)

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
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. This questionnaire will be sent out to Member States in early 2021.

Contents

Abbreviations and explanations 2
Introduction 4
1 Current situation and past trends 5
SRF MSWR-1.1 Distance to target 5
SRF MSWR-1.2 Past trend in municipal solid waste recycling rate 5
2 Legal instruments 6
SRF MSWR-2.1 Proper and timely transposition of the relevant articles of the revised Waste Framework Directive into national law 6
SRF MSWR-2.2 Clearly defined responsibilities for meeting the targets, and support and enforcement mechanisms, e.g. tools, fines etc. 7
3 Economic instruments 7
SRF MSWR-3.1 Taxes and/or ban for landfilling residual or biodegradable waste 7
SRF MSWR-3.2 Taxes on municipal waste incineration 8
SRF MSWR-3.3 Pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system 8
4 Separate collection systems 9
SRF MSWR-4.1 Convenience and coverage of separate collection systems for the different household waste fractions 9
SRF MSWR-4.2 Firm plans to improve the type and coverage of separate collection for the different household waste fractions 11
5 EPR and similar schemes 13
SRF MSWR-5.1 Fee modulation in EPR schemes for packaging 13
6 Data quality 14
SRF MSWR-6.1 Data and quality check 14
SRF MSWR-6.2 Verification process used to verify data 14
7 Bio-waste treatment capacity and quality management 15
SRF MSWR-7.1 Capacity for the treatment of bio-waste 15
SRF MSWR-7.2 Legally binding national standards and Quality Management System for compost/digestate 15
8 Context parameters 16
8.1. Economic parameters 16
8.2. Evolution of municipal waste generation 16
8.3. Implementation of recommendations of the previous Early Warning report (2018) 16
8.4. Prospects for meeting the target to halve residual (incinerated + landfilled) waste by 2030 16
8.5. Waste management plan(s) aligned to requirements in Article 28 WFD and adapted to new directives 16
8.6. Existing capacity for incineration and MBT treatment of generated residual waste 17

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 low, medium or high 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 66% of this maximum score. A MS is considered to be 'at risk' if its score is less than 33% of this maximum score.

In addition, a number of contextual parameters will be 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.

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
Reported data according to WFD Art. 11(2)(c) and Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2019/1004

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
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. The assessment of the distance to target will take this extension of the deadline into account. This aspect will be discussed further during interaction with the MS where applicable.

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 2022 is taken from the reported data according to the calculation rules of the Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2019/1004. This is a compromise as time series data for the compliance with the target will not be available in time for the assessment.

Source

Historical trend: Municipal waste generation, recycling and composting/digestion reported to Eurostat (dataset env_wasmun)
Current situation (RR): Recycling rate for the reference year 2020 as reported in 2022 according to the rules laid down in Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2019/1004)

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 Proper and timely transposition of the relevant articles of the revised Waste Framework Directive into national law

Description and relevance
Are the relevant articles of the Waste Framework Directive properly transposed into national law within the foreseen period or is there a delay? The following articles are selected for being most relevant for meeting the targets:

- Article 3: Definitions
- Article 8: Extended producer responsibility
- Article 10: Recovery
- Article 11: Preparing for reuse and recycling
- Article 20: Hazardous waste produced by households
- Article 22: Bio-waste
- Article 28: Waste management plans
- Article 36: Enforcement and penalties
- Article 37: Reporting

Source
European Commission

Assessment

Transposition without delay	Transposition with a delay of less than 6 months	Transposition with delay of > 6 months, or no full transposition yet

Weight
1

SRF MSWR-2.2 Clearly defined 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 responsibilities for meeting the targets and consequences for failing the targets are, the higher the chance that the targets will be met.

Source
Questionnaire

Assessment

Clearly defined responsibilities and enforcement mechanisms	Partly defined responsibilities or weak enforcement mechanisms	Unclear responsibilities or no enforcement mechanisms

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 and towards recycling.

Source
ETC/WMGE Country profiles (last update 2016), CEWEP 'Landfill taxes and bans overview'. Update through questionnaire.

