



Extended Producer Responsibility

for waste reduction

Policy brief

February 2026

zerowasteeurope.eu



Contents

2 Summary

2 What's the issue?

4 How can EPR become a driver of reuse, repair, and overall waste reduction?

9 Proposed amendments to the Waste Framework Directive (WFD)

11 Annex I

11 What is the EU's regulatory state of play for waste reduction?

11 Waste Framework Directive (WFD)

12 Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Directive

13 Batteries Regulation

14 Packaging & Packaging Waste Regulation (PPWR)

14 Right to Repair Directive

15 Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (ESPR)

16 Annex II

16 Which Member State policies can serve as examples?

16 Belgium

17 France

Summary

The Circular Economy Act (CEA) could overcome the current limitations of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), which prioritises waste management over more impactful circular strategies such as reuse and repair.

To drive real waste reduction, ZWE proposes splitting EPR fees into two distinct budgets—one for waste management and another for waste reduction (supporting mid-level R-strategies). A temporary ‘transition to circularity’ fund could bridge the gap until granular data is available and concrete targets can be introduced.

Strong governance, transparent reporting, and legally binding targets are essential to ensure EPR schemes effectively finance and scale circular business models across the EU.

What is the issue?

The Circular Economy Act (CEA) has the potential to break the linear bias of EPR, which currently focuses on covering the costs of waste management (such as collection, sorting, and recycling), and become an effective tool to boost the higher tiers of the waste hierarchy. The need for a long-term vision for the transition to a circular economy and the importance of prioritising the top tiers of the waste hierarchy were recently underlined by EU Member States.¹

The lack of funding for non-waste-related circular measures partly explains the limited progress² on the EU’s circularity achieved over the past decade. Waste streams such as packaging³ or WEEE⁴ have been growing at a faster pace than their collection and recycling rates, while waste reduction measures such as repairing an appliance or reusing packaging remain uneconomical.

¹ See ‘Europe’s Environment 2030 – Building a more climate resilient and circular Europe – Council conclusions.’ 2025. Council of the European Union. www.consilium.europa.eu/media/3cxfwwlj/final_council-ccls-europe-s-environment.pdf

‘41. REITERATES the need for an integrated EU long-term vision for the transition to a circular economy and sustainable resource use and UNDERLINES the importance of prioritising the top tiers of the waste hierarchy.’

‘57. ACKNOWLEDGES the need to realise the full potential for waste reduction and prevention of material extraction through further incentives to increase durability, reparability and reuse of products, servitisation, and the facilitation and incentivisation of circular business models and ENCOURAGES the Commission to ensure this as part of the Circular Economy Act.’

² “Circular Material Use Rate in Europe.” 2023. European Environment Agency (EEA). www.eea.europa.eu/en/analysis/indicators/circular-material-use-rate-in-europe

³ “Packaging Waste Statistics – Statistics Explained.” 2022. Eurostat. ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Packaging_waste_statistics

⁴ “Waste Statistics – Electrical and Electronic Equipment – Statistics Explained.” 2024. Eurostat. ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Waste_statistics_-_electrical_and_electronic_equipment

Image 1 - Electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) put on the market and waste EEE collected, treated, recovered, recycled and prepared for reuse in thousands of tonnes, EU⁵





Image 2 - Packaging waste generated and recycled in kilograms per capita, EU⁶



⁵ ibid.

⁶ "Packaging Waste Statistics - Statistics Explained." 2022. Eurostat
ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Packaging_waste_statistics#Source_data_28MS_Excel.29

The EPR systems established to solve the waste problem have become a roadblock that stops progress towards better collection, reuse, and overall waste reduction.⁷ However, the foreseen review of EPR has the potential to unlock the necessary funds for circularity, which is crucial to increase Europe's resource productivity and achieve greater autonomy from imports. The EU's legislative basis, as well as national best practices outlined here, show that promoting the mid-level R-strategies⁸ (Reuse, Repair, Refurbish, Remanufacture, Repurpose) via EPR is both feasible and necessary to achieve the union's waste reduction and circularity goals.

How can EPR become a driver of reuse, repair, and overall waste reduction?

Producer responsibility must go beyond financing waste management and include reduction and preparation for reuse measures. If the goal is to increase material productivity, EPR should become a tool to engender the transition from waste management to scaling circular businesses focusing on mid-level R-strategies. In order to achieve this, it is essential that the same cost coverage approach that the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) mandates for waste management is applied to waste reduction. The forthcoming **Circular Economy Act** provides a unique opportunity to increase the competitiveness of circular business with this new financing mechanism and boost circularity in the EU.

Given the prevalence of reduction and reuse over recycling and disposal in the EU waste hierarchy,⁹ it is important to prevent the same EPR fees from financing both options, or the funding will mainly flow to waste management services. Instead, the EPR budget must be split between the funding necessary to cover the costs of collection and management of waste and the costs of reduction measures.

Consequently, **two separate sets of fees should be levied, one fee to cover the costs of waste management and one fee to cover waste reduction measures.** The amount of the respective fees should depend on the funding needed to achieve legally binding waste management, reuse and reduction targets.¹⁰

⁷ "Designing EPR to foster the EU's competitiveness and strategic autonomy". 2024. Zero Waste Europe. zerowasteurope.eu/library/designing-epr-to-foster-the-eus-competitiveness-and-strategic-autonomy

⁸ The 9R Framework. Source: Adapted from Potting et al. (2017, p.5). 2026. ResearchGate. www.researchgate.net/figure/The-9R-Framework-Source-Adapted-from-Potting-et-al-2017-p5_fig1_321432839

⁹ "Waste Framework Directive." European Commission. 2023. environment.ec.europa.eu/topics/waste-and-recycling/waste-framework-directive_en

¹⁰ The PPWR already introduced the option of meeting reuse and reduction targets by utilising EPR fees:

- Art 43 (5) Prevention of packaging waste: '(...) Such measures may include the use of economic instruments and other measures to provide incentives for the application of the waste hierarchy, such as the measures referred to in Annexes IV and IVa to Directive 2008/98/EC, or other appropriate instruments and measures, including incentives provided through extended producer responsibility schemes, and obligations on producers or producer responsibility organisations to adopt waste prevention plans (...).'

