

ROADMAP

TITLE OF THE INITIATIVE	Review of Waste Policy and Legislation		
LEAD DG – RESPONSIBLE UNIT	ENV.C.2	DATE OF ROADMAP	02 / 2013
This indicative roadmap is provided for information purposes only and is subject to change. It does not prejudice the final decision of the Commission on whether this initiative will be pursued or on its final content and structure.			

A. Context and problem definition

- (1) What is the political context of the initiative?
- (2) How does it relate to past and possible future initiatives, and to other EU policies?
- (3) What ex-post analysis of existing policy has been carried out? What results are relevant for this initiative?

Political context of the initiative and how it relates to past and possible future initiatives, and to other EU policies.

The Commission's work programme for 2013 indicates that there will be a review of waste policy and legislation. The results of this single, comprehensive and coherent review will be presented in 2014 and will cover the following three elements:

- 1. A review of key targets in EU waste legislation (in line with the review clauses in the Waste Framework Directive, the Landfill Directive and the Packaging Directive);
- 2. An ex-post evaluation ("fitness check") of five of the EU Directives dealing with separate waste streams: sewage sludge, PCB/PCT, packaging and packaging waste, end of life vehicles, and batteries;
- 3. An assessment of how the problem of plastic waste can best be tackled in the context of the current waste policy framework. This will follow on from the March 2013 Green Paper on Plastic Waste¹ that launches a wide-ranging public consultation on the subject.

This review will be informed by the 'aspirational objectives'² set out in the Resource Efficiency Roadmap, as well as by the objective to ensure safe/sustainable access to raw materials as one of the key contributions to the Raw Materials Initiative. The review will also build upon the 2011 Communication on the implementation of the Thematic Strategy on the Prevention and Recycling of Waste³, where the Commission identified a list of actions and priorities to both improve the implementation of existing legislation and to move towards a more ambitious waste management policy. This includes continuing efforts to modernize, simplify and ensure the consistency of the waste legislation and the review of main targets included in key waste Directives

A legal obligation to review a number of waste management targets is laid down in the Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC (WFD), the Landfill Directive 99/31/EC and the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive 94/62/EC. The targets to be reviewed by 2014 are the following:

- The Waste Framework Directive in its Art. 11.2 stipulates targets for the preparation for re-use and the recycling of waste materials from household and possibly from other origins and targets on preparation for re-use, recycling and other material recovery, including backfilling operations, on non-hazardous construction and demolition waste to be achieved until 2020. By 31 December 2014 at the latest, the Commission should examine these targets with a view to, if necessary, reinforcing the targets and considering the setting of targets for other waste streams. Pursuant to Art. 9 the Commission should propose, where necessary, waste prevention and decoupling objectives for 2020.
- Article 5.2 of the Landfill Directive sets progressive targets for the reduction of landfilling of biodegradable waste, the last target to be achieved in 2016. The 2016 target will have to be re-examined by 16 July 2014.
- Article 6.1 of the *Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive* 94/62/EC sets differentiated recycling and recovery targets, for several categories of packaging waste. Such targets are up for review in 2014.

Existing ex-post analysis of existing policy and results relevant for this initiative.

Several studies on the coherence of the waste legislation have been carried out (see section E) and include several recommendations to improve EU waste legislation. These studies also covered an evaluation of current

achievements, gaps, legal inconsistencies, burdens, socio-economic effects and cost savings potentials. However, older Directives, such as the Sewage Sludge Directive 86/278/EEC and the PCB/PCT Directive 96/59/EC have not been assessed as part of these studies.

The existing studies and other reports published by the Commission, notably the report evaluating ex-post the impact of the Thematic Strategy on waste published in January 2011, provide a good starting point for both the targets review and the fitness check referred to above; they include an assessment of achievements, impacts and limitations of existing legislation and its implementation.

