

## Proposals for amendments to ENVI report on waste directives

### Proposal for amendment 1:

#### ENVI report Amendment 11

#### Proposal for a directive

#### Recital 8 d (new)

<i>Commission proposal</i>	<i>ENVI proposal</i>
	(8d) Member States should ensure the establishment of extended producer responsibility schemes for at least packaging, electrical and electronic equipment and batteries and accumulators. Moreover, Member States should encourage the establishment of extended producer responsibility schemes for all other relevant waste streams.
<b>Our nproposal</b>	
Delete	
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>We want to keep the Commission's proposal. We do not support that it becomes mandatory to introduce producer responsibility on more fractions than already exists today. Partly because we believe that the way we choose to handle waste should be determined in each member country. Partly because some Members states have bad experiences with EPR schemes.</p> <p><b>Proposal for justification:</b>  EPR schemes on for example packaging will be hard to implement in a way that makes sense. In some Member States with EPR on packaging waste it is seen that manufacturers will only take responsibility for the plastic, they are responsible for, which means that only a very small part of the waste is recycled. If the public authorities have the responsibility for all waste streams then a more coherent and holistic approach will be ensured. This ensures a more optimal solution than to split up into many different streams and actors.</p>	

## Proposal for amendment 2:

### ENVI report Amendment 23

#### Proposal for a directive

#### Recital 20

<b><i>Commission proposal</i></b>	<b><i>ENVI proposal</i></b>
(20) Compliance with the obligation to set up separate collection systems for paper, metal, plastic <b>and</b> glass is essential in order to increase preparing for re-use and recycling rates in Member States. In addition bio-waste should be collected separately to contribute to an increase in preparing for re-use and recycling rates and the prevention of contamination of dry recyclable materials.	(20) Compliance with the obligation to set up separate collection systems for paper, metal, plastic, glass, <b>wood and textile</b> is essential in order to increase preparing for re-use and recycling rates in Member States. In addition bio-waste should be collected separately to contribute to an increase in preparing for re-use and recycling rates and the prevention of contamination of dry recyclable materials. <b><i>In addition, separate collection of bio-waste from municipal waste should be made obligatory and a recycling target should be laid down for bio-waste from municipal waste to attract infrastructure investments towards recycling facilities for bio-waste and to boost markets for compost and digestate.</i></b>
<b>Our proposal</b>	
(20) Compliance with the obligation to set up separate collection systems for paper, metal, plastic <b>and</b> glass is essential in order to increase preparing for re-use and recycling rates in Member States. In addition bio-waste should be collected separately to contribute to an increase in preparing for re-use and recycling rates and the prevention of contamination of dry recyclable materials.	
<b>Justification</b>	
We want to keep the Commission's proposal. We believe that the most effective waste management is achieved by leaving a high degree of flexibility to the Member States and local authorities. We believe that separate collection of biowaste is the best method, and many municipalities already collect biowaste separately. It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. But in some areas it is not possible. Hence, the flexibility is needed. Our umbrella organizations, CEEP and CEMR, as well as our sister organizations all share this opinion.	
<b>Proposal for justification:</b> It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. It is, however, necessary with a certain degree of flexibility and freedom of methods for the implementing local authorities. The Commission's proposal is flexible and gives local authorities the freedom of methods and ensures innovative waste management. It will be a major burden if local authorities should ensure separate collection of biowaste irrespective of local conditions.	

**Proposal for amendment 3:**

**ENVI report amendment 47**

**Proposal for a directive**

**Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 2 – point e**

<b><i>Commission proposal</i></b>	<b><i>ENVI proposal</i></b>
16. "preparing for re-use" means checking, cleaning or repairing recovery operations, by which <b>waste</b> , products or components of products that have been collected by a recognised preparation for re-use operator <b>or deposit-refund scheme</b> are prepared so that they can be re-used without any other pre-processing;	16. "preparing for re-use" means checking, cleaning or repairing recovery operations, by which products or components of products that have <b>become waste and have</b> been collected by a recognised preparation for re-use operator are prepared so that they can be re-used without any other pre-processing
<b>Our proposal</b>	
16. "preparing for re-use" means checking, cleaning or repairing recovery operations, by which <b>waste</b> , products or components of products that have been collected by a recognised preparation for re-use operator <b>or deposit-refund scheme</b> are prepared so that they can be re-used without any other pre-processing;	
<b>Justification</b>	
We want to retain the Commission's proposal. ENVI's proposal would mean that, for example the Danish efficient deposit-refund scheme will not be counted in the calculation of re-use and recycling.	
<b>Proposal for justification:</b> Many Member States have very efficient deposit and return systems. This amendment will mean that the efficient deposit-refund scheme will not be counted in the calculation of reuse and recycling. Deposit-refund schemes are very important to get the most out of the EU's resources. Hence there is no reason to punish member states that already have efficient recycling systems.	