For instance, the waste management EPR fee should raise enough money to meet the obligation for separate collection and targets for collection and recycling, while the waste reduction fee should raise the budget necessary to deliver on the waste reduction, reuse and similar targets to be set by law.

Table 1 – Overview of EPR fee separation for waste management and waste reduction

Waste management fee	Covers costs of waste management necessary to meet collection and recycling targets (Bottom-level R-strategies) ¹¹
Waste reduction fee	Covers costs of repair and reuse systems (and other Mid-level R-strategies) ¹² to meet respective targets

While this is the preferred approach, and it has already been applied to waste management costs, a lack of data about the cost of reduction and reuse systems in some Member States makes it currently difficult to define the ‘waste reduction fee’ accurately. For this reason, during an interim period, Member States shall instead introduce a temporary ‘fund for transition to circularity’, earmarking a minimum percentage of the PRO budget for reduction and reuse.

Despite this approach not being fully consistent with the producer responsibility of cost coverage, it would allow Member States to mobilise the necessary funding for urgent reduction and reuse measures, without which existing and future reduction targets cannot be achieved. Annex II demonstrates best practices in Member States in this area.

Table 2 – Bridge measure to finance waste reduction

Fund for transition to circularity	Earmarks 10% of the PRO budget for reuse systems and repair initiatives (and other Mid-level R strategies)
---	--

The advantage of this fund is that the costs for PROs are clearly defined from the onset, while a review of the appropriateness of funding could be mandated later on. ZWE therefore proposes to move forward immediately with **a mandatory fund for transition to circularity at the Member State level of at least 10%¹³ of the PRO budget** unless Member States have already introduced legally binding targets for mid-level R-strategies. This measure would guarantee immediate relief for social enterprises, the backbone of the current reuse and repair systems, that are at a breaking point due to plummeting reuse values and

– Art 51(3) Re-use and refill: ‘Member States shall ensure that extended producer responsibility schemes and deposit and return systems allocate a minimum share of their budget to financing reduction and prevention actions.’

¹¹ The 9R Framework. Source: Adapted from Potting et al. (2017, p.5). 2026. ResearchGate.

www.researchgate.net/figure/The-9R-Framework-Source-Adapted-from-Potting-et-al-2017-p5_fig1_321432839

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ Several reports evaluated the French AGEC law and found that the current 5% allocation of EPR fees to reuse is insufficient to meet the objectives. The parliamentary committee published a [proposal](#) to raise the sum from 5% to 10%.

free-riding.^{14, 15} **From 2030 onwards, the waste reduction fee, including binding targets for mid-level R-strategies, shall apply for EPR schemes mandated at the EU level.**¹⁶

To successfully implement this measure, **mandatory PRO membership for producers**,^{17, 18} **as well as legal accountability of PROs** for meeting EPR requirements, is paramount. Failure to meet the respective requirements must be subject to penalties.¹⁹ Moreover, to ensure transparency, PROs need to provide access to data to administrative bodies on the use of their collected funds. Transparency requirements for PROs on the use of funds should therefore be established in the WFD. These requirements could be combined with measures to further harmonise reporting for PROs across the EU.

It remains important to acknowledge that while EPR fees play a key role in waste reduction, they must ultimately be embedded within a set of other product, consumer, and waste policies at the local, Member State, and EU levels. Annex I provides an overview of the current gaps in the EU regulatory landscape in addressing waste reduction, while Annex II lists good practices at the Member State level.

Table 3 – Proposed split of waste management and reduction measures covered by EPR for consumer goods

Waste management measures with full cost coverage via EPR fees (based on Art. 22a.8 (a)–(d) of the WFD ²⁰ for textiles because they provide the most recent list in legislation for a consumer good category)	Waste reduction measures to be covered by either the ‘fund for transition to circularity’ OR ‘waste reduction fee’ to achieve targets for mid-level R-strategies (see Annex II for examples)
Collection of used products for re-use and the separate collection of waste products for preparing for re-use, and for recycling	Reuse
Transport of collected used and waste products for subsequent sorting for re-use, for preparing for re-use, and for recycling	Repair

¹⁴ Member States should consider earmarking a certain amount of this budget for social enterprises, where appropriate. [Council Recommendation \(C/2023/1344\)](#) introduced a definition of ‘social enterprises’ that has been applied in the revised Waste Framework Directive, while some Member States have their own definitions.

¹⁵ The use of this fund must be organised in a transparent way to avoid mismanagement. In an ideal scenario, this fund would be managed by an independent body instead of a PRO to prevent conflicts of interest.

¹⁶ The proposal for sectoral targets from 2030 onwards is based on the consideration that there will be the need for a transition period before targets can be introduced across the bloc. Targets as of 2030 would also be well-aligned with and help achieve the EU recycling targets for packaging and municipal waste.

¹⁷ The revised WFD (DIRECTIVE (EU) 2025/1892) seems to already include mandatory PRO participation for textile producers in Article 22c 1. ‘Member States shall ensure that producers of textile, textile-related or footwear products listed in Annex IVc entrust a producer responsibility organisation to fulfil their extended producer responsibility obligations laid down in Article 22a on their behalf’.

¹⁸ Common issues arising in systems without mandatory PRO participation are poor collection and treatment rates. Uncertainty about responsibilities means actors lack incentives to collect larger volumes and incur higher costs. This dynamic is evident in Germany for WEEE. Instead, a collective PRO system could even reward good performance via compensation payments between PROs. See also: [DUH \(2025\)](#). An Example of mandatory PRO participation in the Netherlands is Stichting OPEN, the PRO responsible for WEEE. Since 2021 all producers and importers are obliged to join this PRO, the only one with the ‘generally binding agreement’. See: Stichting OPEN (2026) [Producer Responsibility](#).

¹⁹ The amount of financial penalties levied on PROs for non-compliance with targets should depend on the level of non-compliance and be increased over time. Ultimately, a PRO must risk losing their accreditation if non-compliance does not improve over time despite financial penalties. The example from Belgium’s packaging sector in Annex II outlines how PROs can be held accountable without destabilising the EPR system.

