



Q&A from Webinar for Distance Sellers on 3 December 2025

Can you confirm that regulation acts now are used as regulatory tool since directives are not implemented in MS as efficient as intended?

It is too early to say that the regulation is more effective. The packaging regulation has not yet entered into force, and the EPR part of the battery regulation entered into force in August 2025. And WFD is directive.

The current definition of “producer” is often unclear and open to interpretation. The term must be capable of being defined unambiguously so that producers can be clearly identified in every Member State and situation. Due to ambiguities, national authorities in different Member States have already interpreted the definition inconsistently. For instance, interpretations vary as to when a product is deemed to be made directly available to the end-user. If definitions are interpreted differently across Member States, this creates unnecessary reporting challenges as well as administrative and financial burdens for companies operating in several Member States. PROPOSAL: In order to ensure the smooth functioning of the EU internal market, the definition of “producer” must be consistent across all Member States. In addition, producers must be given sufficient time to prepare for the change.

We agree. We have brought out in CEA consultations and meetings that EPR needs more harmonization at EU level to be effective as most of the companies are operating in several MS markets. It is important to ensure same definitions across different EPR legislation such as definitions of producer or placing on the market etc.

Very keen to understand, what steps/approaches are being considered to transition EPR systems from a pure waste management strategy towards a more circular economy.

The EPR system also implements the modulated fees that makes products that are easier to recycle cheaper to bring on the market. This provides an incentive to increase the proportion of recycling in the waste stream. In addition, recycling targets are set that hold producers accountable for ensuring that a greater proportion of waste is recycled.

Does/Will Amazon work as an AR?

Unfortunately, that is not possible. The current regulation only allows 1 AR per product stream. Most Sellers sell on many different platforms and AMZ cannot

take liability for products that are being sold on other platforms. AMZ being an AR for products not sold on their platform would also carry legal competition issues.

Can one ask the national authorities to streamline their regulation - at least within product groups that are closely connected, like electronics, batteries and packaging? In Denmark there are various rules for obligation to have an AR from EU and non-EU between electronics and batteries and their packaging. Makes no sense...

The different producer responsibilities are tied to different EU regulations, which sometimes have different requirements for EPR. Both at EU and national level, work is being done towards more harmonized requirements.

No legal requirement to join a PRO if the producer manages their own products lifecycle? How could this possibly be monitored. Surely to reduce administrative burden, there should be Nordic-Baltic PRO's. What is the interpretation in each country about who can set up a PRO?

In Denmark there are different requirements regarding whether you have to be registered with a PRO, and what the requirements are for setting up a PRO, depending on which product group we are talking about. For packaging, it is a requirement that all producers must be members of a PRO.

In Finland, to fulfil EPR obligations, the producer needs to join a producer responsibility organization. There are some PROs that work in the area cross-border. You can ask the PROs of your product group and country for more information.

In Estonia, right now to fulfil certain EPR obligations (EEE, batteries, tires) the producer needs to join a producer responsibility organization. With packaging it's also reasonable to join with PRO.

But only producers can set up a PRO in Finland, which means other stakeholders have no say even though they are the major enablers involved in providing the recycling. This crates lack of balance.

We're looking to be compliant but not sure about the regulation. What is the first step to take (register somewhere, contact an agency,...?)

In Denmark the first step would be to register as a producer at producentansvar.dk (Dansk Producentansvar). They can also help you determine if you are covered by producer responsibility in Denmark if you are in doubt.

In Finland, to fulfil EPR obligations, the producer needs to join a producer responsibility organization. Once the producer has joined a PRO, it doesn't need to join the register separately. You can find more information on how to take care of EPR in Finland here: www.producerresponsibility.fi

Also in Norway the producer needs to join a PRO to fulfill EPR-obligations. You can find more information on our website here: [Extended Producer Responsibility in Norway - Norwegian Environment Agency](#)
Estonia information is here: [Extended Producer Responsibility | Ministry of Climate](#), Fulfilling EPR depends on the product. You are welcome to email and ask.

Do you offer a list of where an AR is required?

