

The Swedish Implementation Council
KN 2024:04

Klimat- och
näringslivsdepartementet,
Enheten för cirkulär ekonomi,
kemikalier och strålning

Landsbygd- och
infrastrukturdepartementet,
Enheten för djur och livsmedel

Kopia: KN NIM

Recommendation on implementation – revisions of the Waste Directive

The Swedish Implementation Council's recommendations on implementation are presented in full in section eight. The Council's proposals in summary are:

Overall recommendations

- Take advantage of available exemptions and inform companies about this at an early stage.
- Establish direct contact channels for companies to ask questions and get guidance in transition and reporting.
- Ensure that competent authorities have the resources to supervise cheating and actors who avoid producer responsibility.
- Ensure that the reporting systems of competent authorities are developed, implemented and tested well in advance of the reporting of data.
- Avoid overlap between legislations

Food waste recommendations

- Work to ensure that any differences in definitions and measurement methods for monitoring food waste do not lead to the goals becoming more burdensome for companies in Sweden.
- Let donations continue to be voluntary and simplify the donation system.
- Use an earlier reference year than in the proposal, if possible and to the benefit of businesses, and ensure that food waste statistics are accurate.
- Provide early information on how food waste reduction targets will be followed up and adapt the actions of competent authorities to the sectors concerned.

Recommendations for textile waste

- Give companies the opportunity to design their producer responsibility and their producer responsibility organisation(s).
- If targets for the proportion of recycled textile materials are introduced, these should be concretised on the basis of the current situation and gradually escalated.
- Review funding opportunities for research and technological development of textile waste recycling infrastructure.
- Adapt the implementation based on other upcoming proposals from the European Commission.
- Do not introduce the legislation retroactively for the textiles that are already on the market.

1. Task of the Swedish Implementation Council

The Implementation Council is tasked with assisting the Government in its efforts to strengthen the competitiveness of Swedish companies by avoiding implementation above the minimum level and counteracting unjustified regulatory burdens, as well as reducing administrative costs and other compliance costs in connection with the implementation of EU regulations

in Swedish law. The Implementation Council's work must be based on a company perspective.

The Implementation Council is to submit documentation and recommendations to the Government, partly as a contribution to Swedish positions in negotiations and partly on how EU legal acts can be implemented in Swedish law in a way that is not more far-reaching from a business perspective than what the legal acts require.

The Implementation Council's work is based on problem descriptions that have been communicated to the Council, mainly from industry organisations and their member companies. During the work on the documentation, contacts are also made with others who are familiar with the respective subject area, such as government agencies. In the light of the information and knowledge gathered and in the context of the overall objective of the act in question, the Council makes a balanced and independent assessment of how the business perspective can be effectively addressed in each case.

In preparing this opinion, the Council has mainly made use of information and evidence received in discussions with:

- The trade organisations TEKO (Swedish Textile and Fashion Companies), Visita, the Swedish Trade Federation, the Swedish Grocery Trade, the Swedish Food Federation, the Swedish Recycling Industries, the Swedish Farmers' National Association and the Swedish Business Sector's Producer Responsibility (producer responsibility organisation for packaging).
- The companies and organisations HM, Eton, Fristads, Stadsmissionen, Axfood and COOR.
- Relevant authorities and member organisations: The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Avfall Sverige, the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SKR) and the special investigator for SOU 2020:72 "Producer responsibility for textiles – a part of the circular economy".

2. EU legal act concerned

Amendments adopted by the European Parliament and of the Council to Directive 2008/98/EC on waste.¹

3. Objectives and purpose of the EU Act

The revisions of the Waste Directive aim to promote increased circularity in the food and textile sectors and reduce the impact on the environment and climate.

Food waste revisions

The revisions in the Directive aim to strengthen efforts to reduce food waste produced through production, sale and consumption. The revisions focus on measures aimed at changing behaviours and developing processes and working methods with a focus on the waste hierarchy.

Two binding targets will be introduced to reduce food waste by 2030. On the one hand, food waste from retail, restaurants, food services and households is to be reduced by 30 per cent per capita, and on the other hand, processing and manufacturing waste is to be reduced by 10 per cent. The targets will be set in relation to the average amount of food waste in these sectors in the reference years 2021–2023. The Directive provides for the possibility for member states to apply for an earlier reference year.

