

## EURIC POSITION FOR A REVISION OF THE WASTE SHIPMENT REGULATION SUPPORTING THE CIRCULAR ECONOMY

December 2020

One of the founding assumptions of the circular economy is that wastes are resources. When the international and European waste shipment regulatory framework<sup>1</sup> was designed and implemented more than three decades ago, waste was perceived as a risk that needed to be managed rather than a valuable resource enabling the circular economy. [The European Green Deal](#) and the [new Circular Economy Action Plan \(CEAP\)](#) call for far-reaching changes in the way Europe's economy produces goods and provides services. Proper waste management and recycling is no longer an objective to address risks stemming from products which have reached the end of their useful life but is seen as the enabler of circular value chains.

**This ambition calls for a paradigm shift which must be reflected in the EU's regulatory framework at large.**

The Waste Shipment Regulation (WSR) is, as rightly identified in the new CEAP, a pivotal piece of legislation with provisions that need to be aligned with the overarching objectives of transitioning towards a circular economy. Hence, the revision offers the opportunity to make both needed adjustments to fix lasting bottlenecks and radical changes to address long-term obstacles rooted in outdated obligations.

This strategy paper sets the European recyclers' vision to support a revised circular WSR. Its first part focuses on the main bottlenecks stemming from the WSR while the second part looks at solutions to address them.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Far-reaching changes are needed to align waste shipment procedures with the objectives set by the new Circular Economy Action Plan while at the same time tackling more effectively illegal shipments. In order to achieve this objective, EuRIC supports in particular:

#### Potential waste export ban or restrictions

While EuRIC supports restricting exports of unprocessed waste to countries lacking any infrastructure for proper treatment (e-waste in certain African countries, non-depolluted ELVs exported as used cars or unprocessed end-of-life tyres), restricting exports of processed "waste" meeting industry specifications would severely hurt the European recycling industry. Domestic markets for secondary raw materials are simply lacking for most waste streams since Europe's industry remains mostly linear with **only 12% of the materials [the EU's industry] uses come from recycling**, as acknowledged by the European Green Deal. Restricting exports won't render linear value chains more circular overnight. It will simply distort market conditions and artificially sharply lower prices of secondary raw materials making it impossible for the recycling industry to invest in scaling up capacities and innovative processes to further improve quality. As mentioned in EuRIC top 5 priorities, to effectively move towards a circular economy, it is essential in Europe to incentivize the use of recycled materials in production processes via binding recycled content targets for a much wider number of materials than simply packaging plastics and reward in prices environmental benefits stemming from the use of secondary raw materials to support circular value chains.

<sup>1</sup> [Basel Convention](#)

### Distinguishing unprocessed waste from secondary raw materials and leveling the playing field with primary raw materials:

- ✓ Realistic EU-wide end-of-waste criteria and, in the absence of harmonized criteria, mutual recognition of national end-of-waste criteria and a proper status for secondary raw materials to move away from the stark dichotomy between “waste” and “products” and level the playing field with virgin materials;
- ✓ Measures to ensure a free, fair and sustainable trade of both primary and secondary raw materials relying on international standards to prove equivalent conditions of treatment or extraction;

### Simplified notification procedures through:

- ✓ Electronic notification procedures entirely in line with EU’s Digital Transformation Agenda;
- ✓ Making pre-consented facilities for waste recovery the new norm;
- ✓ A proportional financial guarantee system;
- ✓ Clear observance of lead times throughout the notification procedures, with tacit consent becoming the norm when lead times have expired;

### Improved Annex VII procedures:

- ✓ Electronic Annex VII procedures in line with EU’s Digital Transformation Agenda;
- ✓ Harmonized interpretations of the person who arranges the shipment without any further obligation imposed by certain Member States allowing exports for companies established under the jurisdiction of the country of dispatch, as long as the company arranging the shipment is established in one Member State;
- ✓ Better distinction in law between mere administrative mistakes, which should not be qualified as illegal shipment, and truly illegal shipments.

