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1. Policy framework and the political context
The key policy framework instruments are:

- **Thematic strategy on the prevention and recycling of waste, COM(2005) 666 final**
  - sets as long-term goal for the EU to become a recycling society that seeks to avoid waste and uses waste as a resource.
  - It set 7 actions how to reach these objectives, for example, step up enforcement, modernise waste legislation, develop recycling standards and improve prevention.
  - The Strategy played an important role in guiding policy development and has contributed to significant improvement in waste management.

- **Europe 2020 Strategy → Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe, COM(2011)571**
  - outlines how to transform Europe's economy into a sustainable one by 2050, how to increase resource productivity and decouple economic growth from resource use and its environmental impact. It illustrates how policies interrelate and build on each other.
  - It sets various actions (2012-2014) to be taken by the Commission to treat waste as a resource, including the review of the waste targets.
  - **7th Environmental Action Programme, 2013 – 2020**
  - Puts focus to turning waste into a resource including by phasing out landfilling.

  - Waste management plays a central role in the transition to a circular economy. The plan requires the Commission to take measures:
  - Revise waste targets (proposal adopted in December 2015); step up enforcement; communication on waste to energy (adopted in January 2017); disseminate good practices on
separate collection (specific study available on DG Environment website).
2. EU waste legislation and objectives
EU waste legislation objectives (Art 1 WFD)

- Preventing and reducing the adverse impacts of the generation and management of waste
- Resource conservation
- Resource efficiency

EU waste legislation objectives are defined in Article of the Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC:

- Waste prevention – has been and continues to be the first and most important objective of the EU waste management policy.
- Reduce environmental impact of resource use and improve resource efficiency of such use. This objective is also called developing a “recycling society” - one that not only avoids producing waste but also uses it as a resource.
Precautionary, polluter pays and the proximity principles stem from Article 191(2) TFEU and EU waste legislation incorporates all of these principles.
The concept of waste hierarchy is defined in Article 4 of the Waste Framework Directive.

Note: this presentation does not aim to present the principles.
EU waste policy is based on a concept known as the waste hierarchy, which lists the different options for managing waste from 'best' to 'worst' from an environmental perspective. However, the waste hierarchy should not be seen as a rigid prescription, particularly since different waste treatment methods can have different environmental impacts. So, if a waste management option that is normally lower in the hierarchy causes fewer environmental impacts in a specific situation, then it should be implemented. The rules on derogations from the waste hierarchy are also provided in Article 4 WFD.

Definitions of the waste hierarchy levels:

- **PREVENTION**: measures taken for products, i.e. before a substance, material or product has become waste, that reduce:
  - The quantity of waste, including through the re-use of products or the extension of the life span of products;
  - The adverse impacts of the generated waste on the environment and human health; or
  - The content of harmful substances in materials and products.

Reduction in the generation of waste, usually at source is the most effective waste management option.

- **RE-USE** – is a means of waste prevention. A product is used for the same purpose. For example, closed loop system for wooden pallets or deposit-refund systems for re-use.
- **PREPARING FOR RE-USE** – is a type of recovery operation once a product has become waste. Examples of preparation for re-use are: repairing furniture, WEEE, bicycles, washing bottles before re-use.
- **RECYCLING** – is reprocessing of waste into products, materials and substances. Does not include incineration and energy recovery. Examples of recycling are reprocessing of organic
material into compost, plastic waste into granulate plastic, crushed waste glass for blasting.

• RECOVERY – any operation treating waste can either be a recovery or a disposal operation. Recovery is when waste is serving a useful purpose by replacing other materials which would otherwise have been used for a particular function. Recovery operations are: preparing for reuse, recycling, other recovery like incineration with energy recovery and backfilling.

• RECOVERY v DISPOSAL – with respect to incineration CJEU has developed in its case-law a test of “principally used” to avoid sham recovery. Incineration with energy recover is a recovery operation if waste is incinerated and is used as a fuel or other means of generating energy – greater part of waste must be consumed and the greater part of energy must be recovered and used. If waste is simply incinerated without any energy recovery it is a disposal operation.

• DISPOSAL – normally this is landfilling, but also incineration of waste (all D operations listed in Annex I WFD).