Assessment

Ban, or landfill tax > 30 Euro/tonne* with escalator	Yes, taxes > 30 Euro/tonne*	No or low tax (< 30 Euro/tonne*)

*rescaled based on purchasing power parities

Weight
1

Considerations for the assessment
To allow meaningful comparison of landfill taxes across MS, 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 will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Source
Questionnaire

Assessment

Yes, taxes > 7 Euro/tonne* with escalator	Yes, taxes > 7 Euro/tonne*	No or taxes < 7 Euro/tonne*	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, 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

[1] Definition of PAYT is based on (BIPRO, 2015), (EY, 2020) and (ACR+, 2016)

or with a system that does not fully cover the MS territory will have more difficulties in meeting the target.

Source
Questionnaire.

Assessment

Yes, fully rolled out (to at least 80% of the population)	Implemented in some regions/ municipalities (50-80% of population covered)	No or only experimental (less than 50% of population covered)

Weight
1

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.

[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

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

	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	
Paper and Cardboard	H	H	H			H	H	H			H	H	H	
Ferrous metals	H		H			H		H			H		H	
Aluminium	H	H	H			H	H	H			H	H	H	
Glass	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/or MS reports on separate collection acc. to Art. 10(6) WFD, due 31/12/2021 (Art. 10(6): By 31 December 2021, Member States shall submit a report to the Commission on the implementation of this Article as regards municipal waste and bio-waste, including on the material and territorial coverage of separate collection and any derogations under paragraph 3)
Eurostat: Household characteristics by degree of urbanization (HBS_CAR_T315)

Assessment

The assessment will be done on a material basis, and summing up the scores of the different materials according to their 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. [Note: The material-based weighting factors might be updated in 2022 in case new information on EU average waste composition becomes available.]

For MS which allow derogations from separate collection under Art. 10(3), and as reported according to Article 10(6), the derogations will be considered to create MS specific scores for the assessment on

population thresholds applied to 1 km² population grid cells; each LAU belongs exclusively to one of these three classes (Eurostat Glossary).

the coverage of separate collection. This is done on a case-to-case basis by the EEA-ETC/WMGE expert team based on evidence provided by the respective MS.

Paper and cardboard Share: 23%	>= 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	50 – 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	< 50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points
Metals Share: 4%	>= 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	50 – 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	< 50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points
Plastics Share: 14%	>= 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	50 – 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	< 50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points
Glass Share: 9%	>= 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	50 – 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	< 50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points
Bio-waste Share: 42%	>= 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	50 – 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	< 50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points
Wood Share: 3%	>= 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	50 – 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	< 50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points
Textiles Share: 3%	>= 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	50 – 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	< 50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points
WEEE Share: 2%	>= 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	50 – 80% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points	< 50% of the population is covered by high convenience collection points

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

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

Description and relevance
Are there concrete plans to improve the type and coverage of separate collection for the different household waste fractions within the next 3 years? This SRF is only relevant for MS that do not score 'green' in SRF MSWR-4.1. 'Firm plans' are plans that have clear responsible entities and defined targets and timeline.

Source
Questionnaire and/or MS reports on separate collection acc. to Art. 10(6) WFD, due 31/12/2021.

Assessment

The assessment will be 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 cover > 80% of the population by high convenience collection points	Already covering > 50% of the population or firm plans to cover > 50% of the population by high convenience collection points	No firm plans to improve the type and coverage
Metals Share: 4%	Firm plans to cover > 80% of the population by high convenience collection points	Already covering > 50% of the population or firm plans to cover > 50% of the population by high convenience collection points	No firm plans to improve the type and coverage
Plastics Share: 14%	Firm plans to cover > 80% of the population by high convenience collection points	Already covering > 50% of the population or firm plans to cover > 50% of the population by high convenience collection points	No firm plans to improve the type and coverage
Glass Share: 9%	Firm plans to cover > 80% of the population by high convenience collection points	Already covering > 50% of the population or firm plans to cover > 50% of the population by high convenience collection points	No firm plans to improve the type and coverage
Bio-waste Share: 42%	Firm plans to cover > 80% of the population by high convenience collection points	Already covering > 50% of the population or firm plans to cover > 50% of the population by high convenience collection points	No firm plans to improve the type and coverage
Wood Share: 3%	Firm plans to cover > 80% of the population by high convenience collection points	Already covering > 50% of the population or firm plans to cover > 50% of the population by high convenience collection points	No firm plans to improve the type and coverage
Textiles Share: 3%	Firm plans to cover > 80% of the population by high convenience collection points	Already covering > 50% of the population or firm plans to cover > 50% of the population by high convenience collection points	No firm plans to improve the type and coverage
WEEE Share: 2%	Firm plans to cover > 80% of the population by high convenience collection points	Already covering > 50% of the population or firm plans to cover > 50% of the population by high convenience collection points	No firm plans to improve the type and coverage

