

PUBLIC CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Circular Economy Act

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

As announced in the [Clean Industrial Deal](#), the European Commission is preparing a proposal for a circular economy act for adoption in 2026. The main objective of this new legislation is to accelerate the transition to the circular economy in the EU. It will target several obstacles, such as the lack of sufficient demand and supply for secondary raw materials (including critical ones); and the fragmentation of the single market for circular products, waste and secondary raw materials.

As an integral part of the analysis, the Commission is launching this public consultation to gather views from all interested parties. The questionnaire consists of seven parts:

- Part 1 collects some key information about you;
- Part 2 covers general questions on the circular economy;
- Part 3 focuses on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE);
- Part 4 contains questions related to single market barriers to circularity;
- Part 5 contains questions about the demand and supply of secondary raw materials;
- Part 6 contains questions on improving waste management and circular processes;
- Part 7 provides an opportunity to submit open comments and upload documents.

Your feedback will feed into the impact assessment. This questionnaire is launched in parallel to the call for evidence.

You can save your replies as a draft and finish later.

PART 1. ABOUT YOU

About you

* 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

* 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

*** First name**

Mariana

*** Surname**

Lopez Davila

*** Email (this won't be published)**

mariana.lopez@ecostandard.org

*** Organisation name**

255 character(s) maximum

Environmental Coalition on Standards (ECOS)

*** Organisation size**

- ☐ Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ☒ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ☐ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ☐ Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

*** 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	 Guadeloupe	 Nauru	 Switzerland
 Bosnia and Herzegovina	 Guam	 Nepal	 Syria
 Botswana	 Guatemala	 Netherlands	 Taiwan
 Bouvet Island	 Guernsey	 New Caledonia	 Tajikistan
 Brazil	 Guinea	 New Zealand	 Tanzania
 British Indian Ocean Territory	 Guinea-Bissau	 Nicaragua	 Thailand
 British Virgin Islands	 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 | ☐ Zambia |
| | | Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | |
| ☐ Democratic Republic of the Congo | ☐ Lesotho | ☐ Saint Kitts and Nevis | ☐ Zimbabwe |
| ☐ Denmark | ☐ Liberia | ☐ Saint Lucia | |

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. **For 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

* 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.



I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

PART 2. GENERAL QUESTIONS ON THE CIRCULAR ECONOMY

Question 1: To what extent do you agree with the following statements about barriers hampering the EU single market for secondary raw materials?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Prices for secondary raw materials are generally higher than prices of primary raw materials	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. The quality of secondary raw materials is generally lower than the quality of primary raw materials	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. A lack of standardised certification for secondary raw materials affects their marketability	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. There are too many regulatory obstacles to a well-functioning single market for secondary raw materials	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. There are too many other barriers (financial, information, etc.) obstructing economies of scale for the supply and demand of secondary raw materials	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. There is insufficient supply of secondary raw materials	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. There is insufficient demand for secondary raw materials	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. EU-made secondary raw materials face competition from imported secondary raw materials that are cheaper, of lower quality and/or of uncertain origin	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. There is not enough high-quality, sorted waste in the EU to produce secondary raw materials	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

j. There is inadequate infrastructure for the collection, sorting, and transportation of secondary raw materials within the EU							
k. Circular economy business models are not receiving the necessary financial support							
l. Current public procurement practices do not sufficiently prioritise or incentivise the use of secondary raw materials							
m. Key actors in the products' value chains (e.g. producers and recyclers) are not sufficiently working together to improve circularity							
n. Consumer awareness and acceptance of products made from secondary raw materials is low							

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

The section focuses narrowly on market efficiency and trade of secondary raw materials (SRM), overlooking key barriers to circularity. SRM markets cannot function if we only remove trade frictions without addressing how materials are produced, how products are designed for durability, circularity, and non-toxicity, and without supporting reuse, repair, refurbishing, and remanufacturing. Reducing overall resource use is also essential.

.....

Question 2: How important are the following economic incentives in boosting the EU circular economy?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Extended Producer Responsibility schemes (e.g. producers are held financially responsible for the entire lifecycle of their products, including their waste management)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Deposit refund schemes	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Public procurement criteria supporting the circular economy	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Taxes or fees on incinerating and/or landfilling of waste	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Taxes on exports of waste	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Tax breaks and other fiscal incentives supporting circular economy practices	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. EU funding for circular economy practices	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
h. National funding for circular economy practices	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
i. Reduction of subsidies which prevent circularity (e.g. subsidies for landfills and incineration)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Pay-as-you-throw schemes	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Product-as-a-service models	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

EPR schemes should be designed drawing inspiration from and stepping up the ambition of the French model. Most of the fee should be spent on waste prevention, then on repair, then on reuse, and then only on recycling. Also, the circularity of PaaS models must be demonstrated before being applied as a solution to boost the circularity of certain sectors. Tax breaks, such as VAT exemptions for repair and reuse are important and proven economic incentives missing from this list.

