

PET Flake Injection

Novel Technology Development

Data Monitoring Report

report required by Article 13 of Regulation (EU) 2022/1616

10 April 2026 – updated 18 August 2026

The data presented in this report are based on the measurements performed by a third-party laboratory, which was contracted by PET EUROPE. The data provided is the property of PET EUROPE and cannot be copied, reproduced, or distributed without their prior written consent. PET EUROPE is not responsible nor liable for any errors or inaccuracies that may have occurred during the measurement process by the third-party laboratory. The data are provided for informational purposes only and do not constitute any endorsement or recommendation by PET EUROPE.

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
a) Brief description of the novel technology – Art 13(5)(a)	3
b) Summary of the reasoning on the capability of the novel technology and the recycling process(es) to manufacture recycled plastic materials and articles that meet the requirements of Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 and that are microbiologically safe – Art 13(5)(b)	4
Flake To Resin (FTR)	4
Reversed Approach.....	4
Artenius.....	5
US FDA Guidance.....	5
c) List a list of all substances with a molecular weight below 1000 Dalton found in the plastic inputs and recycled plastic output and 20 first detected incidental contaminants – Art 13(5)(c)	6
d) List of contaminating materials regularly present in the plastic input - Art 13(5)(d)	8
e) Analysis of the most likely origin of the identified contaminants referred to in points (c) and (d) - Art 13(5)(e)	9
f) Measurement or estimation of the migration levels to food of contaminants present in the recycled plastic materials and articles - Art 13(5)(f)	10
g) Description of the applied sampling strategy - Art 13(5)(g)	12
h) Description of the analytical procedures and methods used - Art 13(5)(h)	13
i) Analysis and explanation of any discrepancies observed between contaminant levels expected and decontamination efficiency - Art 13(5)(i).....	15
j) a discussion of the differences with previous reports published in accordance with this paragraph, if any - Art 13(5)(j)	22
Appendix I –.FLAKE INJECTION – PET Production Process	23
Appendix II – List of all substances with a molecular weight below 1.000 Dalton found in the plastic inputs to each of the decontamination installations and in the recycled plastic output thereof, sorted in descending order by their relative occurrence	24
Glossary of Terms.....	26
REFERENCES	27

Introduction

The novel technology 'PET Flake Injection' was notified as required under Articles 10(2) and 10(3) of Commission Regulation (EU) 2022/1616 on 17th March 2023.

Article 13 of Commission Regulation (EU) 2022/1616 states the following:

“a recycler operating a decontamination installation in accordance with Article 11 of the regulation shall monitor the average contaminant level on the basis of a robust sampling strategy which samples the plastic input batches and the corresponding plastic output batches”.

On 10 October 2023, 10 April 2024, 10 October 2024, 10 April 2025 and 10 October 2025 five reports discussing the monitoring data and the information as required by Article 13(5) have been published. The enclosed report is based on the latest information from all installations using the novel technology received in accordance with Article 13(3) for the sixth monitoring period and provides the information required by Article 13(5) of the Regulation.

The different subsections (a) to (j) of Article 13(5) are discussed separately.

a) Brief description of the novel technology – Art 13(5)(a)

The Flake Injection process has the capability to combine depolymerised recycled Polyethylene Terephthalate (rPET) with virgin material at different stages of a conventional PET production process for subsequent food contact use.

The input material of the Flake Injection process is previously processed PET as detailed in Table 2 of ANNEX I of COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) 2022/1616 that is deliberately depolymerized (pre-processed) before it enters the high surface area decontamination polymerisation reactor. Referring to the flow scheme [Appendix I: Flake Injection – PET Production Process](#); previously processed PET may be introduced directly to injection point 1 or partially depolymerised with ethylene glycol, in either a stir-tank reactor or an extruder, to a defined degree of polymerisation to correspond with that of the polymer in the PET production process at the injection points labelled 2 to 6 in the flow scheme *or any points in-between*. This initial depolymerisation process of the previously processed PET allows for filtration of the intermediate polymer to remove solid contaminants before the introduction of the recycled material into a PET production process at a blend rate of up to 100% recycled content. The high surface area decontamination polymerisation technology increases the Intrinsic Viscosity (IV) of the PET polymer and removes polymerisation by-products under high vacuum of less than 20mbar, with a high temperature greater than 260°C and with a residence time greater than 30 minutes. This high surface area polymerisation technology also serves as a Decontamination Technology to efficiently remove vapourised contaminants that may have been introduced into the process further upstream by the addition of previously processed PET. Following the high surface area polymerisation and decontamination, the polymer melt is filtered for either direct use, or granulation, in the manufacture of food contact materials or articles or for introduction into a Solid State Polycondensation (SSP) process or a Conditioning Silo should further processing be needed to meet the material parameters required for its end use.

- b) Summary of the reasoning on the capability of the novel technology and the recycling process(es) to manufacture recycled plastic materials and articles that meet the requirements of Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 and that are microbiologically safe – Art 13(5)(b)

All references in this section are references to documents available in the dossier submitted in accordance to Articles 10(2) and 10(3) of Commission Regulation (EU) 2022/1616 on 17th March 2023.

Flake To Resin (FTR)

Ref. ANNEX II Table 1 (1) Decontamination efficiencies of the Novel Technology have been determined by Welle (2008).

Table VI. Concentrations (determined using the HFIP extraction method) of the surrogates in the investigated PET samples of Trial 2 (cocktail A at 10 ml min⁻¹, 50% PCR flakes).

	Toluene	Chloroform	Chlorobenzene	Concentration (ppm) Phenyl cyclohexane	Methyl salicylate	Benzophenone	Lindane
Calculated contamination concentration	3295	5194	1255	327	1004	885	775
Before deep-cleansing	1999 ± 28	3075 ± 47	655 ± 9	163 ± 2	<1.0	345 ± 1	133 ± 1
After deep-cleansing (final product)	<2.7	<0.8	<0.9	<0.2	<1.0	<0.2	<0.8

The study concludes that the cleaning efficiencies for the applied surrogates are above or far above 99.9%. The high cleaning efficiencies are due to the high diffusion rates of compounds in the molten PET.

Based on EFSA's criteria for safety evaluation of PET recycling processes - if a recycling process is able to reduce an input reference contamination of 3 mg/kg PET to a Cres (Residual Concentration) not higher than a Cmod (Modelled Concentration) corresponding to the relevant migration criterion, the potential dietary exposure cannot be higher than 0.0025 µg/kg bw/day and recycled PET manufactured with such recycling process is not considered of safety concern.

Ref. ANNEX II Table 1 (2) [Fraunhofer Dossier-FTR 20061109.pdf](#)

Reversed Approach

Based on Safety Evaluation of Polyethylene Terephthalate Chemical Re-cycling Processes. Frank Welle. 'Reversed Approach'.

