



ADVANCED RECHARGEABLE & LITHIUM BATTERIES ASSOCIATION

RECHARGE recommendations for the Simplification of administrative burden in environmental legislation Call for Evidence

September 2025

RECHARGE, representing the European battery industry and the entire European batteries ecosystem, welcomes the European Commission's implementation of simplification needs established in the Competitiveness Compass. The Compass's set targets of cutting administrative burden by at least 25% for all companies and at least 35% for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are highly relevant for an industry weathering fierce international competitive while developing a homegrown value chain.

The Commission's screening of environmental laws to identify legislative acts with significant potential for simplifying administrative tasks is highly welcomed by the batteries industry which is heavily regulated and some case "double-regulated" (e.g: on due diligence and chemicals management). RECHARGE agrees with the overall principle to reduce the administrative burden without affecting the environmental objectives agreed.

The overall objective of our recommendations is to attain more efficiency, targeting avoidable unnecessary administrative costs to our businesses. **We strongly encourage the Commission to include the EU Batteries Regulation (EUBR) as part of the Simplification initiative with regards to environmental legislation.**

Waste Framework Directive

SCIP database

While the SCIP database is well-intentioned, it currently imposes a disproportionately high bureaucratic burden on companies relative to its actual benefits. In the current economic climate, businesses urgently require genuine relief from excessive administrative demands.

- **Challenge:** The reporting requirements for the SCIP database demand significant time, resources, and expertise from companies to identify, collect, and submit information on Substances of Very High Concern (SVHCs) in their products. This effort often outweighs the tangible value derived from the database, particularly when considering the broader context of impending digital initiatives. This translates into considerable operational costs and administrative strain, especially for SMEs, without a clear, commensurate return in terms of enhanced circularity or material transparency benefits.
 - **Recommendation:** Given the imbalance between effort and benefit, we recommend that the ECHA SCIP database be discontinued. This would provide immediate and necessary relief to companies, allowing them to redirect resources more effectively.

Batteries Regulation (EU) 2023/1542

We encourage the European Commission to include the EUBR as part of the Simplification initiative with regards to environmental legislation and adopt changes in the following parts of the Regulation. Please note that this is not an exhaustive list; RECHARGE can provide further details as and when required, or provide further background information on the below points.

1) Article 6 Substances of Concern

- **Challenge:** Battery manufacturers must currently declare and notify the presence of SVHCs under REACH Article 33, and separately disclose certain hazardous substances under the labelling requirements in Article 13 of the Batteries Regulation. In addition, under Article 6 of the Batteries Regulation, ECHA is required to prepare a report on substances of concern. The Commission will submit this report to the European Parliament and the Council and may consider appropriate follow-up measures, including the adoption of delegated acts. These measures could potentially introduce further declaration or notification obligations for substances used in batteries.
 - **Recommendation:** Introduce a streamlined and efficient method for declaration and notification to avoid duplication. Currently, Article 6 of the Batteries Regulation includes substances of concern during the waste stage. However, there is an opportunity for the REACH Revision to also cover the waste stage and therefore Article 6 of the EUBR is no longer required.

2) Article 7 Carbon Footprint of electric vehicle batteries, rechargeable industrial batteries and LMT batteries & the subsequent draft delegated acts

- **Challenge:** RECHARGE welcomes that the Commission will soon present the Delegated Act on the Carbon Footprint (CF) methodology for EV batteries and thereby provide clarity on the calculation. This [Delegated Act](#) will provide a critical framework for the carbon footprint methodology for EV batteries in order to obtain the Carbon Footprint Declaration (CFD). Whilst the draft Delegated Act (DDA) clarifies much of the process, the responsibility of selecting Notified Bodies (NBs) requires further clarification.
 - **Recommendation:** The verification and validation of company-specific data by Notified Bodies are vital components of the CFD. To avoid inefficiencies, duplicative efforts, and potential incoherencies, RECHARGE proposes best practice guidelines to ensure a clear, consistent, and resource-efficient process across the battery value chain. This RECHARGE recommendations paper can be found [here](#).
- **Challenge:** Align basic methodological requirements. The CSRD, ESRS and EUBR are inconsistent on methodologies such as on electricity accounting
 - **Recommendation:** Introduce methodologies across policies which are consistent and not contradictory.
- **Challenge:** Unclear to ascertain if primary or secondary data is required for some processes.
 - **Recommendation:** Provide clear guidance on which processes require primary data and which require secondary data.

3) Digital-First Approach for Information Requirements

To reduce paper waste and administrative burdens, we advocate for a comprehensive "digital-first" approach for all reporting and information requirements within the Batteries Regulation.