²⁰ “Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives (Text with EEA relevance)”. 2008. EUR-Lex. eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02008L0098-2025I016

Sorting, preparing for re-use, recycling and other recovery operations and disposal of collected used and waste products	Refurbishment (e.g., of used phones, tyres, furniture)
Collection, transport and treatment of waste resulting from operations referred to above and by social economy entities and other actors that are part of the collection system	Remanufacturing (e.g. of EEE, batteries)
Carrying out a compositional survey of collected mixed municipal waste	Repurpose (e.g., of batteries)
Providing information, including via appropriate information campaigns, on sustainable consumption, waste prevention, re-use, preparing for re-use, including repair, recycling, other recovery and disposal	Product-as-a-service business models (e.g., clothing or tool libraries)
Data gathering and reporting to the competent authorities	
Support for research and development to improve product design and waste prevention and management operations in line with the waste hierarchy, with a view to scaling up fibre-to-fibre/closed-loop ²¹ recycling	
<i>Waste management measures currently missing from Art. 22a.8 WFD</i>	
Litter clean-up costs ²²	
Treatment of items collected in mixed municipal waste, including the sorting of mixed waste ²³	

Since the revised WFD does not specify targets for textile collection, (preparation for) reuse, and recycling, etc., we have reasonable grounds to assume that unless Member States introduce targets at the national level, PROs will seek to minimise costs for the measures listed in Art 22a 8 (see above), preventing the system from reaching its full potential. In either case, whether national targets are present or not, earmarking a fixed amount of 10% of the PRO budget for the fund for transition to circularity will immediately help ensure funding to build up circular businesses following mid-level R-strategies.

Moreover, by fully internalising the costs of waste management (by extending cost coverage to litter removal and the treatment of mixed waste), the cost difference between waste management and waste reduction measures would decrease, making the latter more financially attractive.

²¹ 'Fibre-to-fibre recycling' applies to textile waste under the WFD; for other product groups, it should read 'closed-loop recycling'.

²² These costs are only partly covered by the [SUP Directive](#).

²³ WFD Paragraph 9 states that Member States may decide that producers are to cover, partially or totally, the costs referred to in paragraph 8, point (a), for products ending up in mixed municipal waste. To reduce the burden on the municipal budgets, this measure should become mandatory.

Table 4 – Proposed split of waste management and reduction measures covered by EPR for packaging

Note: this list provides a reference for packaging vis-à-vis consumer goods. ZWE does not propose a review of the PPWR as part of the CEA.

Waste management measures with full cost coverage via EPR fees (based on PPWR ²⁴ Article 45, paragraph 2)		Waste reduction measures to be covered by either the 'fund for transition to circularity' OR 'waste reduction fee' to achieve targets for mid-level R-strategies
Costs referred to in Article 8a(4), point (a), of Directive 2008/98/EC	Costs of separate collection of waste and its subsequent transport and treatment, including treatment necessary to meet the Union waste management targets	Cost related to achievements of reuse targets in PPWR Article 29, unless the packaging is included in a mixed DRS system (single use and reuse) If a PRO is investing in reuse, it needs to be linked to performance indicators and cover both CAPEX and OPEX (e.g., initial infrastructure investments as well as running reverse logistics, washing systems, consumer information) ²⁵
	Costs related to the achievements of other targets and objectives defined in point (b) of paragraph 1 of article 8	
	Costs of providing adequate information to waste holders	Costs to achieve the targets of PPWR Article 43, i.e., reducing packaging waste generation per capita of 5% by 2030, 10% by 2035, and 15% by 2040 as compared to 2018
	Costs of data gathering and reporting	
Costs of labelling waste receptacles for the collection of packaging waste		Costs to achieve the targets of PPWR Article 33, i.e., the take-away sector should offer reusable options by 2028 and from 2030, final distributors shall endeavour to offer 10 % of products for sale in a reusable packaging format
Costs of carrying out compositional surveys of collected mixed municipal waste		Costs related to educating and encouraging behavioural change in favour of waste reduction and reuse schemes amongst citizens, in order to reach the objectives and communicate about the transition actions put in place. (Supporting measures under PPWR Articles 29 – 33 and 43)
Waste management measures currently missing from PPWR list		R&D costs with a focus on innovation that prevents packaging waste or enables reuse, e.g., the development of new reusable packaging formats or testing durable materials suitable for multiple use cycles
Litter clean-up costs ²⁶		

²⁴ Regulation (EU) 2025/40 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 December 2024 on packaging and packaging waste, amending Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 and Directive (EU) 2019/904, and repealing Directive 94/62/EC (Text with EEA relevance). 2024. EUR-Lex. eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:L_202500040&pk_campaign=todays_OJ&pk_source=EUR-Lex&pk_medium=X&pk_content=Environment&pk_key_word=Regulation

²⁵ Examples of reuse systems: [En Boîte Le Plat project](#) (France); city of [Aarhus](#).

²⁶ These costs are only partly covered by the [SUP Directive](#).

Note on the cost coverage of packaging reuse systems within EPR schemes

PPWR Art 29 (6) mandates that 'from 1 January 2030, final distributors that make alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages in sales packaging available on the territory of a Member State to consumers shall ensure that at least 10 % of those products are made available in reusable packaging within a re-use system.'²⁸ The most effective and efficient way to meet this 10% reuse target is via the implementation of a mixed Deposit and Refund System (DRS) which includes both single-use and reusable packaging. If the reusable packaging is included in a DRS, there is no need for an EPR fee for waste reduction to be established since a DRS already runs a system with full cost coverage. **If a Member State decides to exclude reusable beverage packaging from the DRS system, then the cost of achieving the 10% reuse target should be covered by the EPR fee for waste reduction after 2030 and via the minimum of 10% of the PRO budget from 2027 to 2030.**

Proposed amendments to the WFD

- Art 3 21. 'extended producer responsibility scheme' means a set of measures taken by Member States to ensure that producers of products bear financial responsibility or financial and organisational responsibility for the ~~management of the waste stage of a product's life cycle.~~ ***various parts of the entire use and end-of-life cycle of a product in line with the waste hierarchy.***
- Art 8 1. In order to strengthen the re-use and the prevention, recycling and other recovery of waste, Member States may take legislative or non-legislative measures to ensure that any natural or legal person who professionally develops, manufactures, processes, treats, sells or imports products (producer of the product) has extended producer responsibility.
Such measures may include an acceptance of returned products and of the waste that remains

²⁷ WFD Paragraph 9 states that Member States may decide that producers are to cover, partially or totally, the costs referred to in paragraph 8, point (a), for products ending up in mixed municipal waste. To reduce the burden on the municipal budgets, this measure should become mandatory.

