

# EU COMMISSION CALL FOR EVIDENCE FOR AN INITIATIVE ON SIMPLIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN IN ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION

A.I.S.E. position

10 September 2025

---

## **Introduction**

A.I.S.E., the voice of the cleaning and hygiene products industry, welcomes the European Commission's initiative aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of EU environmental legislation through the simplification of administrative burdens. This initiative represents a pivotal opportunity to streamline and harmonise reporting obligations across legislative instruments.

On this regard, we appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the Call for evidence for an initiative on "*Simplification of administrative burden in environmental legislation*".

Building on the insights gathered through our contribution to the ongoing study titled *Assessment of Environmental Reporting and the Potential for Simplification*, A.I.S.E. has identified key areas where targeted simplification measures could lead to tangible improvements by enhancing regulatory clarity, streamlining compliance processes, and alleviating administrative burdens.

This position paper presents A.I.S.E.'s perspective by proposing a set of measures that could be considered within the scope of the environmental omnibus. It outlines the main bottlenecks and concerns associated with current requirements, while also highlighting the opportunities that could arise from adapting these measures. The paper concludes with targeted recommendations to support a more balanced, effective, and future-oriented implementation of environmental legislation across the EU.



▪ **Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation – ESPR**

A.I.S.E. fully supports the overarching objectives of the ESPR and its central role in promoting transparency and sustainability across product lifecycles. However, to ensure that the implementation requirements—particularly those under Article 24 on the disclosure of information regarding unsold consumer goods—are proportionate and practically enforceable, we call for targeted adjustments and refinements to the current provisions.

• **Harmonise timeframe for disclosure obligation**

The EU Commission’s proposed draft implementing act (under ESPR Art. 24) on disclosure information for unsold goods mandates economic operators to apply harmonised details and format, verification and relevant disclosure details starting from the first full financial year following the act’s application—effectively one year after its entry into force.

While A.I.S.E. appreciates the Commission’s intention to provide a 12-month lead time for implementation allowing companies to adjust their internal data management systems, **this creates a practical time gap between the reporting obligation and the availability of the harmonised format.** In practical terms, the current scenario presents a gap between deadline for companies to submit their first disclosure reports (as of the first full financial year after the entry into force of the ESPR),

and the time when the reporting format set up by the upcoming implementing act will become applicable (as of the first full financial year after the entry into force of the implementing act that is still to be published).

Hence, companies will be required to comply with Article 24’s reporting obligations without access to a harmonised disclosure template or standardised product categorisation. This misalignment introduces several implementation challenges:

- heightening **legal uncertainty** and **unnecessary administrative burden** among economic operators
  
- resulting in inconsistent reporting methods for discarded goods in absence of a harmonised format risks generating **fragmented and non-comparable data across companies and Member States**, undermining both the reliability of the disclosed information and the effectiveness of the ESPR’s enforcement objectives.

In line with the Commission’s simplification and competitiveness agenda, [A.I.S.E. urges the European Commission to align the application of Article 24’s reporting obligation with the implementation timeline of the harmonised disclosure format introduced in the implementing act. Specifically, we propose postponing the reporting obligation to 2027–2028, when the harmonised format and product categorisation will be fully applicable.](#) This adjustment could be introduced through a provision in the upcoming Omnibus on environmental reporting, expected by the end of 2025. Such alignment would ensure that companies have sufficient time and resources to generate harmonised, comparable, and meaningful data that supports the ESPR’s objectives and enables effective enforcement by the Commission and national authorities.



- **Exemption for Justified Discards**

Article 24 of ESPR legal text requires economic operators to disclose the reasons for discarding unsold consumer products.

However, for certain product categories—*such as detergents and surfactants or cosmetics*—discarding unsold goods is often a legal necessity due to health, hygiene, or safety concerns. These discards are not commercially motivated but mandated by strict safety standards and regulatory obligations, including Good Manufacturing Practices (GMPs) and product-specific legislation, to ensure consumer protection.

