

11th CEWEP Waste-to-Energy Congress, 4th - 6th June 2025 Gdansk // Summary

From Policy to Implementation

This session explored why the status of implementation of EU waste legislation still differed so significantly between the Member States. It examined the obstacles and highlighted the potential benefits that could be gained through the full implementation of EU waste legislation.

Opening of the Congress by Izabela Kuś, the Treasurer of the City of Gdańsk

The Izabela Kuś welcomed CEWEP and highlighted the city's commitment to innovation and a sustainable, circular future. She emphasised the essential role of municipalities in advancing the circular economy, and underlined that the proper integration of Waste-to-Energy (WtE) is a key component in this transition. The city's WtE plant is a testament to Gdańsk's responsible waste management, whilst contributing to energy security and innovation. She reaffirmed that recovering energy from non-recyclable waste is complementary to recycling.

Welcome and introduction by CEWEP, Paul De Bruycker, CEWEP President

Paul De Bruycker expressed his pleasure at being in Gdańsk, especially with the recent opening of the new Waste-to-Energy (WtE) plant—a milestone reached after a long process. He congratulated the city and Poland for their significant strides toward sustainable waste management, setting an example for Europe.

He emphasized that WtE plays a key role in supporting a circular economy, and added: "In a truly circular economy, there is no place for pollution. Waste-to-Energy is not just a last resort—it's a cornerstone. With low emissions, energy recovery, and the extraction of vital secondary raw materials, WtE ensures we handle what others cannot. As we support recycling and protect public health, our sector is proving every day that circularity and climate responsibility go hand in hand. We may be hard to decarbonise, but we are working hard to lower our GHG emissions and even become carbon negative for the welfare of all."

He called for greater recognition of WtE's role in a clean industrial transition and in safeguarding Europe's welfare. Finally, he thanked CEWEP members for their ongoing efforts and crucial role in the circular and decarbonised economy of tomorrow.

What are the Benefits of Waste Law Implementation?

Amalia Cerdá Lacaci, Sustainability Director at TIRME

Amalia outlined the challenges Spain faces in meeting the EU's ambitious municipal waste targets—particularly the goal of reducing landfill to 10% by 2035. Landfilling in Spain has decreased only slowly, and the country remains the EU leader in landfilling, accounting for nearly 20% of all landfilled waste in Europe. As waste management responsibilities are divided among autonomous communities, regional situations vary greatly. Regions with WtE facilities landfill the least, underscoring the need for more WtE capacity.

She identified four key challenges:

- Strong heterogeneity between regions, requiring more integrated and coordinated approaches.
- Infrastructure deficits that demand urgent investment.
- The need to raise public awareness and strengthen citizen participation.
- The necessity to divert at least 3 million tonnes of waste from landfills to WtE.

As a successful case, she highlighted Mallorca, where landfill diversion through a combination of WtE, sorting, and anaerobic digestion led to a 64% reduction in GHG emissions.

Amalia concluded by stressing that doubling WtE capacity is essential for Spain to close the gap and align with EU targets. Integrated waste management, including WtE, is not only crucial for reducing emissions and landfilling but also for contributing to the circular economy.

Jakub Bator, Board Member SPEO

Jakub gave an overview of the development of WtE in Poland. He highlighted that while Poland generates relatively low levels of municipal waste—367 kg per capita annually, well below the EU average—more than 30% of it is still landfilled. In total, nearly 8000 hectares of land are occupied by landfills, an area nearly equal to that of Białowieża National Park.

Poland currently operates 11 WtE plants with a total capacity of over 1 million tonnes, expected to reach 1.7 million tonnes in the coming years. The sector's growth has been supported by significant EU funding: over PLN 1.6 billion in subsidies and more than PLN 1 billion in loans during the 2007–2013 period, with continued investments through 2023 and new regional projects underway. However, some recent projects have been paused or cancelled.

According to the national waste management plan, Poland aims for 30% of municipal waste to be treated through WtE, requiring 4.2 million tonnes of annual capacity. Key drivers for WtE development in Poland include a landfill tax of €91 per tonne, a ban on landfilling waste with a calorific value above 6 MJ/kg, and priority access to district heating networks for WtE-generated heat.

In the Q&A, Jakub noted a key risk: the unrealistic belief that zero waste is achievable without WtE. He emphasized the importance of pragmatic and integrated strategies to drastically reduce landfill use.