Ref. ANNEX II Table 1 (3) [Chemical recycling submitted.pdf](#)

FTR: Calculated maximum concentration (Reference Contamination – the level of contamination that the process can remove, i.e. Cmod:Cres =1) corresponding to a migration of 0.1 µg/l after storage for 365 d at 25 °C (EU cube, AP = 3.1, tau 1577 K, bottle wall thickness 200 µm, density of PET 1.4 g/cm³). Decontamination Efficiency of 99.9%.

mm Hg (25°C)	°C	g.mol ⁻¹	FTR	Reference Contamination	Decontamination Efficiency	Cres	Cmod	
Vapour Pressure	BP	Mw	Surrogate	mg/kg	%	mg/kg	mg/kg	Cmod:Cres
28.4	110.6	92.1	Toluene	90	99.9%	0.09	0.09	1.0
197	61.1	119.4	Chloroform	100	99.9%	0.10	0.10	1.0
12	131.7	112.6	Chlorobenzene	90	99.9%	0.09	0.09	1.0
0.0343	222.9	152.2	Methyl Salicylate	130	99.9%	0.13	0.13	1.0
0.04	240.1	160.3	Phenyl Cyclohexane	140	99.9%	0.14	0.14	1.0
0.00193	305.4	182.2	Benzophenone	160	99.9%	0.16	0.16	1.0
9.40E-06	311.0	290.8	Lindane	310	99.9%	0.31	0.31	1.0

Artenius.

EFSA-Q-2011-00969 - EFSA refused to evaluate as out of the scope of Regulation (EC) 282/2008.

Ref. ANNEX II Table 1 (7) [EFSA Letter Related to Artenius Unique Process.pdf](#)

Ref. ANNEX II Table 1 (8) [Fraunhofer Institute. Challenge Test.pdf](#)

US FDA Guidance

Use of Recycled Plastics in Food Packaging (Chemistry Considerations): Guidance for Industry.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition July 2021

VIII. Elimination of Data Recommendations for 3° Recycling Processes for PET and PEN

Based on a comprehensive review of all surrogate testing data submitted over the past decade for 3° recycling processes for PET and polyethylene naphthalate (PEN), FDA concludes that 3° recycling of PET or PEN by methanolysis or glycolysis results in the production of monomers or oligomers that are readily purified to produce a finished polymer that is suitable for food-contact use. Both 3° processes will clean the polyester sufficiently to allow it to be considered of suitable purity, even assuming 100% migration of residual surrogate to food. This is a significant difference from the surrogate testing of 2° recycling processes. Secondary recycling processes often produce PET that is insufficiently cleaned to withstand 100% migration calculations for the residual surrogates. Under these circumstances, FDA recommends additional migration tests to demonstrate that the finished PET meets the 1.5 µg/person/day EDI limit.

Based on a determination that 3° recycling processes produce PET or PEN of suitable purity for food contact use, FDA no longer recommends that such recyclers submit data for agency evaluation. Because 3° processes for polymers other than PET and PEN were not the subject of FDA reviews, recyclers who wish to engage in 3° recycling of polymers other than PET and PEN are encouraged to submit data for evaluation.

Ref. ANNEX II Table 1 (9) [Recycled-Plastics-Food-Packaging-Chemistry-ConsiderationsGuidance-04112022-1321.pdf](#)

c) List a list of all substances with a molecular weight below 1000 Dalton found in the plastic inputs and recycled plastic output and 20 first detected incidental contaminants – Art 13(5)(c)

As developer of the Novel Technology, PET EUROPE has coordinated with the recyclers regarding the selection of the sampling strategy, the analysis to be performed and the selection of a third-party laboratory. The choice of the laboratory was based on its experience and expertise in analysing PET samples, the relevance of its analytical equipment and validated methods as well as the capability to identify and to risk assess non-intentionally added substances (NIAS) taking into account the particularity of this specific technology.

Analysis for the detection and quantification of substances in polymer represents a major challenge, especially when they are present at very low levels i.e. ppb levels. Although significant advances are regularly reported in the literature, reliable quantification of these substances to the ppb level and without compromising the integrity of the polymer is rarely feasible and certainly not standardized even for the most qualified laboratories. What is presented in this report has been obtained with the state-of-the-art analytical equipment (Table 6) that allows the detection of minute concentrations of various organic substances present in the input and output materials. The list of substances with a molecular weight below 1000 Dalton detected in the plastic input and its recycled output is given in Appendix II. The substances were sorted in descending order by their relative occurrence in the plastic input. The analytical methods do not distinguish between incidental contaminants and PET reaction products such as PET oligomers. In this report, incidental contaminants were identified by comparing the analytical data of the input samples with virgin PET samples analyzed under the same conditions and by the same analytical methods and literature data (Schreier *et al.*, 2023).

Table 1 lists the 22 most frequently detected and identified incidental contaminants in the input material using the different analytical methods specified in section h.

The frequency of detection was determined by dividing the number of samples in which a particular substance was detected by the total number of samples analysed. The average concentration of the incidental contaminants was calculated by taking into account only those samples in which it was detected. If the incidental contaminant was detected but below the quantification limit, the concentration used to calculate the average concentration was the limit of quantification. If the incidental contaminant was not detected in the output (frequency of 0%), the limit of detection is reported in the Table.

This novel technology allows the input material to be introduced into the decontamination process at variable ratios of input material/virgin material. Therefore, the input material is sometimes diluted during the process with virgin material. The concentrations provided in Table 1 are the concentrations of incidental contaminants prior to any possible dilution. However, the dilution with virgin material is taken into account for the evaluation of the decontamination efficiency (section i).

Table 1: List of the first 22 detected incidental contaminants in the input material, their frequency of detection and average amounts in input and output samples.

Substance	CAS	INPUT		OUTPUT	
		Frequency	Average (µg/kg PET)	Frequency	Average (µg/kg PET)
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethenyl)-	1124-20-5	100%	368.65	20%	15.27
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethyl)-	535-77-3	100%	819.20	70%	253.85
Biphenyl	92-52-4	100%	467.04	60%	442.92
D-Limonene	5989-27-5	100%	483.65	0%	<2.74
Styrene	100-42-5	100%	21.57	40%	12.86
α-Methylstyrene	98-83-9	89%	81.93	30%	90.91
1H-Indene, 2,3-dihydro-4-methyl-	824-22-6	89%	96.23	10%	26.45
Benzene	71-43-2	89%	301.76	20%	302.07
Benzene, (1-methylethyl)-	98-82-8	89%	46.53	20%	35.10
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-propyl-	1074-43-7	89%	432.62	40%	14.74
Benzene, 2-ethyl-1,4-dimethyl-	1758-88-9	89%	495.55	60%	43.48
Benzene, propyl-	103-65-1	89%	274.74	30%	<34.03
Indane	496-11-7	89%	286.72	40%	39.19
β-Myrcene	123-35-3	67%	78.18	30%	15.10
γ-Terpinene	99-85-4	67%	224.56	0%	<2.74
Benzyl alcohol	100-51-6	67%	106.29	0%	<10.33
Naphthalene, 1-methyl-	90-12-0	67%	91.64	40%	34.51
1-Hexanol, 2-ethyl-	104-76-7	56%	462.02	10%	24.13
2-Nonanone	821-55-6	33%	316.40	0%	<4.43
7-Acetyl-6-ethyl-1,1,4,4-tetramethyltetralin	88-29-9	33%	157.16	10%	<31.37
Cyclohexene, 1-methyl-4-(1-methylethylidene)-	586-62-9	33%	153.72	0%	<2.74
dl-Menthol	1490-04-6	33%	73.17	0%	<10.33

For the inorganic analysis, a summary of the obtained analytical results is given in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of the analytical results for inorganic elements.