These situations, although rare, can happen when products are returned by consumers or when contamination concerns force retailers to return products. In such cases where destruction occur for safety, hygiene or health concerns, these products should be exempt from reporting.

In this context, Article 25(5) of Regulation (EU) 2024/1781 already recognises health, hygiene, and safety concerns as legitimate grounds for the destruction of unsold goods. Applying Article 24's reporting obligations to such cases would disproportionately impact companies that discard products solely for these justified reasons. It could lead to reputational harm through misinterpretation of discard data—suggesting faults where none exist—and impose unnecessary bureaucratic burdens on companies acting responsibly and in full compliance with the law.

Moreover, these discards represent only a negligible fraction of the total products placed on the EU market and are already subject to strict internal controls and external regulations. Requiring detailed reporting in such cases does not contribute meaningfully to transparency and risks undermining the principle of proportionality.

[In the interest of administrative efficiency and legal coherence, A.I.S.E. calls the European Commission to adopt a derogation to Article 24 of ESPR. Companies discarding unsold consumer goods exclusively for justified reasons—as defined under Article 25\(5\)—should be exempted from the obligation to report such discards.](#)



▪ **Extended Producer Responsibility**

The current landscape of EPR legislation—spanning the Waste Framework Directive, the Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation, the Batteries Regulation, and directives on single-use plastics, electronic waste,—remains fragmented and inconsistent across Member States and product categories, leading to significant administrative burden for companies operating across the EU. Diverging legal frameworks, regional variations, and inconsistent reporting formats result in complex, duplicative compliance processes.

Therefore, we would urge a more consistent and streamlined approach to EPR reporting and compliance. A consistent regulatory framework enhances enforcement, improves data accuracy for waste management and reduces financial burdens for businesses

To address these challenges, [A.I.S.E. would recommend the European Commission to revise Articles 8 and 8a of the WFD aimed at:](#)

- **Harmonise Eco-Modulation Criteria at EU Level:** Eco-modulation of EPR fees should be standardised across the EU in terms of price signal direction and magnitude. Fees must be objectively linked to the actual cost of waste collection and recycling, offset by the value of recovered materials. Arbitrary fee structures risk distorting market incentives and undermining innovation. Instead, harmonised criteria—potentially linked to EU Eco-design or packaging recyclability requirements—would encourage producers to design more circular products and invest in sustainable solutions. Moreover, as highlighted in the EU Commission’s study <sup>1</sup>, EPR schemes for packaging should maintain a clear focus on achieving recycling targets in the most appropriate and effective manner. This approach would ensure that fee structures incentivise design choices that enhance recyclability, thereby supporting the EU’s broader circular economy objectives.

- **Support the digitalisation of existing and future EPR registries:** to address the growing complexity of EPR compliance across the EU, A.I.S.E. strongly supports the digitalisation of both existing and future EPR registries. We would recommend the EU Commission to establish a legal basis to ensure that future registries are developed with harmonised minimum digital requirements, enabling interoperability and reducing administrative burdens for producers.

In line with the [Single Market Strategy](#)<sup>2</sup> and the EU’s broader simplification and Competitiveness Agenda, A.I.S.E. invites the Commission to create a legal framework for a digital one-stop shop (OSS) for EPR compliance, serving as a single point of entry for producers, authorised representatives, and Producer Responsibility Organisations (PROs), facilitating centralised registration, reporting, and fee management across all mandated EPR schemes in the EU and its Member States.