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 incentivised 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

Assessment
The assessment of advanced fee modulation will be 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 colours 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 in at least two of the main packaging fractions* AND fee modulation for one packaging fraction meets all four assessment criteria	At least one packaging fraction* has a fee modulation that meets at least three assessment criteria	No fee modulation OR fee modulation meets less than three assessment criteria

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

Weight
1

6 Data quality

SRF MSWR-6.1 Data and quality check

Description and relevance
Is the data and quality check report related to Article 11(2) points (c) to (e) of Directive 2008/98/EC submitted in the format as laid down in Annex V of Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2019/1004?

Source
Eurostat.

Assessment

Yes	Yes but format not fully followed or missing information or Submitted but delayed with > 2 months (if quality assessment not available)	No

Weight
1

SRF MSWR-6.2 Verification process used to verify data

Description and relevance
Which verification process(es) is (are) used to verify the reported data? To validate the accuracy of the statistical data provided by the MS to Eurostat, a number of verification procedures within the national statistical reporting system can be used, e.g. cross-checks with other data sets, time-series checks or whether the process is independently audited or not. The assessment of the quality of the verification procedure of the MS is done by Eurostat and based upon the information provided by the MS in the quality check report.

Source
Eurostat, data and Quality check report (Annex V).

Assessment

high quality verification method	Medium quality verification method	low quality verification method or no data quality report submitted

Weight
1

7 Bio-waste treatment capacity and quality management

SRF MSWR-7.1 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.

Source
Questionnaire.

Assessment

Enough bio-waste treatment capacity for 80% of generated municipal bio-waste	Bio-waste capacity between 50% and 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 biowaste from municipal waste (e.g. if anaerobic digestion plants for manure also can take in biowaste from households and if they are in the proximity of where the waste is produced).

SRF MSWR-7.2 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 biowaste 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

8 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.

8.1. Economic parameters

Economic parameters influence a Member State's general ability to invest in new infrastructure, enforcement of environmental regulations and acceptance of higher fees for waste services by citizens. Therefore, a weak economy could, but does not have to, hamper the necessary investments for reaching the preparing for reuse and recycling target. On the other hand, several MS are eligible for support from EU Cohesion and Structural Funds.

8.2. Evolution of municipal waste generation

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 will be analysed as a context parameter.

8.3. 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.

8.4. Prospects for meeting the target to halve residual (incinerated + landfilled) waste by 2030

The 2020 'Circular economy action plan – The Green Deal' calls for halving the amount of residual (non-recycled) municipal waste by 2030. While this target is not legally binding for MS, residual municipal waste amounts are closely related to the recycling rate but is also influenced by municipal waste generation. Past trends in generation of residual waste and recycled amounts will be analysed with a view to assess the prospects towards the 'halving residual municipal waste' target.

8.5. Waste management plan(s) aligned to requirements in Article 28 WFD and adapted to new directives

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. Non-compliance with the mandatory requirements or not covering all optional requirements of Article 28 WFD, signals a risk for not meeting the targets. Information will be based on the study 'Detailed assessment of waste Management Plans' conducted under the authority of the European Commission. As not all waste management plans will be assessed within that study, this will be limited to those MS for which the study delivers results.

8.6. Existing capacity for incineration and MBT treatment of generated residual waste

Proper treatment infrastructure and sufficient capacity for the residual waste generated are a basic condition for environmentally sound waste management. Overcapacity generally increases the risk of discouraging recycling.

- Which capacity is available for incineration and MBT treatment of residual waste and is there a significant amount of overcapacity? (Overcapacity is assumed when capacity exceeds 120%)
- The capacity needed is calculated based on the current amount of residual waste.

Information will be sourced from the questionnaire. Information regarding (over)capacity installed in MS might be difficult to obtain. In the questionnaire information will be asked regarding the origin of the waste being incinerated.