The present paper provides further details on the key changes needed to ensure that the WSR effectively supports the transition towards a circular economy.

## MOVING FROM LINEAR WASTE SHIPMENTS TO CIRCULAR MOVEMENT OF RESOURCES

### 1. Current bottlenecks making waste shipment procedures overly complex

Waste shipment procedures are insufficiently predictable, overly long, too costly and format-wise ill-adapted.

- ✓ Unpredictable because they are either too complex (notification procedures) or give rise to too many diverging interpretations (Annex VII procedures);
- ✓ They are too long because provisions rooted in the WSR tend to favor control over movement with lead time which can easily be extended, at the expense of a well-functioning internal market;
- ✓ Too costly since provisions such as the obligation to establish a financial guarantee results in lump sums which can be disconnected from the risks they are due to cover and are withheld for an overly long period;
- ✓ Ill-adapted format-wise, it is essential to digitalize waste shipment procedures. As we approach **the term of the first quarter of the 21<sup>st</sup> century**, the fact that digital shipment procedures in Europe have still to become the norm while cross-border movement of recyclables is key to the success of a more circular economy raises questions. The benefits of digital waste shipment procedures encompass among others easier and faster transmission of documentation to and among competent authorities, reduction of administrative errors if online formats are harmonized, faster translation, easier checks during the shipment itself, protection of personal data and of business secrets which is a general principle of EU law. Digitalizing waste shipment procedures is also a must to take advantage of the benefits of using new technologies.

These substantial shortcomings are not a criticism directed to any stakeholders involved in waste shipment but result from the architecture of the WSR itself, thus the need for a thorough revision.

Fixing them is all the more essential because unpredictable and overly complex procedures foster linear material flows: from an administrative standpoint it is much easier to import raw materials mined or harvested outside Europe in accordance with lower standards than to ship secondary raw materials across Europe.

## 2. Need for decisive support for harmonized and mutually recognized end-of-waste criteria

Clarity of when waste ceases to be waste is instrumental not only in terms of legal certainty but also to reward secondary raw materials' quality meeting industry specifications or harmonized standards, speed up the creation of a well-functioning internal market and level the playing field with virgin raw materials. The lack of harmonization of the end-of-waste status at European level keeps being another major obstacle for the European recycling industry. The European Union has adopted, in the past, harmonized end-of-waste criteria for a handful of secondary raw materials. In the absence of progress on EU-wide end-of-waste criteria over the last years, Member States are increasingly using the competence granted by the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) to enact national end-of-waste criteria complying with the conditions set in it. Yet, there is currently no mechanism under European legislation to ensure that national end-of-waste criteria compliant with the WFD are mutually recognized by Member States when secondary raw materials are shipped cross-border. **What should be a comparative advantage for cross-border shipments of secondary raw materials across the EU is an extra-burden as the diverging interpretation regarding the waste status between for instance two neighboring EU countries make it simpler and faster to ship materials, under the waste status, to non-EU countries.**

In addition, it is important to establish a status of secondary raw materials, without prejudice of end-of-waste criteria, which will benefit recovered materials meeting commonly accepted industry specifications or standards in order to move away from the stark dichotomy between "waste" and "products" and level the playing field with virgin materials.

## 3. Importance of free, fair and more sustainable trade of raw materials

**As stressed by the European Green Deal, only 12% of the materials [the EU's industry] uses come from recycling.** In other words, Europe's industry remains mostly linear and dependent on imports of virgin materials. Since the first Waste Framework Directive in 1975, an increasing amount of recycling targets have been set for different streams. While this regulatory framework has greatly contributed to divert waste from landfills, targets to pull the demand for very few recycled materials into new products have been set only recently.

