

Brussels, 6 March 2026

Orgalim position on the Environmental Omnibus: The case for further simplification

Executive summary

The Environmental Omnibus "Simplifying for sustainable competitiveness" [proposed](#) by the European Commission on 10 December 2025 is a step in the right direction to cut red tape and boost both industrial competitiveness and environmental progress in the EU. However, we urge co-legislators to make further simplifications in a more systemic and substantial way to deliver on the simplification agenda ambitiously across all legislation (see our [19 concrete examples](#) of where to act).

In view of the upcoming negotiations between the Commission, the European Parliament and Council, we believe that it will be essential to:

1. Maintain key simplification provisions included in the proposal
2. Strengthen the proposal with the help of targeted amendments
3. Complement the Omnibus with additional simplification proposals in the future

In particular:

- 1. We call on co-legislators to MAINTAIN the following two key provisions in the proposal:**
 - 1.1** Simplify permitting procedures and environmental management system (EMS) requirements under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive and Industrial Emissions Directive (IED).
 - 1.2** Repeal the Substances of Concern in Products (SCIP) database and related reporting requirements. Information requirements for substances should be streamlined in REACH to avoid duplication.
- 2. We call on co-legislators to AMEND the proposal on the following two points:**
 - 2.1** Delete the provisions in the Environmental Omnibus regarding Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) and instead address EPR rules under the upcoming Circular Economy Act (CEA).
 - 2.2** Amend the definition of Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC) under the Batteries Regulation to ensure alignment with REACH.
- 3. We call on co-legislators to EXTEND the Omnibus with further simplification proposals in the future:**
 - 3.1.** Delete the Substances of Concern (SoCs) criteria from Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (ESPR) and all legal texts in which it is referenced, to reaffirm REACH as the central tool for regulating chemicals.

Beyond simplification, robust market surveillance and effective enforcement are preconditions to ensure fair competition and a level playing field among economic operators based both inside and outside the EU.

You will find in **Annex I** ([available upon request](#)) the list of Orgalim amendments to the Environmental Omnibus Proposal and in **Annex II** links to further Orgalim recommendations on environmental legislation.

1. We call on co-legislators to MAINTAIN the following two key provisions in the proposal

1.1. Simplify the permitting procedures and environmental management system (EMS) requirements under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive and Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)

We strongly welcome the proposals to simplify the permitting procedures and environmental management system (EMS) requirements **under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive and Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)**. Permitting procedures across Member States suffer from a lack of predictability and burdensome complexity. One of the reasons for this is the sequential nature of permitting – whereby each permit or review must be completed before the next can begin – which results in applications typically taking from 12 to 48+ months to be processed. Delays also stem from authorities requesting assessments that go beyond EU requirements, prolonging procedures further. This not only hinders the deployment of new projects – thereby adversely affecting the competitiveness of the European Union economy – but also imposes significant financial costs on developers.

The measures proposed in the Omnibus are strong and represent a timely opportunity to enable a significant simplification and faster, more predictable permitting for infrastructure projects in the EU at a time where they are urgently needed. This is why we urge co-legislators to maintain these provisions proposed by the European Commission to further enhance European competitiveness.

In particular, **we fully support the following proposals** in the Environmental Omnibus which are aimed at addressing permitting delays and complexities:

- **Expansion of Annex II in the EIA Directive** to include projects that may or may not be subject to EIAs, therefore applying a much-needed case-by-case approach.
- **Creation of a single Point of Contact (PoC) and coordinated joint procedure**, which will both facilitate the coordination of, and clarify the scope of, requirements to fulfil for developers.
- **Shortened procedural deadlines**, which will continue to give Member States discretion while significantly reducing timelines.
- **Enhanced cooperation in case of transboundary environmental assessments and digitalisation**, which will require Member States to cooperate and will enable developers to benefit from a central digital portal.
- **Tacit approvals of strategic projects after deadlines are passed**, which will support the competitiveness of Member States while retaining their control over the process.