- **Challenges:** The current regulation mandates various reporting and information requirements, including technical documentation and labelling, that often necessitate physical delivery (e.g., paper documents accompanying shipments or physical labels on packaging). This approach is incongruous given the concurrent requirements for digital labels and Product Passports.
 - **Recommendation:**
 - We request the Commission clarify that phrases such as "accompanied by" are fulfilled when documentation is provided in a readily accessible digital format.
 - We propose allowing battery labelling information to be provided via QR codes on the battery itself, especially, but not only, in cases of limited physical space. This would streamline information dissemination and align with the digital shift already underway.

4) Streamlining Data Points in the Battery Passport

The data points specified in Annex XIII for the Battery Passport currently present significant challenges due to inconsistencies, inaccuracies, overlaps, and a lack of relevance for all battery types – especially when it comes to the more burden-some dynamic data sets.

- **Challenges:** This leads to considerable interpretative burdens for companies and incurs unnecessary costs without providing tangible benefits to manufacturers or end-users.
- **Examples of Inconsistencies:**
 - Annex XIII, point 1(a) requests the "information specified in Part A of Annex VI," yet subsequent point (b) redundantly spells out specific information already covered in Part A of Annex VI.
 - Point (f) requests the "share of renewable content," an information point that is neither requested nor clearly defined elsewhere in the Regulation.
- **Recommendation:** We urge the Commission to conduct a thorough review of Annex XIII to rationalize and refine the required data points, ensuring they are clear, non-redundant, and genuinely add value. We are prepared to provide a comprehensive list of specific examples upon request.

Furthermore, reporting requirements under Annex XIII, Section 4 are excessive, vague, not fit for purpose, overlap with other regulations, and are costly to implement.

5) Critical Concerns Regarding Unsafe Design Requirements (Article 11(5))

We remain gravely concerned by Article 11(5) of the Batteries Regulation, which mandates unrestricted replacement of individual cells in Light Means of Transport (LMT) battery packs. The Commission's January 2025 Guideline has unfortunately not adequately addressed this critical flaw. This provision fundamentally undermines battery safety, a core principle for our members and a cornerstone of EU consumer protection.

We remain concerned for the following reasons:

- **Challenges:**
 - **Compromised Safety & Design Integrity:**

1. High-quality lithium-ion battery packs, especially those used in e-bikes and other LMTs, are complex, finely tuned systems designed for reliability in varying weather conditions and to withstand vibrations.
 2. These packs are classified as dangerous goods (Class 9) and undergo rigorous safety testing and certification. Features like intricate seals, robust Battery Management Systems (BMS), and cell isolation are crucial to prevent thermal runaway – a severe risk of explosion and fire.
 3. Allowing actors other than the original manufacturer to break these seals for individual cell replacement irrevocably compromises the pack's integrity. This significantly increases the risk of short-circuits and thermal events, directly contradicting state-of-the-art safety practices.
- **Limited Benefit, High Risk:**
 1. Replacing individual cells often leads to a "State of Health" mismatch within the battery pack, resulting in rapid degradation, overcharging, deep discharge, and ultimately, premature pack failure or even thermal runaway.
 2. Battery experts universally agree that this offers negligible lifespan extension (a few charge cycles at best) compared to the severe safety risks and the destruction of the pack's sophisticated original design.
 - **Undermining EU Leadership & Innovation:**
 1. European battery manufacturers are global leaders in developing and implementing high safety standards, which are widely adopted internationally.
 2. Article 11(5) would force a significant regression in these established standards, jeopardizing the industry's hard-won reputation and technological advancements. Battery pack designs that enable individual cell replacement would neither be state-of-the-art nor result in products as safe as those currently available in Europe.

These concerns are supported by an independent study, "Personal Light Electric Vehicle (PLEV) Battery Safety Research," published by the UK Office of Product Safety & Standards.

- **Recommendation:** We strongly urge the Commission to reconsider and **delete the half-sentence in Article 11(5) that specifically requires individual cell replacement**. This amendment is essential to align the regulation with current safety standards and prevent avoidable risks to consumers.

6) **Harmonisation of Due Diligence Requirements**

To minimize administrative burdens and ensure consistency across EU legislation, the due diligence requirements within the Batteries Regulation should be harmonized with the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD).

- **Challenge:** The Batteries Regulation imposes a separate reporting obligation for companies regarding due diligence along the battery value chain. This creates redundancy for companies already mandated to publish a CSRD report.
 - **Recommendation:** To reduce the burden on companies, the reporting requirements of the Batteries Regulation should be considered fulfilled if covered within a company's CSRD report. This is contingent on the CSRD report comprehensively addressing all materials and risk categories from Annex X of the Batteries Regulation.

