

Brussels, 23 June 2026  
(OR. en, de, sk)

---

---

**Interinstitutional File:  
2023/0284 (COD)**

---

---

**10651/26  
ADD 1**

**CODEC 1207  
ENV 754  
ENT 156  
MI 653**

**'I/A' ITEM NOTE**

---

From: General Secretariat of the Council  
To: Permanent Representatives Committee/Council

---

Subject: Draft REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on circularity requirements for vehicle design and on management of end-of-life vehicles, amending Regulations (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2019/1020 and (EU) 2023/1542 and repealing Directives 2000/53/EC and 2005/64/EC **(first reading)**  
- Adoption of the legislative text  
= Statements

---

**Germany has requested that the following statement be entered in the Council minutes**

1. In Germany's view, the measures intended to combat the unknown whereabouts of vehicles set out in the political trilogue agreement relating to the Commission's proposal for a Regulation on circularity requirements for vehicle design and on management of end-of-life vehicles, amending Regulations (EU) 2018/858 and 2019/1020 and repealing Directives 2000/53/EC and 2005/64/EC are insufficient. The Federal Republic of Germany considers that the rules in question are not effective enough to reduce illegal dismantling or illegal export.

Germany therefore reaffirms the importance of the impact assessment on the unknown whereabouts of vehicles, as provided for in the Regulation, and the resulting measures, and requests that these take place at an earlier stage.

2. From Germany's perspective, the mirror clause contained in the political trilogue agreement is problematic from the point of view of trade policy, as it is a protectionist instrument creating barriers to trade. Germany does not therefore consider such a clause to be suitable for ensuring the necessary protection of the internal market. The inclusion of the mirror clause in the Regulation does not constitute a precedent for future legislation or free trade agreements.

For this reason, Germany calls for an immediate impact assessment of the mirror clause, including the impact in terms of trade policy and trade law, the impact on EU industry and third countries, and implementation issues.

Notwithstanding these concerns, Germany agrees with the political trilogue agreement in the spirit of an overall compromise.

**Estonia has requested that the following statement be entered in the Council minutes**

Estonia can support the final text of the end-of-life vehicles regulation (ELV). However, we would like to reiterate our concerns regarding extended producer responsibility (EPR) in the Article 22.

The text introduces additional cross-border obligations for manufacturers, which may create a risk of double payments where costs are covered through both national EPR schemes and the cross-border mechanism. We remain concerned, that this can lead to increased administrative burden, as manufacturers would be required to appoint authorised representatives in multiple Member States and demonstrate compliance through parallel arrangements.

Estonia would have preferred a solution more closely aligned with already established EPR principles, as reflected in the Council's General Approach. Such an approach would have better safeguarded against double payments, reduced administrative burden and maintained a clearer link between producer responsibility and the placing of vehicles on the market.

While we support the overall text, we still highlight that the implementation of Article 22 may pose significant practical challenges for Member States, manufacturers and producers.

**Slovakia has requested that the following statement be entered in the Council minutes**

Slovakia welcomes this regulation, which we consider to be an important step towards strengthening the circular economy and establishing a comprehensive legal framework for the whole life cycle of vehicles.

Nevertheless, we would like to draw attention to certain points that, in our view, would require further discussion. We are particularly concerned about the possible negative impacts of the newly introduced obligations and definitions, which could result in an increase in administrative burden and costs for economic operators.

In particular Slovakia would like to highlight Article 22 on the cross-border cost allocation mechanism for end-of-life vehicles. In our view, this mechanism needs to be clarified further in order to ensure equal treatment and effective implementation across the EU, in particular as regards the movement of vehicles between Member States.

In this context, we would stress that the effective functioning of this mechanism is closely linked to the broader regulatory framework governing registration, de-registration and cross-border transfers of vehicles. The cross-border aspect of the management of end-of-life vehicles cannot be addressed in isolation and requires harmonisation with other relevant transport legislation. In particular, we consider it essential to ensure the smooth sharing of information and access to vehicle databases in Member States, including registration records and data on de-registration. Therefore, we would ask the Commission to assess whether further action at EU level is needed, including possible amendments to support the practical functioning of Article 22 or practical guidelines to assist Member States and economic operators in implementing this mechanism consistently and in a uniform manner.