Fireside Chat with Karolina D'Cunha, Acting Head of Waste to Resources Unit, DG Environment, European Commission and Ella Stengler, Managing Director of CEWEP

Ella opened by highlighting the contrasting progress of Spain and Poland in using WtE for resource and energy recovery, stressing that some Member States are still far from achieving EU landfill targets. Karolina responded that the European Commission is closely monitoring Member States' progress on landfill targets, using “both carrots and sticks”—offering recommendations but also pursuing legal action where systemic failures occur. She emphasized that where there is a solid mix of landfill bans, taxes, and economic incentives, results are visible, but these approaches must be tailored to each country.

Karolina confirmed that the Circular Economy Act public consultation will be launched before the summer. There are calls for stronger restrictions, better enforcement, and possibly cap-and-trade mechanisms based on landfill volumes. She noted that despite legal actions, landfilling remains a major issue, and more pressure and monitoring are needed.

Karolina acknowledged the importance of WtE's role in meeting landfill targets, especially for non-recyclable waste, but also stressed the need for balanced investments higher up the waste hierarchy. She added that taxonomy currently includes only non-recyclable hazardous waste under eligible investments.

Ella raised the issue of mandatory sorting before incineration, requested by some stakeholders, noting that in some Member States this could be a disincentive to source separation. Karolina acknowledged the complexity of the topic. Source separation at household level often falls short, meaning that additional materials can still be recovered from residual waste. In her view, if separate collection isn't meeting targets, there should be a process to analyse the composition of residual waste, supported by a comparable methodology across Member States and quality standards for recovered outputs. She pointed to Gdańsk as an example where pretreatment works without prescriptive rules and added that current political instructions are to avoid unnecessary regulatory burdens.

Addressing contradictions between environmental policies, Karolina noted that including WtE in the EU ETS must be done cautiously, as it risks diverting waste to landfilling or export (both environmentally worse outcomes). A comprehensive view of the entire waste management system—including mechanical-biological treatment (MBT)—is required. She emphasized the need to identify who should bear the cost of emissions, suggesting that producers should contribute to the management of the waste.

Q&A highlights:

- On constraints to develop WtE infrastructure: She acknowledged the difficulty but pointed to successful examples elsewhere as a basis for further dialogue.
- On advancing from landfilling and going higher up the waste hierarchy: She confirmed that taxation is the most effective driver to reduce landfill.
- On the slowdown of plastics recycling: Karolina noted the issue is serious. EU-made recycled materials are sitting unused while cheaper virgin plastics are imported. There is a need for an action plan for plastic and other materials, market incentives, and recycled content requirements to stimulate demand.
- On WtE's social acceptance: Karolina acknowledged that WtE investments are needed, but social and political acceptance cannot be imposed from Brussels. Local support is vital for WtE development.

In conclusion, Karolina emphasized:

“While landfilling must be reduced, we also need to invest across the waste hierarchy. Waste-to-Energy remains essential for non-recyclable and problematic waste, as part of a balanced and responsible waste treatment strategy.”

Energy Policy Implementation and WtE: What Does it Mean for District Heating? By Tomasz Surma, Regulatory and Public Affairs Director at Veolia Poland and Expert at Polish DH association (IGCP)

Tomasz Surma presented the potential of WtE and district heating (DH) in Poland. DH in Poland is highly developed, supplying heat to 15 million people through nearly 23,000 km of heating networks. WtE already plays a strategic role in industrial decarbonisation and diversifying the energy mix.

Currently, 11 WtE plants operate in Poland, using about 4.5 million tonnes of residual municipal waste per year. This could replace up to 25 million tonnes of coal, enhancing energy independence. Importantly, the cost of heat from waste has been among the lowest per gigajoule over the past three years, even as heat prices have doubled.

Tomasz highlighted the need to recognize heat from WtE as waste heat under EU regulations—still a work in progress—so that it can be formally integrated into DH systems under the Efficient District Heating and Cooling framework. Going forward, Poland's DH sector must rely on a technology-neutral, diversified mix of renewable energy, waste heat, electricity, and WtE.

In the Q&A, when asked whether carbon capture at WtE plants could interfere with supplying heat to DH, Tomasz acknowledged the question but emphasized that the potential for synergy between WtE and DH remains strong—and must be pursued in the most efficient way.