.....

Question 3: To what extent do you agree that the EU can take the following measures to help raise awareness and encourage a change of mindset among the broader public and economic operators towards a more circular economy?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Set up EU-wide public awareness campaigns	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Set up national or local public awareness campaigns	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Systematically introduce the circular economy into educational curricula	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Introduce standardised product labelling, product information, including toxic substances, and other consumer transparency measures and tools focusing on circularity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Support Member States authorities' capacity building for the circular economy through training, exchanges on best practices and advisory services	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Support Member States authorities in developing a diverse trainings programme and skill set to meet emerging challenges of circularity	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Work on prevention (e.g. reducing resource use, waste generation, foster re-use)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Work on prevention should take centre stage as a key missing point in current EU policymaking on the circular economy. Information provision alone is not enough to change mindsets. Campaigns are not enough, you need to influence attitudes, habits and ensure you have the infrastructure you need so people can make change their behaviour. To make circularity the norm among the broader public, you need, among other things, to regulate advertising of linear practices such as fast fashion and overconsumption.

PART 3. WASTE ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT

(WEEE)

Question 4: How important are the following measures to increase the collection of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE)?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Make producers legally responsible for meeting national WEEE collection targets	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Increase collection targets	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Impose financial penalties on producers that fail to meet WEEE collection targets	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Increase inspection to uncover illegal exports of WEEE from the EU	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Require all actors handling WEEE to register and report quantities through a unified national system	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Conduct recurring, product-specific awareness campaigns at national level	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
g. Investigate consumer behaviour and barriers to WEEE return as a basis for targeted initiatives	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

All producers shall financially participate in nation-wide WEEE return schemes, covering WEEE collection costs from households, mandatory collection, and separate product recovery targets to support reuse. To counter illegal imports, liability and due diligence obligations shall also apply to online platforms. To better control exports of used EEEs and prevent bypass of e-waste trade bans, functional requirements and tests should be set. WEEE mix collection with metal scrap should be banned.

.....

Question 5: How important are the following measures to incentivise waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) take-back?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Mandating online sellers to offer free WEEE take-back for delivered electronics	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Making door-to-door WEEE collection mandatory for municipalities above a certain population size	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Making Commission Recommendation (EU) 2023/2585 that aims to increase the return of used and waste mobile phones, tablets and laptops mandatory	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Establishing deposit return systems for small appliances (or other products, please specify below)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Requiring sellers of electrical and electronic equipment to accept WEEE, regardless of where the product was purchased	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Developing incentives based on consumer preference (e.g. preferences for vouchers over deposit schemes)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Retail stores whose EEE selling area is greater than 400m² should accept small WEEE take-back free of charge and without any purchase obligation. The density of WEEE collection points should also be higher. Deposit refund systems for small WEEE or compensation schemes for their return should be set up. Personal data protection should also be easily ensured for take-back (e.g. for smartphones & tablets).

.....

Question 6: What is currently impeding the recycling of critical raw materials (CRMs) from waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) in the EU?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. WEEE diverted to scrap metal yards or large shredders	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Lack of infrastructure (e.g. collection, sorting and recycling)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Lack of scale / a fragmented market	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Insufficient technology readiness	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
e. The concentration of CRMs in electrical and electronic equipment components is too low to qualify for recycling	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
f. Insufficient removal of electrical and electronic equipment components	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Low price of virgin primary CRMs	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Low price of imported secondary CRMs	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. The quality of secondary CRMs is lower than primary ones	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
j. Insufficient demand for secondary CRMs	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. High energy costs of recycling	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Insufficient information on CRMs in WEEE available to recyclers	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Electrical and electronic equipment not designed for recycling	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Upstream, EEE horizontal ecodesign shall facilitate spare part & CRM removal, replacement & product repair. All substances of concern should be phased out, including those hindering WEEE treatment. Reuse and preparation for reuse should be prioritised, by setting separate targets from recycling and mainstreaming product recovery in standards. Rules for WEEE treatment collection and logistics should be modernised, e.g. to improve CRM recovery, by integrating and updating the CENELEC standards.