These studies have notably shown that while a number of Member States have already met most of the existing targets (sometimes far in advance of established deadlines), others still face significant challenges. Additional work will be required to assess the need for, and the feasibility of, additional or reinforced targets in the WFD, the Landfill Directive, and the Packaging Directive. Ample data are available from EUROSTAT on municipal waste generation and management which is a good proxy on whether the WFD and the Landfill targets are or are not met. Official reporting from Member States on the WFD targets will start in 2013-2014 and will complete the picture.

As regards the Landfill Directive, the implementation reports from Member States indicate potential problems in some of them with meeting the diversion targets. On the other hand, landfilling has nearly disappeared in other Member States. Studies consistently confirm that diversion of biodegradable waste from landfills is environmentally and economically beneficial, and that the use of economic instruments (which have proven their effectiveness in the most advanced Member States) can help address implementation gaps.

With respect to the Packaging Directive, Member State implementation reports indicate that most of them have achieved/surpassed the targets in the Directive (or are well on track to achieve them in cases of transitional periods that were granted). Although a limited number of Member States encountered difficulties in meeting the targets, the overall implementation level is satisfactory. The current performance levels on recycling and recovery in the EU suggests that there is significant room for improvement, with additional environmental and economic benefits.

The studies also contain valuable information on the design and implementation of the five waste stream directives to be covered by the fitness check, including on issues related to coherence.

Further ex-post analysis to be conducted:

- Review of the current targets in line with the mandates given under the WFD, Landfill Directive and the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive. These targets will have to be reviewed for their adequacy and with a view to be reinforced if necessary, as spelled out in the respective legislative mandates.
- The fitness check of the five waste stream directives referred to above.

The fitness check will focus on the five oldest EU waste stream directives (respectively on sewage sludge, PCB/PCT, packaging waste, end-of-life-vehicles and batteries); the recently reviewed ROHS and WEEE Directives will not be covered. It will be guided by evaluation questions on effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and relevance of the screened acquis. This will include analysis of costs (e.g. in terms of administrative burdens) and benefits for public authorities and companies, particularly SMEs, taking into account different implementation methods across Member States and any good practices from an SME perspective.

The fitness check will also analyse whether and to what extent the five older pieces of legislation are consistent with new policy approaches (e.g. waste hierarchy, life-cycle thinking) and current policy goals (e.g. on resource efficiency and raw materials). The following parameters will be looked into in detail:

Effectiveness

- What progress has been made over time towards achieving the objectives (and, where applicable, targets) set out in the Directives in various Member States? Is the progress made in line with initial expectations?
- Which main factors (e.g. implementation by Member States, action by stakeholders, cooperation between producers and recyclers) have contributed to – respectively stood in the way of – achieving these objectives?
- Beyond these objectives, did the Directives achieve any other significant results (e.g. have they helped ensure safer EU access to raw materials, reduced GHG emissions and/or spurred innovation?)

Efficiency

- What are the costs and benefits associated with the implementation of the Directives in various Member States? If there are significant cost differences between Member States, what is causing them? Can any

costs be identified that are out of proportion with the benefits achieved?

- What good practices in terms of cost-effective implementation of the Directives in MS can be identified (e.g. use of economic instruments such as cost-effective producer responsibility schemes, product policies)?
- Can any specific provisions in the Directives be identified that make cost-effective implementation more difficult?
- Have the Directives been kept fit for purpose through regular adaptation to technical and scientific progress?

Coherence

- To what extent do the Directives satisfactorily complement other parts of EU waste law (especially the Waste Framework Directive) and coherently reflect conceptual changes such as the 5 step waste hierarchy, life-cycle thinking and resource efficiency?
- Can any specific inconsistencies and unjustified overlaps (e.g. in terms of definitions and key concepts) across the Directives concerned and between them and other parts of EU waste law (especially the Waste Framework Directive) be identified?
- Is there any scope for aligning key aspects across the Directives concerned (e.g. legal base, provisions related to export)?
- Can any obsolete provisions in the Directives be identified?