Tomorrow Today: Decarbonising Waste

This session explored the critical role that WtE plays in powering the decarbonisation of the EU during a time of significant change. It addressed the interlinkages between the ambitious EU climate targets, the application of CCUS technologies to WtE, and the possibility of generating and trading carbon removals.

Keynote Intro by Krzysztof Bolesta, Secretary of State, Ministry of Climate and Environment, Poland

In a video message, Krzysztof Bolesta provided an introduction on industrial decarbonisation and the role CCUS and WtE can play: “CCS and CCU will be very important technologies going forward to meet the energy transformation objectives. <...> Through capturing CO₂ from WtE processes we have an opportunity to create a totally new sector in Europe, which is negative emissions. It could help us to bring value to some sectors and would help us to fight climate change at a lower cost.”

Carbon Removals Through Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS) by Johan Börje

Johan presented Stockholm Exergi’s large-scale BECCS project, which aims to become Europe’s largest supplier of permanent carbon removals. The €1.2 billion investment has just received final approval.

The project will capture and liquefy 800,000 tonnes of CO₂ annually, using sustainable biomass. The full value chain includes certified biomass incineration, CO₂ capture and liquefaction (with heat reuse to ensure zero energy loss), and geological storage via the Northern Lights project. Stockholm Exergi owns the entire infrastructure, including electricity, steam, and harbor access.

Johan stressed that carbon removals are essential to reach net-zero, as many international frameworks (SBTi, ISO) already require them in long-term climate plans. He called out the need for a calculation method, integrated with ETS, Green Claims and Carbon Removal Certification Framework to achieve a level playing field.

Panel Discussion: How WtE Operators Across Europe Envision Carbon Capture?

Four WtE operators presented their carbon capture strategies, highlighting varying stages of development, technologies, and policy contexts.

Jannicke Gerner Bjerkås (Director CCS and Carbon Markets, Hafslund Celsio) shared the company’s plan to capture 150,000 tonnes of biogenic CO₂ from waste incineration using amine-based capture. The project, part of the Norwegian Longship initiative, resumed in 2025. Jannicke warned that the economic value of carbon removals must not affect waste treatment priorities by diverting non-recyclable fossil-based waste away from WtE to less sustainable alternatives like landfill. CCS for fossil CO₂ remains essential.

Sarah Endres (Deputy Head Business Development, EEW Energy from Waste) shared EEW’s project in Delfzijl combining 128,000 t/y CCU and 72,000 t/y CCS, using amine scrubbing. While permits have been received, full implementation awaits clearer national policies. Sarah noted that CCU is dependent on access to green hydrogen, and that CCS faces transport and subsidy challenges in their region.

Stefano Tondini (Head of WtE, HERAmbiente) presented CAPTURESTE, a CCS project at Ferrara WtE plant. It aims to capture 90% of the plant’s CO₂, transporting it to the Ravenna CCS site. The project received EU Innovation Fund support and is designed to optimise energy use with low-temperature heat inputs. The possibility of integrating carbon removals into the project is under evaluation.

Björn Fredriksson Möller (CCS Strategist, Öresundskraft Kraft & Värme AB) outlined the early-stage CCS project in Helsingborg, targeting 200,000 tonnes/year CO₂ from a single WtE line. The plan includes liquefaction, maritime transport, and permanent storage via Project Greensand. They aim to sell carbon removal certificates locally, supporting municipal decarbonisation.

Q&A Highlights:

- Amine capture is currently the most viable technology, especially when integrated with district heating, which can recover the heat. For electricity-only plants, energy costs may make CCS less feasible for now.

- Participants stressed the critical role of public funding, infrastructure, and regulatory clarity to scale CCUS deployment.

The Future of WtE

This session delved into an overview of current and projected WtE capacities, examined future waste streams for WtE, evaluated pre-sorting options, and reviewed alternative technologies.

Overview of WtE Markets by Mark Döing, Managing Director ecoprog

Mark presented an overview of the global WtE sector, which is concentrated in Europe and Asia. The U.S. market is declining, except in cities with limited landfill space. Landfilling dominates due to lower costs.

Key drivers for WtE include population and economic growth, urbanisation, climate policy, evolving waste composition, public awareness, and better waste management organisation. However, global growth is slowing, with new capacity expected to drop from 215 million tonnes (2019–2024) to 101 million tonnes (2025–2029), mainly due to saturation in China. While Scandinavia, the UK, and Western Europe have strong capacities, Southern and Eastern Europe fall behind. Although EU law promotes landfill reduction and recycling, slow enforcement means progress may not be visible before 2050.