## Proposal for amendment 4:

### ENVI report Amendment 67

#### Proposal for a directive

##### Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 7 – point - a (new)

Directive 2008/98/EC

Article 8 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1

<b>Commission proposal</b>	<b>ENVI proposal</b>
1. In order to strengthen the re-use and the prevention, recycling and other recovery of waste, Member States <b>may</b> take legislative or non-legislative measures to ensure that any natural or legal person who professionally develops, manufactures, processes, treats, sells or imports products (producer of the product) has extended producer responsibility.	<b>(- a) in paragraph 1, the first subparagraph is replaced by the following:</b> "1. In order to strengthen the re-use and the prevention, recycling and other recovery of waste, Member States <b>shall</b> take legislative or non-legislative measures to ensure that any natural or legal person who professionally develops, manufactures, processes, treats, sells or imports products (producer of the product) has extended producer responsibility.";
<b>Our proposal</b>	
1. In order to strengthen the re-use and the prevention, recycling and other recovery of waste, Member States <b>may</b> take legislative or non-legislative measures to ensure that any natural or legal person who professionally develops, manufactures, processes, treats, sells or imports products (producer of the product) has extended producer responsibility.	
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>We want to retain the Commission's proposal. We do not support that it becomes mandatory to introduce EPR schemes on more fractions than already exists today. Partly because we believe that the way we choose to handle waste should be determined in each member country. Partly because some Members states have bad experiences with EPR schemes.</p> <p><b>Proposal for justification:</b> EPR schemes on for example packaging will be hard to implement in a way that makes sense. In some Member States with EPR on packaging waste it is seen that manufacturers will only take responsibility for the plastic, they are responsible for, which means that only a very small part of the waste is recycled. If the municipalities If the public authorities have the responsibility for all waste streams then a more coherent and holistic approach will be ensured. This ensures a more optimal solution than to split up into many different streams and actors.</p>	

## **Proposal for amendment 5:**

### **ENVI report Amendment 68**

#### **Proposal for a directive**

##### **Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 7 – point - a (new)**

Directive 2008/98/EC

Article 8 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 3

<b><i>Commission proposal</i></b>	<b><i>ENVI proposal</i></b>
Such measures <b>may</b> also include the establishment of extended producer responsibility schemes defining specific operational and financial obligations for producers of products.	Such measures <b>shall</b> also include the establishment of extended producer responsibility schemes defining specific operational and financial obligations for producers of products <b><i>in which the producer's responsibility is extended to the post-consumer state of a product's life cycle for at least packaging as defined point (1) of in Article 3 of Directive 94/62/EC, electrical and electronic equipment as defined in point (a) of Article 3(1) of Directive 2012/19/EU, and batteries and accumulators as defined in point (1) of Article 3 of Directive 2006/66/EC.</i></b>
<b>Our proposal</b>	
Such measures <b>may</b> also include the establishment of extended producer responsibility schemes defining specific operational and financial obligations for producers of products.	
<b>Justification</b>	
We want to retain the Commission's proposal. We do not support that it becomes mandatory to introduce EPR schemes on more fractions than already exists today. Partly because we believe that the way we choose to handle waste should be determined in each member country. Partly because some Members states have bad experiences with EPR schemes.	
<b>Proposal for justification:</b> EPR schemes on for example packaging will be hard to implement in a way that makes sense. In some Member States with EPR on packaging waste it is seen that manufacturers will only take responsibility for the plastic, they are responsible for, which means that only a very small part of the waste is recycled. If the municipalities If the public authorities have the responsibility for all waste streams then a more coherent and holistic approach will be ensured. This ensures a more optimal solution than to split up into many different streams and actors.	

## Proposal for amendment 6:

### ENVI report Amendment 104

#### Proposal for a directive

#### Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 9 b (new)

Directive 2008/98/EC

Article 10 – paragraph 2

<b>Commission proposal</b>	<b>ENVI proposal</b>
2. Where necessary to comply with paragraph 1 and to facilitate or improve recovery, waste shall be collected separately <b>if technically, environmentally and economically practicable and shall not be</b> mixed with other waste or other material with different properties.	<b>(9b)</b> <b>In Article 10, paragraph 2 is replaced by the following:</b> "2. Where necessary to comply with paragraph 1 and to facilitate or improve recovery, waste shall be collected separately and shall not be mixed with other waste or other material with different properties.";
<b>Our proposal</b>	
2. Where necessary to comply with paragraph 1 and to facilitate or improve recovery, waste shall be collected separately <b>if technically, environmentally and economically practicable and shall not be</b> mixed with other waste or other material with different properties.	
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>We want to keep the Commission's proposal. We believe that the most effective waste management is achieved by leaving a high degree of flexibility to the Member States and local authorities. We believe that separate collection of biowaste is the best method, and many municipalities already collect biowaste separately. It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. But in some areas it is not possible. Hence the flexibility is needed. Our umbrella organizations, CEEP and CEMR, as well as our sister organizations all share this opinion.</p> <p><b>Proposal for justification:</b> It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. It is, however, necessary with a certain degree of flexibility and freedom of methods for the implementing local authorities. The Commission's proposal is flexible and gives local authorities the freedom of methods and ensures innovative waste management. It will be a major burden if local authorities should ensure separate collection of biowaste irrespective of local conditions.</p>	

