# Public Consultation on the Evaluation of the Waste Shipment Regulation

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

# Public Consultation on the Evaluation of the Waste Shipment Regulation

# INTRODUCTION

### Background

Article 60(2a) of Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste[1] (Waste Shipment Regulation - WSR) calls on the Commission to carry out a review of this Regulation by 31/12/2020. In accordance with the Better Regulation Guidelines, an evaluation is the first step in this process.

The Commission is currently carrying out an evaluation to assess whether the WSR, including Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007[2], meets its objectives using the criteria of: (i) effectiveness, (ii) efficiency, (iii) coherence, (iv) relevance and (v) EU added value. In assessing coherence, the evaluation will take into consideration EU waste legislation, the general objectives of EU environmental policy incl. circular economy, as well as other EU policies such as industrial/raw materials and trade policies, the internal market, etc. The evaluation will include an investigation of costs and benefits associated with the implementation of the WSR for stakeholders at local, national and EU level. The results of this evaluation will be used to assess the performance of the WSR so far.

Further information in relation to the evaluation can be found in the published evaluation roadmap[3].

- [1] Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 June 2006 on shipments of waste. (OJ L 190, 12.7.2006, p. 1)
- [2] Commission Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007 of 29 November 2007 concerning the export for recovery of certain waste listed in Annex III or IIIA to Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council to certain countries to which the OECD Decision on the control of transboundary movements of wastes does not apply. (OJ L 316, 4.12.2007, p. 6)
- [3] http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/roadmaps/docs/2017\_env\_026\_waste\_shipment\_evaluation\_env. pdf

### About the consultation

The process of evaluation follows the EC guidance for evaluations and considers the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and EU added value of the Regulation's provisions and the legislation implementing it.

The consultation will be held between 30 January 2018 and 27 April 2018.

Please make sure to submit your response during this period.

If you would like to address aspects in more detail or to provide information or data which may be of relevance to the evaluation, such information can also be submitted via email until 27 April 2018 at the latest to <u>WSRevaluation@trinomics.eu</u>.

# QUESTIONNAIRE

## About you

1. Contributions will be published on the Commission's website, either with or without the personal information of the contributor. Please state your preference with regard to the publication of your personal information. Please note that regardless of the option chosen, your contribution may be subject to a request for access to documents under Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 on public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents. In this event the request will be assessed against the conditions set out in the Regulation and in accordance with applicable data protection rules.

## \* Your contribution:

- can be published with your personal information (I consent to publication of all information in my contribution and I declare that none of it is under copyright restrictions that prevent publication)
- can be published in an anonymous way (I consent to publication of all information in my contribution except my name/the name of my organisation and I declare that none of it is under copyright restrictions that prevent publication)

# Respondents should not include personal data in documents submitted in the context of consultation if they opt for anonymous publication.

Please note: regardless of the option chosen, your contribution may be subject to a request for access to documents under Regulation 1049/2001 on public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents. In such cases, the request will be assessed against the conditions set out in the Regulation and in accordance with applicable data protection rules.

### \*2. Are you replying as/on behalf of:

- A citizen
- A company
- A European business organisation
- A national business organisation
- A trade union
- A non-governmental organisation
- A national public authority
- A regional/local public authority
- An academic institution/research centre
- A professional consultancy/law firm
- Other

Industry association

\*3. Please provide your name if replying as an individual, otherwise give the name of your organisation.

Eurometaux

#### \* Please provide an e-mail address:

slupek@eurometaux.be

3.1 If your organisation is registered in the Transparency Register, please provide your Register ID number:

61650796093-48

#### 3.2 If your organisation is not registered, you have the opportunity to register now.

In the interests of transparency, organisations, networks, platforms or self-employed individuals engaged in activities aimed at influencing the EU decision making process have been invited to provide the public with relevant information about themselves, by *registering in Transparency Register and subscribing to its Code of Conduct.* 

Please note: If the organisation is not registered, the submission will be published separately from the registered organisations. During the analysis of replies to a consultation, contributions from respondents who choose not to register will be treated as individual contributions (unless the contributors are recognised as representative stakeholders through Treaty provisions, European Social Dialogue, Art. 154-155 TFEU).

