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Public consultation on the evaluation of the EU Directive on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE)

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

# Introduction

The European Commission is evaluating [Directive 2012/19/EU on waste electrical and electronic](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02012L0019-20180704) [equipment (WEEE)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02012L0019-20180704), hereinafter referred to as "the Directive", and therefore collecting insights into how the Directive is functioning.

The evaluation aims to assess the performance of the Directive against its objectives and expectations. The evaluation is also looking into how consistent the Directive is with the EU’s wider policy objectives, including those introduced under the European [Green Deal](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1576150542719&uri=COM%3A2019%3A640%3AFIN) and the [Circular Economy Action Plan](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1583933814386&uri=COM%3A2020%3A98%3AFIN) and will

take into account any other relevant developments in EU environmental and waste policy (e.g., [Batteries](https://environment.ec.europa.eu/topics/waste-and-recycling/batteries_en), [Ec](https://commission.europa.eu/energy-climate-change-environment/standards-tools-and-labels/products-labelling-rules-and-requirements/sustainable-products/ecodesign-sustainable-products_en) [odesign for Sustainable Products](https://commission.europa.eu/energy-climate-change-environment/standards-tools-and-labels/products-labelling-rules-and-requirements/sustainable-products/ecodesign-sustainable-products_en), [Restriction of Hazardous Substances in EEE](https://environment.ec.europa.eu/topics/waste-and-recycling/rohs-directive_en#%3A~%3Atext%3DThe%20RoHS%20Directive%20aims%20to%2Cbe%20substituted%20by%20safer%20alternatives), [Waste Shipments](https://environment.ec.europa.eu/topics/waste-and-recycling/waste-shipments_en), [Critical](https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/sectors/raw-materials/areas-specific-interest/critical-raw-materials_en) [Raw Materials](https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/sectors/raw-materials/areas-specific-interest/critical-raw-materials_en)).

The evaluation covers the implementation of the Directive along with the related secondary legislation and any related measures and good practices taken at national level in all Member States.

You are invited to respond to the questionnaire according to your level of knowledge and involvement in the Directive’s implementation or policy.

You can save your answers as drafts and finish the survey later. The questionnaire is accessible in all official EU languages and you may submit your reply in any of these languages.

If you have any questions, please contact the European Commission via [ENV-WEEE@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ENV-WEEE@ec.europa.eu).

# About you

**\*** 1 Language of my contribution Bulgarian

Croatian

Czech Danish Dutch

English Estonian Finnish French German Greek Hungarian Irish Italian Latvian Lithuanian Maltese Polish

Portuguese Romanian Slovak Slovenian Spanish Swedish

**\*** 2 I am giving my contribution as Academic/research institution Business association Company/business Consumer organisation

EU citizen

Environmental organisation Non-EU citizen

Non-governmental organisation (NGO) Public authority

Trade union Other

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you

would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, ‘business association,**

**‘consumer association’, ‘EU citizen’) country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

## \* 4 Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

## Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

## Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

* 5 First name
* 6 Surname
* 7 Email (this won't be published)
* 11 Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

* 13 Organisation size

Micro (1 to 9 employees)

Small (10 to 49 employees)

Medium (50 to 249 employees) Large (250 or more)

14 Transparency register number

*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?redir=false&locale=en). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

20210641335-88

* 15 Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

*This list does not represent the official position of the European institutions with regard to the legal status or policy of the entities mentioned. It is a harmonisation of often divergent lists and practices.*

Afghanistan Djibouti Libya Saint Martin Åland Islands Dominica Liechtenstein Saint Pierre and

Miquelon

Albania Dominican Republic

Lithuania Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Algeria Ecuador Luxembourg Samoa American Samoa Egypt Macau San Marino Andorra El Salvador Madagascar São Tomé and

Príncipe

Angola Equatorial Guinea Malawi Saudi Arabia Anguilla Eritrea Malaysia Senegal Antarctica Estonia Maldives Serbia

Antigua and Barbuda

Eswatini Mali Seychelles

Argentina Ethiopia Malta Sierra Leone Armenia Falkland Islands Marshall Islands Singapore Aruba Faroe Islands Martinique Sint Maarten Australia Fiji Mauritania Slovakia Austria Finland Mauritius Slovenia

Azerbaijan France Mayotte Solomon Islands Bahamas French Guiana Mexico Somalia

Bahrain French Polynesia Micronesia South Africa

Bangladesh French Southern and Antarctic Lands

Moldova South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands

Barbados Gabon Monaco South Korea Belarus Georgia Mongolia South Sudan Belgium Germany Montenegro Spain

Belize Ghana Montserrat Sri Lanka

Benin Gibraltar Morocco Sudan Bermuda Greece Mozambique Suriname Bhutan Greenland Myanmar/Burma Svalbard and