Relevance

- Do the issues addressed by the Directives still match current needs and do they continue to require action at EU level?
- Are factors (such as eco-design) that influence end-of-life impacts sufficiently integrated into the Directives?
- Are EU waste stream Directives consistent with Commission policies on resource efficiency and raw materials and do they cover all relevant waste streams or are there gaps in present EU waste legislation?
- Are there any gaps where further EU waste legislation is required including to achieve the objectives set out in the Resource Efficiency Roadmap?

What are the main problems which this initiative will address?

General Problems:

Design and implementation of EU waste legislation has evolved over time and may no longer be optimal

Since the adoption of the first Directive on Waste 75/442/EEC in 1975, EU waste legislation has experienced a significant expansion. At present, there is an extensive body of legislation including the revised Waste Framework Directive, rules on shipments of waste and waste management operations (landfilling and incineration) and legislation addressing specific waste streams or specific categories of waste (batteries, packaging waste, end of life vehicles, electric and electronic waste, mining waste, sewage sludge and PCBs/PCTs).

While some of these pieces of legislation are relatively recent or have been recently amended and updated (e.g. mining waste, Waste Framework Directive, WEEE, RohS), others are much older and they have not been subject to a systematic review (this is notably the case for the directives on sewage sludge, PCB/PCT, packaging waste and end-of-life-vehicles). Moreover, all evidence available indicates that there is a significant implementation gap in several areas which means missed opportunities also in terms of resource efficiency, job creation and business opportunities.

Missed opportunities from waste management.

According to the EU Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe⁴, each year in the European Union we throw away 2.7 billion tonnes of waste, 98 million tonnes of which is hazardous. On average only 40% of our solid waste is re-used or recycled, the rest going to landfill or incineration. In some Member States more than 80% of waste is recycled, indicating the possibilities of using waste as one of the EU's key resources. At the same time, based on the same legislation, many Member States still landfill over 75% of their municipal waste and have very low recycling rates. Improving waste management makes better use of resources and can open up new markets and jobs, as well as encourage less dependence on imports of raw materials and lower impacts on the environment while contributing to energy savings and cost efficient reduction of greenhouse gases. As the demand of several

raw materials is expected to dramatically increase in the coming years, the worldwide market for recycling and re-use technologies will offer increasing opportunities. Developing and maintaining high European standards for waste management can support the development of a "European Industry of excellence" in that domain.

The Commission study "Implementing EU legislation for green growth"⁵ concludes that full implementation of EU waste legislation would save €72 billion a year⁶, increase the annual turnover of the EU waste management and recycling sector by €42 billion and create over 400,000 jobs by 2020. It follows from the Commission's 2011 Raw Materials Communication⁷ that, as worldwide demand for raw materials increases, greater efforts will have to be made on recycling. Higher recycling rates will reduce the pressure on demand for primary raw materials, help to reuse valuable materials which would otherwise be wasted, and reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions from extraction and processing. It has been estimated that compared to 2004 emissions, between 146 and 244 million tons of GHG emissions could be avoided by 2020 through reinforced application of the waste hierarchy⁸, representing between 19 and 31% of the 2020 EU target.

The Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe concludes that if waste is to become a resource to be fed back into the economy as a raw material, then much higher priority needs to be given to re-use and recycling. The 2020 milestone for the EU should be to achieve a state where waste is managed as a resource. One of the Commission's tasks in achieving this milestone is to review, by 2014, the existing prevention, re-use, recycling, recovery and landfill diversion targets to move towards an economy based on re-use and recycling, with residual waste close to zero.

The targets set in the packaging and packaging waste Directive, Landfill Directive and WFD are the main instrument to operationalize the goals of resource efficiency and the objectives set out in the raw materials initiative.