The combination of a steady increase of raw materials from recycling and the decrease of Europe's industrial capacity relative to the fastest growing economies has resulted in an increased dependency of the recycling industry on international trade. For a number of streams, the supply of secondary raw materials largely exceeds the domestic demand, as a number of industrial value chains keep being tailored to use extracted or bio-sourced materials instead of secondary raw materials. For instance, 59,1% of steel produced in Europe relies on blast oxygen furnaces (BOF) while consequently 40,9% of steel is produced via electric arc furnace (EAF)<sup>2</sup>. While the former uses on average 20% of scrap, the scrap usage in EAF can be up to 100%. This explains why there is no scrap shortage in Europe as its apparent domestic supply of steel scrap remaining significantly positive<sup>3</sup> demonstrates. A much more developed Electric Arc Furnace (EAF) route, as it is the case in Italy and to a much larger extend in Turkey would contribute to a more intensive use of steel scrap in steelmaking in Europe but so far EU policy falls short in setting the signals to invest heavily in steelmaking processes relying more heavily on secondary raw materials.

In addition, the efficient collection and recovery of paper results in between 7 to 10 million tons of supply exceeding European demand for the last fifteen years. Last but not least, since secondary raw materials are,

<sup>2</sup> World Steel Recycling in Figures, 2015-2019, 11<sup>th</sup> edition, Bureau of International Recycling, 2020.

<sup>3</sup> World Steel Recycling in Figures, 2019 EU-28 Update of the 10<sup>th</sup> Edition by Rolf Willeke & Daniela Entzian, for EFR General Assembly, 25<sup>th</sup> March 2020.

alike primary materials, commodities traded and priced on international markets, free and fair trade is essential.

**Closing boundaries to exports of materials classified as waste will create more problems than the ones it will supposedly solve.** Hence, a holistic approach is needed:

- ✓ Firstly, it is crucial to stimulate the demand for recycled materials via binding recycled content for a much wider range of materials than solely packaging plastics, as currently the case, in order to scale up capacities in Europe of circular value chains relying on secondary raw materials, be it for metals, paper, plastics, textiles, rubber and critical raw materials at large.
- ✓ Secondly, it is essential to shape a revised WSR which will drastically simplify waste shipments within Europe, in order to create *a well-functioning EU market for secondary raw materials*, without hampering exports outside the EU towards facilities operating according with commonly accepted environmental and human health international standards which are essential to balance supply and demand.
- ✓ Thirdly, it is equally crucial to ensure that primary raw materials imported from third countries, which compete with raw materials from recycling and come with a much higher environmental and socio-economic footprint, comply with human rights, health and environmental standards that are equivalent to those established in Community legislation.

## SOLUTIONS TO ALIGN THE WSR WITH THE OBJECTIVES SET BY THE NEW CIRCULAR ECONOMY ACTION PLAN

### 1. Sustainable trade of raw materials

While banning exports of waste and secondary raw materials is everything but a solution, EuRIC entirely supports a holistic approach towards a more sustainable trade of raw materials.

#### *i. Proving sound treatment, stronger enforcement against illegal shipments*

This paper does not discuss measures to prevent illegal exports of End-of-Life Vehicles (ELVs) and Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Directive (WEEE) which shall be addressed through better enforcement and amended requirements set by sectorial legislation (ELV and WEEE Directives), to prevent among others loopholes left by exports for allegedly re-use purposes of unprocessed WEEE or ELVs, entirely unfit for re-use, which should be treated in Europe in accordance with the requirements set by the WEEE or ELV Directives. For waste shipments in general, proving sound treatment shall mean in practice that waste shipped outside Europe is treated in an environmentally sound manner and hence will be effectively shipped to a facility adequately equipped for that purpose. The lack of clarity as to how broadly equivalent conditions are controlled has resulted in a lack of trust. Among the various options which can be considered:

- ✓ EuRIC favors a system whereby receiving treatment facilities prove equivalent conditions through compliance with international quality management and treatment standards, either commonly accepted existing one(s) or to be developed, which can be subject to audits.
- ✓ In addition, EuRIC supports stricter enforcement from public authorities against illegal waste shipments which result in both a loss of valuable resources to compliant recyclers and negative impacts on human health and the environment across the globe.

