1. **Criteria clarifying the end of waste for given waste streams**

- The majority of the Member States supported the approach on end of waste set out by the Commission (outlined in slides attached).
- Some Member States raised the need to look at by-products. The possibility of guidelines and of partial coverage through the end of waste mechanism was noted.
- The Commission clarified that the annexes for the end of waste mechanism would be proposed empty, in order to allow a scientific and measured procedure for selecting appropriate waste streams.
- The importance of a harmonised approach, with a system of compliance checking, was noted.

2. **The definitions of recovery and disposal recycling**

- There was again considerable support for the procedure outlined by the Commission on defining recovery and disposal. (outlined in slides attached) Doubts on the efficiency of comitology were raised for both recovery and disposal and end of waste, but no alternative was identified.
- It was questioned whether there should be the possibility to reclassify a recovery process with a low environmental performance as disposal, on the grounds that processes with low environmental performance should not be allowed at all.
- There was also some preference for general criteria for recovery and disposal that would be more descriptive/detailed than what currently exists.

3. **The definition of recycling**

- Some Member States considered that there was no need to modify the situation as regards the definition of recycling in the three recycling directives or that this could be done in each specific directive. They opposed the Commission’s outline of the possible ways forward (in slides attached) to a harmonised definition of recycling amongst the Member States and across the recycling directives.
- It was nevertheless apparent that the interpretation of the definition of recycling varied amongst the Member States, from purely mechanical recycling to a much wider scope.
- The Commission noted that this could cause serious implementation problems, in particular for WEEE and ELV, and stated that it would send a letter in order to verify to what extent the understanding of the scope of the definition of recycling varied across the EU. It would then analyse the need for further action on the basis of this.

4. **The relationship between BAT in the WFD and the IPPC Directive**

- There was a large degree of support for the Commission’s suggestions on the generalisation of BAT in the Waste Framework Directive. The need for proportionality and adaptation periods was mentioned.
- On the extension of IPPC to a limited range of recycling facilities, there was more less consensus. The need to avoid overlaps and to target facilities carefully was highlighted.

- Other than two Member States, there was wide support for the removal of the regeneration priority in the Waste Oils Directive.
- There was also significant support for the integration of the Hazardous Waste Directive in the Waste Framework Directive.
- A wider approach to the mixing ban was suggested.

6. **Any Other Business**

- Germany and Austria announced that they would hold a workshop on the European Waste Catalogue, 18/19 October in Berlin.
- A number of Member States noted their support for the further co-ordination, analysis or exchange of experience on economic instruments.