Revisions concerning textiles

The purpose of the revisions regarding textiles (including shoes) is to reduce the major climate and environmental impact that textile production entails by introducing a producer responsibility for textiles in each EU member state based on the *polluter pays principle*. Producer responsibility will help to establish rules for producers' responsibility for the entire life cycle and *end-of-life management of products*. Producer responsibility adds, among other things, requirements for the collection of textile waste as well as sorting and handling for reuse and recycling. There are also requirements for member states to ensure that producer responsibility covers costs for

¹ Adopted amendments to Directive 2008/98/EC on waste (ADOPTION OF LEGISLATIVE ACTS FOLLOWING THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT'S SECOND READING. Proposal for a DIRECTIVE OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Directive 2008/98/EC on waste) has not yet been published in the official journal with its own title.

research and development regarding, for example, the expansion of fibre-to-fibre recycling.

- The requirements for producers' collection include the responsibility to establish, maintain and finance the physical collection infrastructure based on the waste hierarchy.
- Requirements for sorting textile waste aim at a division of textiles and textile fractions based on their properties and suitability for reuse and recycling.
- Requirements for reuse include textile waste whose quality is of a sufficiently high level for, for example, second-hand operations.
- Textile waste recycling requirements refer to the producers' responsibility to establish, maintain and finance infrastructure for the breakdown of textile fractions into textile fibres for use in the manufacture of new textile products.

4. Where in the process is the implementation/adaptation of Swedish law?

Following trilogue negotiations in October 2024 and February 2025, the revision of the Waste Directive has resulted in a provisional political agreement adopted by the Council at its meeting on 23 and 24 June 2025. The proposal was adopted by the European Parliament on 9 September 2025.

The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency was commissioned by the Government on 15 May 2025 to carry out a survey of any challenges that exist and trade-offs that need to be made due to the extended producer responsibility for textiles that will be added in the revised Waste Directive. The survey is based on the provisional political agreement. As part of the work on the mapping, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency has called for a hearing with relevant actors, including the business community. The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency must report the assignment to the Government Offices (Ministry of Climate and Enterprise) by 15 October 2025 at the latest.

The business community has also been invited to a roundtable discussion (spring 2025) with the Minister of Climate and Environment on producer responsibility for textiles, by the Ministry of Climate and Enterprise. Thus, several initiatives have been carried out for dialogues with relevant industry organisations and companies regarding the revisions in the Waste Directive.

Producer responsibility for textiles has also previously been investigated by the government. In December 2020, a special investigator submitted the report "Producer responsibility for textiles – a part of the circular economy" (SOU 2020:72), in which the possibilities and approaches for the implementation of producer responsibility for textiles in Sweden were investigated.

5. Responsible ministries

The Ministry of Climate and Enterprise and the Ministry of Rural Affairs and Infrastructure.

6. Problem description from a Swedish business perspective

This chapter presents the aspects and views that have been most prominent and that have recurred in dialogue with the industries concerned. Initially, a brief description is given of how the revisions of the Waste Directive may affect the current situation and the industries' overall attitude to the amendments to the Directive.

Sweden is currently working with general and voluntary targets to reduce food waste for companies and households. The voluntary aspect has led to companies and households coming at different stages in reducing their food waste. The revised directive entails a change in the sense that Sweden now has binding targets for reduced food waste. These targets will be followed up for each Member State and the Commission may require action to be taken to meet commitments.

The current rules regarding textile waste came into force on 1 January this year (2025) and include requirements for separate collection and sorting of textile waste. This responsibility currently rests with the municipalities. From 1 October 2025, it will be possible to dispose of broken textile products together with other waste, for example with combustible waste, which has not been possible with the rules that came into force on 1 January. The revisions of the directive mean that the responsibility for the collection, sorting and management of textile waste is instead transferred to the producers of textiles.

The Implementation Council perceives that the affected industries are fundamentally positive to the revisions in the Waste Directive. There is a desire to take greater responsibility for textile waste and food waste for increased sustainability, and a number of companies have already implemented changes and investments to take steps along the way. The concerns and views expressed by the industries concerned are rather related to how the revisions will be interpreted and implemented in Swedish legislation.

6.1 Problem description – food waste

There are concerns that the binding targets will not provide the same focus on edible food waste

There are some concerns that the binding EU targets will lead to a broader focus, on both edible and non-edible food waste. This will entail different definitions and measurement methods for monitoring food waste than those used in Sweden today.²

In Sweden, the focus of government agencies' action plans and strategies has been on reducing food waste, i.e. the edible parts of food waste (food leftovers, goods that have been left over or are considered too old) and food losses. The binding EU targets, on the other hand, are written on the basis that it is the amount of food waste that is intended to be reduced, i.e. both edible and non-edible food waste.

