The Replacement Has Its Own Migration Profile

BPA-Free Food Packaging After Europe's 2026 Transition: Substitution Chemistry, Process Validation and Divergent Regulatory Decisions

José M. López, BSc, MD, PhD, LLD (C)

Intabiotech Research Director

Abstract

Europe's restriction of bisphenol A (BPA) in food-contact materials has moved from a distant regulatory objective to an operational procurement and validation problem. Following the principal transition deadline of 20 July 2026, food manufacturers face a difficult question: how should a replacement coating, adhesive or polymer be qualified when its identity, migration behaviour and processing performance differ from the legacy material? This article argues that "BPA-free" is a compositional statement, not a comprehensive food-contact safety assessment. It examines non-intentionally added substances, reaction products, sterilisation and storage effects, and the limits of conventional migration testing. The analysis distinguishes the European Union's binding restrictions and 2026 correction from the United Kingdom's evolving policy position and the United States' distinct food-contact framework. Three hypothetical industrial cases illustrate a risk-based qualification strategy for acidic drinks, retorted foods and protein-rich formulations. A proposed research programme tests whether process-aware chemical fingerprinting can identify substitution risks earlier than supplier declarations alone.

Keywords: *bisphenol A; food-contact materials; migration; NIAS; coatings; substitution toxicology; retort processing; regulatory divergence*

Category*: Food Safety & Regulatory Affairs | SEO slug: bpa-free-packaging-substitution-migration-2026*

Meta description*: BPA-free packaging is not automatically migration-safe. Explore Europe's 2026 rules, replacement chemistry, industrial validation and regulatory divergence. [156 characters]*

Internal tags: *BPA; Food Contact Materials; NIAS; Packaging; Migration Testing; EU Regulation; Process Validation; Emerging Research*

1. Why the transition changes the technical question

The European Commission's Regulation (EU) 2024/3190 restricts BPA and certain other bisphenols and derivatives in food-contact materials. The measure entered into force in January 2025, with differentiated transitional provisions; for many single-use food-contact articles, the principal transition ended on 20 July 2026. Commission Regulation (EU) 2026/250 corrected several drafting inconsistencies in the original text. The precise operative provision, permitted exception and transition must be checked against the consolidated instrument for each material and supply-chain situation [1–3].

A supplier can replace a BPA-based epoxy lining without reproducing its chemistry. The new coating may employ a different monomer family, crosslinking system, catalyst, oligomer distribution, adhesion promoter or curing profile. Even where the new material satisfies the formal restriction, migration into food can depend on those components and on substances created unintentionally during manufacture, filling, heating or storage. The scientific problem is therefore not whether BPA is present alone, but what the finished material transfers into the actual food under foreseeable conditions.

This distinction should not be misread as an assertion that BPA substitutes are intrinsically unsafe. It is a statement about the scope of evidence. A prohibition on one substance does not automatically establish either the safety or the hazard of every alternative. The burden is to demonstrate suitability of the selected article under its intended conditions of use, with the relevant statutory obligations and scientific uncertainties made explicit.

2. What a "BPA-free" claim can and cannot establish

2.1 Identity, residuals and non-intentionally added substances

An accurate material specification should describe the food-contact layer, relevant starting substances, additives, catalysts and the manufacturing route. In polymeric systems, residual monomers and low-molecular-weight oligomers may coexist with reaction by-products and degradation products. The latter are often discussed as non-intentionally added substances (NIAS), but the term is a regulatory-analytical category, not a synonym for toxicity. Some NIAS are well characterised and of low concern; others require targeted investigation because identity or exposure is uncertain [4–6].

A certificate that tests only BPA below a stated detection limit addresses a narrow question. It does not establish the absence of all bisphenol derivatives, the suitability of a replacement resin or the migration profile of the complete multilayer article. Equally, a broad untargeted screening peak cannot automatically be called hazardous. The defensible sequence is detection, identification-confidence grading, quantification or semi-quantification, exposure estimation and hazard assessment, with prioritisation proportionate to risk.

2.2 Why food chemistry changes migration

Migration is not simply the transfer of a fixed amount from packaging to food. It is governed by diffusion within the material, partitioning at the material–food interface, food composition, contact area, time and temperature. A simplified Fickian description treats flux as proportional to the concentration gradient and a diffusion coefficient; however, real coatings may swell, age or change structure during thermal treatment. Diffusion coefficients are temperature-sensitive, and

partitioning differs among aqueous, acidic, fatty and protein-rich media. Simulants are useful regulatory tools but cannot capture every complex matrix interaction.