MS must take measures to facilitate compliance with the hierarchy:
- Planning measures (Waste Management Plans) to ensure investments into infrastructure that complies with the hierarchy;
- Regulatory regime;
- Administrative and fiscal instruments to facilitate the waste management choices that correspond to the hierarchy:
  - Landfilling (taxes + charges) should be higher than recovery operations and recovery should be higher than recycling.
  - Extended producer responsibility schemes should be functional
    - To encourage waste prevention
    - Waste collection
    - Design, manufacture

What is life cycle thinking (referenced in Article 4 WFD), how does it relate to the waste hierarchy and how can it be applied?

Life cycle thinking is a mindset for policymakers to make every effort to take into account all relevant environmental aspects for the determination of the best environmental option for a given waste flow. This must include consideration of the whole life cycle of the related resources or products. Applying the life cycle approach to waste – the last stage in the life cycle of a resource or a product - means that waste policy not only looks at the pollution caused by waste, but also at how waste policies can contribute to reducing the environmental impacts of resource use. For example, recycling avoids emissions of landfilling or incineration but also saves energy because recycling generally requires much less energy than the production of new materials. Another example would be the selection of priority waste prevention measures with a view to maximize their environmental return - it might be more efficient to avoid one tonne of food becoming waste than to avoid one tonne of waste paper.

The "waste hierarchy" and "life cycle thinking" are two intimately interlinked concepts as life cycle thinking is both the justification and the complement of the waste hierarchy. On the one hand, the waste hierarchy is justified by taking a life cycle approach to the environmental impacts associated to each option – as illustrated by the example of recycling given above. On the other hand, where because of its general nature the waste hierarchy does not give guidance for a specific case, life cycle thinking helps us identify the environmentally best option. Therefore, the waste hierarchy should remain as the guiding principle of waste policy whilst life cycle thinking will complement the hierarchy for specific cases.

Examples of cases where the deviation from the waste hierarchy could be environmentally
justified include:
It can be better for the environment to shorten the life of old cars and to put new cars on the roads. The reduced emissions of using a new car may outweigh the environmental impacts of producing more waste cars and recycling them; Repair and reuse can be environmentally damaging. Repairing a low energy efficiency fridge can lead to environmental degradation because of continued high energy consumption and high emissions of greenhouse gases. Disposal can be the best option. For example, EU legislation forbids the reuse or recycling of POPS (Persistent Organic Pollutants) waste because these substances are too dangerous.
This slide provides a visual picture of the waste hierarchy and the impact that other measure proposed by the Commission will have on the waste hierarchy.

2030 timeframe reflects the proposed measures in the Commission’s proposed review of the EU waste legislation COM(2015)595.

It shows that:

- Waste prevention will be boosted by measures on waste prevention, specific food waste prevention measures (bio-waste represents around a half of all municipal waste), measures facilitating changes in design of products (e.g. measures on extended producer responsibility);

- Re-use and recycling will be boosted by introducing higher recycling targets for municipal and packaging waste and by introducing obligatory separate collection of bio-waste and by strengthening the role of extended producer responsibility in waste management;

- Landfilling will be phased out by setting landfill reduction target for municipal waste, restricting landfilling of separately collected waste and by increasing recycling targets which will drive waste away from landfills.

- EU has committed under the UN Sustainable Development Goals in September 2015 to reduce food waste and marine litter. The measures strengthening separate collection of waste and recycling of waste will have an impact on land caused marine litter.
This slide lists the key EU waste legislation.

Waste is one of the first topics that EU environmental legislation tackled in the 1970s. The Waste Framework Directive was adopted in 1975 (then 2006/12/EC and now 2008/98/EC) and provides the overall framework for waste management in the EU, seeking to ensure that it does not present a risk to water, air, soil, wildlife and human health.

All Waste Directives have an Environmental legal basis (Article 192 TFEU) with two exceptions: Batteries directive has double legal basis with an internal market basis covering specific articles that provide for full harmonisation on metal content for batteries, labelling accepted on the market; and Packaging Directive that has a full Internal Market legal basis (Article 114 TFEU).

In addition to the Waste Framework Directive and the Landfill Directive also the Directives marked in yellow provide for specific collection, recycling and recovery targets.
This and the next two slides aim to look at the concept of “waste” which is a key concept of the WFD and determines the scope of the EU waste legislation.

It centers around the notion of discard which is not defined.

The holders intention is to be inferred from the holders actions in the light of the aims of the Directive on the basis of all factual circumstances.