It is also the edible food waste that restaurants and hotels, among others, have worked to reduce, since the non-edible parts are largely impossible to influence (e.g. the amount of bones and coffee grounds). It is therefore expressed to be crucial to continue to focus on reducing edible food waste.

The assessments and measurements of the proportion of food waste that is edible differ between Sweden and the European Commission³. In Sweden,

² Authorities in Sweden distinguish between the terms "food waste" and "food waste" and follow up and measure these separately. Food waste is a legal term defined by the EU that includes both previously edible food waste and inedible parts, such as shells, bones and coffee grounds. Food waste is any food, both solid and liquid, that has become waste. Food waste is food that has been produced as food but which, for various reasons, does not continue in the food chain and is eaten by humans. Source: The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency's website "food waste and related concepts".
<https://www.naturvardsverket.se/amnesomraden/avfall/avfallslag/matsvinn-och-livsmedelsavfall/>

³ According to the Commission's impact assessment, 70 per cent of household food waste was estimated to be food waste according to data from the FUSION project (final report in 2016), which can be compared to an estimated share of 28 per cent in Sweden in 2020. Source:
<https://www.naturvardsverket.se/publikationer/8800/978-91-620-8891-0/>

the edible share of food waste is estimated to be significantly lower than in the EU. In the follow-up of the objectives, the assessment and measurement method set by the Commission may be decisive. If it is in line with the EU's assessment and measurement methodology, it may entail greater challenges for Sweden to meet the binding targets.

Affected industries also point out the importance of following up the targets and assessing the achievement of the targets taking into account national volume increases in food produced. If production volumes increase, in line with the goals of the national food strategy, it also leads to an increase in food waste.

Need to maintain voluntariness in the donation system

The directive does not currently lay down any requirements for donations. If such an introduction were to become relevant in Sweden, the industries concerned consider that it would be an over-implementation. Donation of food products to social actors is an important part of reducing the total amount of food waste generated in grocery trade and other store operations, among other things. An appropriate donation system needs to be based on voluntariness, so as not to place an unreasonable burden on companies. In addition, the donation procedure needs to be harmonised with other rules in the food sector in order to reduce costs and administrative burden. Applicable tax rules may also affect companies in the event of such a donation.⁴ The industries have highlighted that the traceability regulations are burdensome in the case of donations.

Furthermore, the current donation system has limited reception capacity, and thus a forced system in the current situation would rather mean an increase in food waste. The Swedish Grocery Trade Association has particularly pointed out the need to clarify that product alarms⁵ can replace delivery notes as documentation for donations. This is described as entailing an administrative simplification, while at the same time meeting the traceability requirements through the trade's existing systems for traceability.

⁴ The issue has been addressed in the report SOU 2025:30 *Simpler VAT rules on the sale of used goods and donation of food*.

⁵ Product alarms are a warning message that is sent out by the supervisory authority in the event of, for example, serious risks to consumer health when an unsafe food has been placed on the market, so that suppliers can quickly handle and recall the product in question.

Uncertainty due to lack of access to reliable statistics and the reference year of binding targets

The directive's binding target of reducing food waste is generally seen as positive by the business community.

However, there is concern that the Directive's reference year 2021–2023 does not provide the best starting point or the most correct picture to start from for the Swedish companies concerned in general, and the hotel and restaurant industry in particular. This is said to be due to the fact that the Swedish companies concerned have already worked with the food waste issue for many years and have thus come a long way compared to several other countries. The proposed reference years were also special years with regard to the COVID-19 pandemic, which entailed changes in consumption patterns that affected the waste statistics in those years. It is therefore requested by the industries to apply to use an earlier reference year.

There is also a concern that the statistics and current measurement methods (random sampling and pick analyses) for food waste are not entirely accurate. Among other things, it is about how food waste from hotels and restaurants has not been separated from household food waste in the statistics. There are statistics that the industry is questioning, such as calculations for the year 2022 that imply an approximate increase of 65% compared to the year 2021⁶ in the total amount of food waste generated by hotels and restaurants. If the statistics do not reflect real conditions of waste produced, especially linked to the Directive's reference year, it poses a problem in calculating goal achievement and may mean that companies need to reduce food waste more than is justified by the targets.

Furthermore, there is great uncertainty about how the binding targets will be followed up, what consequences this may have for companies in practice and whether there will be a division of targets between households and companies. It is argued by the industries concerned that it is crucial that the competent authorities adapt measures based on the different sectors, in order to, among other things, capture the share of households in food waste.

