Waste Preparatory Meeting 02-05-2024

Giovanni Taglialatela – ARERA Italy

Why is it important to start again Waste?

1. To become a stakeholder of the EU Commission. Next future we want to become a recognised stakeholder and to be consulted by the Commission preparing new legislation (medium to long term objective)
2. As we have the general objective of making the circular economy cost-effective
3. If we can contribute in terms of proposals (economic side, EPR, cost effectiveness, quality of services etc…) we can also receive help from EC Commission by discussing, finding effective ways to modify objectives, so to help member countries in troubles with reaching them to have easier goals to reach.

What to do on the 8th

1. Quick round table to present regulatory authorities and situation in each country.
2. Frank discussion about what we want to achieve with them.

At the moment in the agenda:

- Presentation by EC on the new regulation and what has been done in the past years (for example recent approvals of the changes to the waste framework directive, and the regulation on packaging)
- Short presentation by each country (would you be interested in present yourself?)
- Discussion on the impact of new legislation on our regulation and then a forward on the future. We know that the next EC will change Waste Framework Directive again, and we could catch the moment to discuss with them the changes.

David Alves – ERSAR Portugal

1. Who proposed the meeting? EC or us? Answer by Giovanni it was from both parties.
2. Governance topic is the one that is not take into account in the legislation, and I think is a problem in most of EU Countries. It's a very fragmented sector, with a lot of local responsibilities. The struggle is to drive municipalities to do what they have to do in an integrate way. We could discuss what they want to do in this topic. They have a procedure of not interfering with the sector in each country. But in the waste a stronger approach should be recommended at the European Level, to make more manageable the reaching of targets. And I refer to both local and national authorities about the waste sector. For instance, in Portugal, we have the waste authority dealing with transposition of Directives and then the regulatory authority dealing with regulation of services. In Portugal we tend to implement cost effective measures but if we do not act in the legislation side and if we don't integrate them in the legislation side (regulators don't have much voice in integration to national legislation) then the reaching of targets is bad. Common approach on the gate fees, or in the waste management tax are examples of problems.

Pal Sagvari – MEKH Hungary

1. We support this advocacy activity to DG Environment
2. We have several questions for the EC, but not much to present and ask at the moment. We lack information about the other Members of WAREG. So we would like to know more about how other countries are implementing the directives, which systems are in place.
3. We have prepared some slides to present which is our system and how are we doing the regulation.
4. Policy question for EC Commission: how is derogation working? How does derogation from 2035 targets work?

Taglialatela on Sagvari: We should arrange seminars to explain each other our national cases. EC Commission has asked us dozens of questions about regulation. So we could answer to all the questions and seminars will have the purpose to clarify internally common trends in regulation and positions on specific proposals.

Presentations will be done by ARERA (Italy) – ERSAR (Portugal) – MEKH (Hungary) - Not from Latvia and Lithuania

STRUCTURE OF THE PROPOSED PRESENTATION

Same structure in the presentations:

- the structure of the sector in the country
- the role of the regulator and other stakeholders
- the future challenges in the sector

Fabio Tambone – ARERA Italy

1. To be very clear. This is a free willing exercise, but we have an opportunity to catch on the 8th. An important representative from EC wants to hear from us about updating the legislation, recognising the importance of regulation in the waste sector. Having a structured dialogue with them represents an opportunity to easy our work in national regulation.

Pal Sagvari – MEKH Hungary

1. I don't know if we have a list of who are other stakeholders in the waste sector besides WAREG? Answer by DAVID ALVES: one good way of listing those participants would be to have the list of participants in the past consultation on legislation so we can list the lobby groups active. In general, in the waste sector we have a very diverse list of stakeholders and lobby groups. I remark the importance of having this list. We should try not to be only one more group, but we should be one of the most important groups in the sector, because we have the data especially for the urban waste sector. In the presentations we have to remark the fact that we are the only ones with the data.

David Alves – ERSAR Portugal

1. Directive are focusing on environmental products, but not doing much in creating a common market. The circular economy package should aim at creating a common market in reusing resources coming from waste. We should point out this fact, for having an efficient and strong market able to recover resources we need strong regulators. For example, Portugal is very far away from the center of Europe demographically, therefore recovered resources are negatively impacted by transport costs, making them less economically convenient. We regulators can promote the market and create conditions for it to thrive. This has to be done in an integrated way at the European Level.

Fabio Tambone – ARERA Italy

1. David's point is the most important one. We should focus on it. This could be the key driver for our activities.

Giovanni Taglialatela – ARERA Italy

1. There is an issue in using this point as the most important one. Lack of legal basis. We should still strive to have it as a key point, just I recommend a slower approach. Our special mission is indeed to make them think in terms of internal market, economics, cost-effectiveness. No country can afford the current goals. We have to imagine a future legislation in which objectives are set at union level. But this is something to be discussed later.
2. **CHANGE OF THE AGENDA:**

a. Presentation by EC
b. Presentations by our
    i. Introduction to the EC about our goals and priorities
    ii. Presentation by ERSAR
    iii. Presentation by MEKH
    iv. Presentation by ARERA
c. Discuss the challenges with EC.

Pal Sagvari – MEKH Hungary

1. We should establish a monthly touch point to update among us Members to create a common position. Agreed by David and Giovanni.

Fabio Tambone – ARERA Italy

1. We should sent a structured agenda to the EC with the above proposed structure for the meeting.