#### *ii. Minimising adverse effects and unfair competition from imports of primary raw materials*

It is easier, from an administrative viewpoint, to import extracted or bio-sourced raw materials from non-EU countries than to ship secondary raw materials between two neighboring EU countries, despite the fact that the former come with a much higher socio-economic and environmental impact.

Hence, it is essential to require in legislation and verify through audits that primary raw materials imported into Europe comply with human rights, health and environmental standards that are equivalent to those established in Community legislation.

## 2. A revision of the WSR supporting a well-functioning EU market for secondary raw materials

Core principles of the internal market shall prevail including in the field of waste shipments. Article 28 of the WSR entirely negates the principle of mutual recognition by expressly providing that in case of disagreement regarding the distinction between waste and non-waste, the material at stake *shall be treated as if it were waste*. Inherited from a time when waste was perceived mainly as a risk, it is essential to align with the objectives set by the new CEAP to create a well-functioning EU market for secondary raw materials.

In the absence of EU-wide end-of-waste criteria – which is the preferred option –, **Article 28 should instead provide that a shipment complying with national end-of-waste criteria, which are in line with the conditions set by the WFD and have been notified to the European Commission, shall be mutually recognized by Member States as a non-waste.** Such a shift would not only facilitate cross-border secondary materials shipments within Europe, it will also foster harmonization of waste / non-waste status.

Mutual recognition of national end-of-waste criteria is supported by legislation applicable to products. *Regulation 2019/515 on mutual recognition of mutual recognition of goods lawfully marketed in another Member State*, provides, in line with a long-established case-law, that *Member States may not prohibit the sale on their territory of goods which are lawfully marketed in another Member State, even where those goods have been produced in accordance with different technical rules, including goods that are not the result of a manufacturing process*. In addition, *Directive 2015/1535 laying down a procedure for the provision of information in the field of technical regulations (...)* requires Member States to communicate to the Commission and to the other Member States any draft of national technical regulation concerning any product. National end-of-waste criteria fall under the scope of this directive and are published on TRIS database before their adoption since they set the conditions under waste which have undergone a recovery process become a product.

In compliance with well-established European legislation on products, the principle of mutual recognition for materials meeting national end-of-life criteria meeting the conditions set by the WFD and duly notified to the European Commission shall be *de jure* the norm and article 28 should thus be amended accordingly to comply with the product status enshrined in European legislation.

### NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE

#### 1. Reducing diverging interpretations across Member States, implementing electronic notification procedures

The diverging interpretations can lead to the fact that even within one Member State, different regions enforce procedures differently. For example, in Italy, Lombardia and Veneto regions rely on a digital application (SITT) whereas Piemonte and Campania require that the documentation must be sent in paper format, using the digital signature.

**Notifications procedures should be interpreted alike not only within a Member State but across Europe. EuRIC calls in particular for:**

- ✓ **Harmonized shipment procedures which are mandatory across Europe and implemented and executed uniformly in all Member States.**
- ✓ **Electronic notification procedures used throughout the EU that can be seamlessly used by all stakeholders (waste shipment operators and public authorities). In that respect, EuRIC strongly supports the project led by the European Commission on Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) and calls**

**for a technical solution which is fully interoperable across all EU 27 Member States and transparent for operators.**

**Electronic procedures would improve traceability, speed up administrative procedures and protect business confidentiality which will reduce room for diverging interpretations among Member States.**

## **2. Rethink the Financial Guarantee system**

The financial guarantee, which is supposed to cover the cost of transport, cost of recovery or disposal and the cost of storage for 90 days to guarantee the risks arising from these operations is disproportionately expensive and unfit for the purpose of adequately covering those risks.

For example, for a material that consists to 30 – 50 % of metals, which is non-hazardous and has a value of 300 – 600 €/t, a financial guarantee in a high 6-figure to low 7-figure €-range is demanded.