⁶ Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, *Food waste in Sweden 2022*, Infoserien- 8908, Stockholm: Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, 2024, <https://www.naturvardsverket.se/publikationer/8900/978-91-620-8908-5/>.

Overlapping rules can make it more difficult for companies to reduce food waste

Laws and EU legal acts in other areas affect companies' opportunities to reduce their food waste, including PPWR⁷ ⁸ and the Price Information Act (2004:347). Reducing food waste can become unnecessarily complex and burdensome for businesses if the implementation and enforcement of overlapping legislation is not harmonised with the binding targets for reducing food waste.

6.2 Problem description - textile waste

Detailed producer responsibility risks being unnecessarily burdensome and inhibiting the competitiveness of Swedish companies

The introduction of producer responsibility for textiles will add increased requirements for classification, sorting and reporting of textile quantities and textile fractions. Reporting can be particularly burdensome if textiles are to be differentiated based on the environmental performance of the products (eco-modulation) based on ecodesign requirements highlighted by the directive. Such requirements risk imposing a significant administrative burden on businesses in general, and SMEs in particular. If producer responsibility becomes too micromanaged, companies are deprived of the opportunity to fulfil producer responsibility through the producer responsibility organisation(s) based on the industry's terms and conditions.

The Waste Directive states that targets must be set on producer responsibility. Such targets could be, for example, the proportion that is recycled or incinerated, or quotas of recycled textiles in new products. If such targets are set without reasonable regard for available data, the demand for recycled materials, and the development and innovation of recycling technologies, there is a risk that the targets cannot be achieved.

⁷ Regulation (EU) 2025/40 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 December 2024 on packaging and packaging waste, amending Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 and Directive (EU) 2019/904 and repealing Directive 94/62/EC

⁸ Some plastic packaging is used to extend the shelf life of food products. Rules such as PPWR are said to mean that companies in some cases choose not to use such packaging. This, in turn, can lead to shorter shelf life dates for these products and thus increased food waste. Industries are highlighting cucumber as an example of how plastic packaging extends the shelf life of the product and thus helps reduce food waste.

Unrealistic goals risk hampering Swedish companies' competitiveness in the domestic market and the EU's internal market.

Risk that producer responsibility for textiles is introduced without the conditions for the development of infrastructure for the management of textile waste being in place

Sweden has a good capacity for sorting textiles based on classifications of textile fractions, but lacks established and expanded infrastructure for handling and decomposition of such textile fractions for recycling. Without such infrastructure, there is a risk that large quantities of textiles will be collected in Sweden without appropriate handling or exported to third countries that have the necessary infrastructure for textile recycling.

Building the infrastructure required to handle textile waste for recycling or reuse is expressed by companies as requiring large financial investments. This applies primarily to technical solutions for recycling, but also to more developed infrastructure for the actual collection of textile waste. In particular, the recycling industries point out that safety and security are required for investment in the development of infrastructure and technology so that recycling operators can maintain a sustainable business model.

There is uncertainty about the economic cost this will entail for the producer responsibility organisation(s) and their affiliated producers, which poses challenges for companies in planning their activities.

Risk of implementation taking place without secured resources for supervision and control

Extended producer responsibility requires that all companies that place textiles on the Swedish market are involved and contribute to the system for the desired effect. Supervision and control thus become an important part of ensuring the efficiency of the system and the equal conditions and conditions for companies. Failure to ensure that control and supervision is effective so that everyone, both domestic and global companies, complies with the regulations and pays fees, will increase the financial burden on those companies that comply with the rules and contribute to the system.

Ambiguities in responsibility and management of existing textile waste

The municipal responsibility for the separate collection of textile waste defined as municipal waste has meant that larger amounts of textile waste have been built up. The municipal textile waste has not been able to be handled through recycling and reuse, and thus stored in municipal recycling centers. The special nature of textile materials means that damage and the impact of storage make repair, reuse or recycling of the textile more difficult or impeded. Requirements for retroactive management within producer responsibility for such stored textiles would thus constitute a burdensome financial and administrative burden/challenge for the producer responsibility organisation(s) and the companies.

There is a requirement in the revised directive that there must be a professional sorting of the textile waste before transport or immediately after (at the sorting facility). However, it is still unclear who the professional assessors should be because there is no definition of this in the directive. The Recycling Industries, among others, express that this needs to be clarified.