²⁸ See also PPWR recital (142): 'Deposit and return systems should be obligatory for single-use plastic beverage bottles and metal beverage containers. Member States can also decide to include other packaging for other products or made of other materials in those systems, in particular single-use glass bottles. Member States should ensure that deposit and return systems for single-use packaging formats, in particular for single-use glass beverage bottles, are equally available for reusable packaging, where technically and economically feasible. They should consider establishing deposit and return systems also for reusable packaging. Member States should be allowed, while observing the general rules laid down in the TFEU and acting in accordance with this Regulation, to adopt provisions which go beyond the minimum requirements set out in this Regulation, such as charging a deposit at the point of sale in the case of consumption in hospitality premises or the obligation for all final distributors to accept the deposit-bearing packaging regardless of the packaging material and format that they distribute or their sale surface area.'

after those products have been used, as well as the subsequent management of the waste and financial responsibility for such activities. These measures may include the obligation to provide publicly available information as to the extent to which the product is re-usable and recyclable. Where such measures include the establishment of extended producer responsibility schemes, the general minimum requirements laid down in Article 8a shall apply.

~~Member States may decide that producers of products that undertake financial or financial and organisational responsibilities for the various parts of the entire use and end-of-life management of the waste stage of a product's life cycle of their own accord should apply some or all of the general minimum requirements laid down in Article 8a.~~

- Art 8a 1(b) in line with the waste hierarchy, set waste management **and waste reduction** targets **from 2030**, aiming to attain at least the quantitative targets relevant for the extended producer responsibility scheme as laid down in this Directive, Directive 94/62/EC, Directive 2000/53/EC, Directive 2006/66/EC and Directive 2012/19/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council (1), and set other quantitative targets and/or qualitative objectives that are considered relevant for the extended producer responsibility scheme;

Art 8a 1(c) ensure that a reporting system is in place to gather data on the products placed on the market of the Member State by the producers of products subject to extended producer responsibility and data on the collection and treatment of **products and** waste resulting from those products specifying, where appropriate, the waste material flows, as well as other data relevant for the purposes of point (b);

- Art 8a 3. **(NEW) Member States shall ensure that producers entrust a producer responsibility organisation to fulfil their extended producer responsibility obligations laid down in Article (X) on their behalf.** Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that any ~~producer of products or~~ organisation implementing extended producer responsibility obligations on behalf of producers of products:

Art 8a 3(e) makes publicly available information about the attainment of the ~~waste management~~ targets referred to in point (b) of paragraph 1, and, in the case of collective fulfilment of extended producer responsibility obligations, also information about:

(NEW) Art 8a 3(f) has legal accountability for meeting waste management and waste reduction targets.

- Art. 8a 4. Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that the financial contributions paid by the producer of the product to comply with its extended producer responsibility obligations:

ANNEX I

What is the EU's regulatory state of play for waste reduction?

The EU's regulatory framework already includes crucial objectives, targets, and measures aimed at waste reduction via mid-level R-strategies;²⁹ an **overview of central provisions enshrined in law as well as brief reflections on their effectiveness** is provided below.

Waste Framework Directive (WFD)

The Waste Hierarchy,³⁰ enshrined in EU law since the 2008 Directive 2008/98/EC,³¹ clearly states that 'preparing for reuse' should take preference over 'recycling'. However, while 'recycling' is supported by concrete definitions, methodologies, targets, and the obligation to implement EPR systems for several waste streams, reuse has not received the same regulatory attention. Legislation even conflates 'preparation for reuse' and 'recycling': Article 11.2 sets targets which could be achieved through both:

'(a) by 2020, the preparing for re-use and the recycling of waste materials such as at least paper, metal, plastic and glass from households and possibly from other origins as far as these waste streams are similar to waste from households, shall be increased to a minimum of overall 50 % by weight;'

'(c) by 2025, the preparing for re-use and the recycling of municipal waste shall be increased to a minimum of 55 % by weight;'

While there is no legally binding target for waste reduction, Article 9 mandates Member States to take measures to prevent waste, including 'the re-use of products and the setting up of systems promoting repair and re-use activities, including in particular for electrical and electronic equipment, textiles and furniture, as well as packaging and construction materials and products.' Moreover, Article 29 requires Member States to establish waste prevention programmes, while Annex IV lists examples of prevention measures.³² In addition,

²⁹ Mast, Julian, Friederike Von Unruh, and Wolfgang Irrek. 2023. "R-Strategies as Guidelines for the Circular Economy." prosperkolleg.ruhr/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/rethink_22-03_r-strategien_EN.pdf

³⁰ Article 4.1: 'The following waste hierarchy shall apply as a priority order in waste prevention and management legislation and policy: (a) prevention; (b) preparing for re-use; (c) recycling; (d) other recovery, e.g., energy recovery; and (e) disposal.'

³¹ "Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives (Text with EEA relevance)". 2008. EUR-Lex. eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02008L0098-20251016

³² Annex IV (16) 'The promotion of the reuse and/or repair of appropriate discarded products or of their components, notably through the use of educational, economic, logistic or other measures such as support for or establishment of accredited repair and reuse-centres and networks, especially in densely populated regions.'

Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2021/19³³ sets out the common methodology and a format for reporting on reuse, based on the WFD obligation for Member States to report data on reuse to the Commission every year.³⁴

Instead of a legally binding target, the EU introduced an indicator of halving residual municipal waste by 2030 in the 2020 Circular Economy Action Plan and included it in the Zero Pollution Action Plan. Yet, figures show that residual municipal waste reduction reached a plateau since 2015 and the EEA³⁵ concluded that: ‘Without reducing waste generation, achieving the zero pollution target of halving residual municipal waste by 2030 is unlikely, despite efforts to increase recycling. Intensive efforts to prevent municipal waste generation and increase recycling levels are needed — even above the current EU recycling target.’

Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Directive

Preventing the generation of WEEE is a priority of Directive 2012/19/EU,³⁶ including promoting reuse, recycling, and other ways of recovering waste from electrical and electronic equipment. Article 12 mandates Member States to ensure that producers provide for the financing of the collection, treatment, recovery, and disposal of WEEE. Moreover, Article 7 introduced a target for the collection while Article 11 and Annex V define recovery targets for the different product categories, e.g., ‘for WEEE falling within category 1 or 4 of Annex III, 80 % shall be prepared for re-use and recycled’. The text does thus not differentiate between ‘preparation for re-use’ and ‘recycling’.

The 2025 evaluation³⁷ of the directive found that ‘the it has had limited success in waste prevention efforts and has not significantly increased preparation for re-use, recycling, or recovery of WEEE materials.’ The evaluation concluded that ‘current targets are reached by most Member States for most categories, with the highest recycling and preparation for re-use rates achieved for categories 5 and 6 – small equipment and small IT (2020). Information on the share of preparation for reuse is only available when reported voluntarily by Member States. Currently, only 17 Member States carry out preparation for re-use operations, and three have

³³Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2021/19 of 18 December 2020 laying down a common methodology and a format for reporting on reuse in accordance with Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (notified under document C(2020) 8976) (Text with EEA relevance); 2021. EUR-Lex. eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dec_impl/2021/19/oj/eng

³⁴ The reuse for a given product category should be measured at least once per year, but the common methodology allows for a variety of data-gathering tools to measure reuse, such as direct measurement of the mass of reused products; mass balance calculation of reuse on the basis of the mass of inputs and outputs of reuse operations; questionnaires and interviews of reuse operators; and diaries of individuals keeping a record or log of information on reuse on a regular basis. The format for the reporting of quantitative data includes the product categories textiles, EEE, furniture, Construction material and products and other products. [Dataset of the Reuse flows according to the implementing decision \(EU\) 2021/19](#).

³⁵ “Reaching the 2030 Residual Municipal Waste Target (Indicator).” 2025. European Environmental Agency (EEA).

www.eea.europa.eu/en/european-zero-pollution-dashboards/indicators/reaching-the-2030-residual-municipal-waste-target-indicator-1

³⁶ Consolidated text: Directive 2012/19/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 July 2012 on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) (recast) (Text with EEA relevance). 2012. EUR-Lex. eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02012L0019-20240408

³⁷ “Study Supporting the Evaluation of Directive 2012/19/EU on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Final Report.” 2024. Ramboll, Unwleth Bundesamt and Öko-Institut e.V. for the European Commission. environment.ec.europa.eu/document/download/8572b5bb-2416-44a7-aaa8-5e8f8a4661c4_en?filename=Study%20supporting%20WEEE%20evaluation_Final%20report.pdf.

reported the quantity as unknown. On average, based on available data, only ~1.5% (2020) is prepared for re-use, which shows a decrease compared to the previous years.’

The foreseen revision of the WEEE Directive as part of the Circular Economy Act will be crucial to amend these shortcomings.

Batteries Regulation

The objective of Regulation (EU) 2023/1542³⁸ is to make batteries sustainable throughout their entire life cycle and develop a competitive, sustainable battery industry. Key provisions for the reuse, repurposing, and remanufacturing of batteries include:

- Article 45 introduces obligations of economic operators offering batteries that have been subject to preparation for re-use, preparation for repurposing, repurposing or remanufacturing.
- Article 56 establishes EPR for battery producers, including for economic operators that make available batteries that result from preparation for re-use, preparation for repurposing, repurposing or remanufacturing. The financial contributions to be paid by the producer shall cover the costs of (among others):
 - separate collection, transport and treatment, taking into account any revenues obtained from preparation for re-use or preparation for repurposing or from the value of secondary raw materials recovered from recycled waste batteries;
 - providing information on prevention and management of waste batteries;

While the law establishes obligations for reuse, repurposing, and remanufacturing of batteries, binding targets favour recycling:

- Articles 59 and 60 mandate that producers of portable batteries and LMT batteries, or PROs, must attain collection targets.
- Article 71 introduces targets for recycling efficiency and recovery of materials.

The overall effectiveness of the regulation to prevent waste from batteries will depend on the ambition level of secondary legislation.

³⁸ Consolidated text: Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 July 2023 concerning batteries and waste batteries, amending Directive 2008/98/EC and Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 and repealing Directive 2006/66/EC (Text with EEA relevance). 2023. EUR-Lex. eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02023R1542-20250731

Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation (PPWR)

The objectives of Regulation (EU) 2025/40³⁹ are to minimise the quantities of packaging and waste generated while lowering the use of primary raw materials and fostering the transition to a circular economy. The law mandates the achievement of targets for reuse, reduction, and recycling at the Member State level:

- Re-use targets (Article 29.6): 'From 2030, alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages in sales packaging: at least 10 % in reusable packaging within a re-use system. From 2040, at least 40%.'
- Reduction of packaging waste (Article 43.1): 'Each Member State shall reduce the packaging waste generated per capita, as compared to 2018, by at least: (a) 5 % by 2030; (b) 10 % by 2035; (c) 15 % by 2040.'

To achieve the regulation's provisions, Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the Regulation, including fines.

The law also requires that part of the EPR budget support reduction and reuse measures to achieve above targets—though it falls short of mandating a meaningful funding share. Article 51 states:

- '1. Member States to take measures to encourage the establishment of reuse and refill systems for packaging.'
- '3. Member States must ensure that Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) schemes and deposit systems allocate a minimum part of their budget to reduction and prevention actions, which can include reuse initiatives.'

Right to Repair Directive

The Right to Repair Directive (EU 2024/1799)⁴⁰ addresses shortcomings in the repair sector: for goods listed in Annex II, manufacturers are obliged to provide access to spare parts at reasonable prices and make available information on their repair services. The directive also introduced an extension of the legal guarantee period.