Question 7: To what extent do you agree that the current waste of electrical and electronic equipment categories should be expanded?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Setting a new category for renewable energy related equipment, including photovoltaic panels, wind turbines and others	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Setting a new category for photovoltaic panels (from current category 4 into to a new category)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Setting a new category for wind turbines	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Setting a new category for digital and telecommunications equipment (e.g. data servers)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Setting a new category for seabed cables, large industrial cables	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Setting a new category for non-mobile road machinery	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Setting a new category for large-scale stationary industrial tools	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Setting a new category for large scale fixed installations	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

In addition, a new separate category for e-cigarettes and vaping products (including rechargeable vaping devices, vape pods, cartridges and associated charging equipment) should be added, whereas disposable ones should be banned. They pose both fire and environmental hazards due to the chemicals and batteries they embed, when not correctly disposed of. Their end-of-life treatment should tackle both the battery recovery and the proper handling of toxic liquid residues.

.....

Question 8: To what extent do you agree with the following measures to improve the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) system for waste electric and electronic equipment (WEEE)?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. EPR financing needs to be harmonised across the EU as well as registration and reporting requirements	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. EPR fees for electrical and electronic equipment should remain unchanged	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c. Member States should do regular compositional surveys of collected mixed municipal waste stream to determine the share of WEEE	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. EPR fees should cover costs additional to the costs currently covered under the current WEEE Directive (from collection to recycling). These include awareness campaigns, compositional surveys, data gathering and reporting, and deducting any revenues obtained from preparation for re-use or preparation for repurposing or from the value of secondary raw materials recovered from recycled WEEE	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. EPR business-to-business and business-to-consumer obligations should remain different (as is the case in the current WEEE Directive)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. The difference between EPR business-to-business and business-to-consumer obligations should be reduced to the minimum	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
g. EPR fees should also be eligible for financing behavioural research and targeted consumer initiatives, because the consumer's decision to return or not return WEEE is crucial to the quantity and quality of collected material	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

All producers and distributors placing EEE on the EU market shall join a PRO, including online platforms. EPR should incorporate tools to consider waste prevention, repair and reuse, i.e. beyond WEEE management and treatment. Moreover, the EPR scheme governance should be revised to include smaller businesses, NGOs, municipalities and social enterprises to contribute to the scheme design and decision-making. A 'fee transfer mechanism' for reusable EEEs exported from the EU should also be set up.

PART 4. SINGLE MARKET BARRIERS FOR CIRCULARITY

Question 9: How important is it to simplify (e.g. through harmonisation) the following rules in order to improve the single market for waste and secondary raw materials?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Extended Producer Responsibility	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. End-of-waste criteria	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. By-product criteria	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Permits (e.g. for establishing a recycling facility)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
e. Rules on cross-border waste shipments within the EU	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Our responses a, b, c are linked to harmonisation of rules, which should enforce the waste hierarchy. EOW criteria should be updated alongside technological improvements, contributing to an increasing high level of circularity. For instance, EOW criteria for iron and steel products were drafted in 2011 and are based on a set of voluntary practices only – the need to revise this implementing regulation is clear.

.....

Question 10: How important are the following obstacles preventing waste from being recognised as reaching the end-of-waste or a by-product status?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Heterogeneity of end-of-waste and by-product criteria	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Existence of sub-national/local end-of-waste and by-product criteria	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Existence of national end-of-waste and by-product criteria	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Lack of mutual recognition between national end-of-waste and by-product criteria	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Lack of EU-wide end-of-waste and by-product criteria	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

The EU should favour harmonised EU-wide end-of-waste criteria over mutual recognition and consider the most ambitious national or regional criteria. Mutual recognition of national criteria should be enhanced during the transition period towards EU-wide criteria. There is important ECJ case law that should be considered for any update of by-product criteria, which should not be equated with waste.

.....

Question 11: How important are the following reforms to facilitate the attainment of the end-of-waste and by-product status?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Swiftly develop additional EU-wide end-of-waste and by-product criteria	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. No longer allow sub-national/local end-of-waste and by-product criteria	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Enable mutual recognition of national end-of-waste and by-product criteria	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Further develop the provisions for the end-of-waste and by-product criteria in the Waste Framework Directive	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Harmonising EU-wide EOW criteria in the EU WFD is critical, Yet, the EU should ensure the highest level of protection for human health and the environment and do not lead to by-passing the EU Waste Shipment Regulation, nor international EU's commitments such as the Basel Convention, especially for WEEE and plastics. Mutual recognition of national criteria should be enhanced during the transition towards EU harmonised criteria. End-of-waste and by-product criteria should be treated separately.