<sup>1</sup> European Commission (2020) “*Study to support preparation of the Commission’s guidance for extended producer responsibility scheme*”

<sup>2</sup> The **European Commission’s 2025 Single Market Strategy**, “*The Single Market: our European home market in an uncertain world – A Strategy for making the Single Market simple, seamless and strong*” (COM/2025/500 final), includes a reference to the development of a **digital one-stop shop (OSS)** for EPR compliance



Such a digital interface would unlock significant simplification by allowing Member States to maintain their existing frameworks while streamlining access and operations for producers

▪ **Empowering Consumers for the Green Transition Directive - ECGTD**

A.I.S.E. fully supports the overarching objective of the ECGT Directive to enhance transparency and combat misleading environmental claims, thereby empowering consumers to make informed and sustainable purchasing decisions. However, the association expresses several concerns regarding the implementation phase of key provisions, highlighting critical bottlenecks and systemic challenges that may hinder effective and timely compliance.

A.I.S.E. reckons the Directive to lack of clarity and ambiguities in the text, risking to divergent interpretations and enforcement across Member States. This fragmentation undermines legal certainty and imposes disproportionate compliance burdens on companies operating at EU scale.

*Example: One area of concern is the adaptation of packaging and labelling to meet new requirements. Updating packaging artwork and environmental claims typically requires a lead time of at least two years due to design cycles, regulatory reviews, and supply chain coordination. The current timeline does not reflect these operational realities, potentially resulting in premature disposal of packaging stock—an outcome that contradicts the Directive’s sustainability goals.*

The current timeline for implementation—requiring Member States to transpose the Directive by March 2026 and businesses to comply by September 2026—raises significant concerns regarding the feasibility and consistency of meeting the requirements.

Moreover, the European Commission’s recent indication not intending to revise the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive Guidance Document in the near future further exacerbates uncertainty. Without updated guidance reflecting the ECGT provisions, stakeholders are left navigating ambiguous compliance expectations, increasing the risk of inconsistent enforcement and legal disputes.

In light of the implementation challenges outlined above, [A.I.S.E. strongly urges the European Commission to adopt a dual-track approach](#):

- **Guidance and implementation tools:** the Commission should urgently develop and publish practical implementation support—either in the form of a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document or through a revision of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (UCPD) Guidance Document. These tools are essential to ensure harmonised interpretation and enforcement across Member States and to provide legal certainty for businesses.

A.I.S.E., together with 10 industry associations, has already formally raised these concerns in a [joint industry letter](#) addressed to DG JUST, underscoring the urgency of coordinated action to avoid fragmented enforcement and to support a workable compliance framework for industry.



- **“Stop-the-clock” mechanism in parallel:** to allow sufficient time for the development and dissemination of this guidance, A.I.S.E. calls for a temporary suspension of the Directive’s applicability—specifically, a delay of at least one year in the application of its requirements. This postponement would ensure that businesses are not forced to comply with unclear or inconsistently interpreted rules, and would enable a more responsible and sustainable implementation process.

- **European Union Deforestation Regulation - EUDR**

A.I.S.E. calls for the inclusion of EUDR within the upcoming Omnibus on environmental reporting, as a means to simplify and streamline the reporting obligations foreseen under the Regulation.

- **Minimise Duplication of Due Diligence Statements and information sharing across the supply chain**

The most important thing is to have the first operator or trader placing a relevant EUDR product on the EU market to obtain the DDS. If the product is not processed into another product and just a purchase happened to a customer or in an intra-group transfer, no new DDS must be required.

While recent clarifications in the Commission’s FAQ are a step in the right direction, A.I.S.E. believes that updating the relevant provisions in the EUDR itself is essential to provide legal certainty and operational clarity for economic operators. This adjustment would significantly reduce duplication, streamline digital reporting, and improve the overall efficiency of compliance processes.

Under the current legislative framework, multiple operators within the same supply chain may be required to submit separate DDS for the same product, even when no further transformation has occurred. This duplication creates a disproportionate administrative burden, particularly for downstream operators and traders who have limited visibility into upstream sourcing and limited capacity to verify data already collected by the first placer.