CJEU has emphasized the need for a broad interpretation of the concept of waste and for flexibility in adopting a case-by-case approach and taking into account the factual circumstances of each case.

More extensive guidelines on the concept of waste are provided in the Commission’s guidelines available here:
CJEU has concluded that in view of the objectives of the WFD (and the precautionary principle), the concept of waste cannot be interpreted restrictively.

This slide brings up a couple of situations which illustrate the different circumstances that may or may not be relevant when applying the definition:

Does it matter if discard is deliberate or accidental?

• It is irrelevant whether materials, substances are deliberately or accidentally discarded. With regard to waste water, they are within the scope of the WFD if they are not covered by other legislation, like Directive 91/271/EEC on urban waste water.
• Oil mixed with water, soil, sediments is waste where not possible to be exploited/marketed without further processing.

Does it have any bearing on the waste/ non-waste status if the material has an economic value?

• The concept of waste does not exclude substances that can be further exploited and has an economic value.
• The concept of waste does not in principle exclude any kind of residue, industrial by-product or other substance arising from production processes.

There is extensive CJEU case-law on the interpretation of this definition that offers guidance. More extensive guidelines on the concept of waste are provided in the Commission’s guidelines available here:
The concept of waste does not in principle exclude any kind of residue, industrial by-product or other substance arising from production processes. Through the interpretation of the definition of waste the CJEU has provided guidance when material can be regarded as something that the operator wishes to exploit rather than a substance that is being discarded.

Article 5 WFD has tried to increase the legal certainty by codifying this case-law.

This slide brings up a couple of situations which illustrate the different circumstances that may or may not be relevant when applying the definition of waste in relation to production processes:

Does it have any bearing on the waste/ non-waste status if the material has an economic value?
• The concept of waste does not exclude substances that can be further exploited and has an economic value.
• The concept of waste does not in principle exclude any kind of residue, industrial by-product or other substance arising from production processes.

Is it relevant whether the substance or material has an environmental impact?
The absence of a clear risk to the environment from a material, does not prove that it is not a waste. In Palin Granit, the ECJ considered that even if it was proven that the material in question does not pose any real risk to human health and environment; this was not a relevant criterion in order to consider that a material was not waste. This is logical – inert industrial waste dumped in an inappropriate area may pose no risk to human health or to the
environment. However, it undoubtedly constitutes a nuisance and should be covered by the scope of the waste definition.

Following on from this, the fact that a substance can be recovered as a fuel in an environmentally responsible manner and without substantial treatment does not mean that the substance is not a waste (Arco Chemie case). The waste definition exists to ensure that this environmentally responsible treatment is indeed carried out on wastes.

Attention can be drawn to the Commission’s communication on the waste and by-products (COM(2007)0059 final) which provides more extensive guidance on the concept of by-product and the different considerations that the CJEU has provided as guidance.

It should be noted that the notion of “animal by-product” (referred to in Art 2(2)(b) WFD) has not the same meaning as “by-product” in Art 5 WFD. Animal by-product is entire bodies or parts of animals or products of animal origin not intended for human consumption. “animal by-product” is excluded from the scope of the WFD if it is used for uses that are not considered waste operations. Management of animal by-products is governed by Regulation 1069/2009.
Article 6(1) WFD sets conditions when a recovery operation may result in the waste ceasing to be waste. These conditions are based on case-law of the CJEU interpreting the concept of waste and the notion of discard. All conditions have to be met cumulatively.

The Article provides for 3 avenues for decision making:
(1) End of waste criteria can be set at EU level that have to be applied across the EU, (2) national level criteria that have validity only within a MS and (3) case-by-case decisions on end-of-waste status.

EU level criteria have been set for metal scrap, glass, and are being proposed for compost and digest.

There is no mutual recognition of national criteria or case-by-case decision when the waste is shipped across the MS borders. Where the involved competent authorities disagree on the waste/non-waste status of a shipment, those materials should be treated as waste in accordance with the precautionary principle – this is according to Art 28 of the Waste Shipment Regulation.
This slide aims to shed light on the relation between waste legislation and chemicals legislation. REACH applies when waste material ceases to be waste.

If a material is not a waste, this does not mean that it falls completely out of the system of environmental protection set down in EU law. Product based regulation, and other legislation such as REACH Regulation aim at protecting human health and the environment from the potential environmental impacts of products and other materials that are not wastes.