.....

Question 12: To what extent do you agree with the following statements about Extended Producer Responsibility schemes?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Producer responsibility organisations should be regulated at Member State level	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Producer responsibility organisations should be regulated at EU level	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Various actors in the life cycle of the product should be represented in producer responsibility organisations	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Extended Producer Responsibility fees should cover the entire waste management costs (e.g. collection, transport and treatment)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Extended Producer Responsibility fees should cover waste prevention (e.g. re-use, repair and waste prevention campaigns)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Extended Producer Responsibility fees should be modulated (lower or higher) depending on the circularity performance of related products	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Transparency should be required on how fees are determined and how they are spent	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. The issue of 'free riders' (producers that do not register for Extended Producer Responsibility) needs to be addressed	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Ensuring cost efficiency is a key objective of Extended Producer Responsibility	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

j. Ensuring high recycling rates is a key objective of Extended Producer Responsibility							
k. Ensuring minimal landfilling of waste is a key objective of Extended Producer Responsibility							
l. Ensuring minimal incineration of waste is a key objective of Extended Producer Responsibility							

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

EPR schemes should include separate targets for waste prevention, collection, reuse & recycling. EPR fees should cover as a minimum all costs for collection, transport, sorting, preparing for re-use, repair, reuse, recycling & treatment of residual waste textiles, data gathering, communication to consumers, administrative costs. All actors, including social enterprises, municipalities, waste managers, and NGOs should be included in the decisions on the design, governance and functioning of EPR.

Question 13: To what extent do you agree that EU mandatory Extended Producer Responsibility systems would benefit for the following product groups?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Agricultural plastics	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Tyres	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Mattresses	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Furniture	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Construction products	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

.....

Question 14: How important are the following digitalisation measures to simplify Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) systems?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Setting up a national webpage for each EPR system	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Setting up an EU-level webpage for all EPR systems	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Turning an EU-level online registration of producers into an EU-level EPR register	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Turning an EU-level online registration into national EPR registers	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Setting up an EU-level online platform to register and access national EPR schemes (one-stop-shop)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

An EU centralised EPR should be endowed with dedicated resources for monitoring and surveillance.

PART 5. DEMAND AND SUPPLY OF SECONDARY RAW MATERIALS

Question 15: Would you be in favour of the Commission proposing minimum bio-based content targets at EU level?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Do not know

Please explain why?

500 character(s) maximum

Biobased does not mean sustainable, carbon neutral, or circular. If biobased content targets are considered, they must avoid unintended consequences. Targets should follow the waste hierarchy, applying in priority where reuse and recycling are not feasible and where biobased options deliver clear environmental gains. Strict sustainability and sourcing criteria must apply, consumer bio-based content claims should include environmental information to prevent greenwashing.

Question 16: How important are the following measures in increasing the demand of secondary raw materials?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Minimum recycled content targets	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Minimum EU-made recycled content targets	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Public procurement rules favouring products/companies using secondary raw materials	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Public procurement rules favouring products/companies using EU-made secondary raw materials	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. EU-wide standards on the quality and traceability of secondary raw materials	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Measures to further reduce the landfilling of waste	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Information on the quality and origin of secondary raw materials	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Price incentives for products or companies using EU-made secondary raw materials (e.g. value-added tax exemptions and tax credits)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Price disincentives for products or companies using primary raw materials (e.g. taxes and carbon cost)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Stronger support from extended producer responsibility schemes for the uptake of secondary raw materials (e.g. eco-modulation of Extended Producer Responsibility fees)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

k. Stronger market surveillance							
l. Support to increase waste recycling activities in the EU (e.g. financial support for new capacities)							

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Strong resource efficiency requirements should help access/disassemble secondary components & raw materials for repair, reuse, repurposing, or recycling. They should include removability, replaceability and interoperability of components. Information in the supply chain through the DPP is key. Deposit-return systems or similar financial incentives should support materials recovery, together with PPP and recycled content targets. The calculation method should be reliable and not rely on credits.

.....

Question 17: To what extent do you agree with the following statements on public procurement?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Public procurement can be a significant driver of the circular economy	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Circularity criteria should complement price criteria	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Circularity criteria should be optional for contracting authorities to use	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d. Circularity criteria should be mandatory for contracting authorities to use	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Circularity criteria should apply to specific products' aspects (e.g. durability, reparability, recyclability and recycled content)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Question 18: In order to support the transition to circular economy in the EU, which goods or services should be prioritised for public procurement criteria?