Retorting, hot filling and repeated thermal cycling may alter a coating's crosslink density or create new extractables. Long storage can permit slow diffusion even when short-term release appears low. Protein binding can lower the freely dissolved concentration of a migrant without necessarily eliminating total dietary exposure. Consequently, the analytical method must distinguish total recoverable migrant, freely dissolved fraction and any relevant transformation products; the choice depends on the toxicological question.

3. Substitution toxicology is a comparative discipline

A responsible replacement programme compares the old and new systems across chemical identity, potential hazards, migration under intended use, performance and supply-chain variability. The goal is not to defend legacy BPA technology, but to avoid regrettable substitution: exchanging a known regulatory concern for an inadequately characterised exposure. EFSA's 2023 reassessment of BPA set a tolerable daily intake of 0.2 ng/kg body weight per day, reflecting its evaluation of immune-system effects and uncertainties. That hazard-based context informed the European policy response; it is not a universal numerical safety limit for every structurally different replacement [7].

Structural similarity may justify screening for endocrine-related activity or reproductive toxicity, but similarity alone cannot establish a shared potency or an identical mechanism. Conversely, a novel structure is not proof of safety. In vitro screening, computational alerts, read-across and targeted toxicological data can be combined, but their applicability domains and limitations must be documented. Exposure and toxicology should be evaluated together: a compound detected at trace levels may warrant a different programme from one migrating at materially higher concentrations, particularly where genotoxic potential is plausible.

Analytical non-detection should be reported with a method-specific limit of detection or quantification, matrix recovery, blank correction and sampling plan. "Not detected" is not equivalent to zero exposure. This is particularly important for multilayer packages, where inks, adhesives, sealants and closure compounds can contribute migrants independently of the nominal internal coating.

4. Three industrial qualification cases

Case A - Acidic beverage in a lined metal container

Consider a hypothetical fruit beverage at pH 3.7–4.1, filled hot into a metal container using a newly qualified BPA-free internal coating. The formulation contains organic acids, sugars and a low concentration of soluble protein. The relevant question is whether the coating remains chemically and physically suitable after filling, distribution and its intended shelf life. No specific commercial coating or measured result is implied.

The study should compare the intended food, suitable regulatory simulants and a control beverage without the protein component. At minimum, it should examine three independent coating lots and several production lots, with samples immediately after filling and at justified real-time storage intervals. Targeted BPA and relevant known starting-substance analysis should be complemented by suspect screening for oligomers and degradation products. LC–HRMS may be appropriate for polar

and semipolar species; GC–MS for volatile or semivolatile extractables; method selection must follow the chemistry rather than a generic instrument list.

Physical performance belongs in the same dossier: adhesion, corrosion resistance, seam integrity and sensory change can determine whether the new system remains viable even if chemical migration is acceptable. A failed corrosion test cannot be rescued by an excellent BPA assay. Conversely, a small unidentified signal should trigger proportionate characterisation, not an automatic declaration of unsafety.

Case B - Retorted meat or vegetable preparation

A second hypothetical case concerns a retorted ready meal with a coating exposed to a high-temperature sterilisation cycle. Here the process is not a peripheral variable: it may influence curing, hydrolysis, oxidation and migration. Experimental conditions must reproduce the actual thermal history, container geometry, fill ratio and subsequent storage. Simply placing a coupon in a heated simulant may be useful for screening but cannot substitute for finished-container verification where seam regions, local coating defects or product interactions matter.

The protocol should measure known migrants before and after processing and screen for new signals attributable to the retort step. It should include a thermal-process control and, where feasible, an unprocessed reference article to separate manufacturing residues from heat-generated products. Microbiological commercial sterility and package integrity remain distinct from chemical suitability. A retort process that meets microbial lethality requirements may still require migration and corrosion qualification.

Case C - Protein-rich nutritional formulation

The third scenario is a high-protein liquid product in a polymeric or multilayer package. Protein concentration, fat content, emulsifiers and pH can influence migrant partitioning, while processing may change protein conformation and the availability of binding sites. Comparing a protein-containing formulation with a matched base matrix can help establish whether differences in measured migration reflect actual transfer, extraction efficiency or binding. Standard addition and recovery experiments are particularly important when matrix suppression affects mass-spectrometric quantification.