1.2 Repeal the Substances of Concern in Products (SCIP) database and related reporting requirements.

We fully support the proposal to repeal the obligation to report Substances of Concern in Products (SCIP) related data, a long-time Orgalim request. It is high time for the discontinuation of a tool that has never delivered on its intended purpose and has instead created a **significant unnecessary burden for industry without leading to any environmental benefits**. The SCIP database was introduced without an impact assessment and we strongly believe that this has contributed to the following major problems stemming from its implementation:

- ECHA's implementation has stretched far beyond what the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) and REACH Article 33 legally require. The result is a maze of duplicated reporting, unclear rules and technical flaws. Companies face high administrative costs for information that is already required and transmitted under REACH Regulation Article 33. We strongly believe that this information should only be provided once, and we understand that the Commission is considering including this information in the context of the Digital Product Passport (DPP) under the ESPR.
- The SCIP system itself suffers from persistent issues such as mismatched TARIC codes, weak filtering, slow performance, long dissemination delays, undefined specifications, and no protection against incorrect or even reputation-damaging entries. Therefore, we recommend the deletion of this database.

We understand that these problems stemmed partially from the absence of an impact assessment or sufficient stakeholder involvement. We emphasise the importance of conducting an impact assessment prior to implementation and of giving more consideration to industry concerns and warnings about feasibility and benefits, which have been raised by more than 40 industries since 2020 (see [here](#) and [here](#) and also see page 16 of our latest [regulatory burden report](#)).

We recommend harmonisation and mutual recognition of existing substance information requirements between REACH Regulation, Ecodesign for Sustainable Product Regulation (ESPR) / Digital Product Passport (DPP), and other legal acts according to the principle of 'one list – one declaration'. Information requirements for substances in articles should preferably be anchored in REACH in order to prevent fragmentation of the legal framework across value chains.

However, we urge caution regarding next steps:

- The SCIP Database should not be replaced by other not fit-for-purpose tools as it would require significant investment to set up the right tools and data collection systems.
- We highlight again the importance of conducting an impact assessment for any new proposal.
- **We call on co-legislators to add a proposal to delete the reporting obligations under the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) requiring the SCIP database to remain in place unnecessarily for yet another 24 months.** See our amendment suggestion in Annex I.
- We would welcome clarification from decision-makers on **the exact timing for the ending of SCIP reporting obligations** and we **call on Member States to transpose the amended Directive as soon as possible**.
- We call for **the deletion of ECHA's obligation to maintain existing SCIP datasets and firmly oppose any continued 'secure public access' to this data**. The SCIP database has failed to achieve its purpose, its informational value is steadily declining, and it is unacceptable for ECHA to continue spending public resources on storing or disseminating data that is not fit for use. Although the proposal removes the

current legal obligation to provide access for waste operators and consumers, the financial and digital sheet still lists 'secure public access' as a mandatory function of an archived SCIP system – an approach we reject. Data that is not fit for purpose should no longer be made available to external parties by ECHA.

2. We call on co-legislators to AMEND the proposal on the following two points

2.1. Delete the provisions in the Environmental Omnibus on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) and instead address EPR rules under the upcoming Circular Economy Act (CEA)

Orgalim supports the Commission's efforts to simplify Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR). Standardising EPR reporting frequency to once every 12 months, as proposed, could for example reduce the administrative burden and support smoother compliance across national EPR schemes. However, the proposed measure to simplify EPR in this Omnibus, by suspending the obligation for EU-based producers to appoint an authorised representative (AR), will not help to maintain a level playing field in the EU. Instead, this measure will unintentionally exert a profoundly negative impact on European producers by making it more difficult to control and enforce rules similarly across Member States.

Overall, we recommend co-legislators to delete the provisions in this Omnibus Proposal on EPR and to instead address the broader EPR framework under the upcoming Circular Economy Act (CEA). This will allow for the development of an EU-wide and fully coherent vision on EPR, best aligned with international rules. It will also ensure a coherent and effective approach that reduces fragmentation, strengthens compliance and tackles online free riding. In that context, we support clarifying and strengthening the AR framework, particularly for third country producers placing products on EU markets. For further details, please see our proposed amendment in Annex I.

