

From: SCHALLY Hugo-Maria (ENV)
Sent: mardi 25 septembre 2018 14:42
To: SADAUSKAS Kestutis (ENV)
Cc: [REDACTED] (ENV); NELEN Sarah (ENV); [REDACTED] (ENV); [REDACTED] (ENV); [REDACTED] (ENV); [REDACTED] (ENV)
Subject: Meetings : Plastics Strategy/SUP proposal

Kestutis,

A very dense morning of meetings related to the Plastics Strategy/SUP proposal:

1) A breakfast meeting in the EP hosted by two EPP MEPs from Austria (Lukas Mandel/Paul Rübig) at the request of an Austrian Plastic Converter (Greiner Group). I spoke together with [REDACTED] (Rapporteur on the Plastics Strategy) , who spoke very strongly in support of the Plastics Strategy to the extent that it was difficult to distinguish his position from the COM position; Manfred Stanek (CEO of Greiner Group, who made a bland statement of support, but voicing opposition to any kind of ban; a representative of Nestle (whom we will meet on Thursday) who announced a public pledge of Nestle towards the end of the week, spoke in support of the overall proposal, including advocating the switch to monomaterial packaging as well as the possible ban of EPS and PS (quite surprising); [REDACTED] (REWE Group - german retailer) who also voiced support and highlighted REWE group initiatives on less packaging, but highlighted regulatory difficulties in Germany and Austria attributable to regulatory gold-plating, And [REDACTED] from Reloop, who highlighted the environmental challenge and was also the only one to mention biodegradability (In a negative way). In the ensuing discussion the main points raised related to well known issues regarding the bans, regrettable substitution, lack of clarity in the EPR articles and the pros- and cons of the design requirements on tethered caps and lids.

A useful opportunity to highlight the main rationale of the Com proposal to confirm our position on definition, design requirements and EPR systems. I also had the opportunity to discuss the upcoming shadow meeting with [REDACTED] , who appeared to be on our line with regard to definition, biodegradability and EPR , not sure about design requirements.

2) Immediately following I met with representatives of the „ WKÖ „ (Austrian Federal Chamber of Commerce) who related their members concerns about

a) Definition of plastics/SUPs, fearing that too many products would be covered;

b) Collection targets for bottles, where they argued that we needed to change the Art. 9, to allow for the counting in of bottles, coming from mixed collection ,

c) design requirements,

d) lack of clarity on the extent of the obligations under EPR, repeating the well known argument that we were giving a blank cheque to local and regional authorities.

Useful opportunity for clarifying some of the concerns.

3) Later I had a meeting with BASF and the owner of big German packaging company (Südpack). The owner of Südpack started the meeting by declaring his total opposition to the COM proposal based on the fact that too many of his products would be covered by the draft directive and that innovation would be stifled by regulation. In the course of the meeting I could clarify with him that by far not all of the products mentioned by him were covered by the draft and it became apparent that his main concern (Support by BASF) was the question. Of whether the commission would push - through regulation - for mono materials.

Another useful opportunity to clarify wrong perceptions around both the Plastics Strategy and the SUP proposal .

Regards

Hugo

Von meinem iPad gesendet