Therefore, the review of the targets should address, in a comprehensive manner the adequacy of the current targets under the Waste Framework Directive, the Landfill Directive and the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive. This may lead to the reinforcement of existing targets or to the introduction of new targets, including waste prevention and landfill reduction/diversion targets. At the same time, the review will look into possible overlaps (e.g. between the recycling targets in the Waste Framework Directive and in the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive) and, if necessary, identify options to simplify legislation and improve clarity and consistency.

Moreover, the following elements will have to be reviewed:

- *Consistency of the present targets - overlaps*

The current WFD household waste target partly overlaps with those contained in other EU waste Directives, particularly with the targets of the Packaging Directive.

The Landfill Directive's target for diversion of biodegradable waste includes several waste streams (green waste, food and kitchen waste, etc.) but also paper waste. However, the definition of bio-waste contained in the WFD does not cover paper waste. Paper is covered by a recycling target for household waste under the WFD and by the targets of the Packaging Directive for paper considered as packaging.

All these – and possibly other – overlaps and inconsistencies with respect to targets should be identified and addressed.

- *Difference in depth of implementation of current targets between Member States and reliability of data*

The available data demonstrate significant implementation gaps, with some Member States having eliminated landfilling of untreated household waste and a majority of others landfilling up to almost 100%. Accordingly, performance on meeting the targets for diversion of biodegradable waste from landfills as well as recycling targets under the Waste Framework Directive diverges strongly between Member States. This should inform the review which should also consider ways (e.g. the use of economic instruments⁹) to close the implementation gap.

Another aspect that may need to be addressed concerns the reliability of statistical data. Ambiguous calculation methods - ("as minimum to include plastics, metals, glass, paper") - for measuring the recycling targets make a differentiated and precise comparison of progress across the EU difficult, since they allow Member States to add other waste streams from households, in particular bio-waste. The open character of the target renders the data non-comparable. In addition, There is no full comparability between Eurostat's municipal waste data and those reported under the current WFD target. This is mainly due to the fact that waste statistics are collected by Eurostat on the basis of the 2002 Regulation on Waste Statistics, which, however, has not been aligned to the WFD. While the WFD distinguishes between household waste and commercial waste, the Waste Statistic Regulation does not.

Who will be affected by it?
Member States including regional and local authorities, waste management industry, producers and consumers when producer responsibility schemes are set in place, citizens to the extent that more separate collection may be introduced. The recycling industry will profit from more legal certainty and a well-functioning fully coherent recycling legislation should help improve framework conditions for business and employment.
Is EU action justified on grounds of subsidiarity? Why can Member States not achieve the objectives of the proposed action sufficiently by themselves? Can the EU achieve the objectives better?
Reviewing the targets stems from an explicit mandate in EU waste legislation and will be informed by the objectives of other EU policies and strategies including on resource efficiency and access to raw materials. Effective design of recycling legislation is important because industry must be able to rely on clear legal concepts and common standards in a single market. EU action on effective design of recycling legislation is necessary for creating a smooth functioning of the single market, and a level-playing field in terms of environmental protection and resource efficiency.

B. Objectives of the initiative
What are the main policy objectives?
The objective is to lay the ground for more effective design of waste legislation that promotes further the principle of the waste hierarchy to remove ambiguity and improve legal certainty, thus making legislation clearer, more effective and more easily enforceable. The target review follows the mandate under Art. 11.4 WFD, Art. 5.2 LD, Art. 6.5 PPWD. It will help to increase coherence between the three Directives and to simplify the application of waste acquis in relation to targets.
Do the objectives imply developing EU policy in new areas?
No