	INPUT		OUTPUT	
	Frequency	Average (mg/kg PET)	Frequency	Average (mg/kg PET)
Al	89%	1.80	60%	0.9845
Au	33%	0.035	20%	0.038
Ba	78%	0.136	70%	0.071
Bi	33%	0.5995	10%	0.055
Cd	0%	<0.002	10%	0.002
Co	100%	1.038	100%	27.261
Cr	100%	1.6933	100%	1.753
Cu	100%	0.9924	90%	0.401
F	11%	0.008	0%	<0.001
Ge	67%	0.388	50%	0.494
La	100%	0.010	100%	0.008
Li	67%	0.008	20%	0.0025
Mg	89%	3.098	90%	1.651
Mn	44%	0.241	50%	0.160
Na	100%	11.823	70%	6.8466
P	100%	2.806	90%	8.961
Pb	78%	0.064	80%	0.068
Sb	100%	215.440	100%	206.933
Si	100%	20.156	100%	25.976
Sn	56%	2.388	70%	0.223
Ti	89%	2.980	70%	3.071
W	67%	0.3774	60%	0.0922
Zn	67%	0.418	30%	4.623
Zr	78%	0.012	50%	0.007

The high average level of cobalt in the output material is due to the intentional addition of a cobalt-containing substance during the production of the output material by one of the members of the consortium.

Of all the analysed primary aromatic amines (Table 7) o-toluidine was detected in 33% of the input samples below the limit of quantification. p-Phenylenediamine, m-Phenylenediamine and benzidine were detected in 11% of the input samples below the limit of quantification. None of the analysed primary aromatic amines were detected in the output samples

BPA was detected in 22% of the input samples at an average concentration of 218.35 µg/kg PET. No BPA, BPF or BPS was detected with targeted analysis in any of the other input samples or output samples.

d) List of contaminating materials regularly present in the plastic input - Art 13(5)(d)

Table 3 lists the contaminating materials regularly present in the PET plastic input.

Table 3. Contaminating materials regularly present in the PET plastic input.

Contaminating material	
PVC	<50 mg/kg input
Polyolefin (caps/labels)	<20 mg/kg input
Other Polymers	<100 mg/kg input
Metal	<10 mg/kg input
Other Inert Materials	<30 mg/kg input

e) Analysis of the most likely origin of the identified contaminants referred to in points (c) and (d) - Art 13(5)(e)

Contaminating materials

Depending on the collection and sorting process, post-consumer PET waste can contain a limited amount of other materials such as polyolefins, polyvinyl Chloride (PVC), polyamide (PA), ethylene vinyl alcohol (EVOH), polystyrene (PS) and fillers. These materials originate from the following sources:

- Polyolefins like polyethylene (PE) and polypropylene (PP) are used to manufacture bottle closures and are present in a wide range of other plastic products.
- PVC is used in the manufacturing of certain labels and sleeves for bottles.
- PS is used in disposable cups and other packaging materials.
- EVOH is used as oxygen barrier in food packaging.
- PA is often used as barrier layer in flexible packaging films.
- Fillers are used in plastic packaging materials to modify their properties and enhance their performance.

Incidental contaminants

The likely origin of the incidental contaminants detected in the input material (Table 1) is as follows:

- Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethenyl)-; Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethyl)-; Benzene, 2-ethyl-1,4-dimethyl-; Benzene, (1-methylethyl)-; Benzene, 1-methyl-3-propyl-; Benzene, propyl-: aromatic hydrocarbons that can originate for example from inks, or the decomposition of certain plastics, antioxidants or plasticizers.
- Biphenyl: can originate from the thermal degradation of styrenic polymers.
- D-limonene: since a large fraction of PET bottles is used to pack flavoured beverages, the flavour substance limonene is found in nearly all post-consumer PET waste streams (Franz *et al.*, 2004).
- Styrene: monomer used in the manufacture of thermoplastics used in packaging materials and articles (ECHA, 2025).
- α -Methylstyrene: likely originates styrenic polymers that contaminate the waste stream.
- 1H-Indene, 2,3-dihydro-4-methyl-: alkyl indane that potentially originates from mineral-oil-based printing inks, lubricants, or other petroleum-derived materials present in the collected waste stream
- Benzene: most probably formed from the breakdown of contaminating PVC material through a heat induced reaction (Thoden van Velzen *et al.*, 2020)

- Indane: aromatic hydrocarbons that can originate for example from inks, or the decomposition of certain plastics, antioxidants or plasticizers
- β -Myrcene: used as a flavouring substance in food and beverages.
- γ -Terpinene: major component of essential oils made from citrus fruits with strong antioxidant activity and used as a flavouring substance in foods.
- Benzyl alcohol: listed in Annex I to Regulation (EU) 10/2011; is widely used solvent used in several applications and natural ingredient of several essential oils.
- Naphthalene, 1-methyl: contamination from petroleum-derived hydrocarbons (diesel, gasoline, mineral oils) or from combustion-related environmental source
- 1-Hexanol, 2-ethyl-: listed in Annex I to Regulation (EU) 10/2011; could originate from plasticizers and polymer additives used in contaminating materials (other plastics).
- 2-Nonanone: food flavouring (Regulation (EC) No 1334/2008) and used in washing & cleaning products, cosmetics and personal care products.
- 7-Acetyl-6-ethyl-1,1,4,4-tetramethyltetralin: AETT or versalide is a fragrance substance.
- Cyclohexene, 1-methyl-4-(1-methylethylidene)-: natural plant-derived terpene found in pine, citrus, herbs and essential oils and often used as fragrance component in household and personal-care products.
- dl-Menthol: natural monoterpene alcohol found in mint oil, widely used in personal-care products (toothpaste, mouthwash, shampoos, shower gels) and fragranced household products.

f) Measurement or estimation of the migration levels to food of contaminants present in the recycled plastic materials and articles - Art 13(5)(f)

An estimation of the migration levels was made based on the average levels of incidental contaminants in the output samples in which they were detected (Table 1) and assuming a worst case total migration to food using the average weight of 27.2g PET for a one litre PET bottle (Table 4).

Table 4. Worst case migration of the 22 first incidental contaminants present in the output samples.