For all three cases, an industrial decision requires a predefined acceptance framework: legal eligibility, analytical fitness for purpose, migration and toxicological evaluation, package performance, manufacturing reproducibility and a documented change-control plan. These are hypothetical validation designs, not reports of INTABIOTECH product trials.

5. Regulatory comparison: the same pack, different decisions

Jurisdiction	Operative question in November 2026	Practical implication
EU / Spain	Regulation 2024/3190, as corrected by 2026/250, alongside 1935/2004, GMP 2023/2006 and material-specific rules	Check article type, exception, transitional date, declaration and migration evidence.
Great Britain	Domestic food-contact rules; FSA consulted on a	Do not treat EU prohibition as automatically transposed;

	BPA/related-bisphenol ban and UK COT issued a 2026 supplementary statement	verify current GB legal text.
Northern Ireland	EU-linked product rules may apply under Windsor Framework arrangements	Check applicable NI arrangements and product-specific obligations.
United States	FDA food-contact framework, including applicable 21 CFR provisions and food-contact notifications	Assess the exact substance, supplier, intended use and conditions; EU compliance is not US clearance.

For the EU, Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 supplies the overarching principle that food-contact articles must not transfer constituents in quantities that endanger human health or bring about unacceptable changes in composition or organoleptic characteristics. Regulation (EC) No 2023/2006 establishes good manufacturing practice; Regulation (EU) No 10/2011 provides specific rules for plastic materials where applicable. The BPA instrument operates within this wider architecture and does not replace it [1,4–6].

The EU's 2026 correction matters because technical and legal documents must cite the amended operative text, not a superseded shorthand. Transitional provisions are not interchangeable: dates can differ by material, application and specific conditions. Procurement teams should avoid blanket claims such as "all legacy stock became illegal in July 2026" or "all coated metal packaging has until 2028." Each conclusion needs a precise article-level legal basis.

In Great Britain, the Food Standards Agency consultation on a proposed BPA and related-bisphenol ban closed in December 2025 and was updated in March 2026; the UK Committee on Toxicity issued a supplementary statement in July 2026. These are important evidence and policy signals but should not be described as an enacted GB-wide ban without confirming a corresponding legislative change [8–9]. Northern Ireland requires a separate check under its applicable EU-linked arrangements. In the United States, FDA evaluates food-contact substances within a different statutory and authorisation framework, including substance- and use-specific clearances; a European declaration does not establish US compliance [10].

6. From supplier declaration to process-aware evidence

A defensible industrial dossier should be organised around the finished article and its real use rather than the marketing name of the coating. Procurement must capture composition and manufacturing information under appropriate confidentiality arrangements. Quality should record supplier and production lot traceability. R&D must define the matrix and process envelope; analytical laboratories must select targeted and non-target methods with validated recovery; toxicology must prioritise the signals that matter; and regulatory affairs must document the legal status for each market.

A two-tier strategy is efficient. The first tier screens the declared composition, authorised substances, expected extractables, food category and processing severity. The second tier investigates unresolved peaks, atypical process conditions, supplier changes or exposure scenarios that could alter the safety conclusion. This avoids both superficial reliance on a "BPA-free" label and indiscriminate high-cost testing of every low-risk material.

Digital traceability can support this approach by linking the coating lot, container lot, food formulation, thermal history, chromatographic raw data and legal decision. Machine-learning models may rank suspect structures or flag unusual analytical profiles, but they cannot independently establish molecular identity, safety or authorisation. Each model output must retain provenance, uncertainty and human review.

7. Research & Innovation Opportunity

Unresolved problem and scientific basis

The literature already establishes migration science, NIAS screening and food-contact toxicology. The potentially underdeveloped industrial question is whether routine qualification systematically captures process-induced differences among BPA-free replacements in complex foods. This is a proposed research gap, not a claim that the analytical methods or concept of substitution risk are novel. Patent and public technical disclosures describe many alternative coating chemistries; a patentable invention cannot be inferred from the present conceptual framework.