**EuRIC proposes to harmonize and clarify the provisions about financial guarantees, be it the calculation of the quantum of the financial guarantee or the guarantee itself. Among the different options considered, EuRIC would favour an insurance-based system meaning that each market participant contributes proportionally to the amount of waste shipped in order to mutualize the risk coverage.** If alternatively, the solution of a fund was to be laid down in the revised WSR, then EuRIC would strongly recommend an EU-wide fund instead of several national funds that would very likely diverge from one Member State to another.

## **3. Pre-consented facilities for waste recovery should become the new norm**

Article 14 of the WSR, which implements an OECD Decision, allows to substitute the standard notification procedure for certain waste streams with a lighter approach applicable to facilities pre-consented by competent authorities of destination. Yet this possibility is entirely discretionary and in practice barely used. EuRIC strongly supports a widespread use of the pre-consented regime which is entirely in line with the objective to speed up shipments for recovery purposes across Europe. [As a result, EuRIC participated in the first 'Fast-Track' notification for Waste electrical and electronic equipment \(WEEE\) launched within the North Sea Resources Roundabout \(NSRR\) which enabled to organise a shipment of WEEE between two facilities thanks to an approval procedure by the Dutch and Austrian authorities of just 19 working days.](#)

In order to make of the pre-consented regime the new norm, EuRIC supports a solution whereby operators certified against European or international standards (e.g. for WEEE treatment) – whenever they exist – should automatically be granted pre-consented regime whereby operators which are permitted but not certified should have the opportunity to be granted pre-consented regime by applying to their competent authorities.

## **4. Simplifying notification procedures**

Simplifying notification procedures is essential in particular for complex waste streams such as WEEE or technical plastics recycling requiring specialized installations to complete proper treatment. EuRIC supports that a duly consented notification for waste shipment between two installations shipping similar types of waste for recovery purposes (e.g. fridges, TV panels, etc.) to be valid not only for the shipment at stake but for a determined period of time (e.g. 1 year), to prevent burdensome procedures for repetitive waste shipments. During the period of validity of the notification, some logistical elements such as the transport company in charge of the shipment or the itinerary shall be modifiable provided the information is provided to the competent authorities. Electronic notifications will enable to update instantly such information. When the notification is renewed at the end of term, only the foreseeable changes in the type of waste (incl. composition) subject to that notification shall be duly documented in order to reduce to a minimum the lead time needed to examine the renewal of the notification.

## **5. No harmonized expiry dates of written and tacit consents**

According to Article 9(4) and (5), a written consent to a planned shipment shall expire one calendar year after it is issued or on such later date as is indicated in the notification document, whereas a tacit consent shall expire one calendar year after the expiry of the 30-day time limit referred to in paragraph 1. This can lead to

the fact that the written consent is still valid whereas the tacit consent has already expired, without the notifier knowing it.

**We propose that the Regulation should provide that all competent authorities, including the competent authority of transit, must issue their consents for the time period requested by the notifier, i.e. with the same date of expiry.**

## 6. Prior information regarding actual start of notified shipments

After consent has been given to a notified shipment by the competent authorities involved, the notifier shall send signed copies of the then completed movement document to the competent authorities concerned at least three working days before the shipment starts. The 3 working days requirement poses significant difficulties in organizing shipments of waste lead-acid batteries, for example, since there is lack of transport capacity, and many times the notifier gets to know at the last moment whether the transport company is able to send a truck. The requirement seriously and unnecessarily hinders the organization of waste shipments falling under the prior notification and consent procedure, the route of which is known anyway by the authorities.

**Therefore, we propose that the 3 working days requirement should be reduced to a more workable 1 working day requirement.**

## 7. Language barriers

Language barriers slow down waste shipments procedures as some Member States have required to have all submitted documents (regarding notification, information, documentation or other communication) only in their national language. This renders waste shipments procedures even more complex.

**EuRIC suggests that it should be set out in the WSR that if the information is provided in English, it should be acceptable for all EU Member States.** It goes without saying that electronic procedure should allow to take advantage of steady progress made in automatic translation services.