## **Proposal for amendment 7:**

### **ENVI report Amendment 105**

#### **Proposal for a directive**

##### **Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 9 c (new)**

Directive 2008/98/EC

Article 10 – paragraph 2 a (new)

<b><i>Commission proposal</i></b>	<b><i>ENVI proposal</i></b>
	<b><i>(9c) In Article 10, the following paragraph is added: "2a. Member State shall take measures so that waste that has been separately collected on the basis of Article 11(1) or Article 22 is not accepted by an incineration plant. This paragraph does not apply to residue resulting from the sorting of that waste.";</i></b>
<b>Our proposal</b>	
Delete	
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>We want to keep the Commission's proposal. We believe that the most effective waste management is achieved by leaving a high degree of flexibility to the Member States and local authorities. We believe that separate collection of biowaste is the best method, and many municipalities already collect biowaste separately. It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. But in some areas it is not possible. Hence the flexibility is needed. Our umbrella organizations, CEEP and CEMR, as well as our sister organizations all share this opinion.</p> <p><b>Proposal for justification:</b> It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. It is, however, necessary with a certain degree of flexibility and freedom of methods for the implementing local authorities. The Commission's proposal is flexible and gives local authorities the freedom of methods and ensures innovative waste management. It will be a major burden if local authorities should ensure separate collection of biowaste irrespective of local conditions.</p>	

**Proposal for amendment 8:**

**ENVI report Amendment 110**

**Proposal for a directive**

**Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 10 – point a a (new)**

Directive 2008/98/EC

Article 11 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 3

<b><i>Commission proposal</i></b>	<b><i>ENVI proposal</i></b>
Subject to Article 10(2), <b>by 2015</b> separate collection shall be set up for at least the following: paper, metal, plastic <b>and</b> glass.	<b>(aa)</b> <b><i>in paragraph 1, the third subparagraph is replaced by the following:</i></b> "Subject to Article 10(2), separate collection shall be set up for at least the following: paper, metal, plastic, glass, <b>wood, textile and bio-waste.</b> ";
<b>Our proposal</b>	
Subject to Article 10(2), <b>by 2015</b> separate collection shall be set up for at least the following: paper, metal, plastic <b>and</b> glass.	
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>We want to keep the Commission's proposal. We believe that the most effective waste management is achieved by leaving a high degree of flexibility to the Member States and local authorities. We believe that separate collection of biowaste is the best method, and many municipalities already collect biowaste separately. It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. But in some areas it is not possible. Hence the flexibility is needed. Our umbrella organizations, CEEP and CEMR, as well as our sister organizations all share this opinion.</p> <p><b>Proposal for justification:</b></p> <p>It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. It is, however, necessary with a certain degree of flexibility and freedom of methods for the implementing local authorities. The Commission's proposal is flexible and gives local authorities the freedom of methods and ensures innovative waste management. It will be a major burden if local authorities should ensure separate collection of biowaste irrespective of local conditions.</p>	

## **Proposal for amendment 9:**

### **ENVI report amendment 126**

#### **Proposal for a directive**

##### **Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 11**

Directive 2008/98/EC

Article 11a – paragraph 1 – point c

<b><i>Commission proposal</i></b>	<b><i>ENVI proposal</i></b>
<b><i>(c) Member States may include products and components prepared for re-use by recognised preparation for re-use operators or deposit-refund schemes. For the calculation of the adjusted rate of municipal waste prepared for re-use and recycled taking into account the weight of the products and components prepared for re-use, Member States shall use verified data from the operators and apply the formula set out in Annex VI.</i></b>	Deleted
<b>Our proposal</b>	
<b><i>(c) Member States may include products and components prepared for re-use by recognised preparation for re-use operators or deposit-refund schemes. For the calculation of the adjusted rate of municipal waste prepared for re-use and recycled taking into account the weight of the products and components prepared for re-use, Member States shall use verified data from the operators and apply the formula set out in Annex VI.</i></b>	
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>We want to retain the Commission's proposal. ENVI's proposal would mean that, for example the Danish efficient deposit-refund scheme will not be counted in the calculation of re-use and recycling.</p> <p><b>Proposal for justification:</b> Many Member States have very efficient deposit and return systems. This amendment will mean that the efficient deposit-refund scheme will not be counted in the calculation of reuse and recycling. Deposit-refund schemes are very important to get the most out of the EU's resources. Hence there is no reason to punish member states that already have efficient recycling systems.</p>	