Hypothesis and validation

Hypothesis: a process-aware fingerprinting protocol, combining pre- and post-processing chemical profiles with food-matrix controls, will detect more consequential substitution-related discrepancies than a supplier-declaration-plus-targeted-BPA-testing workflow. To test this, recruit several coating families and representative food matrices, use independent production lots, pre-register the suspect-compound prioritisation criteria and create blinded comparisons between conventional and integrated reviews. Measure sensitivity to verified discrepancies, false-positive investigations, analytical cost, time to decision and interlaboratory reproducibility.

A second hypothesis concerns the importance of matrix composition: protein-rich and acidic products may alter the measured distribution or analytical recovery of some migrants relative to standard simulants. This is plausible on physicochemical grounds but cannot be generalised without substance-specific data. Validation should include mass-balance experiments, recovery controls, time-series sampling and orthogonal confirmation of priority signals. Where toxicological information is incomplete, the programme should identify that uncertainty rather than fabricate a safety threshold.

Regulatory limits and industrial value

The proposed fingerprint is not a substitute for required migration tests, declarations of compliance, material-specific authorisations or competent-authority decisions. Its possible value is earlier identification of incompatible packaging, better formulation–packaging co-development and fewer late-stage reformulations. For INTABIOTECH, the relevant opportunity lies in technical qualification of functional beverages, protein-rich foods and preserved formulations—not in making unverified claims about proprietary ingredients.

8. Conclusions

Europe’s 2026 BPA transition makes a longstanding scientific principle operationally urgent: substitution is not complete when the restricted compound disappears from a certificate. A replacement must be characterised as a material, tested under intended processing and storage conditions, and assessed for migration, performance and regulatory eligibility. The strongest

industrial dossiers connect the incoming chemistry to the finished food-contact article and to the exposure that can actually occur.

The article's established foundation is the binding EU legal framework and the science of migration and toxicological assessment. Its expert interpretation is that process-aware qualification should be treated as a core part of packaging substitution. Its research hypothesis—that integrated chemical fingerprinting improves decisions—remains to be validated. The appropriate response to uncertainty is neither promotional reassurance nor indiscriminate alarm, but a transparent programme of identification, measurement and legally grounded decision-making.

References and official sources

[1] Commission Regulation (EU) 2024/3190, bisphenol A and other bisphenols in food-contact materials. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/3190/oj

[2] Commission Regulation (EU) 2026/250, correction of Regulation (EU) 2024/3190, Official Journal 3 February 2026. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2026/250/oj

[3] European Commission (2026), guidance on implementation of the BPA food-contact restriction; see Commission food-contact-materials portal. https://food.ec.europa.eu/safety/chemical-safety/food-contact-materials_en

[4] Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 on materials and articles intended to come into contact with food. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2004/1935/oj

[5] Commission Regulation (EC) No 2023/2006 on good manufacturing practice for food-contact materials. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2006/2023/oj

[6] Commission Regulation (EU) No 10/2011 on plastic materials and articles intended to come into contact with food. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2011/10/oj

[7] EFSA (2023), Re-evaluation of the risks to public health related to the presence of bisphenol A in foodstuffs. EFSA Journal 21(4):6857. DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2023.6857. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2023.6857

[8] UK Food Standards Agency, Consultation on proposal to implement a ban on BPA and related bisphenols in food-contact materials, updated 19 March 2026. https://www.food.gov.uk/news-alerts/consultations/consultation-on-the-proposal-to-implement-a-ban-on-the-use-of-bisphenol-a-bpa-other-bisphenols-and-bisphenol-derivatives-in-food

[9] UK Committee on Toxicity, Supplementary statement to the COT position paper on BPA, 6 July 2026. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/supplementary-statement-to-the-cots-position-paper-on-bisphenol-a-bpa/supplementary-statement-to-the-cots-position-paper-on-bisphenol-a-bpa

[10] US FDA, Food Ingredients and Packaging: Food Contact Substances. https://www.fda.gov/food/food-ingredients-packaging/food-contact-substances-fcs

[11] EFSA, Food contact materials: scientific assessment and risk evaluation. https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/food-contact-materials

[12] European Commission, New EU packaging rules enter into application, 11 August 2026 (published 11 August). https://environment.ec.europa.eu/news/new-eu-rules-packaging-enter-application-2026-08-11_en

Related INTABIOTECH Knowledge Areas: Food Safety; Regulatory Affairs; Functional Ingredients; Processing Technologies; Sustainability; Emerging Research.

© 2026 José M. López. All rights reserved.