

Management of Combustible Waste

Mark Milke*

Department of Natural Sciences, Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London, London, UK

Introduction

The primary factor influencing trash producers' treatment choices is typically the economic cost of various waste management alternatives. On the other hand, society is concerned about other things as well, such as the effects on the environment. In order to encourage sustainable waste management techniques, policymakers should take action. Environmental taxes are important instruments of policy because they provide waste producers with financial incentives that represent the environmental costs of waste treatment solutions. In other words, environmental taxes encourage environmentally friendly waste management by enforcing the "polluter pays" principle. Analysis of environmental levies for the treatment of combustible waste, however, reveals that European rules are both inconsistent and lacking in environmental incentives. The usage of incineration taxes, which are levied per tonne of burned garbage, is the greatest way to highlight differences between adjacent nations in North Western Europe. There is no incineration tax in the United Kingdom, Germany, or the Netherlands.

Description

In contrast, although there is an incineration tax in France, Flanders, and Wallonia in Belgium, the rates vary greatly amongst the three nations. The impact of these taxes can be significant because the incineration tax can account for up to 15% of the cost of garbage incineration. There is no doubt that the current environment does not provide waste processing facilities in various European nations with an equal playing field. Given that trash management is increasingly being handled at the European and even global levels, especially for challenging waste streams like combustible garbage, tax disparities between neighbouring regions may result in cross-border waste transfer to reduce disposal costs to waste haulers. In reality, a system that permitted cross-border trading included incineration taxes in both Sweden and Norway. Due to the quantity of trash exports across borders, both Norway and later Sweden eliminated their incineration levies. According to this illustration from Norway and Sweden, these artificial cross-border trash flows may influence strategic behaviour in decision-makers who aim to safeguard domestic interests. This could lead to a "race to the bottom" that lowers environmental levies and, as a result, weakens the financial incentives for more eco-friendly trash disposal methods. Therefore, a decrease in the difference between waste taxes in various European

nations should coexist with the development of a shared European market for waste management. Combustible waste taxes are not just different, but also relatively cheap [1-5].

Conclusion

The direct cost of the environmental impact is often lower than taxes, even in areas where incinerator taxes are enforced. For instance, in Flanders, the external cost of environmental damage is anticipated to be more than twice as high as the incinerator tax rate of about 8 euros per tonne. Environmental harm from waste treatment choices is not fully taken into account by rational waste producers if environmental levies are too low. This will result in more waste being burned, which is against the European Waste Management Hierarchy's priority ranking. In fact, modest incineration fees do little to promote recycling or prevention, which are options higher up in the waste management hierarchy. Environmental expenses that are not internalised have the same impact as subsidies that are destructive to the environment. In the "Roadmap for a resource efficient Europe," the necessity of reforming these destructive financial incentives is emphasised.

References

1. Lupo, Philip J., and Logan G. Spector. "Cancer progress and priorities: Childhood cancer." *Cancer Epidemiol Biomark Prev* 29 (2020): 1081-1094
2. Kessler, Ronald C., Patricia Berglund, Olga Demler, and Robert Jin, et al. "Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication." *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 62 (2005): 593-602.
3. Stein, Dan J., Carmen C. W Lim, Annelieke M. Roest, and Peter De Jonge, et al. "The cross-national epidemiology of social anxiety disorder: Data from the World Mental Health Survey Initiative." *BMC Med* 15 (2017): 143.
4. Inaba, Hiroto, Mel Greaves, and Charles G. Mullighan. "Acute Lymphoblastic Leukaemia." *Lancet Lond Engl* 381 (2013): 1943-1955.
5. Padmini, Chiyadu, and K .Yellamma Bai. "Oral and dental considerations in pediatric leukemic patient." *ISRN Hematol* (2014): 895721.

How to cite this article: Milke, Mark. "Management of Combustible Waste." *Adv Recycling Waste Manag* 7 (2022): 265.

*Address for Correspondence: Mark Milke, Department of Natural Sciences, Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London, London, UK, E-mail: milke.ma22@gmail.com

Copyright: © 2022 Milke M. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Received: 02 December, 2022, Manuscript No. arwm-23-86745; Editor Assigned: 05 December, 2022, PreQC No. P-86745; Reviewed: 16 December, 2022, QC No. Q-86745; Revised: 21 December, 2022, Manuscript No. R-86745; Published: 28 December, 2022, DOI: 10.37421/2475-7675.2022.7.265