Please also see our recommendations on EPR on pages 13 and 14 in our [five step idea for a successful and competitive CEA](#). One of our main recommendations is that online free riding must be tackled by clarifying and strengthening the role of ARs, in particular for Online Manufacturing Platforms (OMPs), under the WEEE Directive. ARs should hold full legal, operational, and financial responsibility – as set out in the Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation (PPWR). Registration of each represented producer must be mandatory and obligations to ensure transparency, traceability and fair competition should be introduced.

2.2. Amend the definition of Substances of Very High Concern (SVHCs) under the Batteries Regulation to ensure alignment with REACH

The EU Batteries Regulation contains labelling obligations for hazardous substances. However, the group of hazardous substances is not yet defined in the Batteries Regulation.

The Environmental Omnibus proposal clarifies and reduces the substances in scope of labelling requirements in the Batteries Regulation. Linking hazardous substance in the Batteries Regulation to SVHCs identified under REACH constitutes a good starting point, in line with our call for a horizontal framework under REACH. However, the introduction of a new **definition of Substances of Very High Concern (SVHCs) remains highly problematic**. Rather than simplifying, it will create substantial uncertainties:

- The REACH Regulation does not contain a definition for SVHCs. This means that the inclusion of SVHCs under the Batteries Regulation would introduce an entirely new definition outside the scope of the well-established EU Chemicals Regulation (REACH). In the current implementation of REACH, SVHCs are a widely used and accepted synonym for substances in the Candidate List.
- The given definition goes beyond the designation of substances in the Candidate List where information obligations under Article 33 of REACH Regulation exist. In addition to the SVHC candidate substances under the REACH Regulation, the proposed definition also includes substances with properties listed in Article 57 (carcinogenic, mutagenic, toxic to reproduction, persistent and bioaccumulative, or endocrine disrupting) that are harmonised according to Annex VI of the classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures (CLP) Regulation). This would be a significantly larger group.

This is why **we call on co-legislators to amend the definition Substances of Very High Concern under the Batteries Regulation to ensure alignment with REACH**. See our amendment suggestion in Annex I.

3. We call on co-legislators to **COMPLEMENT** the Omnibus with additional simplification proposals in the future

3.1. Delete the Substances of Concern (SoC) criteria from ESPR and all legal texts in which it is referenced, to reaffirm REACH as the central tool for regulating chemicals

We regret the absence of a workable solution for the obligation to provide information on Substances of Concern (SoC) as stipulated in the Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (ESPR) – see Article 5 of the ESPR Regulation (EU) 2024/1781) – as we explained together with 35 other associations in our [Joint Industry Letter](#). **We strongly recommend addressing this open issue in a future Simplification Proposal.**

Inconsistent definitions and applications of SoC criteria and comparable substances lists across different EU regulations, such as the ESPR, the EU-Taxonomy Regulation, the Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation (PPWR) and the Batteries Regulation, create significant legal uncertainties and therefore substantial compliance burdens. **We are especially concerned about the definition of:**

- **SoC(b)**, which refers to a large number of substances classified in Part 3 of Annex VI to Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 in various hazard categories and classes. This burden is not justified from an environmental point of view, partly because substances of concern are not harmful to the environment 'by default'; rather, they can be essential to support the circularity, longevity, safety and sustainability of a product. Also, tracking such a large number (several thousands) of substances of concern throughout the life cycle of (complex) articles is not practically feasible.

- **SoC(d)**, which vaguely references 'other' substances that "negatively affect the reuse and recycling of materials in the product in which it is present", lacks a clear, harmonised methodology, is subject to multiple interpretations, and could potentially cover any substance. As we understand this was not the intention of the regulators, we recommend the Commission to focus on enforceability of requirements.

The duplication of information requirements must be avoided:

- **SoC(a)**: Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC, REACH Candidate List) are already subject to mandatory information obligations according to Article 33 of REACH.
- **SoC(c)**: Substances already regulated under the POPs Regulation are already subject to established material compliance processes in industry – no further information requirements are needed.