C. Options
(1) What are the policy options (including exemptions/adapted regimes e.g. for SMEs) being considered? (2) What legislative or 'soft law' instruments could be considered? (3) How do the options respect the proportionality principle?
(1) What are the policy options (including exemptions/adapted regimes e.g. for SMEs) being considered? The two main policy options are: (1) maintaining status quo (no change to current targets and possible shortcomings in effective design of legislation) or, (2) revising the targets (several options to be considered and developed as part of the review process) including the introduction of new targets. There are three possibilities to be considered under the main option (2). (a) a review of all targets under the WFD, LD and PPWD (b) a review only of the PPWD and the LD in order to harmonise them with the targets in the WFD (c) a combination of (a) and (b) with a view to improve methodological and statistical aspects in order to improve effectiveness in monitoring the attainment of targets. E.g. the 50% target for household waste in the WFD can presently be calculated in a way that only a single waste stream is taken into account which would make it fairly difficult to compare achievements in attainment of targets between Member States.
(2) What legislative or 'soft law' instruments could be considered? Legislative instruments: revising current targets, introducing new targets. New policy initiatives with a view to amending existing product-specific waste legislation. "Soft law" instruments: guidance documents, exchange of best practice (already applied in waste management policy, with limited effect).

(3) How do the options respect the proportionality principle?

Targets are already in place. Any new options will be closely checked against the proportionality principle. Concrete options addressing a potential lack in coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance may need to be developed with their impact for administration and stakeholders, in particular SMEs, to be assessed. It will be ensured that the possible future options will not lead to proposals that go beyond what is necessary to achieve the environmental objective. In-depths analysis will also cover the principles of proportionality and subsidiarity

D. Initial assessment of impacts

What are the benefits and costs of each of the policy options?

No yet fully known,

However, Commission study "Implementing EU legislation for green growth" concludes that full implementation of existing EU waste legislation (including reaching the existing targets) would save €72 billion a year, increase the annual turnover of the EU waste management and recycling sector by €42 billion and create over 400,000 jobs by 2020. Moving towards the objectives of the Roadmap on Resource Efficiency (going beyond mere implementation of existing legislation) could help to create 526,000 jobs compared to 2008 and an additional turnover of € 55 billion. It has also been estimated that compared to 2004 emissions, between 146 and 244 million tons of GHG emissions could be avoided by 2020 through reinforced application of the waste hierarchy¹⁰, representing between 19 and 31% of the 2020 EU target. Streamlining of present legislation would increase legal certainty and make recycling legislation more easily enforceable, potentially lifting burdens for SMEs as well as administration. Benefits and costs for industry including SMEs (both in the waste management and other relevant sectors) will be further analysed.

Could any or all of the options have significant impacts on (i) simplification, (ii) administrative burden and (iii) on relations with other countries, (iv) implementation arrangements? And (v) could any be difficult to transpose for certain Member States?

The review will consider if it is possible to simplify the existing targets of the WFD (including by replacing the 4 calculation methods by one transparent method).

No extra administrative burden is expected going beyond the implementation of the targets, i.e. their enforcement, collection of data for reporting on progress (for this, administrative structures should already be put in place). Simplifying existing WFD targets and streamlining calculation methods may reduce administrative costs.

No impact on relations with other countries is expected apart from an increased independence of the EU for its access to raw-materials – some of them being considered as 'critical'.

Implementation aspects will be addressed in the assessment of the options; there could be impacts on implementation arrangements from all options.

Ambitious targets can be difficult for MS which are currently lagging behind with the implementation of the present legislation and where no continuous progress is being made – even if the experience of the most advanced MS is demonstrating that with a good strategy these targets can indeed be met. Transition periods or phase-in policies should be considered for those MS.

The fitness check of certain waste stream directives within the review of waste legislation could inter alia highlight potential for simplification. The administrative burden for Member States, industry, notably SMEs and the Commission could likely significantly be reduced, e.g. by streamlining reporting obligations with less reporting, avoiding overlaps and synchronisation of reporting.

(1) Will an IA be carried out for this initiative and/or possible follow-up initiatives?

(2) When will the IA work start?

(3) When will you set up the IA Steering Group and how often will it meet?

(4) What DGs will be invited?