While it obliges Member States to take at least one measure promoting repair on their territory (financial or non-financial), no concrete funding obligation (e.g., via EPR fees) was introduced. A comprehensive overview⁴¹ of the current repair incentive systems shows that funding comes almost exclusively from public budgets. As

³⁹ Regulation (EU) 2025/40 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 December 2024 on packaging and packaging waste, amending Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 and Directive (EU) 2019/904, and repealing Directive 94/62/EC (Text with EEA relevance). 2024. EUR-Lex. eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:L_202500040&pk_campaign=todays_OJ&pk_source=EUR-Lex&pk_medium=X&pk_content=Environment&pk_key_word=Regulation

⁴⁰ Directive (EU) 2024/1799 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 on common rules promoting the repair of goods and amending Regulation (EU) 2017/2394 and Directives (EU) 2019/771 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Text with EEA relevance). 2024. EUR-Lex. eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32024L1799

⁴¹ Meyer, Katrin and Molnár, Magdolna. 2024. "A Comprehensive Overview of the Current Repair Incentive Systems: Repair Funds and Vouchers." repair.eu/news/a-comprehensive-overview-of-the-current-repair-incentive-systems-repair-funds-and-vouchers

public finances are under increasing pressure, EPR fees must play a role in securing the long-term funding of repair infrastructure, as already established in some Member States (see below)

WRAP's⁴² calculation of displacement rates for clothing (UK data) found that repair has an even higher potential to replace the purchase of a new item than resale: for every 5 items repaired, 4 displace a new purchase – resulting in a displacement rate of 82.2%. While the purchase of 5 preloved items displaces 3 new purchases – resulting in a displacement rate of 64.6%. These findings point to the potential of developing repair incentives to further waste reduction.

Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (ESPR)

Regulation (EU) 2024/1781⁴³ is aimed at improving the sustainability of products placed on the EU market by improving their circularity, energy performance, recyclability and durability. The ESPR sets performance and information rules, 'ecodesign requirements', for each product group considered, including on:

- Improving product durability, reusability, upgradability and reparability.
- Enhancing the possibility of product maintenance and refurbishment.
- Addressing the presence of substances that inhibit circularity.
- Making products easier to remanufacture and recycle.
- Limiting the generation of waste.

While the introduction of those ecodesign requirements per product group will have an impact on the scalability of business models supporting Mid-level R-strategies, the implementation of secondary legislation defining those requirements per product group takes a lot of time. Even once enforced on products entering the EU market, there is no financing mechanism supporting the necessary infrastructure for reuse, repair and remanufacturing of the more reusable and repairable products.

⁴² "Displacement Rates Untangled." 2025. WRAP – the Waste and Resources Action Programme. www.wrap.ngo/resources/report/displacement-rates-untangled

⁴³ Consolidated text: Regulation (EU) 2024/1781 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 establishing a framework for the setting of ecodesign requirements for sustainable products, amending Directive (EU) 2020/1828 and Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 and repealing Directive 2009/125/EC (Text with EEA relevance). 2024. EUR-Lex. eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02024R1781-20240628

ANNEX II

Which Member State policies can serve as examples?

National EPR schemes often include targets for (local) reuse (e.g., for textiles in the Netherlands⁴⁴ and France).⁴⁵ This guarantees a share of EPR funding to support these systems. Member States have also been leading the way with (preparation for) reuse targets⁴⁶ that are not supported financially by EPR; yet, these initiatives usually require public funding and therefore are constrained to the more affluent regions. For instance, in Thuringia (Germany), the regional repair bonus⁴⁷ system will be cancelled as of 2026⁴⁸ due to public budget constraints.

The list below highlights **examples of EPR/PRO funding for waste reduction** and producer accountability implemented in Belgium and France.

Belgium

Recupel,⁴⁹ Belgium's PRO for WEEE, supports reuse by offering payments to second-hand shops,⁵⁰ thrift stores, and reuse centres that resell collected electrical appliances. The fee is based on the total weight of appliances sold each year: €60 per tonne up to the 2020 reference volume and €120 per tonne for anything above it. The aim is to maximise reuse of electrical goods. Participating shops also gain access to Recupel's collection network and its partner network of appliance dealers. The agreement⁵¹ was developed with Herwin and Ressources (social enterprises) and is open to all Belgian reuse shops affiliated with Ressources.

The background of this initiative are the targets for WEEE reuse in Flanders and Brussels, which include sales from thrift shops and private refurbishers. For Recupel, the challenge is that the reuse target is currently set at a point in the supply chain where it has limited control as a PRO. The targets require Recupel to work on structural circularity problems, like the lack of repairers. Recupel hence supports thrift shops with funding and

⁴⁴ "Extended Producer Responsibility for Textiles." 2025. Human Environment and Transport Inspectorate - Ministry of Infrastructure and Waster Management. english.ilent.nl/topics/extended-producer-responsibility/epr-textile

⁴⁵ "EPR for Textiles in France." 2024. Ellen MacArthur Foundation. www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/epr-for-textiles-in-france

⁴⁶ "Re-use targets: why they matter and what initiatives already exist in the EU". Accessed February 12, 2026. RREUSE.

cdn.nimbu.io/s/zx3wipv/channelentries/2lxizwf/files/1742218089283/2022_03_rreuse_re-use-targets_-_why-they-matter-and-what-initiatives-already-exist-in-the-eu.pdf?gljwf8a.