500 character(s) maximum

Priority should go to goods and services with high circularity potential and greatest share of public investment. Construction uses half of EU raw materials and generates a third of waste, with 31% of investments public. Circular concrete and steel could cut construction-related procurement emissions by up to 25% at minimal cost. Electronics, textiles, and food should also be prioritised for their strong environmental benefits.

Question 19: To what extent do you consider it important to improve the scrap classifications and trade codes for steel, aluminium and other secondary raw materials?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Additional scrap classifications for recycled steel	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. More granularity in trade codes for recycled steel	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Additional scrap classifications for recycled aluminium	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. More granularity in trade codes for secondary aluminium	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Other materials: please specify

500 character(s) maximum

CN trade codes do not report the quality of scrap, and the European informal system of definitions of qualities can be improved. For instance, the system in the U.S. based on ISRI is a good starting point, yet it is managed by private entities. Ideally, the EU would propose a transparent and public system monitoring quality of scrap. This proposal is along the same line of the conclusions by the latest report of the JRC on the topic.

.....

Question 20: How important are the following measures in reducing the export of products and waste streams containing critical raw materials and increasing recycling capacity within the EU?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Introducing export fees for certain waste streams that contain critical raw materials and reinvesting the revenues generated into domestic recycling infrastructure and technology	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Tightening controls or restrictions on the export of waste that contains critical raw materials	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Enhancing transparency and reporting requirements for exports of secondary raw materials	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Introducing further regulatory requirements (e.g. for environmental objectives) on exports of secondary raw materials	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Prioritising access to critical raw materials for strategic EU sectors before authorising exports	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Aligning with practices of non-EU countries that restrict critical raw materials exports to support domestic recovery	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Illegal exports, e.g. of e-waste, should be stopped by setting minimum functional requirements and precise testing procedures for EEEs to be classified as reused products. This would help support better control of exported used EEEs and their CRMs. WEEE mixed collection with metal scrap should be banned. New EEE, second-hand EEE and e-waste should have different trade codes.

PART 6. IMPROVING WASTE MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULAR PROCESSES

Question 21: How important are the following elements into improving waste management systems?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Further limit the use of derogations from the obligation on Member States to establish separate collection systems for certain waste streams (Article 10(3) of the Waste Framework Directive)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Establish a harmonised methodology at EU level to conduct compositional analysis of the mixed waste	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Introduce a legal obligation to use advanced sorting facilities for mixed municipal waste	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

.....

Question 22: To what extent do you agree with the following measures to reduce the landfilling or incineration of waste and incentivising recycling?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Strengthening the provisions on enforcement of EU legislation concerning landfilling and uncontrolled dumping of waste	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Introducing a general ban on landfilling of waste	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c. Introducing (additional) bans on landfilling for specific types of waste	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d. Tax policy aimed at taxation of landfilling waste in the EU	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Tax policy aimed at taxation of incinerating waste in the EU	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Introducing a market-based instrument (e.g. cap-and-trade systems) for landfilling waste in the EU	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Ensuring a level playing field for circular products by eliminating value added tax (VAT) embedded in the value of recycled goods used as input	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Introducing a general ban on landfilling of waste risks to increase waste incineration. Instead, an EU ban on waste landfilling should target untreated waste. Such bans should be accompanied by mandatory pretreatment requirements and common waste acceptance criteria. They should go hand-in-hand with taxation measures on waste incineration and untreated waste landfilling to prevent lock-in and ensure coherence with EU circular economy objectives.

Question 23: Which are the most important barriers hindering the use of sewage sludge and bio-waste as secondary materials?

500 character(s) maximum

Plastic contamination in collected bio-waste hinders its reuse, e.g. for industrial composting. Bulk collection or use of certified compostable bags should ensure proper management, aligned with EN 13432 revision under the PPWR standardisation request. False and misleading environmental claims on packaging, especially plastics, such as home compostable or biodegradable, should be stopped to avoid consumers' confusion and bio-waste contamination.

Question 24: How important are the following measures for the management of extractive waste and supporting the recycling of critical raw materials (CRMs) from extractive waste?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Improved data availability on the recycling potential of CRMs in extractive waste facilities across the EU	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Ensuring a high level of environmental and human health protection	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Promoting research and innovation in new and emerging technologies	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Adopting mandatory best available techniques (BAT) conclusions for the management of extractive waste	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

All listed measures are essential to responsible extractive waste management and support recycling. These efforts should align with ongoing research and international standardisation under ISO/TC 82/SC 7, which is developing standards on backfilling, economic evaluation of mining waste, and the disposal and utilisation of mine solid waste.