Name	CAS	OUTPUT		TOTAL MIGRATION* Average (µg/kg food)
		Frequency	Average (µg/kg PET)	
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethenyl)-	1124-20-5	121.56	20%	0.42
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethyl)-	535-77-3	314.85	70%	6.90
Biphenyl	92-52-4	160.85	60%	12.05
D-Limonene	5989-27-5	163.51	0%	<0.075
Styrene	100-42-5	7.51	40%	0.35
α-Methylstyrene	98-83-9	40.41	30%	2.47
1H-Indene, 2,3-dihydro-4-methyl-	824-22-6	38.55	10%	0.72
Benzene	71-43-2	96.06	20%	8.22
Benzene, (1-methylethyl)-	98-82-8	17.41	20%	0.95
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-propyl-	1074-43-7	153.70	40%	0.40
Benzene, 2-ethyl-1,4-dimethyl-	1758-88-9	191.13	60%	1.18
Benzene, propyl-	103-65-1	102.61	30%	<0.93
Indane	496-11-7	106.22	40%	1.07
β-Myrcene	123-35-3	26.36	30%	0.41
γ-Terpinene	99-85-4	72.46	0%	<0.075
Benzyl alcohol	100-51-6	50.40	0%	<0.28
Naphthalene, 1-methyl-	90-12-0	36.30	40%	0.94
1-Hexanol, 2-ethyl-	104-76-7	196.39	10%	0.66
2-Nonanone	821-55-6	133.23	0%	<0.12
7-Acetyl-6-ethyl-1,1,4,4-tetramethyltetralin	88-29-9	49.76	10%	<0.85
Cyclohexene, 1-methyl-4-(1-methylethylidene)-	586-62-9	48.08	0%	<0.075
dl-Menthol	1490-04-6	27.10	0%	<0.28

*considering 1L beverage filled in a PET bottle of 27.2g

The worst case estimation of the migration levels of the inorganic substances is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Worst case migration of incidental contaminants present in the output samples.

	OUTPUT		TOTAL MIGRATION* Average (mg/kg food)
	Frequency	Average (mg/kg PET)	
Al	60%	0.9845	0.0268
Au	20%	0.038	0.0010
Ba	70%	0.071	0.0019
Bi	10%	0.055	0.0015
Cd	10%	0.002	0.0001
Co	100%	27.261	0.7415
Cr	100%	1.753	0.0477
Cu	90%	0.401	0.0109
F	0%	<0.001	0.0000
Ge	50%	0.494	0.0134
La	100%	0.008	0.0002
Li	20%	0.0025	0.0001
Mg	90%	1.651	0.0449
Mn	50%	0.160	0.0043
Na	70%	6.8466	0.1862
P	90%	8.961	0.2438
Pb	80%	0.068	0.0019
Sb	100%	206.933	5.6286
Si	100%	25.976	0.7066
Sn	70%	0.223	0.0061
Ti	70%	3.071	0.0835
W	60%	0.0922	0.0025
Zn	30%	4.623	0.1257
Zr	50%	0.007	0.0002

*considering 1L beverage filled in a PET bottle of 27.2g

g) Description of the applied sampling strategy - Art 13(5)(g)

The PET Flake Injection recycling technology is a technology that is used for over 10 years to produce PET with recycled content for food contact applications. The individual recyclers using this technology have proven records that the output produced by recycling installation applying this technology is stable and complies with the requirements of Framework Regulation (EC) 1935/2004 and Plastics Regulation (EU) No 10/2011. Therefore, the sampling frequency of the monitoring was reduced to one sample per recycler per monitoring cycle of 6 months.

In total 9 input batches and 10 corresponding output batches (9 pellet samples and 1 film sample) were collected. The samples were analysed for the following substances:

- Volatile substances,
- Semi-volatile substances,

- Non-volatile substances,
- Inorganic substances,
- Primary aromatic amines
- Bisphenols A, F and S
- Common plastic additives.

The analysis was carried out by an independent third-party analytical laboratory.

The laboratory was chosen based on its experience and expertise in analysing PET samples and its relevant analytical equipment and validated methods.

h) Description of the analytical procedures and methods used - Art 13(5)(h)

Samples of PET input batches and their corresponding output batches were labelled for traceability purposes and shipped in clear and hermetically sealed containers.

The sample preparation methods and analytical procedures and methods used for the analysis of the samples as well as their limits of detection and quantification are summarised in Table 6. In all cases, 3 independent replicates were analysed.

Analysis of organic substances is done through a non-targeted screening of volatile, semi-volatile and non-volatile substances with different methods (Table 6).

Table 6. Applied analytical procedures and methods including their limits of detection and quantification.

	Sample preparation	Analytical method	LOD	LOQ
Non-target screening of volatile and semi-volatile substances	Cryogenic milling 0.5 mm	HS-SPME-GC/MS, extraction 20 min @80°C	Between 2.31 and 24.64 µg/kg PET	Between 7.7 and 82.13 µg/kg PET
Non-target screening of semi and non-volatile substances	Cryogenic milling, dissolution in HFIP followed by precipitation of the polymer in methanol.	UPLC-MS-QTOF	Between 0.012 and 5.3 mg/kg PET	Between 0.036 and 17.6 mg/kg PET
Bisphenols A, S and F		UPLC-QqQ, negative mode	38.5 µg/kg PET	128.33 µg/kg PET
Targeted analysis of common non-volatile additives		UPLC-MS-MS	Between 305 and 3247 µg/kg PET	/
Targeted analysis of inorganic substances (Annex II of EU 10/2011)	Microwave digestion with a mixture of H ₂ SO ₄ and HNO ₃	ICP-MS	Between 0.001 and 19.25 mg/kg PET	/
Primary aromatic amines	Migration in 3% acetic acid, 2h@70°C	UPLC-QqQ-MS, positive mode	Between 0.19 and 8.4 µg/kg PET	/

HS: Head Space; SPME: Solid phase micro-extraction; GC: Gas chromatography; MS: Mass spectroscopy; QqQ: triple quadrupole; QTOF: Quadrupole- time-of-flight; UPLC: ultra-high performance liquid chromatography; ICP: Inductively Coupled Plasma; HFIP: 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoroisopropanol

LOD: limit of detection; LOQ: limit of quantification

For volatile substances, a solid phase microextraction in headspace mode connected to GC-MS method (HS-SPME-GC-MS) is used which is a versatile technique employed in a wide range of industries and research areas to identify, quantify, and characterize volatile and semi-volatile compounds in plastic/polymer samples. The concentration of the volatile and semi volatile compounds on the SPME microfibre increases a lot the sensitivity of the method in such a way that most of the volatile substances can be detected at very low concentrations. The adsorption conditions for SPME of 20 mins@80°C specifically allow the exhaustive extraction of volatile substances present in PET without degrading the sample. The detection is done by MS and by using Mass Spectrometry–Data Independent Analysis (MS-DIAL), an open-source software platform used for identifying compounds from the MS chromatograms. Its capabilities include deconvolution of complex MS data, retention time alignment, and identification of a wide range of metabolites, including those present at low concentrations or with unknown structures (Estremera *et al.*, 2025). It minimizes subjective human assessment by applying standardized, algorithm-based peak deconvolution and library-driven identification with transparent scoring metrics. Substance identification was performed using the NIST20 database (Match > 850) and retention index values (85% tolerance) which were calculated injecting an alkane solution (C8-40) in the same conditions as the analytes. Substances were (semi-)quantified by injecting known concentrations of commercially available standards corresponding to the detected substances. Calibration curves were prepared from these standards for the quantification. In the absence of a pure standard of the identified substance, the identified substance was semi-quantified with another substance of similar chemical structure.

For semi-volatile and non-volatile substance, the samples were first extracted. The solvent and extraction conditions have been chosen to swell the polymer, without generating new substances (Nerin *et al.*, 2022). The extracts were analysed using GC/MS and LC/MS-QToF for semi-volatile and non-volatile substances, respectively. High-resolution MS detectors like the QToF provide accurate masses isotopic patterns and intensities, which can lead to theoretical information about composition of fragments (Peters *et al.* 2019). This allows for the identification of unknown NIAS. The identification of a given substance was based on its retention time, mass spectrum and the comparison of its analysis against commercial standards. PET oligomers were quantified with the commercially available C₂₀H₁₆O₈ PET oligomer standard.