**Proposal for amendment 10:**

**ENVI report amendment 128**

**Proposal for a directive**

**Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 11**

Directive 2008/98/EC

**Article 11a – paragraph 3**

<b><i>Commission proposal</i></b>	<b><i>ENVI proposal</i></b>
<b><i>3. By way of derogation from paragraph 1, the weight of the output of any sorting operation may be reported as the weight of the municipal waste recycled provided that:</i></b> <b><i>(a) such output waste is sent into a final recycling process;</i></b> <b><i>(b) the weight of materials or substances that are not subject to a final recycling process and that are disposed or subject to energy recovery remains below 10% of the total weight to be reported as recycled.</i></b>	Delete
<b>Our proposal</b>	
<b><i>3. By way of derogation from paragraph 1, the weight of the output of any sorting operation may be reported as the weight of the municipal waste recycled provided that:</i></b> <b><i>(a) such output waste is sent into a final recycling process;</i></b> <b><i>(b) the weight of materials or substances that are not subject to a final recycling process and that are disposed or subject to energy recovery remains below 10% of the total weight to be reported as recycled.</i></b>	
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>We support the standardisation of methods of calculation. We support the Commission's proposal to standardise the methods of calculation of the recycling rates. We find it very positive that the recycling rates will be based on the final treatment of the waste. The current methods calculate what is collected for recycling. The new calculation method will provide a more accurate picture of what is actually recycled. It will thus ensure a greater focus on resource efficiency and environmental performance of the collected waste.</p> <p><b>Proposal for justification:</b> The current methods of calculation calculate what is collected for recycling. The proposed calculation method will provide a more accurate picture of what is actually recycled. It will thus ensure a greater focus on resource efficiency and environmental performance of the collected waste.</p>	

**Proposal for amendment 11:**

**ENVI report Amendment 136**

**Proposal for a directive**

**Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 13**

Directive 2008/98/EC

Article 22 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1

<b><i>Commission proposal</i></b>	<b><i>ENVI proposal</i></b>
	<p>1. Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that, by 2025, the organic recycling of bio-waste from municipal waste shall be increased to a minimum of 65 % by weight.</p> <p>The weight of bio-waste recycled shall be understood as the weight of the input waste entering an organic recycling process in a given year.</p>
<b>Our proposal</b>	
Delete	
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>We think that it is not necessary with a target for biowaste as biowaste is included in municipal waste.</p> <p><b>Proposal for justification:</b> It is not necessary with a target for biowaste as biowaste is included in municipal waste.</p>	

**Proposal for amendment 12:**

**ENVI report Amendment 137**

**Proposal for a directive**

**Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 13**

Directive 2008/98/EC

Article 22 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1

<b><i>Commission proposal</i></b>	<b><i>ENVI proposal</i></b>
Member States shall <b><i>ensure the separate collection of bio-waste where technically, environmentally and economically practicable and appropriate</i></b> to ensure the relevant quality standards for compost and to attain the targets set out in Article 11(2)(a), (c) and (d) and <b>11(3)</b> .	<b>1.</b> Member States shall <b><i>set up systems for the separate collection at source of bio-waste by 31 December 2020</i></b> to ensure the relevant quality standards for compost <b><i>and digestate</i></b> and to attain the targets set out in Article 11(2)(a), (c) and (d) and <b><i>in the first paragraph of this Article</i></b> .
<b>Our proposal</b>	
Member States shall <b><i>ensure the separate collection of bio-waste where technically, environmentally and economically practicable and appropriate</i></b> to ensure the relevant quality standards for compost and to attain the targets set out in Article 11(2)(a), (c) and (d) and <b>11(3)</b> .	
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>We want to keep the Commission's proposal. We believe that the most effective waste management is achieved by leaving a high degree of flexibility to the Member States and local authorities. We believe that separate collection of biowaste is the best method, and many municipalities already collect biowaste separately. It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. But in some areas it is not possible. Hence the flexibility is needed. Our umbrella organizations, CEEP and CEMR, as well as our sister organizations all share this opinion.</p> <p><b>Proposal for justification:</b></p> <p>It is necessary to collect biowaste separately in order to achieve the high, ambitious targets for recycling, as the Commission proposes. It is, however, necessary with a certain degree of flexibility and freedom of methods for the implementing local authorities. The Commission's proposal is flexible and gives local authorities the freedom of methods and ensures innovative waste management. It will be a major burden if local authorities should ensure separate collection of biowaste irrespective of local conditions.</p>	