



27 April 2020

## FEAD feedback on the Commission Delegated Regulation on a climate change mitigation and adaptation taxonomy

Following the publication of the final TEG's report, FEAD welcomes the possibility to be consulted on the matter, in view of the Delegated Act (end 2020). Considering the role the Taxonomy has to play in future investments in the waste management field and the importance it will have for reporting on activities of waste management companies, we would like to stress the importance of **FEAD being consulted all along the legislative process**. Our inclusion in the Stakeholder Platform on Sustainable investment is essential for our sector.

At this initial stage, FEAD would like to put forward some **crucial points**:

- **Material recovery** (p. 307, Technical Annex): FEAD believes that the concept is not properly described. This is because material recovery is only considered as a green activity in reference to non-hazardous waste, thus excluding material recovery from hazardous waste. Concerning the two thresholds mentioned, we first believe it is not appropriate to consider recovery activities as “green”, only when materials are reincorporated in production processes. The concept should also be extended to any recovering activity for which the material recovered is used as a substitute for other materials. In addition, the list of operations mentioned by the text is rather restrictive. For the treatment of waste and, consequently, secondary raw materials, a variety of processes are needed. In the new CEAP, many objectives lead to material recovery through processes that are not always reincorporation into a production process. In relation to the second threshold criteria requiring at least 50% of the processed separately collected non-hazardous waste to be converted into secondary raw materials, we believe it would add complexity to the classification as it would imply calculations along the waste recovery/recycling chain which can be complex and not reliable due to lack of data.
- **Hazardous waste activities** include recovery of substances with high energy content, as metals and solvents. There is no reason why, from a climate mitigation perspective, material recovery differentiates between hazardous and non-hazardous waste.
- **Selective collection and transport of non-hazardous waste:** (p. 531) hazardous waste and its treatment represent an aspect of the circular economy which should neither be neglected nor negatively regarded. FEAD stresses the fact that hazardous waste's activities must be included in the taxonomy's classification.

APOH, Slovakia  
ARMD, Romania  
ASEGRE, Spain

BDE, Germany  
CAObH, Czech Republic  
DWMA, Netherlands

ESA, UK  
ECEIA, Estonia  
FISE, Italy

FLEA, Luxembourg  
FNADE, France  
go4circle, Belgium

HRABRI ČISTAC,  
Serbia  
IWMA, Ireland  
LASUA, Latvia

NORSK INDUSTRI,  
Norway  
PASEPPE, Greece  
PIGO, Poland

SRI,  
Sweden  
VOEB,  
Austria  
YTP,  
Finland

- **Energy recovery from waste:** FEAD regrets that this activity is still not included. The TEG's final report (p. 208, Technical Annex) mentions that the subject needs to be further investigated. FEAD stresses that energy recovery from waste, fulfilling the R1 criterion has an increasing role to play for the treatment of non-recyclable waste residues<sup>1</sup>. It is an indispensable missing link for increasing recycling rates and diverting non-recyclable waste from landfills, while providing for CO<sub>2</sub> savings by producing electricity/heat then reducing the use of fossil fuels. Significant CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are already avoided (50 Mt /year) and will be (up to 120 Mt/year in 2030) by W-to-E processes, for treating non-recyclable municipal as well as industrial and commercial waste. Carbon capture of emissions is already being evaluated. It is also relevant to note that CO<sub>2</sub> accounting should not be the only criterion used under the classification. W-to-E is crucial for the treatment and sanitation of residual waste. It should thus be considered as "green". In fact, classifying the sector only according to the GHG emissions' criterion goes against the principle of "best available" method, as clearly defined under the IED's BATs. "Best" in this case indicates the most effective methods in achieving a high level of environmental protection as a whole. We further note that several MS, namely in Central Europe, have decided to develop W-t-E in parallel and in support of their efforts to increase recycling and decrease large scale landfilling.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/waste-to-energy.pdf>