The application ranges of the above used non-targeted screening methods overlap but the sensitivity of the methods is different. In case the same substance was detected by different methods, the highest concentration of both analyses was reported.

For the screening for primary aromatic amines a dedicated method was used as the concentration level of interest is so low that general non-target screening methods cannot detect them (Nerin *et al.*, 2022). The primary aromatic amines were analysed after migration into 3% acetic acid for 2h at 70°C. Table 7 lists the primary aromatic amines that have been analysed.

The method used to analyse inorganic substances was adapted during the various monitoring periods. For the monitoring reports published on 10 October 2023 and 10 April 2024, inorganic substances were analysed using ICP-MS after digestion of the samples. However, due to equipment issues, Total Reflexion X-Ray Fluorescence (TRXRF) was used for the subsequent two monitoring reports. For this sixth report, the analysis was again performed using ICP-MS after digestion of the samples. Inorganic elements analysed were Al, Au, Ba, Bi, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, F, Ge, La, Li, Mg, Mn, Na, P, Pb, Sb, Si, Sn, Ti, W, Zn and Zr.

The independent third-party laboratory follows ISO17025 quality control measures and all analytical methods are validated.

Table 7. List of primary aromatic amines analysed.

Name	CAS	Name	CAS
<i>p</i> -Phenylenediamine	106-50-3	3,3'-Dimethylbenzidine	119-93-7
<i>m</i> -Phenylenediamine	108-45-2	2,6-Dimethylaniline	87-62-7
2,6-Toluendiamine	823-40-5	4,4'-Thiodianiline	139-65-1
4-Methoxy- <i>m</i> -phenylenediamine	615-05-4	2,4-Dimethylaniline	95-68-1
2,4-Toluendiamine	95-80-7	2-Naphtylamine	91-59-8
1,5-Diaminonaphtalene	2243-62-1	4,4-Methylenedi- <i>o</i> -toluidine	838-88-0
Aniline	62-53-3	4-Aminobiphenyl	92-67-1
Benzidine	92-87-5	4-Aminoazobenzene	60-09-3
<i>o</i> -Anisidine	90-04-0	5-Nitro- <i>o</i> -toluidine	99-55-8
4,4-Oxidianiline	101-80-4	2,4,5-Trimethylaniline	137-17-7
<i>o</i> -Toluidine	95-53-4	4-Chloro- <i>o</i> -toluidine	95-69-2
4-Chloroaniline	106-47-8	<i>o</i> -Aminoazotoluene	97-56-3
4,4-Methylenedianiline	101-77-9	3,3-Dichlorobenzidine	91-94-1
<i>o</i> -Dianisidine	119-90-4	4,4-Methylene-bis-(2-chloroaniline)	101-14-4
2-Methoxy-5- <i>m</i> -toluidine	120-71-8		

i) Analysis and explanation of any discrepancies observed between contaminant levels expected and decontamination efficiency - Art 13(5)(i).

Detected contaminant levels

Except for Cyasorb UV 1084 that was detected in one input sample at a concentration of 1% (w/w), the levels of incidental contaminants detected in the input samples are in the µg/kg range and are far below the conservative reference level of incidental contaminants of 3 mg/kg PET, considered by EFSA in its scientific guidance on post-consumer mechanical PET recycling processes (2024). The origin of the high level of Cyasorb UV 1084, a UV absorber/light stabilizer, is unknown. The input material was sourced in EU and originated from food contact applications which should not contain this substance since it is not listed in Annex I of (EU) 10/2011. The concentration of the different contaminants in the different input samples are quite similar. The same is true for the output samples with the exception of the film sample that showed a different profile than the pellet output samples for several substances. Unexpected is the presence of D-limonene in the film output sample.

The incidental contaminants detected with a high frequency in the input samples are not unexpected (see section e).

Some of the most frequently detected incidental contaminants or inorganic elements were sometimes also detected in the output samples, but generally at a lower frequency and at a lower concentration. A safety assessment was carried out based on the following considerations:

- Exposure: the worst case migration levels were calculated by making the assumption of no reaction and 100% migration and by applying a beverage/PET bottle ratio of 1L/27.2 g PET and using the concentrations measured in the PET output. In case the substance was not detected in the PET output, the limit of detection (LOD) of the analytical method was used for the calculations.

- Hazard: the following principles were used in order of priority:
 - If the substance is listed in Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 10/2011 and has an SML, the specified limit is applied. If the limit belongs to a group, the group limit is applied to the sum of all the substances in the group. If the substance is listed in Annex I to the Regulation (EU) No 10/2011 with no SML, the 60 mg/kg food limit is applied.
 - For the remaining substances, the human exposure threshold values according to the Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC) approach were used (EFSA, 2019). The infant exposure scenario A was applied to establish the migration limits (EFSA, 2024) (Table 8).

Table 8. Migration limits for different classes of substances

	Human exposure threshold value (EFSA, 2019) (µg/kg bw/per day)	Migration limit* (µg/kg food)	Migration limit* in case of worst case calculation or modelling (µg/kg food)	
			substances ≤ 150 Da	substances > 150 Da
Genotoxic substances	0.0025	0.00962	0.0481	0.0962
Organophosphates or carbamates	0.3	1.15	5.75	11.5
Cramer class III substances	1.5	5.8	29	58
Cramer class II substances	9	34.6	173	346
Cramer class I	30	115	575	1150

*EFSA scenario A (infant consuming water) (EFSA, 2024)

The potential for genotoxicity of substances was assessed using EFSA or JECFA evaluations, prepared for example in support of their inclusion in Regulation (EC) 1334/2008 on flavourings and food ingredients with flavouring properties or Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 on food additives. In the absence of such an evaluation, the Toxtree software¹ is used to predict their genotoxic potential. This software is also used to further assign substances into Cramer classes I, II or III.

- Specific case: For benzene the safety limit/regulatory limit that has been applied is the limit in drinking water.
- Risk assessment: for each substance, the migration limit that was defined based on the hazard assessment, was compared to the worst case exposure levels. If the worst case exposure level is lower than the migration limit, it was concluded that the substance does not give rise to safety concern. In case the worst-case exposure level exceeded the determined migration limit, the following was considered in order of priority:

¹ Toxtree version v3.1.0, May 2018

1. The application of overestimation factors: Since EFSA (2024) acknowledges that generally recognized diffusion migration models overestimate migration by a factor of 5 for substances ≤ 150 Da and by a factor of 10 for substances > 150 Da, the worst case exposure levels that were calculated using 100% migration can be considered to also overestimate migration by at least these factors.
2. The application of migration modelling applying the modelling parameters used by EFSA (2024): the modelled concentration in PET (Cmod) that corresponds to a migration that is not expected to give rise to a dietary exposure that would exceed the established migration limit was calculated. The Cmod was calculated for the established migration limits for genotoxic substances, Cramer I, II and III substances for different surrogate contaminants. The concentration of the incidental contaminant in the output material (Cres) was compared to the calculated Cmod of a surrogate contaminant that is representative for the incidental contaminant. If the Cres is not higher than the Cmod, it was concluded that the substance does not give rise to a safety concern.
3. The application of migration modelling applying a more realistic migration model based on experimentally determined activation energies of diffusion E_A , whereas the conventional prediction model is based on a fixed activation energy of 100 kJ/mol for all migrants independent from their molecular weight or volume (Schreier *et al*, 2023)
4. To conduct migration testing under the conditions of use.