New EU legal acts can simplify, but also lead to ambiguity for businesses

The European Commission has announced two additional proposals relating to producer responsibility. Concrete proposals are expected to be presented by the end of 2025 and in 2026. The proposals aim at simplification, digitalisation and harmonisation of producer responsibility rules, and are expected to target reporting procedures, producer agents and other measures to promote circularity.⁹

The Commission's initiatives to simplify and clarify producer responsibility are positive, but it poses challenges for industries and companies when new or changed rules are added during an implementation process. It is currently unclear whether, and to what extent, the implementation of the Waste Directive is affected by these new EU legal acts.

It is also important that the revisions of the Waste Directive are harmonised with other legislation for a successful implementation. For example, relevant

⁹ European Commission, *Ares(2025)6250342* (37 July 2025); European Commission, *Ares(2025)5953566* (22 July 2025).

industry organisations highlight that the final design of the Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (ESPR) and the Textile Delegated Act will be central. It includes requirements for product passports that are described as having the potential to streamline the handling chain.

Collaboration and harmonisation with the systems and solutions of other producer responsibility organisations, especially in the Nordic countries, are also highlighted as important in order to take advantage of synergy effects in the form of, for example, sharing and disseminating technical solutions between the countries.

7. Implementation Council's analysis

The revisions of the Directive show that there are possibilities for Member States to make certain exceptions (see separate annex for a more detailed account of these). The derogations provide, among other things, for the possibility for Member States to apply for an earlier reference year for the monitoring of the binding targets for food waste. It is also possible for Member States to exempt social enterprises, cooperatives, foundations and non-profit associations that have their own separate collection system from specific reporting requirements in cases where such reporting entails a disproportionate administrative burden.

7.1 Food waste analysis

Affected industries and companies

The objectives for reducing food waste cover the entire food chain, which also includes processes that take place after harvest. This means that companies in the production, processing and manufacturing, retail and distribution of food, restaurants and hotels, and food service services will be subject to the binding targets. In Sweden, there are about 39,000 active companies in hotels and restaurants and in food production about 600 companies.

The goals include both the business community and households and are a common goal that the business community together with households must achieve by 2030.

Consequences for Swedish companies

Expected administrative and other performance costs

In particular, the transition is described as entailing costs for those companies that have not previously worked to reduce their food waste and thus have not taken action. The companies describe that the transition may include, among other things, costs for increased waste collection and costs for ensuring sufficient space for handling waste that meets food requirements (e.g. flushable floors and temperature controls).

Impact on Swedish companies' competitiveness

If it is not taken into account that authorities in Sweden make a stricter assessment and measurement of the proportion of edible food waste than in the rest of the EU, there is a risk that the targets will become more burdensome and more difficult for companies in Sweden to live up to. This may affect pricing and competitiveness.

The competitiveness of Swedish companies may also be adversely affected if Sweden does not get approval on the application to use another reference year (further back in time) for the binding targets. If the proposed reference year in the EU directive is used, it will be more difficult for Swedish companies to achieve the targets, as the work already done in Sweden would then not be credited.

7.2 Textile waste analysis

Affected industries and companies

In the inquiry on producer responsibility for textiles (SOU 2020:72), it is estimated that approximately 7,400 Swedish companies are covered by the extended producer responsibility for textiles. In this calculation, companies with one or more employees have been included, which means that, for example, sole traders and other companies with zero registered employees have been excluded.

According to the Implementation Council's estimate, the revisions in the Waste Directive may affect up to approximately 45,900 Swedish companies. This calculation is based on the same selection of SNI codes that were used

in the previous investigation with a few additions¹⁰ and with the difference that companies with zero employees were also included¹¹. The Implementation Council's estimate includes all active companies for the following company forms: limited liability companies, simple companies, sole proprietorships, economic associations, trading and limited partnerships and other company forms.

Size Company	Number of companies	Share of enterprises
0 employees	32 555	70,9%
1-9 employees	11 954	26,0%
10-49 employees	943	2,1%
50-249 employees	222	0,5%
250-499 employees	35	0,1%
Over 500 employees	45	0,1%
Unregistered number of employees	158	0,3%
COMPLETELY	45 912	100%

The distribution of affected companies by size (number of employees) shows that about 99% of the company stock is micro and small enterprises with fewer than 50 employees. The majority are companies with zero employees or with 1–9 employees. This means that the revisions concerning textiles in the Directive will affect smaller companies in particular and should therefore be adapted to their more limited resources and capacities.