The purpose of REACH is to ensure a high level of protection of human health and the environment, as well as the free circulation of substances on the internal market. REACH consists of obligations of data gathering and sharing (in registration and evaluation) with the ultimate aim to adequately manage chemicals and a number of processes designed to control/reduce the risks posed by substances.

A material or substance that is considered a by-product under Article 5(1) is subject to REACH obligations.

Article 2(2) of REACH states that waste is not within the scope of REACH. This means that materials have to cease to be waste before REACH requirements apply.

To ensure workability and maintain incentives for recycling, REACH provides an exemption for recovered substances from registration, evaluation and downstream user obligations provided that (1) they can demonstrate the substance is the same as a substance that has already been registered under REACH and (2) that safety information on that substance is available to the recovery operator (so that it can be supplied with the substance). For
example, compost and biogas is subject to such exemption.

The exemption is perceived as justified because the “sameness” requirement between the recovered and the virgin registered substance would ensure that any risks posed by the former would have already been assessed in the registration dossier of the latter. Therefore, enforcement is crucial to ensure that Article 6 is complied with.
The classical policy instrument for attaining our objectives is the **setting of targets.** MS and the economic operators agree that targets are instrumental to driving technological development and recycling.

This slide summarises all the key targets for collection, recycling, recovery and landfilling concerning different waste streams.

The targets that are not listed here: WFD sets **additional targets for household waste and C&D waste.**

WFD, packaging directive, and landfill directive contains mandates for the Commission to review these **targets by 2014.** As a result, in 2015, the Commission proposed to increase the municipal waste and packaging waste targets for 2030 and introduce a landfill reduction target for municipal waste.

More information on the target review is available here: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/target_review.htm
As already said, waste prevention is the key tool for resource efficiency — key tool for preserving resources (and avoiding marine litter).

Reducing the amount of waste generated at source and reducing the hazardous content of that waste is regarded as the highest priority according to the Waste Hierarchy established in the Waste Framework Directive (Article 4).

By the end of 2013 MS had to put in place Waste Prevention Programmes. MS have to set objectives and describe **concrete prevention measures**.

The legislator has outlined in Article 9 WFD that an eco-design policy with a view to **promoting technologies focusing on durable, re-usable and recyclable products** (Article 9 WFD) is key for waste prevention.

Consumer habits and **green public procurement are also important elements to be further taken account of**.
There are two crucial elements addressed by the WFD to improve resource efficiency and recycling: one is separate collection and the other one is extended producer responsibility.

This slide covers the rules on separate collection.

**Separate collection** is the best way to provide a constant material flow and also high quality recyclables.

Ideally, all recyclables would be collected separately in the cleanest way possible and then sorted. Separate collection is essential to ensure meeting quality standards required by recyclers.

**As of 2015, separate collection is obligatory for paper, metal, plastic and glass. It will also be mandatory for bio-waste when the WFD is amended.**

There is some uncertainty as to what "separate collection" exactly means. A number of Member States experiment with different ways of co-mingled collection. A final answer to what extent co-mingled collection may be legally acceptable will depend on the merits of the individual system and will have to be judged in the light of effectiveness ("effet utile"). For example, it is accepted to collect together metal and plastic because both streams do not undermine specific treatment afterwards.
Separate collection is not an absolute and unconditional requirement as WFD provides for some flexibilities to the Member States – the separate collection is to be introduced where technically, economically and environmentally possible. This flexibility is to be interpreted restrictively.
This slide explains who is responsible for the financing of waste management.

According to the polluters pays principle, the cost of waste management is borne by the waste producer or waste holder.

This obligation is for the Member States to implement and the modalities are for their discretion. In relation to municipal waste which is organised by municipalities it may be hard to determine the precise volume of municipal waste presented for collection by each household. Therefore, recourse to criteria is justified: surface area, its use, nature of waste. The criteria must be objective having direct relationship to the cost of service such as waste production capacity, nature of waste produced. This was clarified in the CJEU judgment in case C-254/08 Futura Immobiliare.

Extended producer responsibility – this is a “cradle-to-grave” approach – whereby the producers are made physically and financially responsible for the collection, recycling and disposal of their products. Producer is one who manufactures, sells, treats, processes or imports products.

Extended producer responsibility was designed as "soft law" that Member States "may" introduce. On the other hand, Art. 8 WFD is very explicit and detailed in "what" precisely Member States "may" do and "who" may be held responsible as producer.