Crucially, CSRD reports are already subject to third-party auditing, aligning with the auditing requirements of the Batteries Regulation.

- **Challenge:** The Batteries Regulation's due diligence obligations are not following the same wording and therefore logic and approach of the CS3D.
 - **Recommendation:** The batteries due diligence should be harmonised with the CS3D. This includes adopting a **risk-based approach** that allows for the **prioritization of risks**, similar to the CSDDD. Specifically, the severity and probability of an adverse impact should be the primary factors used to prioritize risks. Furthermore, mirroring the CSDDD, the Batteries Regulation should explicitly allow for due diligence obligations to be carried out at the **group level**, rather than solely at the individual company level.

Other simplification recommendations:

- **Introduction of a “Repair as produced” principle:** Alignment should be sought between the EUBR and other requirements, such as the EU’s 2022 Blue Guide and Type Approval requirements. Manufacturers should be able to repair existing batteries or replace them with newly produced spare batteries without having to incur additional conformity requirements, which were not in force at the time the battery was placed in the market.
- **Range of disclosure obligations:** The EUBR stipulates, under Art. 52, a range of disclosure obligations that can be, but have not yet been harmonized with the CSRD framework.
- **Acceptance of English as easily understood language:** Since the labelling information under EUBR shall be written “in a language or languages which can be easily understood by end-users in the Member State in which the battery is placed on the market or put into service”, but that each Member State is free to define the languages which are “easily understood”, the information be duplicated in every national language in the EU. This leads to added bureaucracy e.g., due to translation and design of the labels, with minimal environmental or customer safety benefits. We therefore call on English being recognized as “easily understood language”.
- **On the Recycled Content obligation and targets:** If the rules to calculate the recycled content does not take into account the market realities and the established practices in Europe, the recycled content provision risks to put the entire European battery value chain under further immense pressure and favour sourcing of materials, components and batteries from outside Europe. Calculation of Recycled Content targets for batteries should indirectly support developing the strategic value chain in Europe, and not favour sourcing from outside the EU: Calculation rules should minimize the negative impacts of this target by including incentives for producers and EU battery manufacturers to recycle their waste batteries and production waste in Europe. The review of the Article 8 can also be anticipated (under Art. 8.5 planned for 2028 only) – to further take into account market developments and availability of waste material in Europe.
- **On Member States Reporting waste collection & treatment:** We had identified as the main issue that the recyclers do not have the information where the battery was placed on the market initially, and the reporting format for MS should not impose on recyclers to source such data which would be a significant administrative burden and cost. Batteries incorporated in vehicles or appliances are one of the most common products to be sold within

different countries across the EU, including non-EU countries, which may lead to impossibility to track those that were once introduced in an EU Member State. Clarification is therefore needed with regards to the scope of waste traceability and collection, where we urge for a realistic approach.

- **Producers according to the EU Batteries Regulation face administrative challenges regarding the non-harmonized implementation of the EU Batteries Regulation CHAPTER VIII (Management of waste batteries):** The EUBR defines the extended producer responsibility minimum requirements on collection and recycling targets, distributor take-back and second life. Member States should be required to define the extended producer responsibility provided for in the EUBR, in accordance with the Waste Framework Directive and national law transposing that Directive. In addition, where the EUBR does not provide for full harmonisation in Chapter VIII, Member States should be able to provide for additional measures on those specific topics. This non-harmonised implementation of the Chapter VIII of the EUBR creates complex EPR implementation at MS-level. ‘Producers’ as defined in the EUBR need to approve their take-back systems and/or join/appoint an extended producer responsibility organization – all in accordance with the specific national legislation implementing the Chapter VIII of the EUBR which varies across 27 Member States.



ABOUT RECHARGE

RECHARGE is the European industry association for advanced rechargeable and lithium batteries. Founded in 1998, it is our mission to promote advanced rechargeable batteries as a key technology that will contribute to a more empowered, sustainable and circular economy. RECHARGE's unique membership covers all aspects of the advanced rechargeable battery value chain in Europe: from suppliers of primary and secondary raw materials, to battery, equipment and original equipment manufacturers (OEMs), to logistic partners and battery recyclers. www.rechargebatteries.org

Contact: Kinga Timaru-Kast, Director, Public Affairs & Communications, ktimaru-Kast@rechargebatteries.org

EU Transparency Reg. 673674011803-02