

2.1.1 Is the term “natural polymer” clear and consistent?

Answer 1 Yes

2.1.2 Is the term “not chemically modified” clear and consistent, particularly in relation to natural polymers?

Answer 1 Yes

2.1.3 Is the term “main structural component” clear and consistent?

Answer 1 Yes

2.2.1 Is this term “products made from oxo-degradable plastic” clear and consistent?

Answer 1 Yes

2.3.1 Is the non-product specific definition in Article 3(2) and the explanation in recital 12 clear and consistent to differentiate between single and multiple use plastic products?

Answer 2 No

Response:

I do not agree with coated cartons, which are predominantly made up of wood fibre, being included in the definition of a single use plastic product and hence coming within the scope of the directive. Coated cartons are manufactured from 90% + fibre and are hence predominantly non-plastic; they are renewable and recyclable coming from sustainably managed forests, mostly certified by third party verified schemes. These cartons fit perfectly within the desire for a true circular economy.

2.4.1 Based on the definitions in the Directive and the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive, are there any problems to determine whether a product is both a single-use product and packaging at the same time, or is there a need to distinguish single-use non-packaging products and single-use packaging products?

Answer 2 Yes

Response:

The stated definitions prejudice against ‘single use’ packaging which is an integral part of how the product it contains is consumed versus simply packaging the product to the point of consumption. For example, a burger clam-shell carton both facilitates effective transport of the burger to the point of consumption and is usually an integral part of how the product is consumed safely, cleanly and hygienically ‘on the go’.

2.4.2 What are the implications and problems with potential overlaps between the two categories?

Response:

The Lex Specialis nature of this directive should not result in tariffs or bans, which result in consumers being unable to safely, cleanly and hygienically consume food or beverages from an item, within the scope of the directive, which acts as a means of both packaging AND consuming the product.

2.5.1 Please include any general, non-product-specific remarks on scope and definitions that you consider relevant in the context of the Directive.

Response:

Packaging products which are predominantly made out of sustainable and recyclable non-plastic materials should not be defined as 'Single Use Plastic' and hence included within the scope of the directive. I disagree with the term 'Single Use Plastic' in relation to a product such as a clam-shell carton which is predominantly not made from plastic.

3.1.1 Are the descriptions and terms of what constitutes a "food container" in the context of the Directive clear and consistent particularly in relation the criteria "intended for immediate consumption", "typically consumed from the receptacle" and "ready to be consumed without any further preparation"?

Answer 1 Yes

3.1.2 How should their "tendency to become litter" be taken into account when defining/limiting the scope of food containers?

Response:

Littering is an issue that effects all packaging types (single use – or not) and we support all efforts in educating consumers not to litter their packaging coupled with effective labelling advising how the packaging should be disposed of. This should be part of a wider programme to also include the widening of and improvements to the infrastructure for recycling.

3.1.3 Are the descriptions and terms clear and consistent in relation to the differentiation between "food containers" and "beverage containers"?

Answer 1 Yes

3.1.4 Are the descriptions and terms clear and consistent in relation to the differentiation between "food containers" and "wrappers and packets"?

Answer 1 Yes

3.1.5 Is this definition in Article 3(2) and the explanation in Recital 12 clear and consistent to differentiate between single and multiple use plastic food containers?

Answer 2 No

Response

Packaging products – such as clam-shell cartons - which are predominantly made out of sustainable and recyclable non-plastic materials should not be defined as 'Single Use Plastic' and hence included within the scope of the directive.

The directive should define the products I have highlighted above as 'single use' packaging

3.1.6 Does the fact that the product is both covered by the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive and the Directive result in confusion and/or uncertainty as regards the implementation?

Answer 2 Yes

Response:

The Packaging & Packaging Waste directive was instrumental in the growth in recycling rates for paper-based packaging. Eurostat stated in 2017 that the recycling rate for paper-based packaging was 84.8% - more paper-based packaging was recycled than all other packaging materials combined. The economic and environmental benefits of this growth are clear to see. Manufacturers of coated cartons are confused at the implementation of the SUP on a product sector which has demonstrated its alignment with the Circular Economy and been hugely successful in ensuring the valuable raw materials (wood fibre) used in the manufacture of the cartons are collected, recycled and used again...and again...and again...