

Brevdato 02-06-2023

Afsender Janne Birk Nielsen (Kontorchef, Cirkulær økonomi)

Modtagere Mattia.Pellegrini@ec.europa.eu

Akttitel VS: Danish questions regarding the Waste Framework Directive definition of recovery

Identifikationsnummer 430456

Versionsnummer 1

Ansvarlig Amalie Hedeager Bruun

Vedlagte dokumenter VS Danish questions regarding the Waste Framework Directive definition of recovery
Questions regarding Waste Framework Directive 4 May

Dokumenter uden PDF-version (ikke vedlagt)

Udskrevet 15. jun 2023

Til: Mattia.Pellegrini@ec.europa.eu (Mattia.Pellegrini@ec.europa.eu)
Cc: Amalie Wang Norus (amwno@mim.dk)
Fra: Janne Birk Nielsen (jabn@mim.dk)
Titel: VS: Danish questions regarding the Waste Framework Directive definition of recovery
Sendt: 02-06-2023 13:57
Bilag: Questions regarding Waste Framework Directive 4 May.docx;

Dear Mattia,

I hope this e-mail finds you well.

We have some questions regarding the definition of recovery in the Waste Framework Directive and the change to the definition in 2008, please see our enclosed questions. We have reached out to the Waste Framework Directive Team, however this is a matter of high importance for Denmark, so we would appreciate if the experts from your team has the opportunity to take a meeting with our experts next week. Could one from your team contact: Amalie Wang Norus, amwno@mim.dk or +45 22 72 74 52, regarding the meeting?

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require further information.

Best regards,

Janne

Best regards

Janne Birk Nielsen

Head of Division I Cirkular Economy
+45 41 93 23 38 | jabn@mim.dk

Ministry of Environment

The Departement | Slotsholmsgade 12 | 1216 København K | Tlf. +45 38 14 21 42 | mim@mim.dk | www.en.mim.dk
[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Youtube](#)

Fra: Amalie Wang Norus

Sendt: 1. juni 2023 14:19

Til: 'ENV-WASTE-FRAMEWORK-DIRECTIVE@ec.europa.eu' <ENV-WASTE-FRAMEWORK-DIRECTIVE@ec.europa.eu>

Cc: Amalie Hedeager Bruun (amheb@mim.dk) <amheb@mim.dk>; Christian Hust Stigel <chhus@mim.dk>

Emne: SV: Danish questions regarding the Waste Framework Directive definition of recovery

Prioritet: Høj

Dear waste framework directive team,

I hope that you have had the opportunity to look into our questions. We would really appreciate a meeting with you sometime next week. Would Tuesday at noon work for you? Else will you please inform us your earliest convenience?

Kind regards,

Amalie

Amalie Wang Norus

| Cirkulær økonomi
+45 22 72 74 52 | +45 22 72 74 52 | amwno@mim.dk

Ministry of Environment

Frederiksholms Kanal 26 | 1220 Copenhagen K | Tel. +45 38 14 21 42 | mim@mim.dk | www.mim.dk
[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

Fra: Amalie Wang Norus

Sendt: 15. maj 2023 15:58

Til: 'ENV-WASTE-FRAMEWORK-DIRECTIVE@ec.europa.eu' <ENV-WASTE-FRAMEWORK-DIRECTIVE@ec.europa.eu>

Cc: Amalie Hedeager Bruun (amheb@mim.dk) <amheb@mim.dk>; Christian Hust Stigel <chhus@mim.dk>

Emne: Danish questions regarding the Waste Framework Directive definition of recovery

Dear waste framework directive team,

I hope this e-mail finds you well.

Some colleagues and I have some questions regarding the Commissions understanding of the Waste Framework Directive and the definition of recovery, please see the attached. I hope that you might be available for a meeting to discuss our questions possibly on Monday at 11 am?