⁴⁷ "Reparaturbonus Thüringen | Verbraucherzentrale Thüringen." 2025. Verbraucherzentrale Thüringen. www.vzth.de/reparaturbonus

⁴⁸ Wilfer, Tom. "Reparaturbonus Wird in Thüringen Eingestellt." 2025. EUWID.

www.euwid-recycling.de/news/politik/reparaturbonus-wird-in-thueringen-eingestellt-190925

⁴⁹ "Réparer, Réutiliser et Recycler : Voici Comment Vous Contribuez à Réduire Le Volume de Déchets." 2026. Recupel. www.recupel.be/fr

⁵⁰ "Demandez Votre Indemnité Recupel En Tant Que Centre de Réemploi Ou Magasin de Seconde Main." 2020. Recupel.

www.recupel.be/fr/demandez-votre-indemnite-recupel-en-tant-que-centre-de-reemploi-ou-magasin-de-seconde-main

⁵¹ "Convention relative à la réutilisation des DEEE". 2023. Recupel. www.recupel.be/fr/media/1047

setting up partnerships, for example, with producers who need to send their usable waste to thrift shops. Moreover, Recupel is trying to strike contracts with repair companies and is investing in training programmes. As regards the packaging sector in Belgium, the 2024–2028 accreditation⁵² of the **household packaging PRO Fost Plus** includes innovative measures to hold producers accountable for meeting targets:

- Packaging reduction (art. 33): ambition to reduce the absolute quantity of single-use packaging placed on the market by at least 5% (as compared with the 2023 tonnage) by the end of the accreditation period [end 2028]. This shall apply to all members. Fost Plus must also demonstrate that the decrease is not due to material substitution.
- Reuse share increase (art. 34): Fost Plus, together with its members, shall propose to the Interregional Packaging Commission an ambitious action programme to encourage its members to use reusable packaging. The action plan shall aim to increase the market share of reusable packaging by at least 5% by the end of the accreditation period: the measures proposed should not be limited to glass beverage packaging. The action plan must indicate how the targets will be achieved.
- Budget for change (art. 34 (4)): in each year of this accreditation, Fost Plus should invest at least 2% of its total budget for 2024 in the implementation of the action programme on avoiding and reducing packaging;

Furthermore, the ongoing revision of the **interregional regulation on packaging** (initial text [here](#)⁵³) includes a proposal for placing the responsibility for meeting the reduction targets for single-use packaging, as mandated by the PPWR, on producers. The text proposes that PRO must demonstrate, for all producers affiliated with it, that they collectively meet the objectives. In addition, the proposal introduces financial penalties for non-achievement of the PPWR prevention targets, to be covered by the PRO. Penalties apply per material stream to avoid material substitution and are modulated per tonne of diverging results from the targets (i.e., between 2030 and 2034, €50 per tonne diverging from the 2030 target).

France

In France, every PRO and individual producer that places on the market products likely to be reused must allocate a minimum of their **EPR fees to reuse projects, according to the AGECS⁵⁴ law**. This sheet provides an overview of the EPR schemes⁵⁵ that currently have reuse and/or repair funds, including their objectives and the activities covered. The list of questions below sheds light on how the fund operates in practice.

⁵² "Decision of the Interregional Packaging Commission of 2 February 2024 concerning accreditation of the non-profit association Fost Plus Olympiadenlaan 2, 1140 Evere, as a packaging waste compliance organisation". 2024. Interregional Packaging Commission. www.ivcie.be/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/ACCREDITATION-FOST-PLUS-2024-online.pdf

⁵³ Cooperation agreement on the prevention and management of packaging waste (Belgian Official Gazette, 29.12.2008). Interregional Packaging Commission. www.ivcie.be/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Cooperation-agreement-of-04-11-2008-on-the-prevention-and-management-of-packaging-waste.pdf

⁵⁴ Loi n° 2020-105 du 10 février 2020 relative à la lutte contre le gaspillage et à l'économie circulaire (I). 2021. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT000041553759/2025-11-19

⁵⁵ Comparison of the EPR schemes in France. 2026. Zero Waste Europe. docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aHhnxJRQ_lvcvND1DebN87mYYmJu9wWielrpUL1CnB8/edit?gid=0#gid=0

- ***Which sum does the law mandate for funding reuse?***

According to Article L541-10-5⁵⁶ of the Environmental Code, for 8 EPR schemes, the reuse fund must represent at least 5% of the EPR fees collected to meet national reuse objectives. For example, the PROs CITEO and Léko, under the Household Packaging and Graphic Papers EPR scheme, are legally required to allocate at least this minimum to reuse and 're-utilisation'⁵⁷ projects. The 5% represents a minimum threshold, not a limit, and the AGECE law encourages exceeding it when necessary to reach national reuse targets.

Furthermore, as stated in paragraph 4.5. of the operational guidelines,⁵⁸ if a PRO allocates less than 5% in a given year, the shortfall must be carried over to the following fiscal year, ensuring it is applied directly to additional reuse projects.

For other EPR schemes that have reuse objectives, sufficient resources must be allocated to achieve them.

- ***Are PROs legally accountable to ensure this funding is spent appropriately?***

PROs are legally accountable under the Environmental Code through operational reporting. Article L541-10-5⁵⁹ specifies that if reuse or re-utilisation targets are not met, PROs must increase their allocation to the reuse fund proportionally to the shortfall. Article L541-9-6⁶⁰ requires additional funding for missed prevention or waste-management targets – calculated as the points gap multiplied by the average cost per point plus at least 50%⁶¹. Operational guidelines⁶² reinforce this by obliging PROs, such as CITEO and Léko, to submit an annual report detailing reuse actions, funding, results, challenges, and corrective measures.

- ***Which operators benefit from this fund?***

Article L541-10-5⁶³ specifies that beneficiaries of a formal reuse fund are organisations under Law No. 2014-856 on the Social and Solidarity Economy,⁶⁴ meaning social-economy structures active in waste prevention, reuse, and re-utilisation. Additional eligibility conditions may be set by ministerial decree or by PROs. Operational guidelines⁶⁵ require these organisations, within six months of approval, to establish transparent, non-discriminatory criteria for funding reuse operators and ensure supported activities respect proximity principles. In practice, reuse operators are mainly social-economy actors, but conventional enterprises carrying out reuse activities may also qualify if they meet the approved criteria (e.g., this is the case for packaging reuse systems).

⁵⁶ Code de l'environnement.2021. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/article_lc/LEGIARTI000043975004

⁵⁷ The law differentiates between 'reuse' and 're-utilisation': 'Reuse' means any operation by which substances, materials or products that are not waste are used again for the same purpose for which they were designed. 'Re-utilise' means any operation by which substances, materials or products that have become waste are used again.