To address this, [A.I.S.E. recommends simplifying DDS requirements for intra-group transfers by clearly assign full due diligence responsibility to the first operator or trader placing a relevant product or commodity on the EU market.](#)

Specifically, the DDS (Duplication of Due Diligence Statements) should be required only when a product first enters a company group and again only when it is processed into a new product and placed on the market. Requiring every legal entity within the same group—including intermediaries that merely resell the product without modification—to submit separate DDSs imposes unnecessary administrative steps that do not enhance traceability or regulatory oversight. This approach would ensure that the core objective of the Regulation—preventing deforestation-linked products from entering or leaving the EU market—is achieved without imposing redundant obligations on downstream actors.

*An example is when a company A located in the EU buys O-rings made from natural rubber from a company in the EU (company B) and uses those O-rings as spare parts for repair purposes with a customer C. Company A needs to obtain DDS number from company B and company A needs, as next step, to obtain its own DDS number before actually selling this spare part to company C. This second DDS number adds no additional value in term protection of the environment and creates additional burden to companies.*



*More examples as this one can be found on the EU Guidelines from 2025, named “Understanding Your Company Position in Beef, Cocoa, Coffee, Palm Oil, Rubber, Soy, and Wood Supply Chains” published by the EU Commission.*

Moreover, A.I.S.E. recognises the importance of robust digital tools to support the implementation of Due Diligence Statements. However, the current framework often results in a complex digital burden, particularly when it comes to efficiently receiving and sharing data across supply chains. This complexity risks undermining operational efficiency and increasing administrative costs without contributing meaningfully to the Regulation’s objectives.

### ▪ Packaging Packaging Waste Regulation – PPWR

A.I.S.E. acknowledges the importance of the PPWR in advancing packaging sustainability and supports its overarching objectives. However, we urge the Commission to provide further clarification and practical guidance on the applicability of certain requirements to ensure effective and feasible implementation by businesses. This is particularly critical given the ambitious timelines and the complexity of compliance obligations.

Two provisions merit immediate attention:

- **Article 7 – Minimum PCR Content:** The current requirement mandates that plastic packaging placed on the market must contain minimum percentages of recycled content from post-consumer plastic waste, calculated as an average per manufacturing plant each year. While this approach supports safety and quality, A.I.S.E. recommends that the Commission clarify whether an alternative calculation method—such as averaging across all packaging placed on the EU market by a company annually, as permitted under the Single Use Plastics Directive (2019/904)—could be considered. This would offer greater flexibility and facilitate compliance across diverse product categories.
- **Article 10 – Packaging Minimisation:** The intent to establish a standardized method for measuring compliance is commendable. However, the current approach risks oversimplifying the diversity of packaging needs. A.I.S.E. stresses that packaging limits must be tailored to the specific characteristics of each product, including its physical and chemical properties, intended use, and functional requirements. Factors such as material type, size, weight, volume, wall thickness, and empty space are essential to fulfilling packaging functions and ensuring product safety. We therefore call for clearer definitions and implementation guidance that preserve packaging diversity while supporting minimisation goals.

In conclusion, [A.I.S.E. does not advocate for revising the Regulation but strongly encourages the Commission to issue targeted clarifications and supporting tools to ensure consistent interpretation and practical implementation across Member States.](#)

**About A.I.S.E.** - A.I.S.E. represents the detergents and maintenance products industry in Europe. Based in Brussels, A.I.S.E. has been the voice of the industry to EU regulators since 1952. Membership consists of 30 national associations across Europe, 19 corporate members and 23 value chain partners. Through this extensive network, A.I.S.E. represents over 900 companies supplying household and professional cleaning products and services across Europe. Committed to promoting sustainable practices and innovation, A.I.S.E. collaborates closely with European institutions, industry stakeholders, and the public to enhance the sector's environmental protection, consumer safety, and regulatory compliance efforts.

**Contact:** Alessandro D'Augusta Perna, Sustainability Manager [alessandro.daugustaperna@aise.eu](mailto:alessandro.daugustaperna@aise.eu)