Since the SNI codes do not fully correspond to the CN codes¹² used to delimit the scope of producer responsibility, there is a certain overestimation

¹⁰ The additions of SNI codes consist of: Manufacture of leather (14,110), Manufacture of footwear (15,200) and specialised retail sale of footwear (47,721).

¹¹ Companies with zero employees make up about 71% (about 32,560 companies) of the total number of companies concerned.

¹² A CN code (Combined Nomenclature) is a commodity code system within the EU that is used to classify goods for the purposes of the customs tariff and trade within the EU and between the EU and other countries

of the number of companies that are actually affected. In accordance with the previous investigation, it is also assumed that there is an overestimation of the number of companies concerned based on the fact that all manufacturers, sellers and lessors of textiles have been counted as producers. This is despite the fact that producer responsibility according to the directive only covers one actor in the value chain. The operator covered by the Directive is the person who puts the product on the market for the first time. If, for example, a manufacturer or distributor has producer responsibility, the retailer does not also have it.

The companies covered by the Directive are mainly in the manufacturing industries (clothing, carpets, knitted fabrics, tablecloths, workwear, underwear, socks, handbags), wholesalers/wholesale (clothing, accessories, home furnishing goods), retail trade (clothing for children, women and men, accessories, home furnishing goods), market and market trade, mail order, distance and internet shopping, textile rental, and industrial and institutional laundry.¹³

Recycling companies that work with, among other things, the collection, processing and recycling of waste are of course also affected by the revisions in the Waste Directive, especially the parts relating to textile waste.

Consequences for Swedish companies

Expected administrative and other performance costs

The introduction will entail cost increases for the companies, partly in the form of fees to the producer responsibility organisation(s) (which will cover, among other things, start-up costs, ongoing personnel and premises costs, costs for purchased services and investments to ensure the collection system), and partly administrative costs in the form of working hours for reporting data/statistics on textile waste. The revisions in the directive also include that companies with fewer than ten employees and with an annual turnover and balance sheet of less than two million euros must have reduced reporting to producer responsibility organisation(s).

Companies will also need to devote administrative capacity to the classification of textile products and waste. This applies both to smaller

¹³ Includes companies in the laundry industry that put textiles on the market, such as companies that provide bed linen, towels, etc. to public entities such as hospitals and other healthcare facilities.

companies, where resources are more limited, and to larger companies that have operations in several countries and have to spend time investigating and adapting to the introduction and requirements of different Member States. Administrative costs can be less burdensome if clear guidance reducing potential scope for interpretation is in place well before the rules enter into force.

Furthermore, there is a need for investments and expansion of technical recycling infrastructure. Fiber-to-fiber recycling technology is only available on a small scale in Sweden. The development and expansion of recycling technology will require large financial investments, something that the industry expresses some concern about. It is currently uncertain how large the investment costs can be and the industries (producers and the recycling industry) express that they should not be solely responsible for these investments.

In the impact assessment carried out as part of the previous inquiry into producer responsibility for textiles, the total costs for Swedish companies selling textiles were estimated at SEK 1.3 million in one-off costs (an administrative cost for notification to the competent authority) and SEK 320.2 million in annual costs for ensuring the collection system, among other things. For the companies that work with the collection of textiles and have a permit for this, the total costs were estimated at SEK 720,000 in one-off costs for the permit process and SEK 296 million in annual costs for collection, handling, information, supervision fees and administration, among other things. It has been pointed out by the industry that the cost estimates for developing recycling are low in the investigation. The costs are ultimately expected to be passed on to consumers in the form of price increases.

Impact on Swedish companies' competitiveness

Risk of distortion of competition for companies in the event of a lack of supervision and control by the competent authority

When implementing producer responsibility for textiles, companies that comply with the rules may be disadvantaged if the supervision by the authorities is not also targeted at those actors who do not comply with the reporting requirements or pay fees to producer responsibility

organisation(s). Similar problems have been identified in the European Commission's evaluation of producer responsibility for electronics.¹⁴

Targets for producer responsibility for textiles must be set with regard to technology, infrastructure and available statistics

Articles 8 and 8a of the Waste Directive set out general provisions that extended producer responsibility must relate to, including that specific objectives must be set for extended producer responsibility.

Previously established producer responsibility for specific products has a concrete target of a certain number of percent of material waste to be used for recycling. Such recycling quotas can be problematic for producers from a Swedish competition perspective if they do not take into account available technology and information. In addition, there is currently a low demand for products that have higher quotas of recycled materials. Thus, the competitiveness of Swedish companies can be disadvantaged by objectives that are not anchored in the companies' terms and conditions, as well as access to the necessary infrastructure.

