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MUNICIPAL WASTE EUROPE

• MWE members:
  16 members +
  2 observers
  = 18 national public waste associations

• EU Municipalities and their waste management companies

WHO WE ARE

• National Associations of Municipalities responsible for waste management and their waste management companies
• We represent those Responsible for the provision of the service of general interest that is waste management and includes the recovery of resources from households
• We are committed to sustainable waste management which promotes resource efficiency and a circular economy

WASTE REVIEW: EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT VOTE

Globally:

• It is clear that the EP has understood what legislative changes are needed to improve implementation at national level and thereby also the achievement of recycling targets

• Definitions: MWE is in agreement with the amendments and in particular with the definition of municipal waste which now is a statistical definition and does not attempt to influence who does what: ‘nature and composition’.

Globally:

• Biowaste definition: also ‘nature and composition’ which is correct and clear

• Deletion of TEEP: For Biowaste the notion of separate collection must clearly include home and community composting.

• EPR: The minimum requirements set up an acceptable framework for the proper functioning of Producer Responsibility Organisations, however…
**WASTE REVIEW: EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT VOTE**

- ...the Services of General Interest and responsibility of municipalities to ensure waste management seems to have been forgotten through this mention:
  - in the framework of collective schemes, the selection procedure for waste management operators;
  - the selection procedures for waste management operators, where contracting third parties for waste collection and/or sorting is part of their permit.

- **Calculation method**: One calculation method is correct, with no derogation. The details remain to be finalised in Trialogue in our opinion.

---

**THE ‘MILAN’ MODEL**

- Door-to-door Collection:
  - Bins (paper, glass, household organic waste)
  - Bags (metals, plastic, residual waste)

- Amenity sites and CAMs Bulky waste (at home, on the street)
  - Bring banks (paper, glass) Street bins

---

**THE ‘LJUBLJANA’ PARADIGM**

- Door-to-door Collection:
  - Bins/underground collection points in the city (packaging, paper/cardboard, glass, bio-waste/residual waste)

- Bring system: WEEE/Hazardous waste/ Bulky waste (or collection at source)

- Collection centre: clothing, footwear, textiles and toys

---

**WASTE REVIEW: EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT VOTE**

- **Targets**: The level and implementation system for targets will have to be adapted to the final calculation method

- **Hazardous Waste**: separate collection and mixing/dilution ban

- **Landfill**: EP 5% reduction target (from EC 10%)
  - still only focusing on municipal waste which is only 10% of total waste.

---

**SEPARATE WASTE COLLECTION (2011-2015)**

- Chart showing waste composition and trends from 2011 to 2015.

---

**SEPARATE WASTE COLLECTION (2004-2014)**

- Chart showing waste composition and trends from 2004 to 2014.

---

**CONVENIENCE**
Case Studies on our website:

www.municipalwasteurope.eu
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