Jan Mayen

Bolivia Grenada Namibia Sweden

Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Guadeloupe Nauru Switzerland

Guam Nepal Syria

Botswana Guatemala Netherlands Taiwan Bouvet Island Guernsey New Caledonia Tajikistan Brazil Guinea New Zealand Tanzania

British Indian Ocean Territory British Virgin Islands

Guinea-Bissau Nicaragua Thailand

Guyana Niger The Gambia

Brunei Haiti Nigeria Timor-Leste

Bulgaria Heard Island and McDonald Islands

Niue Togo

Burkina Faso Honduras Norfolk Island Tokelau

Burundi Hong Kong Northern Mariana Islands

Tonga

Cambodia Hungary North Korea Trinidad and

Tobago Cameroon Iceland North Macedonia Tunisia

Canada India Norway Türkiye

Cape Verde Indonesia Oman Turkmenistan Cayman Islands Iran Pakistan Turks and

Caicos Islands

Central African Republic

Iraq Palau Tuvalu

Chad Ireland Palestine Uganda

Chile Isle of Man Panama Ukraine

China Israel Papua New Guinea

United Arab Emirates

Christmas Island Italy Paraguay United Kingdom Clipperton Jamaica Peru United States

Cocos (Keeling) Islands

Japan Philippines United States Minor Outlying Islands

Colombia Jersey Pitcairn Islands Uruguay Comoros Jordan Poland US Virgin Islands Congo Kazakhstan Portugal Uzbekistan

Cook Islands Kenya Puerto Rico Vanuatu Costa Rica Kiribati Qatar Vatican City Côte d’Ivoire Kosovo Réunion Venezuela Croatia Kuwait Romania Vietnam Cuba Kyrgyzstan Russia Wallis and

Futuna

Curaçao Laos Rwanda Western Sahara

Cyprus Latvia Saint Barthélemy Yemen

Czechia Lebanon Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha

Zambia

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Lesotho Saint Kitts and Nevis

Zimbabwe

Denmark Liberia Saint Lucia

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement)

# Objectives and Scope

The assessment should explore whether the objectives and scope of the Directive are still applicable and sufficient also considering current and future needs. The objectives are to protect the environment and human health by:

preventing or reducing the adverse impacts of the generation and management of WEEE; reducing the overall impacts of resource use;

improving the efficiency of resource use.

To reach these objectives, the Directive sets out measures, inter alia, for WEEE to be collected separately from unsorted municipal waste, for proper treatment (recovery and recycling) and promoting (preparing for) re-use. It sets ambitious collection targets increasing over time, combined preparing for re-use and recycling targets as well as recovery targets. The Directive incorporates extended producer responsibility (EPR), according to which electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) producers are obliged to finance WEEE collection and treatment.

16 To what extent do you think the Directive has been effective in achieving the following main objectives?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very Effective** | **Effective to some extent** | **Ineffective** | **Don’ t know** |
| **\*** Reduction of WEEE generation |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Reduction of negative impacts on the environment and on human health during collection and treatment of WEEE |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Efficient use of (primary) resources to produce EEE |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Retrieval/ Recycling of secondary raw materials from WEEE |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Application of [best available techniques](https://eippcb.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reference) for WEEE collection and treatment (prevention of emissions, proper treatment) |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Prevention of illegal shipments of WEEE out of the EU |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Establishment of a level playing field between the Member States |  |  |  |  |

18

For each of the objectives listed below, please indicate and describe the factors that supported or hindered their achievement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objectives** | **Contributing factor** | **Hindering factor** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reduction of WEEE generation |  |  |
| Reduction of negative impacts on the environment and on human health during collection and treatment of WEEE |  |  |
| Efficient use of (primary) resources to produce EEE |  |  |
| Retrieval/ Recycling of secondary raw materials from WEEE |  |  |
| Application of best available techniques for WEEE collection and treatment (prevention of emissions,  depollution) |  |  |
| Prevention of illegal shipments of WEEE out of the EU |  |  |
| Establishment of a level playing field between the Member States |  |  |

# General aspects

19 To what extent has the Directive been successful in implementing specific aspects of the extended producer responsibility principle?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very Effective** | **Effective to some extent** | **Ineffective** | **Don’ t know** |
| **\*** Financing the costs for the management of WEEE by responsible producers (avoiding free-riders) |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Ensuring that sufficient and convenient take-back possibilities for WEEE from households exist |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Development of appropriate recycling technologies for WEEE |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Ensuring that WEEE is managed using best available techniques |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Ensuring knowledge about volumes of EEE put on the market |  |  |  |  |

