#67

COMPLETE

Collector: Nano Consult - Industry (Web Link)
Started:
Last Modified:
Time Spent:
IP Address:

PAGE 2: Section I - Identification

Q1: Please provide the following details (*compulsory):	
Organisation*:	Fecc
Town/City:	Brussels
Country*:	Belgium
Contact name:	Ophelie Roblot
E-mail address:	
Transparency Register ID number (if applicable)	0346440357-87
Q2: Received contributions may be published on the Commission's website, with the identity of the contributor. Please state your preference with regard to the publication of your contribution:	My contribution may be published under the name indicated
Q3: We might need to contact you to clarify some of your answers. Please state your preference below:	I am available to be contacted
Q4: Did your organisation participate in the online survey (undertaken by RPA/BiPRO for the European Commission in early 2014) on the administrative burden of the notification schemes?	No

PAGE 3: Section II - Organisation Information

Q5: Please indicate which of the following applies to you or your members (tick all that apply):	a) has to notify to the French Notification System , b) has to notify to the Cosmetic Products Notification Portal , c) is a manufacturer of nanomaterials, d) is an importer of nanomaterials, e) is a formulator of mixtures containing nanomaterials , h) is a distributor of nanomaterials and/or mixtures containing nanomaterials

Q6: Please indicate the four-digit NACE code of your primary and secondary business sector (if applicable). If you require information regarding NACE codes, please visit the European Commission Competition webpage at http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/index/nace_all.html	
Primary business sector (NACE 4 digit code):	20
Q7: Please indicate the number of employees.	*Respondent skipped this question*
Q8: Please indicate the approximate annual turnover of your organisation and the annual turnover which relates to nano-related products (where these include nanomaterials as well as mixtures and articles containing nanomaterials).	*Respondent skipped this question*
Q9: Please indicate the number of nano-related products (where these include nanomaterials as well as mixtures and articles containing nanomaterials) that you place on the national market.	*Respondent skipped this question*
Q10: Please indicate the number of nano-related products (where these include nanomaterials as well as mixtures and articles containing nanomaterials) that you place on the EU market.	*Respondent skipped this question*
Q11: Please indicate the number of nano-related products (where these include nanomaterials as well as mixtures and articles containing nanomaterials) that you place on the global market.	*Respondent skipped this question*
Q12: Please indicate the number of customers and, if applicable, number of suppliers for all your nano-related products combined (where these include nanomaterials as well as mixtures and articles containing nanomaterials).	*Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 4: Section III – Problem definition and objectives

Q13: Please rate the importance of the following objectives on a scale between 1 (not important at all) and 5 (very important).

a) Provide decision makers, regulatory authorities and professional users with information that allows for an appropriate response to health or environmental risks of nanomaterials	5
b) Provide consumers with relevant information on products containing nanomaterials on the market	3
c) Maintain competitiveness and innovation of businesses bringing nanomaterials or products containing nanomaterials to the market (including SMEs)	5
d) Ensure consumer trust in products containing nanomaterials	5
e) Ensure the availability of relevant information on the presence of nanomaterials or products containing nanomaterials on the market	2
f) Ensure the proportionality of the information requirements and the associated costs and administrative burden.	5
g) Protect confidential business information	5
Please provide additional comments	Nanomaterials should be treated as any other substance. The focus should be put on ensuring safe use of the substance or mixture and data should only be gathered for this purpose.

Q14: To what degree (from 1 - not at all to 5 - fully) does the current legislative framework (including the REACH and CLP Regulations and product-specific legislation) and the currently available databases (including the JRC web platform, see http://ihcp.jrc.ec.europa.eu/our_databases/web-platform-on-nanomaterials) meet the following objectives?

a) Provide decision makers, regulatory authorities and professional users with information that allows for an appropriate response to health or environmental risks of nanomaterials	4
b) Provide consumers with relevant information on products containing nanomaterials on the market	3
c) Maintain competitiveness and innovation of businesses bringing nanomaterials or products containing nanomaterials to the market (including SMEs)	2
d) Ensure consumer trust in products containing nanomaterials	2
e) Ensure the availability of relevant information on the presence of nanomaterials or products containing nanomaterials on the market	4
f) Ensure the proportionality of the information requirements and the associated costs and administrative burden.	4
g) Protect confidential business information	4
Please provide additonal comments	Fecc supports Cefic's comments that 'consumer trust can be increased by a good implementation of the current European legislative framework (even if some adaptations in the REACH annexes are needed), provided that it is well explained to the public.'