Additionally, Europe faces a modernisation challenge: many WtE facilities are more than 25 years old. A strong demand for renewal and capacity upgrades is expected in the coming years. Long-term WtE development is expected to continue in waves, particularly in regions where landfill restrictions tighten. Mark concluded that landfill reduction policies and recycling targets directly support WtE expansion.

Practical Example: Can WtE compete with Landfills? By Yuriy Starodubtsev, Business and Project Development, Kanadevia Inova

Yuriy presented their approach to developing WtE projects in high-growth regions. He showed that WtE can be economically competitive with landfilling, especially when factoring in environmental and climate costs. The proposed model leverages large-scale, efficient technology and strong local partnerships to provide integrated waste and energy solutions in a financially viable way.

Is Chemical Recycling a Game Changer? By Geert Torremans, Indaver

Geert presented Indaver's Plastics2Chemicals (P2C) initiative — a chemical recycling project developed over ten years to close the loop for specific plastic waste streams. The technology focuses on thermal depolymerisation of polystyrene (PS) and polyolefins (PO) into raw materials such as crude styrene oil and hydrocarbon feedstock, which can be reused to produce new plastics.

A key requirement is clean, sorted waste. Indaver's Willebroek installation in Belgium sorts packaging waste into 16 fractions. PS and PO are then granulated, washed, and homogenised before entering the depolymerisation process. P2C enables circularity for plastics not suitable for mechanical recycling, offering an alternative to incineration or landfill.

In the Q&A Geert stated that PFAS contamination is not a concern due to the focus on food-grade PS.

Panel: What are the Waste Streams of the Future?

The panel discussed how the streams that come to WtE would be changing in the future, the advantages and disadvantages of pre-treatment and the place of WtE in a truly circular economy.

Michiel Timmerije, Director Energy & Residues AVR described pre-sorting of the WtE input in urban areas with insufficient source separation. In Rotterdam, 400 000 tonnes are processed in 2 lines, with around 10%

packaging recovered through pre-sorting. Though helpful, a pretreatment facility is not a full solution and is only effective where source separation is not viable.

Lars Börger, CEO nova-Institute emphasized that decarbonisation isn't about eliminating carbon but should aim at the source. The goal is thus to “defossilise” and keep carbon in the loop, through biogenic sources and CCU. Since recycling and collection are imperfect, all plastics will eventually end up in WtE.

Paul De Bruycker, CEWEP President challenged the notion of “residual waste”, as it is of low-quality and difficult to work with, sorting out residual waste delivers low-quality streams. A high-quality mechanical recycling sector is needed, alongside WtE and future chemical recycling. He advocated for closing the carbon loop using CO₂ from WtE as feedstock—enabled by cheap renewable energy; carbon needs to be reused, independently from its source. He questioned the sustainability of a bio-based economy, citing risks to biodiversity.

Michiel agreed with Paul on closing the carbon loop. He added that source separation is often expensive and less effective in large cities. Pretreatment can help remove problematic items like nitrous oxide canisters, but it is not a silver bullet. The panel agreed that WtE does not compete with recycling but complements it by treating residuals and recycling rejects. Recycling should aim for virgin-quality outputs. Decarbonisation strategies must consider both material and energy recovery.

During the Q&A, the need for upstream solutions like ecodesign was raised. Michiel noted that even recyclable materials degrade in quality over time, meaning some loss is inevitable—WtE remains necessary.

The panel concluded that achieving circularity requires a balanced mix of technologies: recycling, WtE, CC and sustainable carbon inputs, supported by robust infrastructure and long-term policy vision.

Everyday WtE Communication

Community Relations and Impacts on Business and Operations by Andrius Kasparavičius, Senior Public Relations Consultant, Gren

Andrius explored how communication directly shapes the public reputation and social acceptance of Waste-to-Energy (WtE) facilities. Drawing on experience from both Belgium and Lithuania—countries with different waste profiles but similar communication challenges—he emphasised that communication must be treated as a strategic necessity, not an afterthought.