On the EU level, an Authorized Representative is mandatory for all distance sellers of batteries. EU-based distance sellers of electrical and electronic equipment, single-use plastics and fishing gear containing plastic are also obliged to appoint an Authorized Representative. An Authorized Representative will also be required for packaging from August 2026 onwards. There may also be national additional requirements!

In Estonia we don't have a list. In Estonia AR can also be a PRO.

Pease specify when an AR is obligated from EU and non-EU countries by each producer responsibility product group. e.g., in Denmark.

On the EU level, an Authorized Representative is mandatory for all distance sellers of batteries. EU-based distance sellers of electrical and electronic equipment, single-use plastics and fishing gear containing plastic are also obliged to appoint an Authorized Representative. An Authorized Representative will also be required for packaging from August 2026 onwards. There may also be national additional requirements!

In Estonia, AR is mandatory for a producer that is not established in Estonia.

From a collaboration perspective, is there any ongoing discussion about allowing marketplaces to act as facilitators on a voluntary basis to fulfil certain EPR-related administrative steps on behalf of distance sellers? This type of model could help ensure smoother participation in compliance schemes, especially for cross-border SMEs.

In Estonia, we have set that online platform have the right to register as a producer and fulfill extended producer responsibility obligations on behalf of its traders.

In Finland this is possible, this is in our Waste Act section 66 a: "An operator of an online trading platform may appoint its authorized representative established in Finland to be responsible for the producer responsibility obligations in Finland of a distance seller operating on its platform or enter into an agreement for an equivalent purpose with an accepted producer responsibility organization. The online trading platform operator shall have a written authorization issued for this by the distance seller operating on its platform."

Are there talk of a collective EU EPR scheme much like the OSS?

With the implementation of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation, there will be more harmonized requirements for EPR across the EU. However, it will still be largely up to individual EU countries to implement their own national system.

It is a good idea; we can bring it up on CEA regulation discussions.

It great with a harmonized system, but VAT is also up to each country, so is there really no talk about making it possible to register, report and pay for EPR only one place?

In Estonia, we see the need to explore whether it would be feasible to set up EU wide EPR registry or alternatively registry that is interfaced with Member States registries.

We are selling to distributors in Nordics and Baltics. They are selling to end consumer. Will they be the EPR responsible and not us?

In Denmark, the responsibility will be on the first company to bring the packaging on the market in Denmark.

In general, the distance seller is responsible when the product is sold to the end user. If the product is sold to a distributor who sells the products to end user, the distributor is considered to be the importer (when it comes to EPR).

In Estonia, producer is the one who places the product on the market. It depends. Producer is also the one who sells the product threw distance communication directly to private households or to users other than private households.

Do you have any idea about Doble-Taxing of Tyre utilization in Latvia? If I buy tyres in Latvia - price include Utilization tax (Dabas Resursu Nodoklis). If I buy tyres outside Latvia - I pay Utilization tax (Dabas Resursu Nodoklis) to Zaļā Jost or Zaļais Punkts authorities. But when i want to get rid of old tyres - all services or waste collection locations would ask 10-15 EUR from me again "for utilization". This is a crazy double taxing practice. Where is the problem? Latvian Environment Ministry is distributing collected tax incorrectly? or companies like Zaļā Jost or Zaļais Punkts are spending too much money collect in the unnecessary envirnment non-related directions? or simply Utilization tax in latvia not big enough?

In which countries may the platform take over the customer duties?

In Latvia Natural Resources Tax (Dabas resursu nodoklis) is applied only in cases where the producer does not participate in extended producer responsibility scheme, e.g., does not have a contract with a Producer responsibility organization (PRO). This excludes possibility of double taxing, as it is up to the company to choose between two options - paying the Tax or having a contract with a PRO and thus receiving and exemption from the payment of Tax. Pros have specific requirements and responsibilities they have to meet, set out in the legislation, which for tires specifically can be found here -

<https://likumi.lv/ta/id/320622-kartiba-kada-atbrivo-no-dabas-resursu-nodokla-samaksas-par-videi-kaitigam-precem>. When getting rid of old tires as a company You may pay utilization price, which is not a tax, but a price for a service. Please note that from the legislation, in regards of PRO, currently only a responsibility to ensure the acceptance of environmentally harmful **household** waste is set.