

13 March 2023

**Parliament and Council updates on Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation (PPWR)**

Dear member,

In this note you will find information on the works of the European Parliament and the Council on the proposed Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation (PPWR).

Updates in this note will be indicated using the red font.

This note does not include information on the activities carried out by FoodDrinkEurope in relation to this proposal. For the updated FoodDrinkEurope tracker of meetings (and feedback received thereof) with EU Parliament and Permanent Representations of EU Member States, please check this document on this extranet: [ENV/CIRCECON/009/23E](https://members.fooddrinkeurope.eu/publishe.nsf/Redirect.xsp?refid=ENV_CIRCECON_009_23E).

For more information, please contact Silvia Lofrese at s.lofrese@fooddrinkeurope.eu

Kind regards,

The Secretariat

\*\*\*

An updated timeline of the works on PPWR in the Parliament and the Council can be found in the following pages.

**EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT**

In the European Parliament, there are four Committees involved in the analysis and amendment of the PPWR proposal: ENVI (lead), AGRI, IMCO and ITRE.

ENVI will be the Committee ultimately responsible for adopting the draft negotiating position of the Parliament (in the form of a Report), then will then have to be validated by ta vote during a Parliament’s Plenary session.

The AGRI Committee will issue an Opinion on the PPWR proposal, that will send a political message to the leading ENVI Committee. IMCO and ITRE are requesting more important competences on certain articles of the proposed Regulation, but a decision on the matter has not been made yet. In any case, those two Committees will adopt an Opinion that may – or may not – have a heavier weight than the AGRI one, depending on the decision on the competences.

These are the key MEPs across those four Committees:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ENVI | ITRE | IMCO | AGRI |
| **Ms Ries (Renew)**Ms Regimenti (EPP)Ms Burkhardt (S&D)Mr Fiocchi (ECR)Ms O’Sullivan (Greens)Mr Pimenta Lopes (The Left) | **Ms Toia (S&D)**Mr Torvalds (Renew)Ms Niebler (EPP)Mr Borchia (ID) | **Ms Joron (ID)**Ms Melchior (Renew)Ms Schaldemose (S&D)Mr Vandenkendelaere (EPP)Mr Fidanza (ECR) | **Mr De Meo (EPP)**Ms Katainen (Renew)Mr Variati (S&D)Mr Holmgren (Greens)Mr Jurgiel (ECR)Ms Conte (ID)Mr Flanagan (The Left) |

On 28 February, the AGRI Committee held a first exchange of views on the proposal. Many MEPs raised concerns on the implications of the proposal on the safety and shelf life of fresh (hence perishable) fruit and vegetables, as well as on the import/export of agri-food products – especially those falling under the EU quality and promotion schemes, such as GIs. Another point raised related to the sale of certain products in bulks (a specific reference was made to olive oil). Doubts arose also on the timing foreseen to implement the new requirements and achieve targets, on the financial implications (also on consumers) and on the environmental benefits of certain solutions proposed by the Commission (notably in relation to reuse).

**COUNCIL OF THE EU**

In the Council, the Working Party on Environment is responsible for this file. No other Council formations are officially involved in the works (contrary to the European Parliament) and the coordination with other relevant ministries (i.e. Agriculture, Industry or else) is left in the hands of each Member State to carry out at national level.

On 20 December 2022, only three weeks after the publication of the PPWR, the Council held a preliminary exchange of views on the proposal. Then, the Working Party on Environment started to work on the proposal in mid-January. For two months, under the aegis of the Swedish Presidency, Environment Attaches have carried out a first reading of the PPWR, using this as an opportunity to ask the European Commission to clarify certain aspects of the proposal. Most of the Member States had a scrutiny reservation during this period, meaning that they did not have yet a position on the text.

This is also due to the fact that the proposal had not been translated in many of the EU languages. All the translations have been finally made available at the beginning of March.

We understand that France and Germany are supportive of the proposal, whereas Italy is vocally concerned by the push on reusable packaging as preferred option vis-à-vis recycling. Finland and Czech Republic are reported to have raised concerns during the meetings of the Working Party on Environment.

On 16 March, the EU Ministers for the Environment held a policy debate on the PPWR proposal. This indicated the political priorities of the Member States, without digging into the technical details of the proposal. Here you can find the positions expressed by Member States on key issues for the food and drink sector:

* Regulation or Directive

In favour of a Directive as a way to give more room for manoeuvre to Member States: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czechia, Latvia, Luxembourg, Greece

In favour of a Regulation: Netherlands (but in some areas there should be room for more ambitious policies), Bulgaria, Estonia

* Internal market legal basis (only) or dual legal basis (internal market + environment)

In favour of a dual legal basis as a way to give Member States the possibility to adopt or maintain ambitious national measures: Austria, France, Ireland, Luxembourg

* Reuse

In favour or reuse: Netherlands, Spain, Latvia

Cautious on pushing reuse (“vs” recycling), look at impact: Italy, Slovakia, Croatia, Luxembourg, Greece, Malta

* Targets and deadlines

In favour or higher targets and shorter deadlines: Netherlands, Luxembourg

Believes that they are too ambitious: Czechia (deadlines), Lithuania, Greece

* Chemical recycling

In favour: Slovakia, Finland

* Food safety

Special mention to the need to preserve food safety: Italy, Latvia

* Cost/burden for SMEs

Special mention to the burden that the new rules would create for SMEs: Italy, Poland, Greece, Malta

* Delegated acts

Doubtful on the number of delegated acts: Italy, Belgium, Czechia, Bulgaria, Slovenia

* More
* Italy askes to update the Commission’s Impact Assessment
* Italy: no one-size-fits-all
* Spain: sorted collection should be improved, as well as better recycling techniques
* France: packaging should be standardised
* France: certain types of packaging should be banned where alternatives exist
* Croatia: to properly assess all impacts of the proposal, this file should not be rushed
* Czechia: for effective implementation, at least 2 years are needed for adaptation
* Germany: the proposal could be more ambitious when it comes to recyclability
* Finland: the requirements for recycling at scale should be further specified and assessed in terms of appropriateness
* Lithuania: recycling and reuse targets should not be contradictory; they could be set by the type of packaging and type of use
* Ireland: consistency with other EU legislation is needed
* Ireland: targets should be based on robust analysis and data
* Romania: the calculation methods have to be adopted before the deadlines and economic operators need to have transitional periods
* Latvia: the principle of proportionality should be applied to food packaging; this is vital in preventing the increase in food waste due to less substantial packaging
* Portugal: need to develop the infrastructure for collecting, sorting and recycling
* Portugal: having rates of minimum recycled content in plastic packaging is good to boost the demand for secondary raw materials; however, the amount available does not match the demand
* Luxembourg: it is paramount that these rules would lead to more sustainable solutions
* Greece: the recycled plastic target is impossible to achieve (60% by 2040)
* Bulgaria, Romania: against “per unit” target for recycled content
* Bulgaria: in favour of priority access to recycled materials for food packaging
* Slovenia: concerned that environmental matters would be “subordinated” to issues linked to the internal market