(1) Yes, following the work on the review of targets, any consequent legal proposal will be accompanied by an impact assessment which will have to address all options that may be envisaged.

<p>(2) Two studies, on the target review and on the fitness check of waste legislation will be launched in the autumn of 2012. The study on target review will include the assessment of impacts while the fitness check study will lead to a report assessing the ex-post effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and relevance of waste stream specific legislation as a basis for future policy decisions to be taken later in a separate process.</p> <p>(3) A Commission Steering Group has already been set up (first meeting took place on 29 June 2012). It will be involved in preparing the Terms of Reference for the study, monitoring the study results, preparing the Impact Assessment and the proposal. It will meet several times throughout the targets' revision process.</p> <p>(4) Invited DGs include: SG, CLIMA, ECFIN, ENTR, ESTAT.</p>
<p>(1) Is any option likely to have impacts on the EU budget above € 5m?</p> <p>(2) If so, will this IA serve also as an ex-ante evaluation, as required by the Financial Regulation? If not, provide information about the timing of the ex-ante evaluation.</p>
<p>(1) No</p> <p>(2) n/a</p>

E. Evidence base, planning of further work and consultation
<p>(1) What information and data are already available? Will existing IA and evaluation work be used?</p> <p>(2) What further information needs to be gathered, how will this be done (e.g. internally or by an external contractor), and by when?</p> <p>(3) What is the timing for the procurement process & the contract for any external contracts that you are planning (e.g. for analytical studies, information gathering, etc.)?</p> <p>(4) Is any particular communication or information activity foreseen? If so, what, and by when?</p>
<p>Already available studies include:</p> <p>1. Commission staff working document (2011) accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the Thematic Strategy on the Prevention and Recycling of Waste</p> <p>The Staff Working Paper was based on a number of preparatory studies including one synthetic study coordinated by the Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP).</p> <p>The paper contains an in-depth assessment of the contribution that current EU waste legislation has made, Directive by Directive, to achieve the objectives of the 6th EAP, mainly to help Europe to become a resource efficient, recycling society with a high standard of environmental protection.</p> <p>The report was underpinned ample stakeholder consultation. It examined the achievements of each single Directive and their individual contribution to the 6th EAP. Among the parameters assessed were: level of implementation; Member State performances; progress to a recycling society; GHG emissions and recycling; economic impacts of legislation; waste policy and globalisation; and future trends in all relevant parameters.</p> <p>2. Study on coherence of waste legislation 2009</p> <p>This study checked coherence between the new WFD and the Directives on Packaging, ELV, WEEE, RoHS, Batteries, including their interaction with REACH.</p> <p>It was accompanied by extensive stakeholder consultation and delivered significant results in identifying incoherence between older legislation and the new WFD. The stress was on legally formal inconsistencies with impact on practicality of the acquis. Inconsistencies were inter alia identified relating to: definitions, objectives and principles, legal bases, producer responsibility, targets and their comparability (baselines and end points), flexibility for adjustment to scientific progress, different concepts not mainstreamed (such as waste hierarchy, life cycle thinking, re-use, recycling, recovery not defined or defined differently etc.)</p> <p>This study is an in depth assessment of coherence of the main legal instruments in waste policy.</p>

3. Study on coherence of waste legislation 2011

This study took an even broader look in the functionality of existing key legislation, the Directives on WEEE, Batteries, ELV, RoHS, Packaging and its interdependence with the WFD and corollary acquis such as the Landfill Directive and the Waste Shipment Regulation as well as its effectiveness and efficiency.

The objectives were to identify: potential gaps, inconsistencies and overlaps between the five Directives and other main elements of EU waste legislation; the effectiveness and efficiency of the current waste stream Directives; potential alternative approaches in the design of legislation; and upcoming challenges in the development of EU waste legislation related to recycling.

Key findings include: introduction of additional material-based targets, better implementation and enforcement, integration of eco-design requirements, harmonisation with WFD, improved separate collection, increased quantitative targets for ELV and Packaging Waste.