Extended producer responsibility is considered as a major instrument in support of the implementation of the European Waste Hierarchy, and therefore for the increase of, by priority: prevention, reuse and recycling. Extended producer responsibility is also widely used.
in support of the implementation of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive (94/62/EC), although the Directive itself does not impose the principle.

At EU level, Extended producer responsibility is established for ELV, WEEE and Batteries. This is essential in order to finance and organise the waste management and achieve the high collection and recovery targets provided in those Directives. There is no harmonisation of how this responsibility is to be implemented and data shows that these systems have a wide range of efficacy:

- **Batteries** – collection rates vary from 5% (MT) to 72% (Switzerland), 50% BE
- **ELV** – recycling and re-use rates 64% MT – 96 % DE
- **WEEE** – collection 1.2kg/cap BG to 17.2 kg/cap BE – the average is 6.6.
- **Packaging** – recycling rated 29% MT to 84% DK

At national level Member States have established Extended producer responsibility for a variety of other products. For more information an overview of EPR schemes was adopted by a study commissioned by the Commission. It is available here: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/waste/eu_guidance/pdf/Guidance%20on%20EPR%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf

Below is a list of a variety of legislative and non-legislative measures concerning EPR:

- Acceptance of returned products
- Financial responsibility for the following:
  - consumer information
  - take back points
  - product and material design to ensure recyclability and re-usability
  - multiple use, re-usability, durability, suitability for safe recovery and environmentally compatible disposal
Waste management planning is fundamental to a well organised system of waste management that complies with the waste hierarchy. Therefore, Art 28, 30 WFD requires that MS put in place waste management plans and keep them regularly updated. WFD also prescribes the minimum content that the plans must address. These are listed in Article 28 WFD.

Waste management plans are to be subject to strategic environmental impact assessment. Art 16 WFD is one of the most important measures – it requires that MS establish an integrated network of waste management infrastructure which must enable disposal of waste in one of the nearest appropriate installations. For municipal waste – the network should provide installations close to source of production (where proximity is complied this may include regional cooperation).

The principle of proximity implements Article 191 TFEU – principle that environmental damage must be remedied at source. On the basis of that it is for each region/municipality to take appropriate steps to manage waste close as possible to where it was produced.

As illustrated in the case C-278/09 Commission v Italy, if one region lacks sufficient infrastructure to manage its waste – it is legitimate to conclude that this will compromise the national network of waste management and that the network is no longer integrated and adequate or complies with the principle of self-sufficiency.

Internal Market
Waste materials are products, though of a specific nature, to which articles on the free movement of goods of the TFEU apply. Restrictions to cross border shipment of wastes may be allowed only in some limited cases. The slide lists a number of cases that explain some of
those circumstances. This may be discussed if time allows.
Besides the general definition in WFD, the list of waste established in the Decision is of utmost importance. The list is binding as far as the determination of hazardous waste is concerned (haz waste is marked with an asterisk in this list). The list is updated by the Commission.
Non-hazardous waste destined for recovery may freely circulate between MS (without notification).

Shipments of waste for disposal are subject to principles of proximity and self-sufficiency.

Export of waste for disposal is prohibited, unless to EFTA countries.

MS may restrict shipments of waste for disposal operations and mixed municipal waste.

Case C-209/98 Sydhavens Sten & Grus clarifies that a restriction of waste collectors to bring waste to waste treatment facility in the same MS amounts to a measure of general application prohibiting shipments of waste to other facilities. Question is whether it is justified under the Regulation Article 11(1)(a).

Objective – measures encouraging rationalisation of the collection, sorting and treatment of waste, including a measure to treat waste in the nearest facility of production, especially in the case of mixed municipal waste.

C-292/12 Ragn Sells
Case from EE contesting national procurement requirement that municipal waste, industrial and construction and demolition waste are transported to specific treatment facilities in EE. National court asked if the Waste Shipment Regulation and the principle of proximity allows such rule to treat waste in the nearest treatment plant or whether that could be interpreted as a restriction to free movement of goods.

The Court ruled that MS can restrict that mixed municipal waste is treated in the nearest appropriate treatment facility in the same MS; However, MS cannot restrict transport of industrial and C&D waste to the nearest appropriate treatment facility in the same MS if that waste is for recovery.
The following slides aim to identify the main implementation problems concerning the main EU waste legislation.
The last three bullet-points aim to point out to implementation issues that arise from the interpretation of some of the key EU waste legislation terms. Illustration with some important judgments are provided for the notions of recovery and disposal.