He highlighted that reputation is built on what you do, what you say, and how you present yourself. In today's environment, communication has shifted from one-way messaging to a more dynamic, participatory format—referred to as a “social picnic”—where transparency and dialogue are expected.

Eight key principles for effective WtE communication were outlined:

- Be transparent – share timely, accurate information; avoid “no comment” responses.
- Show empathy – acknowledge public concerns sincerely without assigning blame.
- Speak their language – avoid technical jargon; be clear and accessible.
- Share one story – ensure consistency across all voices in the organisation.
- Love thy neighbour – treat local communities as partners; engage proactively.
- Tell the truth – be honest, especially when issues arise; silence creates distrust.
- Be selective on social media – respond meaningfully, ignore trolls, avoid overposting.
- Trust your communications team – involve them early; they are strategic allies.

The presentation concluded with a strong message: communication is critical for operational success. Facilities that embrace openness and human-centred messaging will be better equipped to earn trust and maintain public support.

Communication Strategy of a New Plant Marta Bańka, Spokesperson, Gdańsk PCE WtE plant

Marta presented the communication journey of the Clean Energy Harbour, Gdańsk's new WtE facility, which was commissioned in February 2025 after 19 years of development. Though construction began in 2020, delays due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine extended the timeline. Public communication became critical once funding was secured in 2018.

At the time, public awareness on WtE was low. In Gdańsk specifically, residents were environmentally conscious and wary, partly due to an older hazardous waste plant associated with air pollution. To address this, the project launched a comprehensive, proactive communication strategy centred on transparency, engagement, and education.

Key tools included:

- A multichannel media presence (website, Facebook, LinkedIn, YouTube)
- A knowledge-rich website with facts, FAQs, and updates
- A virtual press office for journalists
- Community engagement through open days, public events, study tours, and contests
- The Stakeholder Council, established in 2014, facilitating regular dialogue with residents, local authorities, and NGOs

The campaign aimed to build public trust by showing the plant as modern, safe, and environmentally beneficial. A 2024 survey showed that 91% of Gdańsk residents viewed the project as a worthwhile investment, compared to 74% in 2022.

Marta concluded that effective WtE communication requires long-term commitment, professional collaboration, respect for diverse audiences, and consistent messaging across all platforms. The Clean Energy Harbour case illustrates how strong community relations can shape project success.

Wrap-up by Ella Stengler, Managing Director of CEWEP

Ella emphasised how the discussions of the day confirmed WtE's contribution to the EU's targets of sustainable prosperity and competitiveness through:

- Providing reliable and affordable energy from residual waste, reducing dependence on fossil fuels;
- Recovering valuable materials, such as metals and minerals, from bottom ash;
- Supporting the implementation of EU landfill reduction targets.

CEWEP will further support the EU's objectives, including the exchange on the implementation and upcoming legislation like the Waste Framework Directive, Landfill Directive, REACH, CLP, Circular Economy Act, EU ETS, Taxonomy etc.

Technical Seminar: PFAS

During the Technical Seminar, experts from authorities, research institutions and industry discussed the growing concern over the use of PFAS and the current knowledge on their presence in waste treatment and thermal processes. The seminar reinforced that while WtE is a key tool in treatment of PFAS-containing residual waste, further harmonisation, research, and regulatory clarity are urgently needed.

Julia Vogel (German Environmental Protection Agency) outlined the widespread use of PFAS and the resulting presence in different waste streams. Major PFAS-contaminated waste streams include paper, textiles, sewage sludge, and construction materials. Studies show that in Germany:

- 80% of paper is recycled (retaining PFAS); 20% is incinerated (most PFAS destroyed).
- Textiles have lower PFAS loads; 69% are recycled, keeping PFAS in circulation.
- Sewage sludge is mostly incinerated, but 22% used in agriculture still spreads PFAS.

Incineration is the only treatment proven to significantly destroy PFAS (>99.9%). However, data is limited, and waste treatment alone cannot solve the PFAS problem: restrictions on PFAS use are essential.

Thijs de Kort (Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment) clarified the ongoing works with ECHA to restrict PFAS under EU chemical legislation. To avoid regrettable substitution and to reduce the regulatory burden, they are focusing on a group restriction, based on chemical structure and extreme persistence.

The proposal assumes high incineration efficiency (99% for non-hazardous, 99.99% for hazardous waste), though no full mass balance is yet proven. The full PFAS lifecycle is considered, including manufacturing, use, and disposal. Two main options are under assessment:

- RO1: full ban (up to 96% emission reduction)
- RO2: ban with derogations
- A compromise RO3 is also under review.