Kind regards,

Amalie

Amalie Wang Norus

| Cirkulær økonomi

+45 22 72 74 52 | +45 22 72 74 52 | amwno@mim.dk

Ministry of Environment

The Department | Frederiksholms Kanal 26 | 1220 Copenhagen K | Tel. +45 38 14 21 42 | mim@mim.dk | www.mim.dk

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)



15 May 2023

Assessing whether an operation is a recovery operation or a disposal operation

The Danish case

In Denmark, we are phasing a challenging situation regarding a Danish company importing oily wastewater for recovery. It concerns shipments of waste, which consists of only about 3% oil for recovery, while the remaining part of the shipment is destined for a disposal operation. In processing these notifications, some broader questions regarding the Waste Framework Directive have occurred. We are looking into what constitutes recovery, and how to assess whether a shipment is destined for recovery or disposal and therefore have a few questions we hope to get your view on.

Recovery

According to the 2008 Waste Framework Directive Article 3 (15) “recovery” is defined as “any operation the principal result of which is waste serving a useful purpose by replacing other materials which would otherwise have been used to fulfil a particular function, or waste being prepared to fulfil that function, in the plant or in the wider economy.”

According to the Court as set out in case C-147/15 this definition “corresponds to the definition developed in the Court’s case-law, according to which the essential characteristic of a waste recovery operation is that its principal objective is that the waste serves a useful purpose in replacing other materials which would have had to be used for that purpose, thereby enabling natural resources to be preserved”.

- a. Do you interpret Article 3 (15) of the Waste Framework Directive as meaning that recovery can comprise situations where the waste is not recovered in the plant itself but prepared for recovery at another place than the initial plant, ie. out in the wider economy?
- b. Can an operation be considered a recovery operation if the waste does not replace other materials at the plant, e.g. the waste is treated at the plant and the outcome (product) of the treatment is recycled elsewhere in the wider economy, replacing other materials there?
- c. In assessing whether or not recovery can comprise situations in which the recovery takes place other places than at the plant do you then take the ruling in C-147/15 into account?

Assessing whether a shipment is destined for recovery or disposal

We have had notifications where part of the waste was to be recovered and part of the waste was to be disposed of, and we are wondering how you would assess such notifications.

- a. How do you assess whether a shipment is destined for recovery or disposal? Which criteria do you take into account when determining the principle result of the operation?
- b. Furthermore, to what extent do the criteria differ depending on the type of waste or the type of operation?

The Court has in case C-458/00 ruled that “[t]he shipment of waste in order for it to be incinerated in a processing plant designed to dispose of waste cannot be regarded as having the recovery waste as its principal objective”.

- a. Do you consider the design of the plant an important criteria in the assessment of whether a shipment is destined for recovery or disposal?
- b. How would you assess the design of a plant?
- c. Do you have plants which perform both recovery and disposal operations?

According to the Court in case C-147/15 “the fact that the operator of the quarry at issue in the main proceedings acquires [the] waste in exchange of payment to the waste producer or holder may indicate that the main objective of the operation in question is the recovery of such waste”.

- a. Would you consider payment on the part of the waste producer to indicate that the shipment is destined for disposal?
- b. Do you accept import of waste for recovery where the treatment facility receives payment for the recovery of the waste? Or is this only in rare cases?

Which operation?

In case C-116/01 the Court has held that “the treatment process as a whole is not to be assessed as a single operation, but each phase must be classified separately for the purpose of implementing the [Waste Shipment Regulation] when it constitutes a distinct operation in itself”.

- a. How do you assess whether a phase constitutes a distinct operation in itself?
- b. Would you consider the judgement to be applicable also where the 'first' operation is for example separation or sorting?

In such a small quantity that the provision of new specialized disposal installations within that State would be uneconomic

According to the Waste Shipment Regulation Article 11 (3) “In the case of hazardous waste produced in a Member State of dispatch in such a small quantity overall per year that the provision of new specialised disposal installations within that Member State would be uneconomic, paragraph 1(a) shall not apply”.

- a. How would you assess whether hazardous waste in a Member State of dispatch is produced in such a small quantity overall per year that the provision of new specialised disposal installations within that Member State would be uneconomic?