#### \*4. Your country

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy

- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- 🔘 Romania
- Slovak Republic
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Other

# **Evaluation of the Waste Shipment Regulation (WSR)**

## 5. To what extent has the WSR been effective in achieving the following objectives?

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Somewhat ineffective	Very ineffective	Don' t know
* Protecting the environment	0	۲	0	0	0	0
*Respecting the principle of proximity and priority for recovery and self- sufficiency at EU and national levels	۲	۲	0	0	0	©
* Keeping waste shipment systems and procedures adapted to technical progress	0	0	0	۲	0	۲
* Achieving consistent waste shipment rules across the EU	0	0	0	۲	0	O
* Complying with international obligations such as the Basel Convention and OECD Decision C (2001)107/final	©	0	0	۲	O	O

* Preventing and detecting illegal	0	0	0	۲	0	0
shipments of waste						

### \*6. Is the WSR still relevant?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

# \*7. Are you aware of any problems/issues related to waste shipments, including their impact on the environment and human health that the WSR does not adequately address?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

# 7.1 [If yes] Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

The following problems are identified:

1) Burdensome notification procedure for haz. waste creating delays (i.e. prenotification for each shipment, out-of-date paper forms, low recognition of preconsented recovery facilities, transit countries approval)

- 2) No provision to ensure that exported waste is recycled to the same quality standards as in the EU
- 3) Divergent waste classification between MSs, disrupting shipments
- 4) Lack of new green-listed codes for certain AI waste-Annex IIIB

\*8. Is the application of the WSR consistent across all EU Member States?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

# 8.1 [If no] Please specify

500 character(s) maximum

A major barrier is lack of harmonised definitions across MSs leading to delays & unpredictability. This applies to:

waste codes & classification (haz. vs. non-haz.) - Ex.: e-scrap was shipped from HU through AT and BE without a problem. All those MSs considered it non-haz. However, DK deemed it opposite and stopped it.
waste & by-product - Ex.: Anode slimes containing precious metals were classified as by-products in AT and BE, while the NL authorities recognised them as haz. waste.

9. Are there any specific requirements in the WSR or Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007 that have led to significant costs for you or your organisation? Please consider both monetary and non-monetary costs.

\*Waste Shipment Regulation (WSR)

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

9.1. [If yes] Please provide examples of requirements in the WSR that have led to significant costs:

500 character(s) maximum

Burdensome notification procedure leads to significant delays and potential business losses.

\*Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

### 10. What is the impact of the WSR on the following areas:

### Waste Shipment Regulation

	Very negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very positive	Don' t know
*Human health	0	0	0	۲	0	0
* Emissions to the environment	O	0	۲	O	0	0
* Climate change	0	0	۲	0	0	0
*Clean-up costs	0	0	۲	0	0	0
* Prevalence of illegally shipped waste	0	0	0	۲	0	0
*Material recovery	0	0	0	۲	0	0
* Energy recovery	0	0	۲	0	0	0
*Creation of jobs	0	0	۲	0	0	۲

*Level-playing field for	0	۲	0	0	0	0
operators						

# Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007

	Very negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very positive	Don' t know
*Human health	0	0	0	۲	0	0
* Emissions to the environment	0	0	۲	0	0	0
*Climate change	0	0	۲	0	0	0
*Clean-up costs	0	0	۲	0	0	0
* Prevalence of illegally shipped waste	O	0	0	۲	0	0
*Material recovery	0	0	0	۲	0	0
*Energy recovery	0	۲	۲	0	0	0
*Creation of jobs	0	0	۲	0	0	0
* Level-playing field for operators	O	۲	0	0	0	0

# 11. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the costs and benefits of the WSR and Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007?

# Waste Shipment Regulation

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don' t know
* It has reduced costs for the sector (e.g. through harmonisation of rules)	0	0	0	۲	0	0
* The costs involved in implementing the Regulation are justified given the benefits	0	0	0	۲	0	0

# Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don' t know
* It has provided greater legal certainty for exporters of 'green'- listed waste	0	۲	0	0	0	0
* The costs involved in implementing the Regulation are justified given the benefits that have already been achieved	O	۲	۲	۲	۲	۲
* The costs involved in implementing the Regulation are justified given the benefits that will be achieved in the longer term	O	0	۲	0	O	۲

# 12. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don' t know
* The WSR is an effective tool to the combating of illicit trafficking of waste across borders through increased transparency of waste shipments	۲	0	۲	۲	0	O
* The WSR is well adapted to technical and scientific progress	0	0	0	۲	0	0
* The WSR is well adapted to new political priorities	0	۲	۲	۲	0	0
* The WSR is well adapted to EU and global market developments	0	0	0	۲	0	0
* The WSR is relevant in the context of the EU's international obligations resulting from <i>inter alia</i> the Basel Convention and OECD Decision C(2001)107/final	۲	۲	٢	©	O	O

