

**Question for written answer E-003747/2025
to the Commission**

Rule 144

Charlie Weimers (ECR), Beatrice Timgren (ECR), Dick Erixon (ECR)

Subject: Technical and operational concerns with the deforestation-linked import ban and its postponement

The Commission's decision to postpone the deforestation-linked import ban for the second time, citing technical challenges with the registration system, reveals serious gaps in the regulation's operational feasibility¹.

Industry representatives and various Member States, including Sweden, have highlighted the practical issues with the law's implementation, particularly the complexity of tracking and verifying the origin of commodities.

Nordic forest stakeholders, who operate under one of the most rigorous and transparent sustainability models globally, have expressed concern that the law fails to account for the high level of traceability and certification already in place within the Swedish forestry sector. The current system, based on European satellite data and geolocation requirements, is both inefficient and unworkable for many low-risk suppliers, especially in countries with less infrastructure and expertise.

The Commission's current reliance on a flawed registration system and its inability to address these technical shortcomings suggest that the regulation in its present form is fundamentally unfit for purpose.

1. Given the overwhelming evidence of technical and operational flaws in the current regulatory framework, why has the Commission not proposed a full repeal of the deforestation regulation, or at least a comprehensive rework of the system to address its inefficiencies?
2. Will the Commission consider introducing a differentiated approach that accounts for existing traceability systems in low-risk countries like Sweden, and reduce unnecessary burdens for operators?

Submitted: 26.9.2025

¹ EU delays ban on imports linked to deforestation for second time: <https://www.ft.com/content/ab4053ec-0a90-46da-a291-31f1c455663e>.