## 8. Shipments of waste explicitly destined for laboratory analysis

EuRIC supports a simplified regime which does not require notification for waste shipments in limited quantity but above 25kg solely for laboratory analysis used to determine if waste fractions are or not suitable for material recovery in specialized installations treating for instance through heavy media separation shredder residues. The absence of derogation for such specific shipments requires in many instances a notification procedure which considerably slow down the determination of whether waste fractions are not suitable for material recovery and gives an edge to cheaper and faster treatment options sitting lower in the waste hierarchy.

# ANNEX VII PROCEDURE

## 1. Different waste classifications & interpretations

There are significant barriers for recycling and uncertainty for recycling companies which are caused by differences in (1) classifications of waste (whether or not green-listed), (2) in understanding of authorities whether the material is a waste or a product, and (3) interpretations of impurity levels acceptances. For example, impurities accepted by competent authorities vary between 0 – 10 %.

**We call for a better harmonization of waste classification with a particular focus on hazardous waste as well as predictable, proportionate and risk-based rules regarding contamination thresholds in green listed waste.**

## 2. Different interpretations of persons who arrange the shipments

A major issue for the recycling industry is that some countries only allow export for companies established under the jurisdiction of the country of dispatch. The application of the WSR is not only inconsistent between EU Member States, but also between regions within one Member State. This causes major burdens to the internal market for secondary raw materials.

**EuRIC strongly supports a harmonized solution, which streamlines/simplifies exports of non-hazardous waste destined for recovery. In line with the principles of free movement of establishment and services, the obligation for a legal seat shall be met provided the company arranging the shipment is established in one Member State, without any further more obligations to be established in a number of Member States in order to be able to appear as person arranging the shipment in box 1 of the Annex VII document.**

Such a harmonized solution is entirely supported by European legislation. Article 17 of EU Directive 2006/123 authorizes Member States to restrict the freedom to provide services in the field of cross-border shipments of waste if it is “appropriate” and “necessary” to achieve the environmental objectives pursued by EU regulation 1013/2006 (*CJEU, 14 December 2004, Radlberger Getrankegesellschaft mbH & Co, C-309/02, §75*).

The environmental objective of EU Regulation 1013/2006, the requirement set by the WSR that the person who organizes the transfer “falls” under the jurisdiction of the Member State of dispatch, is to provide this State with sufficient judicial power to compel the person concerned to take back the waste if the transfer cannot be completed (art. 24 of the regulations) and to sanction this person (art. 50 of the regulations).

However, such a power of constraint and sanction can be exercised by each Member State all over the European Union on the basis of the system of mutual recognition of sanctions set up by Council Framework Decision N° 2005/214 /JHA of 24 February 2005.

In these circumstances, the requirement of establishment in the territory of the Member State of dispatch of the persons in charge of organizing cross-border shipments of waste can hardly be justified in terms of necessity and proportionality to the objective of the EU Regulation 1013/2006. Such a requirement disproportionately restricts freedom to provide services laid down by Article 56 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and should be removed.

## 3. Electronic Annex VII procedures

**EuRIC supports, as for notification procedures, uniform electronic Annex VII procedures across Member States to speed up the shipments of green listed waste and protect business confidentiality while improving their traceability for competent authorities.**

The current paper-based system is inefficient and error-prone which is detrimental to both competent authorities and the waste management and recycling value chain. Moving to electronic Annex VII procedures based on an EU-wide platform or interoperable platforms for the registration of waste shipments can streamline the work of recycling operators, transport companies, end-users and regulatory authorities, by providing dramatically more accurate and timely data than the current paper-based system, which is inefficient, error-prone and insufficiently transparent, as the example below testify:

### Example demonstrating the inefficiency of paper-based Annex VII procedures

- **Seller and place of loading (Block 1 and 6)** - the shipper fills out, stamps, and signs minimum 3 paper copies of an Annex VII and gives them to the driver
- **Transport (Block 5)** - the documents are signed and stamped by the driver and placed with the other shipping documents (CMR, weight slip, and any other documents required by the buyer)
- **Unloading at consignee (block 13)** - the documents are handed over to the receiving personnel
  - Sometimes the document is stamped and returned to the driver immediately.
  - Sometimes the document is forwarded internally to an administrator in the firm who fills out their section and
    - returns the signed and stamped document to the shipper by e-mail or post
    - OR forwards the document to their buyer the end-user (**Block14**) for further stamps and signatures
    - OR simply does nothing (if the supplier's country does not require the signed document to be submitted).
- **Requirements of authorities:** some EU Member States request that companies acting as “persons arranging the shipment” submit on a regular basis to the competent authority all Annex VII documents they have filled in. The Annex VII documents must all be signed, stamped, and sent back by the recovery facilities. Other Member States do not control these documents. This results in confusion and asymmetric requirements, cost structures between Member States and different penalties when diverging obligations are not met.
- **Reporting to authorities** – due to the above, many recycling operators along the value chain spend an enormous amount of time (hundreds of working hours) per year requesting stamped forms from their transporters and customers and then many more hours preparing these forms for the local authorities. Such obligations could easily be met, without unnecessary administrative burdens, through electronic procedures on a secure platform providing a straightforward shipping registration procedure where each operator involved in the arrangement of the shipment confirms his activity online. In addition, an electronic-based Annex VII system can guarantee competent authorities access to all the data they require in real time. They also immediately see which market participants fulfill their reporting duties responsibly, which will lead greater compliance and greater focus on genuinely illegal shipments.

## 4. Distinguish in law between mere administrative mistakes and criminal behaviour

No shipment should be regarded as illegal shipment because of mere administrative errors in Annex VII, and no company should be sanctioned with extremely high fines applying to illegal shipments because of an administrative error. Some companies fill in tens of thousands of Annex VII documents per year, with the largest ones reaching hundred thousand Annex VII documents per year. Compliant companies conduct their business with high-level of precision, but still an error can occur for example filling incomplete contact details of the recipient.

**We propose that the Regulation should explicitly stipulate, for example in the definition of illegal shipment in Article 2(35)(g)(iii), that a shipment shall not be regarded as illegal shipment because of administrative errors in Annex VII.**

## 5. Improving the update of Regulation 1418/2007

Regulation 1418/2007 is currently under revision but those revisions are only conducted every few years. Since the last revision 5 years ago, many countries have changed or updated their national legislations on waste imports so that Regulation 1418/2007 does not reflect the current legislation of some countries.

**EuRIC calls for a more frequent update of Regulation 1418/2007 in order to effectively mirror the changes regarding legislation on waste imports on international level. Additionally, EuRIC calls for improving the operation of Regulation 1418/2007 by establishing a mechanism by which data is collected from third-countries but then placed onto an interactive web platform that can be updated without having to update the Regulation 1418/2007 itself.**



EuRIC is the Confederation representing the interests of the European recycling industries at EU level. EuRIC, through its various Branches covering the vast majority of waste streams, brings together National Recycling / Resource Management Federations and Companies in lieu from more than 23 European countries active locally and globally.

EuRIC represents across Europe over:

- § 5,500+ companies generating an aggregated annual turnover of about 95 billion €, including large companies and SMEs, involved in the recycling and trade of various resource streams;
- § 300,000 local jobs which cannot be outsourced to non-EU countries;
- § Million tons of waste recycled per year (metals, paper, glass, plastics, WEEE, ELVs, tyres, textiles and beyond).

By turning wastes into resources, recycling is the link which reintroduces recycled materials into the value chains again and again. Recyclers play a key role in bridging resource efficiency, climate change policy and industrial transition.  
For more information: [www.euric-aisbl.eu](http://www.euric-aisbl.eu)

For further information, please contact [euric@euric-aisbl.eu](mailto:euric@euric-aisbl.eu).