21 To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Directive…** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Don’ t know** |
| **\*** is well adapted to the changes in the composition (types of devices, material composition etc.) of WEEE generated |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** is well adapted to scientific progress regarding management of hazardous substances |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** is well adapted to the technological developments in WEEE treatment |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** has helped to improve knowledge about WEEE flows (including materials derived from WEEE treatment) |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** has promoted research and innovation |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** has helped to establish a well-functioning single market for secondary raw materials |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** has contributed to creating additional jobs |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** implementation does not cause unnecessary costs for business, citizens and public authorities |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Member States would not have achieved as much progress in the absence of the EU legislation |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Member States acting on their own would have incurred greater expense to achieve the same progress in the absence of EU legislation |  |  |  |  |

# WEEE collection

23 The following reasons were mentioned as hindering the achievement of high levels of collection. To what extent do you agree that the following reasons are hindering?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Fully** | **To a large extent** | **To some extent** | **Not at all** | **Don't know** |
| **\*** Insufficient collection systems (e.g. coverage, financing of EPR, capacities) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Inconvenient collection systems |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Collection by the informal sector including scavenging for valuable parts |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **\*** Lack of awareness /information about take back possibilities or about the advantages of not hoarding WEEE |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Enforcement shortcomings |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\*** Other |  |  |  |  |  |

# WEEE treatment

* 25 Do you consider that the requirements for the proper treatment of WEEE set out in Art. 8 and Annex VIII of the Directive are appropriate to minimise pollution as far as possible and contribute to the efficient use of resources?

Yes No

Don't know

* 27 Do you consider the recovery targets set out in Art. 11 and Annex V of the Directive are appropriate to ensure high levels of material recycling including critical raw materials and minimizing disposal of WEEE materials?

Yes No

Don't know

29 Following a mandate by the Commission, European Standards for the treatment of WEEE have been developed (EN 50625 series on WEEE treatment and EN 50614 on WEEE preparing for reuse). What is your experience with the implementation of these standards?

# Efficiency of the Directive

1. To what extent has the implementation of the Directive affected the following **direct costs**?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Lowered significantly** | **Lowered to some extent** | **No change** | **Increased to some extent** | **Increased significantly** | **Don't know**  **/ na** |
| **\* Adjustment costs** (i.e. investment and expenses to adjust to the requirements of the Directive or national legislation e.g. costs for implementing treatment standards) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\* Administrative costs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\* Enforcement costs** (linked to the implementation of an initiative such as monitoring, inspections etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\* Hassle costs** (e.g. because of deficiencies in the administrative implementation of legislation) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. To what extent has the implementation of the Directive affected the following **indirect costs**?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Lowered significantly** | **Lowered to some extent** | **No change** | **Increased to some extent** | **Increased significantly** | **Don't know / na** |
| **\* Transaction costs** (e.g. due to renegotiation of contracts due to the requirements of the Directive) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\* Opportunity costs** (e.g. costs of foregone alternative investments to comply with legal obligations) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\* Indirect compliance costs** (e.g. because other stakeholders must comply with legislation.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\* Offsetting/substitution costs** (e.g. related to reliance on alternative sources of supply) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\* Environmental costs** (e.g. related to negative externalities , e.g., illegal e-waste export) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\* Indirect social costs** (e.g. jobs lost due to increased costs of compliance) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. What other direct or indirect costs, if any, have you experienced related to the Directive?

Art. 12 of the Directive lays down financing obligations by responsible producers to at least finance the collection, treatment, recovery and environmentally sound disposal of WEEE from households.

* 33 In your opinion: To what extent are the costs associated with the management of WEEE covered by this producer financing obligation?

Fully covered

To a large extent To some extent To a small extent Don't know

# Coherence and EU added value

1. Are there any provisions in the Directive you consider obsolete? If so, which ones and why?
2. Do you see any deficits in the adaptation of the Directive to scientific and technical progress?
3. Are you aware of any unexpected or unintended effects caused by the Directive? If so, which ones?
4. Which EU and international (non-EU) legislation do you consider relevant for the EU (W)EEE market?
5. What is your opinion about the links **between the Directive and the Ecodesign Directive**?
6. What is your opinion about the links **between the Directive and the Directive on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in EEE (RoHS)**?
7. Have you encountered any gaps, contradictions, overlaps or missing links **betwe en the Directive and other EU legislation**? Please elaborate, if yes.
8. Have you encountered any gaps, contradictions, overlaps or missing links **within the Directive**? Please elaborate, if yes.
9. Did you encounter any (potential) incoherences with the strategic direction of certain EU policies?

* 44 Do you think that the issues addressed by the Directive continue to require action at EU level?

Yes No

1. Do you see the Directive being effective as a legal instrument? Please elaborate.
2. Please feel free to upload a relevant document, such as additional evidence supporting your responses or a position paper. The maximum file size is 1 MB.

Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire, which is the essential input to this public consultation. The document is an optional complement and serves as additional background reading to better understand your position

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

**Contact**

[ENV-WEEE@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ENV-WEEE@ec.europa.eu)