Question 25: Do you agree that amending the List of Waste (Commission Decision 2000/532/EC) to cover new waste streams or to revise existing entries would benefit the efficient and circular management of waste?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

How important is it to specifically include the following waste streams into the List of Waste?

	1 (very important)	2 (important)	3 (neutral)	4 (less important)	5 (not at all important)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Waste from photovoltaic panels	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Waste from permanent magnets	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Waste from glass and carbon fibre composite materials	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Separately collected bio-waste	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Metal waste from mechanical and physical treatment going beyond specification of ferrous and non-ferrous	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify

500 character(s) maximum

.....

Question 26: To what extent do you agree with the following interventions to facilitate the establishment of trans-regional circularity hubs that promote smart specialisation and economies of scale for (separate) collection, sorting and recycling?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. Legal enablers (e.g. permitting, licences and permits)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Financial enablers (e.g. tax breaks and public and private funding)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Information provision (e.g. digital platforms matching supply and demand)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Capacity building in national, regional and local authorities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Question 27: Industrial processes often not only produce the core output but also provide side streams or by-products. Those could become an input for another industrial process, which could then be valorised, creating an industrial symbiosis. Is that the case for your industry?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Do not know

Question 28: Do you agree with the following statements about the benefits and challenges in conducting pre-demolition and pre-renovation audits?

	1 (strongly agree)	2 (agree)	3 (neutral)	4 (not agree)	5 (not agree at all)	6 (do not know)	7 (not applicable)
a. The audit improves planning of selective demolition	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. The audit increases reuse/recycling of materials	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. The audit reduces landfilling	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. The audit allows better cost estimation and project control	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. The audit supports circular economy targets	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. The audit leads to high administrative burden	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
g. A harmonised database would improve pre-demolition and pre-renovation audits	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Pre-demolition and pre-renovation audits should be mandatory	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Pre-demolition and pre-renovation audits should be digital	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. High costs (especially for small-scale projects)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Lack of expertise is a challenge	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
l. Lack of a market for recycled materials is a challenge	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Demolition contractors would duplicate the audits	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Pre-demolition and redevelopment audits can shift construction from a linear to a circular model. Already used in some Member States, they identify hazardous materials (such as asbestos) and recoverable components. The Commission recently revised its guidelines; the CEA should build and expand on this and require digital, standardised templates and procedures (as being developed in CEN/TC 350 SC1/WG8) to enable traceability and circular material recovery.

PART 7. OPEN COMMENT BOX + UPLOAD DOCUMENTS

Question 29: What impact do you expect measures supporting EU circularity (particularly measures on WEEE; improving the single market for secondary raw materials; measures on the supply and demand of secondary raw materials; and measures improving waste management systems) to have on international trade?

500 character(s) maximum

To lead global trade rooted in environmental ambition, the EU must strengthen compliance and market surveillance to prevent non-compliant products (EU-made or imported) from harming people and the environment. Combined WEEE and EEE Ecodesign rules should prevent waste creation, improve WEEE treatment, and reduce illegal exports, while due diligence and liability for online platforms should curb illegal imports. Measures enabling urban mining will boost EU trade independence.

If you wish, please provide additional comments/suggestions related to this consultation

1000 character(s) maximum

ECOS is concerned that basing the CEA solely on Article 114 TFEU, focused on the internal market, risks undermining its environmental purpose. Circular economy policies tackle systemic issues—resource depletion, pollution, waste—that cannot be solved through market measures alone. A dual legal basis, combining Article 114 and an environmental article (e.g. Art. 192), is legally sound and politically coherent, ensuring market harmonisation while delivering real environmental gains. Precedents exist: the Batteries Regulation and Packaging Directive use dual bases (114 + 192), while the Waste Framework Directive relies solely on Article 192. The mandate of Commissioner Roswall, “Environment, Water Resilience and a Competitive Circular Economy,” also links circularity to environmental goals under the Clean Industrial Deal. Without an environmental base, measures to prevent waste, cut material footprints, and promote reuse risk being secondary.

If you wish, please upload a document/position paper here

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

2fee47e4-5d51-409b-8691-612bb6aa0074/2025-10_ECOS-response_CE-Act-web-flnal.pdf

Contact

EC-CIRCULAR-ECONOMY-ACT@ec.europa.eu