However, the recycling industries believe that quotas are necessary to create demand for recycled textiles, and describe that a buyer of the recycled material is required for greater investments in textile recycling to take place. They also highlight that quota obligations can be a way to stimulate the market and increase the supply of recycled textiles.

Investments in innovation and development of "down-cycling" (waste is recycled into products of lower quality and function than the original material) and fiber-to-fiber recycling will over time enable textile products to maintain high quality even with higher quotas of recycled textile material. Therefore, the objectives of producer responsibility need to be designed so that they take into account necessary technological developments.

8. Implementation Council recommendations

The Implementation Council's recommendations have been summarised in three sections: overall recommendations that apply to both textile and food

¹⁴ European Commission, *Final Report: Study Supporting the Evaluation of Directive 2012/19/EU on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE)* (Directorate-General for Environment, 2025)
https://environment.ec.europa.eu/publications/study-supporting-evaluation-directive-201219eu-weee_en

waste and recommendations that are specific to food waste and textiles, respectively.

8.1 Overall recommendations related to implementation

Make use of available exemptions and inform companies early about this

The Implementation Council recommends that the exemptions granted in the revised Waste Directive be used (see appendix) and that companies are informed of this at an early stage. The exemptions are intended to make it easier for certain actors and should therefore be used to avoid unnecessary administrative burden for the companies concerned.

Establish direct contact channels for companies to ask questions and get guidance in transition and reporting

Companies have a need for clear and accessible guidance and direct contact with the authorities for advice. This makes it easier for companies to understand how to comply with the requirements that are set. For example, it is mentioned that there is a need for guidance and support in reporting data and statistics correctly. It is also mentioned that it is important that companies receive consistent answers and guidance regardless of the administrator.

Furthermore, the Implementation Council recommends that predictability be created by the agency communicating its plan for implementation (timetable, key milestones, progression, etc.) and updating it gradually.

Ensure that competent authorities have the resources to supervise cheating and actors who avoid producer responsibility

The fact that competent authorities need to have the resources to carry out good supervision and follow-up of the objectives is something that is particularly highlighted based on concerns about actors who try to avoid producer responsibility or cheat. Supervision should focus on minimising cheating and detecting those actors who do not join producer responsibility organisation(s) and thus do not pay fees or register information on textile waste.

Ensure that the reporting systems of the competent authorities are developed, implemented and tested well in advance of the obligation to report data

Competent authorities must have had time to develop, implement and test the systems for reporting before the producer responsibility organisation(s)/companies need to report data. It is also important to provide information on how, when and what is to be reported well in advance of the producer responsibility organisation(s)/companies' reporting obligation arises.

Avoid overlap between legislations

There is an ongoing need to review how existing regulations interact with new and revised rules relating to waste and the environment. In textile waste, the Environmental Code, the Waste Ordinance and the Waste Transport Ordinance are mentioned, among other things. Overlapping legislation risks leading to ambiguity, additional work and increased administrative costs for companies.

8.2 Recommendations on food waste

Work to ensure that any differences in definitions and measurement methods for monitoring food waste do not lead to the objectives becoming more burdensome for companies in Sweden

Work to ensure that any differences in definitions and follow-up of the amount of edible and non-edible food waste do not lead to affected companies in Sweden having more burdensome objectives than other member states.

Let donations continue to be voluntary and simplify the donation system

There is a consensus and clear desire from the industries concerned that donations should continue to be voluntary, and that the directive should not be over-implemented in this regard. It is supported both by food companies and by donation recipient organizations. This is partly due to the fact that there is currently insufficient capacity among receiving organisations to handle and distribute the increased volumes that the introduction of requirements would entail.

However, it is pointed out that there is a need to simplify the donation system by allowing product alarms to replace delivery notes as

documentation for donations. Today's requirements for traceability are stated to be very time- and resource-intensive, and the above would entail administrative simplification while at the same time meeting the traceability requirements.

Use an earlier reference year if this is possible and to the benefit of companies and ensure that the statistics for food waste are correct

Apply to use an earlier reference year/reference year interval than the one proposed in the Directive (in 2021–2023) to measure progression if this is to the advantage of Swedish companies. An earlier base year could be more accurate, as Sweden has already come further than many other member countries in reducing food waste. The Swedish Grocery Trade Association would like to see the reference year 2015 used, in order to be able to credit the efforts that have been made to reduce food waste since then.