Recovery or disposal
1. C-228/00 Is processing of waste in cement kilns a recovery or disposal? ECJ gave three criteria that have to be fulfilled so as to consider the incineration as a recovery process.

- The burning of waste constitutes a recovery operation under point R1 where the principal objective is for the waste to fulfil a useful function as a means of generating energy, replacing the use of a source of primary energy which would have had to have been used to fulfil that function.
- The use of waste in cement kilns may be classified as a recovery operation if waste to be used as a means of generating energy it takes place in conditions which give reason to believe that it is indeed a means to generate energy, the greater part of the waste is consumed during the operation and the greater part of the energy generated is recovered and used.

Annex IV provides a complicated formula according to which an incinerator which incinerates municipal waste can be considered a recovery installation when reaches a certain energy efficiency value.

2. C-6/00 Is waste that is deposited in a former salt-mine to secure hollow spaces a recovery or disposal? If the waste replaces other materials and thus natural resources are conserved then it is recovery.
3. C-147/15 Mastrodonato

The backfilling of a used quarry using waste. When is it disposal waste and when can it be considered as a recovery operation?

Waste recovery – waste serves a useful purpose replacing other non-waste materials. If the conservation of natural resources is only a secondary effect the primary objective of which is the disposal of waste – this is still disposal of waste. The test is to determine whether the backfilling of a quarry is a genuine need, i.e. whether it would have taken place in the absence of availability of waste. Waste must be suitable for the purpose of backfilling – non-hazardous, inert – mostly C&D.
This slide lists some important judgments where the Court has condemned MS for failing to ensure an integrated waste management system or failed to comply with the obligations to ensure proper landfilling of waste in line with the requirements of the Landfill Directive. These judgments are also important in that they are one of the few examples when the Court has imposed penalty payments on Member States.
This slide mentions the key implementation failures in relation to the Landfill Directive.

Waste management planning at national and regional levels to ensure capacity – strategic planning on the location and capacity needs of a MS or region still is an issue in some MS. This should be addressed by proper Waste Management Plans.

Infrastructure gaps – EU money was available for the construction of landfills in the past, but that is no longer the cases since the WFD contains a waste hierarchy. However, there are still gaps in some MS. Infrastructure gaps also exist in related treatment infrastructure e.g. sorting, pre-treatment (note that pre-treatment is obligatory before landfilling).

Illegal landfills, substandard landfills – COM receives plenty of complaints about illegal dumping, about landfills that do not have an authorization, or landfills that do not comply with the authorisation. There is also still widespread illegal dumping.

Compliance with the target to divert biodegradable waste – this is a considerable challenge for a number of MS. Collection, information of public, composting, creating of a market for the compost, creating regulations that define the quality of compost.

The main environmental threat from biowaste is the production of methane in landfills, which accounted for some 3% of total greenhouse gas emissions in the EU-15 in 1995. The Landfill Directive obliges Member States to reduce the amount of biodegradable waste that they landfill to 35% of 1995 levels by 2016, which will significantly reduce the problem.

C-323/13 Commission v Italy – is a very important judgment where the Court interpreted the
notion of treatment. Treatment is defined in Article 2(h) of the Directive as ‘physical, thermal, chemical or biological processes, including sorting, that change the characteristics of the waste in order to reduce its volume or hazardous nature, facilitate its handling or enhance recovery’. MS are not free to decide what level of treatment they choose. Treatment has to be effective to reduce negative effects. Where MBT is applied, this has to suffice specific technical requirements that allow reduction of hazardous properties of waste, reduction of volume through sorting of all recyclable material, stabilisation of waste, in such a way that negative effects on human health and the environment are excluded to the greatest possible extent. This concerns in particular bio-waste, which has to be stabilised through thermal, chemical or other relevant treatment before it can be landfilled. If bio-waste has to be stabilised, it has to be isolated from other waste. This can be done at an MBT plant, or the waste can be collected separately, be put into anaerobic digestion to produce bio-gas.
This slide summarizes the key implementation problems on the WEEE Directive.

More information on these issues can be found on the Commission’s website:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/weee/events_weee_en.htm
Thank you for your attention!

More information:
Waste Management: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/index.htm