Worst case exposure assessment and hazard assessment for incidental contaminants and inorganic elements are summarised in Table 9 and 10, respectively.

As demonstrated in Table 9, the worst case exposure assessment by total migration indicates that the average benzene levels of the output samples in which benzene is detected would lead to migration levels that exceed the EU drinking water limit of 1 $\mu\text{g/l}$. However, migration testing experiments and realistic migration modelling indicate that benzene levels up to 1.6 mg/kg PET (5 times higher than the levels detected in the analyses of this report) would not lead to benzene levels in water exceeding the limit of 1 $\mu\text{g/L}$ (Thoden van Velzen *et al.*, 2020).

Furthermore, none of the other 22 first incidental contaminants do give rise to a safety concern at the concentrations present in the PET output material or, for substances present in the input plastic but not in the PET output, at the LOD levels when worst case exposure assessment is applied.

With regard to the inorganic substances detected in the output samples, the worst case migration level would exceed the migration limits established in Regulation (EU) No 10/2011 for cobalt, chromium and antimony.

Regarding antimony, Welle and Franz (2011) showed that, due to the extremely low diffusion coefficients of antimony species in PET, the SML will not be exceeded under standard use of PET at room temperature and/or hotfill conditions with antimony concentrations up to 350 mg/kg. Since antimony levels in the output samples were below these levels, there would be no safety concern.

For cobalt and chromium, no such studies are available. Since the exact molecular identity under which inorganic substances are present in the PET is not known, migration modelling cannot be performed and only migration testing can rule out the risk of exceeding the migration limits. Consortium members have done migration testing on different output batches and confirmed compliance with the migration limits of Annex II of Regulation (EU) No 10/2011. In addition, verification of compliance with migration limits

established in Regulation (EU) No 10/2011 is part of the routine compliance work performed by the users of the material.

Table 9. Summary of risk assessment of substances in the output samples

Name	CAS	Frequency	Concentration Output (µg/kg PET) = Cres	TOTAL MIGRATION* average (µg/kg food)	Hazard	Migration Limit (µg/kg food)	Migration limit applying OF** (µg/kg food)	Cmod EFSA Ap model (µg/kg PET)	Cmod Welle E _A model (mg/kg PET)
Naphthalene, 1-methyl-	90-12-0	40%	34.51	0.94	Toxtree: Cramer III	5.8			
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethenyl)-	1124-20-5	20%	15.27	0.42	Toxtree: Cramer I	115			
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethyl)-	535-77-3	70%	253.85	6.90	Toxtree: Cramer I	115			
Biphenyl	92-52-4	60%	442.92	12.05	Toxtree: Cramer III	5.8			
D-Limonene	5989-27-5	0%	<2.74	<0.075	listed in (EC) No. 1334/2008; Toxtree: Cramer I	115			
Styrene	100-42-5	40%	12.86	0.35	FCM193 w/o SML	60000			
α-Methylstyrene	98-83-9	30%	90.91	2.47	FMC187 with SML=0.05 mg/kg	50			
1H-Indene, 2,3-dihydro-4-methyl-	824-22-6	10%	26.45	0.72	Toxtree: Cramer II	34.6			
Benzene	71-43-2	20%	302.07	8.22	EU Drinking water limit: 1 µg/L	1	5		
Benzene, (1-methylethyl)- = cumene	98-82-8	20%	35.10	0.95	Toxtree: Cramer I	115			
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-propyl-	1074-43-7	40%	14.74	0.40	Toxtree: Cramer I	115			
Benzene, 2-ethyl-1,4-dimethyl-	1758-88-9	60%	43.48	1.18	Toxtree: Cramer I	115			
Benzene, propyl-	103-65-1	30%	<34.03	<0.93	Toxtree: Cramer I	115			
Indane	496-11-7	40%	39.19	1.07	Toxtree: Cramer III	5.8			
β-Myrcene	123-35-3	30%	15.10	0.41	listed in (EC) No. 1334/2008; Toxtree: Cramer I	115			
γ-Terpinene	99-85-4	0%	<2.74	<0.075	listed in (EC) No. 1334/2008; Toxtree: Cramer I	115			
Benzyl alcohol	100-51-6	0%	<10.33	<0.28	FCM194 w/o SML	60000			
1-Hexanol, 2-ethyl-	104-76-7	10%	24.13	0.66	FCM209 with SML=30mg/kg	30000			

The data presented in this report are based on the measurements performed by a third-party laboratory, which was contracted by PET EUROPE. The data provided is the property of PET EUROPE and cannot be copied, reproduced, or distributed without their prior written consent. PET EUROPE is not responsible nor liable for any errors or inaccuracies that may have occurred during the measurement process by the third-party laboratory. The data are provided for informational purposes only and do not constitute any endorsement or recommendation by PET EUROPE.

Table 9. Summary of risk assessment of substances in the output samples (continued)

Name	CAS	Frequency	Concentration Output (µg/kg PET) = Cres	TOTAL MIGRATION* average (µg/kg food)	Hazard	Migration Limit (µg/kg food)	Migration limit applying OF** (µg/kg food)	Cmod EFSA Ap model (µg/kg PET)
2-Nonanone	821-55-6	0%	<4.43	<0.12	listed in (EC) No. 1334/2008; Toxtree: Cramer I	115		
7-Acetyl-6-ethyl-1,1,4,4-tetramethyltetralin	88-29-9	10%	<31.37	<0.85	Toxtree: Cramer II	34.6		
Cyclohexene, 1-methyl-4-(1-methylethylidene)- = terpinolene	586-62-9	0%	<2.74	<0.075	listed in (EC) No. 1334/2008; Toxtree: Cramer I	115		
dl-Menthol	1490-04-6	0%	<10.33	<0.28	listed in (EC) No. 1334/2008; Toxtree: Cramer I	115		

*considering 1L beverage filled in a PET bottle of 27.2g

**OF= overestimation factor (EFSA, 2024)

Table 10. Results of the safety evaluation of the incidental contaminants

	Frequency	TOTAL MIGRATION* Average (mg/kg food)	EU 10/2011 - Annex II (SML (mg/kg food))
Al	60%	0.0268	1
Au	20%	0.0010	/
Ba	70%	0.0019	1
Bi	10%	0.0015	/
Cd	10%	0.0001	ND (<0.002)
Co	100%	0.7415	0.05
Cr	100%	0.0477	ND (<0.01)
Cu	90%	0.0109	5
F	0%	0.0000	/
Ge	50%	0.0134	/
La	100%	0.0002	0.04
Li	20%	0.0001	0.6
Mg	90%	0.0449	60
Mn	50%	0.0043	0.6
Na	70%	0.1862	60
P	90%	0.2438	/
Pb	80%	0.0019	ND (<0.01)
Sb	100%	5.6286	0.04
Si	100%	0.7066	/
Sn	70%	0.0061	/
Ti	70%	0.0835	/
W	60%	0.0025	/
Zn	30%	0.1257	5
Zr	50%	0.0002	/

*considering 1L beverage filled in a PET bottle of 27.2g

ND: not detectable with detection limit of minimum 0.01 mg/kg PET

Decontamination efficiency

As indicated in section b, it was determined, based on the results of a challenge study, that the decontamination efficiency of the Flake Injection Novel Technology was above or far above 99.9%.