The study also covered an evaluation of current achievements, gaps, burdens, socio-economic effects, cost savings potentials, contribution to resource efficiency and relevant drivers for resource efficiency.

4. Study on green growth (2010)

This study looked into benefits and barriers related to better implementation of the EU waste acquis. It was informed by a number of stakeholder workshops. The study contains ample information about the functioning of legislation, its benefits and obstacles to reaping these benefits.

5. Study on market-based instruments for waste management (2012)

This study was a follow-up to the studies carried out for the study on the Thematic Strategy on Waste and looked into the use of economic instruments in relation to the management of specific waste stream Directives in different Member States (producer responsibility schemes, pay-as-you-throw schemes and taxes for landfill and incineration).

This study also looks into how the implementation of the waste stream Directives can be improved by using economic instruments. The results have already been used in the AGS 2012 exercise as well as to better define ex ante conditionality for the use of structural funds.

6. Study on the feasibility of a waste implementation agency (2010)

This study examined how insufficient enforcement by Member States affects the effectiveness of the EU waste acquis and lists the benefits of better enforcement of current rules.

7. Follow-up study on the implementation of Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste in EU-25 (2007)

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/landfill_index.htm

That study documents systemic problems in the implementation of the Landfill Directive and draws general conclusion which are of importance for waste stream Directives.

It will be necessary to gather information on the impacts of any modified/new targets of the WFD, the Landfill Directive and the Packaging Directive. It will also be necessary to consolidate the findings of existing studies including on coherence of waste legislation, and filling possible gaps as well as to gather further information on effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and relevance in relation of the Sewage Sludge Directive and the PCB/PCT Directive, This will be done by in two separate studies by an external consultant to be monitored by the Steering Group (contract to be signed in 2nd half 2012, to last until end 2013/beginning 2014).

Stakeholder consultation is planned for the first half of 2013 for the target review and the fitness check. Publication of results with supporting communication/information on activities is foreseen for early 2014.

Which stakeholders & experts have been or will be consulted, how, and at what stage?

Member States, NGOs and the waste management industry. It is planned to launch a targeted consultation of a broad, balanced and representative group of stakeholders and subsequently and, if appropriate, a broader online consultation (to be decided with the Steering Group).

¹ COM (2013) 123 final

² By 2020 landfilling should be virtually eliminated, reuse and recycling should be at their maximum feasible level, energy recovery should be limited to not recyclable waste and waste generation should have been decreased

³ COM (2011) 13

⁴ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions, **"Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe"**, COM(2011) 571 final, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/resource_efficiency/pdf/com2011_571.pdf.

⁵ **"Implementing EU legislation for Green Growth"**, Final Report, 29 November 2011, <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/studies/pdf/study%2012%20FINAL%20REPORT.pdf>.

⁶ This is understood as the reduction of total net costs of waste management taking into account the economic value of reductions in GHG emissions including methane from landfills. (Green growth study, p. 11)

⁷ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions **"Tackling the Challenges in Commodity Markets and on Raw Materials"**, COM(2011) 25 final, http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/raw-materials/files/docs/communication_en.pdf.

⁸ Source: Prognos study, <http://www.prognos.com/CO2-study.609.0.html> The study considers both direct GHG emission reduction due to better waste management (for instance reduction of methane emissions from landfilling) and indirect avoided emissions due to increased recycling and reduced use of virgin materials

⁹ Economic instruments such as producer responsibility/landfill + incineration taxes and pay as you thrown schemes - combined with appropriate legal obligations such as landfill bans.

¹⁰ Source: Prognos study, <http://www.prognos.com/CO2-study.609.0.html> The study considers both direct GHG emission reduction due to better waste management (for instance reduction of methane emissions from landfilling) and indirect avoided emissions due to increased recycling and reduced use of virgin materials