Ensure that there are accurate statistics on food waste from the hotel and restaurant industry, including commercial kitchens. The industries do not recognize themselves in the statistics presented in public reports on the amount of food waste and how it has changed over time. They feel that this is not in line with the development that has taken place in reducing food waste in recent years in the industries and that there are shortcomings and limitations in the statistics and measurement methods (random sampling and pick analyses) between the proportion of food waste that comes from households and companies.

Provide early information on how the food waste reduction targets will be followed up and adapt the actions of competent authorities to the sectors concerned

It is important to communicate to companies in a timely manner how the targets will be followed up. It is also crucial that the measures taken by competent authorities are adapted to the realities of the different sectors, in order to ensure that the measures are proportionate and to capture the share of household food waste.

In the follow-up of the goals and assessment of goal achievement, it is also necessary to take into account national volume increases in produced food, which also results in an increase in food waste.

Submission to the planned revision of the Waste Directive in 2027

If it is decided that primary production will also contribute to the binding targets for reduced food waste in the future, the targets and follow-up should be adapted based on the specific nature of primary production. This applies, for example, to sensitivity to weather influences and access to plant protection. The objectives should also be designed based on the challenges of producing reliable statistics on food losses.

8.3 Recommendations on textile waste

Give companies the opportunity to design their producer responsibility and their producer responsibility organisation(s)

It is crucial that the companies concerned are given the right to design their producer responsibility and establish producer responsibility organisation(s) based on clear objectives from the Government, which take into account, among other things, necessary technological developments. How the industries choose to design, for example, producer responsibility organisation(s), infrastructure and systems for handling textile waste as well as tariffs for fees should be up to the industry to choose, decide and adapt.

Giving companies control over how to achieve the goals makes it possible, among other things, for producer responsibility organisation(s) to decide that companies that, according to themselves, already have functioning models for circularity can maintain and build on these.

If targets for the proportion of recycled textile materials are introduced, these should be concretised on the basis of the current situation and gradually stepped up

. In the event that targets for the proportion of textiles that are recycled or incinerated, or quotas for recycled materials are set for companies, these should be designed on the basis of the current situation (e.g. opportunities to make use of textile waste and consumer demand for recycled materials). Then they can be gradually stepped up based on, among other things, the development of recycling technology and infrastructure takes place.

Promote funding for research and technological development of textile waste recycling

infrastructure Promote funding for further research and technology development in order to be able to utilise the increasing volumes of textile waste for recycling. At present, there is a lack of sufficiently developed and developed technology to make use of the textiles that are thrown away, including shoes.

Adapt the implementation based on the other upcoming proposals from the EU Commission

European Commission has announced two proposals that will affect the rules on producer responsibility, one regarding simplification of the administrative burden resulting from environmental legislation and a new Circular Economy Act, which is expected to come into force at the end of 2025 and during 2026. The introduction of the Waste Directive should take into account that these acts may also affect producer responsibility rules.

It is also important to harmonise the Waste Directive based on, for example, the final design and implementation of the ESPR and the Delegated Act for Textiles.

Do not introduce the legislation retroactively for the textiles that are already on the market

Let the producer responsibility apply to the textiles that come onto the market from the day the legislation enters into force and not retroactively. Otherwise, companies risk having to take responsibility and bear costs for managing the stocks of textiles that have been built up at the municipal recycling centers.

Contact persons in this case are Assistant Secretary Mikkel Seierup Bagge and Committee Secretary Veronica Götherström (förnamn.efternamn@regeringskansliet.se)

Decided by the Implementation Council on 22 September 2025.

This document has been machine translated from Swedish to English

9. Appendix 1. Explanation of the exceptions

The exceptions provided for in the Directive are set out below.

Food waste

- Article 9a, para. 5 allows Member States to apply for an earlier reference year than 2021, provided that the methodology of the statistics is comparable to the methodology established in Commission Delegated Decision (EU) 2019/1597.

Textile

- Article 22a, para. 2 allows Member States to establish a separate producer responsibility for mattresses that is in accordance with Articles 8 and 8a of the Waste Directive.
- Article 22a, para. Paragraph 9 allows Member States to decide whether producers, through producer responsibility organisation(s), should cover all or part of the cost of managing the textile waste added to the unsorted municipal waste collection.
- Article 22c para. 13 allows Member States to exempt social enterprises, cooperatives, foundations and non-profit associations that have their own separate collection system from specific reporting requirements in cases where such reporting imposes a disproportionate administrative burden.