In this report, the decontamination efficiencies for the different incidental contaminants in the samples were calculated based on the levels of incidental contaminants in the input and output samples. For the calculation, the following rules were applied:

- Whenever the concentration in a sample is below the limit of quantification or the limit of detection, the value of the limit of quantification or the value of the limit of detection, respectively, was used.

The data presented in this report are based on the measurements performed by a third-party laboratory, which was contracted by PET EUROPE. The data provided is the property of PET EUROPE and cannot be copied, reproduced, or distributed without their prior written consent. PET EUROPE is not responsible nor liable for any errors or inaccuracies that may have occurred during the measurement process by the third-party laboratory. The data are provided for informational purposes only and do not constitute any endorsement or recommendation by PET EUROPE.

- To ensure that the calculated decontamination efficiencies are not artificially increased² by a potential dilution with virgin material, the measured concentrations of incidental contaminants in the input material (Table 1) were corrected for the percentage virgin material used to produce the analysed batches of output material, as explained in section c.

As a result, the calculated concentration of incidental contaminants in the input material was frequently below the limit of detection of the substance. In such a case, if the substance was not detectable in the output material, the calculation generates a seemingly negative decontamination efficiency that is not relevant because it is not a real decontamination efficiency. Similarly, if the concentration of the incidental contaminant is below the limit of detection or the limit of quantification in both the input and the output sample, the obtained decontamination efficiency value is also not relevant as it is not the actual value.

There is also not always an explicable correlation between the levels detected in the input samples and those found in the output samples. This is most probably due to the industrial scale of the recycling operations where the input batch is not perfectly homogenous combined with the fact that, in comparison, only relatively small sample sizes are used for the analysis. It is also not possible to completely rule out analytical artefacts, even if this is not the most likely causal explanation.

While high decontamination efficiencies (values up to >99.77%) were found for most incidental contaminants in several input-output sample sets, the average decontamination efficiency cannot be demonstrated for all the incidental contaminants of the sample sets due to the limitations described above.

In addition, it is technically almost impossible to confirm a decontamination efficiency of 99.9% as reported in the Novel Technology dossier due to the analytical limitations associated with the relatively low levels of incidental contaminants detected in the input materials. Despite the very low analytical detection limits of the applied state-of-the-art analytical equipment, the concentration of the incidental contaminants in the input material needs to be 1000 times higher than the detection limit to be able to demonstrate a decontamination efficiency of 99.9%.

In conclusion, although there are indications that the Flake Injection Novel Technology can achieve a high decontamination efficiency, a decontamination efficiency of 99.9% cannot be practically confirmed for all incidental contaminants with the current samples and monitoring testing methodology as defined in Article 13 of Regulation (EU) 2022/1616 mainly due to analytical limitations.

j) a discussion of the differences with previous reports published in accordance with this paragraph, if any - Art 13(5)(j)

The presence of Cyasorb UV 1084 in the input batch at a concentration of around 1% (w/w) is unexpected, given the confirmation that the input batch originated from food contact material applications and was sourced in the EU. This is the first instance of a contaminant being detected in such a high concentration.

Apart from this, the concentration of incidental contaminants in the input samples was in the same order of magnitude as in the previous reports.

The negative decontamination efficiencies for certain organic acids reported for all samples sets in the previous monitoring report are not confirmed.

² Article 13 of Regulation (EU) 2022/1616² requires that residual contaminant levels in the output are determined before any dilution of the output material


Appendix I – FLAKE INJECTION – PET Production Process

Key:

Flake – Pre-processed PET material

(Post Consumer, Post Industrial, Pellets, Regrind)

FLAKE INJECTION – PET Production Process



Appendix II – List of all substances with a molecular weight below 1.000 Dalton found in the plastic inputs to each of the decontamination installations and in the recycled plastic output thereof, sorted in descending order by their relative occurrence

Name	Formula	CAS	Frequency INPUT	Frequency OUTPUT
Naphthalene	C10H8	91-20-3	100%	70%
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethenyl)-	C10H12	1124-20-5	100%	20%
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-(1-methylethyl)-	C10H14	535-77-3	100%	70%
Biphenyl	C12H10	92-52-4	100%	60%
D-Limonene	C10H16	5989-27-5	100%	0%
Styrene	C8H8	100-42-5	100%	40%
Toluene	C7H8	108-88-3	100%	80%
Benzene, 1,2,4,5-tetramethyl-	C10H14	95-93-2	100%	0%
Nonanoic acid	C9H18O2	112-05-0	100%	100%
Benzene, 1,2,4-trimethyl-	C9H12	95-63-6	100%	80%
1,3-Dioxolane, 2-methyl-	C4H8O2	497-26-7	100%	100%
C[TPA + DEG]2	C24H24O10	16104-98-6	100%	100%
C[TPA + EG] + [TPA + DEG]	C22H20O9	29278-57-7	100%	100%
C[TPA + EG]2	C20H16O8	24388-68-9	100%	90%
C[TPA + EG]2 + [TPA + DEG]	C32H28O13	873422-64-1	100%	90%
C[TPA + EG]3	C30H24O12	7441-32-9	100%	100%
α-Methylstyrene	C9H10	98-83-9	89%	30%
1H-Indene, 2,3-dihydro-4-methyl-	C10H12	824-22-6	89%	10%
Benzene	C6H6	71-43-2	89%	20%
Benzene, (1-methylethyl)- = cumene	C9H12	98-82-8	89%	20%
Benzene, 1-methyl-3-propyl-	C10H14	1074-43-7	89%	40%
Benzene, 2-ethyl-1,4-dimethyl-	C10H14	1758-88-9	89%	60%
Benzene, propyl-	C9H12	103-65-1	89%	30%
Indane	C9H10	496-11-7	89%	40%
L[TPA + EG] + [TPA + DEG]	C22H22O10		89%	90%
o-Xylene	C8H10	95-47-6	89%	60%
Benzaldehyde, 4-(1-methylethyl)-	C10H12O	122-03-02	89%	10%
Nonanal	C9H18O	124-19-6	89%	30%
L[TPA + EG]3	C30H26O13	16958-96-6	89%	80%
Hexanoic acid	C6H12O2	142-62-1	89%	80%
Ethylbenzene	C8H10	100-41-4	78%	0%
Benzaldehyde	C7H6O	100-52-7	78%	60%
B-Myrcene	C10H16	123-35-3	67%	30%
γ-Terpinene	C10H16	99-85-4	67%	0%