In the Q&A, Thijs confirmed that PFAS toxicity is complex and often hard to test, so the precautionary principle remains fundamental.

Jelle Hofman (Flemish Institute for Technology, VITO) presented their research on measurement methods for PFAS emissions to air. VITO developed the LUC/VI/003 method based on OTM-45 sampling and validated the method in an interlaboratory testing, measuring over 50 PFAS across different stacks.

Findings showed wide PFAS concentration ranges (11 ng/m³ to 43 mg/m³), with consistent fingerprints per stack and significant impact from flue gas cleaning systems. A shift toward non-targeted analysis (NTA) aims to detect unknown PFAS beyond the current scope, using new screening methods and EU-level standardisation (CEN TC 264 WG48, MetZeroPol). Jelle emphasised the need for advanced methods, including non-target screening, and standardisation at EU level.

In the Q&A, Hofman confirmed that diffuse PFAS emissions need to be further investigated, e.g. diffuse emission measurements near wastewater treatment plants often exceed background levels. While NTA is complex, it helps identify presence of PFAS even without full quantification.

Hans-Joachim Gehrmann (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology) presented results from pilot tests on PFAS destruction in rotary kiln incinerators with post-combustion chambers. Two studies (2019 and 2024) funded by industry demonstrated that both hazardous and conventional waste incineration achieved PFAS destruction efficiencies >99.98% using the R2PIC method (comparing fluorine input and output).

At the Schweinfurt facility, incineration of waste containing fluoropolymers and firefighting foam showed consistently high destruction rates, with results confirmed across multiple sampling methods (including OTM-45 and LC/GC-MS). Hans-Joachim concluded that with high temperatures and sufficient residence time, waste incineration can be a highly effective method for PFAS elimination. However, further standardisation and a comparable dataset from operational plants are still needed.

Earl Goetheer (HighTechXL, University of Delft) explored the implications of PFAS contamination in carbon capture systems at WtE plants. PFAS can enter CC as gases and solids, with some, especially short-chain PFAS and volatile fluorotelomers, bypassing cleaning systems and potentially contaminating the captured CO₂.

Amine solvents will absorb and bind PFAS, but solvent regeneration via heat is often ineffective, especially for acidic, thermally stable PFAS. As a result, some PFAS may end up in treated flue gas or the final CO₂ stream.

Key recommendations include better monitoring methods, PFAS-specific analysis, and improved treatment technologies, as current systems only partially remove these persistent substances.

PFAS Panel: Practical Experience from Measurement Campaigns

During the panel discussion, WtE operators stressed the importance of harmonised sampling and analytical methods, challenges in quantifying PFAS in mixed waste, and ongoing campaigns across Europe to improve measurement protocols.

Andres Van Brecht (Indaver) highlighted the need for clear definitions ("what," "how," and "limits") and stressed the importance of standardised methods to ensure consistent and comparable results across sites.

Åsa Benckert (Umeå Energi) described their project which conducts flue gas measurements using multiple methods (OTM-45, OTM-50, and a local Umeå method). Projects included PhD research and national collaboration to improve understanding of PFAS behaviour in WtE.

Ragnar Warnecke (GKS Schweinfurt) reported on an extensive test campaign at GKS Schweinfurt, dosing PFAS-rich materials under controlled conditions. Multiple sampling methods and labs were used, and findings reinforced the importance of accurate spiking, proper preparation, and robust protocols.

Gabriel Volcovschi (SVDU) presented the French decree (2024) which outlines analysis of PFAS emissions to air for hazardous and non-hazardous waste incineration plants. SVDU launched a study across six WtE plants to standardise sampling and analysis. Results varied widely, especially between dry and wet flue gas treatment systems, with some wet systems showing unexpectedly high concentrations, likely due to local industrial sources.

Q&A Highlights:

- PFAS deposition measurements showed that the results are very susceptible to wind conditions and brought the significant presence of diffuse emissions to light.
- Wet scrubbers may reduce PFAS in flue gas, but further evidence is needed.
- The call for standardised EU-wide methods was supported by all speakers.
- Panellists stressed the importance of allowing a realistic timeline before applying limit values, mirroring ECHA's approach to ban PFAS in products.