⁵⁸ Code de l'environnement.2021. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jorf/id/JORFTEXT000048543633

⁵⁹ Code de l'environnement.2021. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/article_lc/LEGIARTI000043975004

⁶⁰ Code de l'environnement.2021. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/article_lc/LEGIARTI000041583353

⁶¹ Additional Funding = (points missed) × (average cost per point × 1.5)

⁶² Arrêté du 7 décembre 2023 portant cahier des charges des éco-organismes et des systèmes individuels de la filière à responsabilité élargie des producteurs des emballages ménagers, des imprimés papiers et des papiers à usage graphique. 2023. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jorf/id/JORFTEXT000048543633

⁶³ Code de l'environnement.2021. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/article_lc/LEGIARTI000043975004

⁶⁴ Loi n° 2014-856 du 31 juillet 2014 relative à l'économie sociale et solidaire (I). 2014. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/article_lc/LEGIARTI000029314926

⁶⁵ Arrêté du 7 décembre 2023 portant cahier des charges des éco-organismes et des systèmes individuels de la filière à responsabilité élargie des producteurs des emballages ménagers, des imprimés papiers et des papiers à usage graphique. 2023. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jorf/id/JORFTEXT000048543633

As a result, 40% of repairers⁶⁶ reported higher turnover after joining the 'Bonus Réparation' scheme, and over 50% of consumers reported that the Bonus Réparation influenced their repair decision.⁶⁷

- ***Which reuse activities are covered?***

Definitions are included in Decree No. 2021-517.⁶⁸ In addition, operational guidelines for certain EPR schemes, like household packaging, provide examples including reuse infrastructure, standardised reusable containers, and catering/takeaway systems, while most other schemes leave specific activities to be defined by PROs through calls for proposals. A few schemes explicitly list eligible reuse and repair activities in their guidelines.

- ***Has the law been reviewed?***

Several reports from different French institutions have been published evaluating the AGECE law: Government (General Inspection of Finance, General Inspection of the Environment and Sustainable Development and General Council for the Economy – 18/07/2024);⁶⁹ Senate (Commission on Finance – 8/10/2025);⁷⁰ Parliamentary (Commission on Sustainable Development and Territorial Planning – 29/05/2024).⁷¹ While each provides its own detailed analysis, all highlight that progress towards the waste reduction goals has been limited, with a system still too focused on recycling, not enough progress on reuse, and a system weakened by fragmented governance and increasing administrative complexity.

Common priority recommendations emerging from the reports:

- Increase funding for reuse: The current 5% allocation to reuse funds is insufficient to meet AGECE objectives. All reports call for a substantial increase. In line with this, the rapporteurs of the parliamentary committee introduced a law proposal⁷² to raise the share of EPR fees dedicated to reuse from 5% to 10%.
- Simplify, enforce, and automate sanctions for PROs: Establish a strong, independent public regulator to supervise all EPR schemes, ensure effective monitoring of targets, and apply consistent, automatic, and proportionate financial penalties when recycling, reuse, or repair targets are not met (covering both means-based and results-based obligations).
- Integrate local authorities into regional planning: Include local and regional authorities in target-setting and operational requirements to adapt implementation to local conditions and ensure both coherent national deployment and a good use of the fund.
- Ensure independent fund management by a public entity to avoid conflicts of interest with producers.

⁶⁶ "Rapport HOP : Le Bonus Réparation Peut (Encore) Mieux Faire – HOP" 2024. HOP – Halte à l'Obsolescence Programmée.

www.halteobsolescence.org/rapport-hop-bonus-reparation

⁶⁷ "L'impact Positif Du Bonus Réparation et Des Réparations à Distance : Un Succès Au-Delà Des Attentes." 2024. Le Blog de Spareka.

aide.spareka.fr/limpact-positif-du-bonus-reparation-et-des-reparations-a-distance-un-succes-au-dela-des-attentes

⁶⁸ "Décret n° 2021-517 du 29 avril 2021 relatif aux objectifs de réduction, de réutilisation et de réemploi, et de recyclage des emballages en plastique à usage unique pour la période 2021-2025." 2021. Legifrance. www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT000043458675

⁶⁹ "Performances et Gouvernance Des Filières à Responsabilité Élargie Du Producteur – Igf – IGF Inter." 2024. Inspection Generale des Finances.

www.igf.finances.gouv.fr/igf/accueil/nos-activites/rapports-de-missions/liste-de-tous-les-rapports-de-mi/performances-et-gouvernance-des.html

⁷⁰ "Soutien de l'État à La Prévention et La Valorisation Des Déchets Ainsi Qu'à l'Économie Circulaire – Sénat." 2019. Sénat.

www.senat.fr/rap/r25-011/r25-0110.html#toc0

⁷¹ "N° 2696 ASSEMBLÉE NATIONALE CONSTITUTION DU 4 OCTOBRE 1958." 2024. Législature, Quinzième.

www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/16/rapports/cion-dvp/I16b2696_rapport-information.pdf

⁷² "Proposition de Loi, N° 1812." 2025. Assemblée nationale. www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/17/textes/I17b1812_proposition-loi



Zero Waste Europe (ZWE) is the European network of communities, local leaders, experts, and change agents working towards a better use of resources and the elimination of waste in our society. We advocate for sustainable systems; for the redesign of our relationship with resources; and for a global shift towards environmental justice, accelerating a just transition towards zero waste for the benefit of people and the planet.

www.zerowasteurope.eu



Zero Waste Europe gratefully acknowledges financial assistance from the European Union. The sole responsibility for the content of this material lies with Zero Waste Europe. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the funder mentioned above. The funder cannot be held responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.



Authors: Theresa Mörsen, Sacha Mevel, Joan Marc Simon

Editors: Ana Oliveira, Aline Maigret, Jack McQuibban, Manon Jourdan, Andrea Veselá

Date: February 2026

General information: hello@zerowasteeurope.eu

Media: news@zerowasteeurope.eu

Cities-related topics: cities@zerowasteeurope.eu

www.zerowasteeurope.eu

www.zerowastecities.eu

www.missionzeroacademy.eu