Name	Formula	CAS	Frequency INPUT	Frequency OUTPUT
Benzyl alcohol	C7H8O	100-51-6	67%	0%
Naphthalene, 1-methyl-	C11H10	90-12-0	67%	40%
1-Hexanol, 2-ethyl-	C8H18O	104-76-7	56%	10%
2-Nonanone	C9H18O	821-55-6	33%	0%
7-Acetyl-6-ethyl-1,1,4,4-tetramethyltetralin	C18H26O	88-29-9	33%	10%
Cyclohexene, 1-methyl-4-(1-methylethylidene)- = terpinolene	C10H16	586-62-9	33%	0%
dl-Menthol	C10H20O	1490-04-6	33%	0%
Decanal	C10H20O	112-31-2	22%	10%
Ethanol, 1-(2-butoxyethoxy)-	C8H18O3	112-34-5	22%	0%
NI	C27H48O8	potentially 330198-91-9	22%	0%
Diethyl Phthalate	C12H14O4	84-66-2	22%	0%
1,4-Dioxane	C4H8O2	123-91-1	22%	30%
Bisphenol A	C15H16O2	80-05-7	22%	0%
.beta.-Bisabolene	C15H24	495-61-4	11%	0%
1H-Indene, 2,3-dihydro-1,1,3-trimethyl-3-phenyl-	C18H20	3910-35-8	11%	0%
4-Hexen-1-ol, 5-methyl-2-(1-methylethenyl)-, acetate, (R)-	C12H20O2	25905-14-0	11%	0%
7,9-Di-tert-butyl-1-oxaspiro(4,5)deca-6,9-diene-2,8-dione	C17H24O3	872-478-6	11%	0%
7-Octen-2-ol, 2,6-dimethyl-	C10H20O	18479-58-8	11%	10%
Anthranilamide	C7H5NO	88-68-6	11%	0%
Azacyclotridecan-2-one	C12H23NO	947-04-6	11%	10%
Cyasorb UV 1084	C32H51NNiO2S	14516-71-3	11%	0%
Dimethyl phthalate	C10H10O4	131-11-3	11%	0%
Dodecanal	C12H24O	112-54-9	11%	10%
Hexadecanamide	C16H33NO	629-54-9	11%	20%
Tinuvin 326	C17H18ClN3O	3896-11-5	11%	0%
Diphenyl ether	C12H10O	101-84-8	11%	11%
C[TPA + EG]4	C40H32O16	16104-96-4	11%	20%

NI: not identified

Glossary of Terms

Cmod	Modelled concentration
DEG	diethylene glycol
EG	ethylene glycol
GC	gas chromatography
HPLC	high performance liquid chromatography
ICP-MS	Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry
MS	Mass Spectrometry
NIAS	non-intentionally added substances
PE	polyethylene
PET	polyethylene terephthalate
PP	polypropylene
PVC	polyvinyl chloride
TPA	terephthalic acid
TTC	Threshold of Toxicological Concern
XRF	X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy

REFERENCES

ECHA (2025). Styrene Substance Infocard. Retrieved March 4, 2025, from [Substance Information - ECHA \(europa.eu\)](https://echa.europa.eu)

EFSA (2011). Panel on Food Contact Materials, Enzymes, Flavourings and Processing Aids (CEF). Scientific Opinion on the criteria to be used for safety evaluation of a mechanical recycling process to produce recycled PET intended to be used for manufacture of materials and articles in contact with food. EFSA Journal, 9, 2184.

EFSA Scientific Committee, More, S. J., Bampidis, V., Benford, D., Bragard, C., Halldorsson, T. I., Hernández-Jerez, A. F., Hougaard, B. S., Koutsoumanis, K. P., Machera, K., Naegeli, H., Nielsen, S. S., Schlatter, J. R., Schrenk, D., Silano, V., Turck, D., Younes, M., Gundert-Remy, U., Kass, G. E. N., ... Wallace, H. M. (2019). Guidance on the use of the threshold of toxicological concern approach in food safety assessment. EFSA Journal, 17(6), 5708. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5708>

EFSA CEP Panel (EFSA Panel on Food Contact Materials, Enzymes and Processing Aids), Lambré, C., Barat Baviera, J. M., Bolognesi, C., Chesson, A., Coconcelli, P. S., Crebelli, R., Gott, D. M., Grob, K., Mengelers, M., Mortensen, A., Rivière, G., Steffensen, I.-L., Tlustos, C., Van Loveren, H., Vernis, L., Zorn, H., Dudler, V., Milana, M. R., ... Lampi, E. (2024). Scientific Guidance on the criteria for the evaluation and on the preparation of applications for the safety assessment of post-consumer mechanical PET recycling processes intended to be used for manufacture of materials and articles in contact with food. EFSA Journal, 22(7), e8879. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2024.8879>

Estremera, C.; Blazquez-Martín, J.; Aznar, M.; Nerín, C.; Domeño, C. (2025). MS-DIAL as efficient tool for the food safety assessment of volatile substances in disposable tableware. Food Packaging and Shelf Life 49: 101528.

European Commission (2012) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 872/2012 of 1 October 2012 adopting the list of flavouring substances provided for by Regulation (EC) No 2232/96 of the European Parliament and of the Council, introducing it in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1334/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Commission Regulation (EC) No 1565/2000 and Commission Decision 1999/217/EC, applicable from 22/10/2012

Franz, R.; Mauer, A.; Welle, F. (2004). European survey on post-consumer poly(ethylene terephthalate) materials to determine contamination levels and maximum consumer exposure from food packages made from recycled PET. Food Addit. Contam. 2004, 21, 265–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02652030310001655489>

Franz, R.; Welle, F. (2020). Contamination levels in re-collected PET bottles from non-food applications and their impact on the safety of recycled PET for food contact. Molecules 2020, 25, 4998. <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules25214998>

Nerín, C., Bourdoux, S., Faust, B., Gude, T., Lesueur, C., Simat, T., Stoermer, A., Van Hoek, E., Oldring, P. (2022). Guidance in selecting analytical techniques for the identification and quantification of non-intentionally added substances (NIAS) in food contact materials (FCMS). Food Additives & Contaminants: Part A, vol 39(3): 620-643. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19440049.2021.2012599>

Peters, R.J.B., Groeneveld, I., Sanchez, P.L., Gebbink, W\$, Gersen, A., de Nijs, M., van Leeuwen, S.P.J. (2019). Review of analytical approaches for the identification of non-intentionally added substances in paper and board food contact materials. Trends Food Sci Technol. 85:44–54. <https://doi:10.1016/j.tifs.2018.12.010>.

Schreier, V.N.; Odermatt, A.; Welle, F. Migration Modeling as a Valuable Tool for Exposure Assessment and Risk Characterization of Polyethylene Terephthalate Oligomers. *Molecules* 2023, 28, 173. <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules28010173>

Thoden van Velzen, E.U., Brouwer, M.T., Stärker, C., Welle, F. Effect of recycled content and rPET quality on the properties of PET bottles, part II: Migration. *Packag Technol Sci.* 2020;33:359–371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pts.2528>

Welle F. (2008). Decontamination efficiency of a new post-consumer poly(ethylene terephthalate) (PET) recycling concept, *Food Additives & Contaminants: Part A*, 25:1, 123-131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02652030701474227>

Welle, F. (2021). Safety Evaluation of Polyethylene Terephthalate Chemical Recycling Processes. *Sustainability* 2021, 13, 12854. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212854>