*The WSR supports the EU internal market and the creation of a level playing field for economic operators, including SMEs	0	0	O	۲	O	٢
* The WSR promotes industrial innovation	0	0	۲	0	0	0
* The WSR provides additional employment opportunities	0	0	۲	0	0	0
* The WSR contributes to the circular economy	0	۲	0	0	0	0
* The WSR helps mitigate climate change	0	0	۲	0	0	0
* The effectiveness of the WSR is enhanced by some Member States taking stricter measures	0	O	0	۲	0	0
* There is a need for more common and harmonised rules under the WSR across Member States	۲	0	O	0	0	0
* Definitions and classifications included in the WSR are clear and non-ambiguous	0	0	0	۲	0	0
* Inspection plans are effective means to achieve the objectives	O	O	۲	O	O	0

* Regulation 1418/2007 is effective in regulating the export of 'green'-listed wastes for recovery to non-OECD countries	O	۲	O	O	O	٢
* Regulation 1418/2007 is well adapted to technical and scientific progress	0	O	۲	0	0	0
*Regulation 1418/2007 is well adapted to new political priorities		0	۲	0	0	0
* Regulation 1418/2007 is well adapted to EU and global market developments	0	0	۲	0	0	O
* Regulation 1418/2007 contributes to the circular economy	0	O	۲	0	0	0

# \*13. Are there any provisions of the WSR and/or Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007 that could be simplified without compromising the objectives of the WSR?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

#### 13.1 [If yes] Please specify [max. 500 char]

500 character(s) maximum

Current notification procedure has 7 steps for each shipment, even for pre-consented recyclers. This causes delays of min. 1 month up to 3+. Simplifying the notification procedure for pre-consented recovery facilities would facilitate shipments to proven high-quality recyclers, without jeopardising WSR objectives. Operators should be able to ship to pre-consented facilities without waiting for CA approval of every notification. Regular auditing can be used to guarantee high quality standards.

14. Please indicate if there are gaps, overlaps, inconsistencies or discrepancies in the provisions of the Waste Shipment Regulation and/or between the Regulation, other EU or national legislation or policy and/or international law.

	Gaps	Overlaps	Inconsistencies/ discrepancies	No gaps, no overlaps, no inconsistencies /discrepancies	Don't know
* Within the provisions of the WSR	<b>V</b>				
*Between the provisions of the WSR and Regulation 1418/2007					
*Between the WSR, Regulation 1418/2007 and other legislation (national or international)					

# 14.1 Where you have indicated specific gaps, overlaps and/or inconsistencies, please indicate the specific piece(s) of legislation and explain their impact

1000 character(s) maximum

Gap - There is not yet a solution for ensuring that exported waste is treated under equivalent conditions as within the EU. This disrupts the level playing field for Europe's high-quality recyclers, and risks that exported European waste is treated under sub-standard conditions, resulting in environmental/human harm. Although the WSR/Waste Framework Directive/WEEE Directive refer to "equivalent conditions" for waste exports, there is not yet a methodology for ensuring this.

Inconsistency – Member States have different interpretations of waste codes & classifications (see 8.1 above – hazardous/non-hazardous waste, waste/byproduct). This results in delays and extra costs for European high-quality recyclers, lowering their competitiveness and disrupting the intra-EU transit of waste. Introducing consistency in the national rules will help to maintain their business operations.

# 15. Without the Waste Shipment Regulation (and Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007), i.e. if measures had been taken at national level only, what would it be like in your country(ies) in terms of:

	Much better	Better	The same	Worse	Much worse	Don't know
* Protecting the environment	0	0	O	۲	0	0
* Respecting the principle of proximity and priority for recovery and self-sufficiency at EU and national levels	0	0	0	۲	0	0
*Keeping waste shipment systems and procedures adapted to technical progress, scientific progress, new political priorities and EU and global market developments	0	0	0	۲	0	0
* Enforcing take-back obligations for illegal shipments of waste (at least within the EU)	0	0	0	۲	0	0
* Facilitating an EU market for secondary raw materials	0	0	O	۲	O	0

16. If Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007 did not exist, please specify what impacts there would be in the EU and in third countries (non-OECD members).

500 character(s) maximum

No specific comment.

# 17. Do you have any other views which have not been covered in the consultation? Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

No specific comment.

# Contact

ENV-EVALUATION-WSR@ec.europa.eu