The EU already has in place a comprehensive and effective regulatory framework for the safe management of chemicals and waste. Examples include the REACH Regulation, RoHS Directive, and POPs Regulation. **The ESPR and the SoC concept should complement these frameworks, not duplicate them**, and must avoid risking the implementation of circularity goals as laid down in the Circular Economy Action Plan (CEAP) and the announced upcoming Circular Economy Act (CEA). This means that substances shall not be banned for chemical safety reasons under the ESPR and thorough assessments shall be made to address possible trade-offs between circularity and non-toxic environment objectives. The overall objective should be to provide manufacturers with an EU regulatory framework which is coherent.

Finally, we believe that the existing Substances of Concern concept should be abandoned and removed from ESPR and all legal texts in which it is referenced. As mentioned in Section 1, a better solution would be a uniform concept for the information requirements for substances that require regulation (with clear identification of the substances) along the supply chain, which is implemented in REACH (for example, by adapting the role of the REACH Candidate List based on scientific hazard classification and risk assessment, with sufficient stakeholder involvement). At the very least, our proposed adjustments should be taken into account, as they will make the EU regulatory framework more effective and workable to support Europe's circular economy ambitions. This balanced approach will strengthen both sustainability outcomes and the competitiveness of European companies. See our amendment suggestion in Annex I.

This is clearly showcased in the JRC publication "[Method for the identification and tracking of substances of concern in products and for the preparation of restriction measures on the use of substances in products](#)". A report intended to be a clarification of the methodology to identify substances of concern which brings another layer of complexity.

In conclusion, we welcome the Environmental Omnibus proposal, but it needs to be strengthened and complemented by further simplification. See our [19 concrete examples](#) of where to act, and below in Annex II further recommendations from Orgalim on several environmental legislations concerning the circular economy, products, chemicals and waste policies.

Annex II – Links to further Orgalim recommendations on environmental legislation

Orgalim recommendations on the circular economy

- Orgalim [Position Paper](#) - A competitive and successful **Circular Economy Act**: our five step idea, 6 November 2025
- Joint Industry [Priorities](#) for the **Circular Economy Act**, 15 July 2025
- Orgalim [key recommendations](#) for the 2024-2029 legislative cycle for the circular economy, May 2024

Orgalim recommendations on products

- Orgalim [views and recommendations](#) on the Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (**ESPR**), 21 March 2024
- Orgalim [recommendation](#) for a staged implementation of the **Digital Product Passport (DPP)** system in the context of the **Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (ESPR)**, 6 February 2025
- Orgalim comments on the Commission **Discussion Paper** about the first **Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (ESPR)** and **Energy Labelling Working Plan**, 27 February 2025

Orgalim recommendations on chemicals

- Orgalim's [reaction](#) to **PFAS** restriction evaluation process, 29 September 2025
- Orgalim [position and recommendations](#) on the proposed **PFAS** restriction, 7 June 2024
- [Orgalim position and recommendations](#) on the upcoming revision of the **REACH** Regulation, 25 April 2025
- Orgalim [position and recommendations](#) on the upcoming revision of the **RoHS** Directive, 31 May 2022
- Orgalim [position and recommendations](#) on the **Essential Use** Concept Communication, 30 September 2024
- Joint Industry [Letter](#) on the Urgent Need for a Harmonised and Workable Approach to **Substances of Concern**, 10 September 2025

Orgalim recommendations on waste

- Orgalim [opposes](#) the proposed new tax on uncollected e-waste and planned EU tax for large corporates
- Orgalim [position & recommendations](#) on the upcoming revision of the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (**WEEE**) Directive, 22 September 2023
- Orgalim [position paper](#) with preliminary key messages for the upcoming revision of the **Waste Framework Directive (WFD)**, 11 August 2022

Orgalim represents Europe's technology industries, comprised of 770,000 innovative companies spanning the mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, electronics, ICT and metal technology branches. Together they represent the EU's largest manufacturing sector, generating annual turnover of over €2,750 billion, manufacturing one-third of all European exports and providing over 11 million direct jobs. Orgalim is registered under the European Union Transparency Register – ID number: 20210641335-88.