Q15: To what extent do you agree with the following statements from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree):

a) The current level of available information on the presence of nanomaterials and products containing nanomaterials on the market is insufficient for an adequate response to health and environmental risks	1
b) The current level of available information on the presence of nanomaterials and products containing nanomaterials on the market is insufficient for informed consumer choice	3
c) The current level of available information on the presence of nanomaterials and products containing nanomaterials on the market is detrimental to consumer trust	2
d) The available information on the presence of nanomaterials and products containing nanomaterials on the market is presented in an incoherent or ineffective way	3
e) The establishment of national registries and notification schemes causes market fragmentation and hampers trade within the internal market	5
Please provide additional comments	Fecc supports Cefic's views and believes that it is not the availability/listing of information which will ensure safety and environment protection but rather the performance of a risk assessment based on data gathered by industry and a clear information delivered to the consumers.

PAGE 5: Section IV – Health and environmental aspects

Q16: With regard to health and environmental hazards and risks of specific nanomaterials/types of nanomaterials, please tick the relevant boxes:	I am aware of health and/or environmental hazards of specific nanomaterials/types of nanomaterials , I am aware of specific nanomaterials that are classified as hazardous under Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 on classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures , I am aware of DNELs/PNECs/OELs set for specific nanomaterials/types of nanomaterials , I am not aware of any significant exposure of workers/users/consumers to specific nanomaterials/types of nanomaterials , Please explain your responses (if any, please report the nanomaterials, the health and/or environmental hazards, any relevant classification, any DNELs/PNECs/OELs, any exposure and in which condition): We are aware for example that DNELs specific for TiO2 and carbon nanotubes, as we are aware that specific assessment has been carried out for TiO2 in sunscreens.
Q17: With regard to the past and current use of nanomaterials (tick the relevant box):	I am not aware of any health and/or environmental incidents which have occurred
Q18: The establishment of an EU nanomaterial registry (tick the relevant box):	Would not significantly contribute to reducing the health and/or environmental risks related to the use of nanomaterials , If appropriate, please explain further: Fecc supports Cefic's views that the current legislative framework is sufficient to cover risk assessment and recommendations to control risk. Additional legislations will increase complexity and misunderstanding of applicable legislations.

PAGE 6: Section V – Consumer trust

Q19: In case information on the presence of nanomaterials in your products were made available, what impact do you think this would have on your clients? (Please tick all that would apply)	b) They would try to avoid those products, Please explain: Experience from the French registry demonstrates that consumer seems to avoid products containing nanomaterials.

Q20: Do you believe that the public availability of information on the presence of nanomaterials in products would be likely to...(choose one of the following answers)	c) generate insecurity or stigmatise such products, and thus have a negative effect on the market for the concerned products , Comments: Consumers often do not know that the information is available and if they are aware, very few are able to interpret it.

PAGE 7: Section VI - Innovation and competitiveness

Q21: With regard to innovation, do you believe that information on nanomaterials and products containing nanomaterials that could be gathered in a nanomaterial registry would...(choose one of the following answers)	c) hamper innovation in the EU (e.g. through concerns about confidential business information or through additional costs related to providing information) , Comments: Fecc supports Cefic comments.
Q22: With regard to competitiveness of EU companies manufacturing nanomaterials or products containing nanomaterials, do you believe that information on nanomaterials and products containing nanomaterials that could be gathered in a nanomaterial registry would...(tick all that apply)	f) hamper the competitiveness of European companies against extra-EU companies , Please explain Fecc believes that a register for nanomaterials will be costly and burdensome for EU companies. Providing different data set depending on the national inventories requirement would increase the workload for EU companies and therefore it will decrease their competitiveness.

PAGE 8: Section VII – Possible impact of a registry on your company/members of your association

Q23: Overall, how would a possible obligation to notify nanomaterials at the EU level affect your company/the members of your association, assuming that no exemptions were to be made from 1 (no impact) to 5 (significant impact):

a) with respect to nanomaterials on their own	4
b) with respect to nanomaterials in mixtures	5
Please explain:	As distributor, the major impact will be on substances and mixtures. Distributors are in principle not producing articles.

Q24: Would disclosure of the notified information conflict with the confidentiality of business information?	Yes, there would be a conflict with business information confidentiality , If yes, please elaborate; you may differentiate according to the different information that may be required in a notification scheme (e.g.: if a notification is only per substance and general use, or if the exact use needs to be disclosed): Fecc supports Cefic answer.

Q25: Do you experience or expect any significant barriers for your company/members of your association from diverging registration obligations in the schemes in France/Belgium/Denmark?	Yes, we foresee significant barriers, If yes, please describe these barriers? Each country has developed its own data set requirement which means that a company will have to submit different information to comply with individual national reqirements.
Q26: Is the market for your nanomaterials/products containing nanomaterials significantly different from Member State to Member State?	No, there is not any significant difference in the national markets for our products

Q27: In case the European Commission were to recommend a best practice model for national notification schemes based on the experiences in France, Belgium and Denmark, which elements of these systems can be considered as "best practice"?

Fecc supports Cefic's answer.

PAGE 9: Section VIII – Possible options and exemptions

Q28: What would be the added value of a notification per use (i.e. for each mixture/article) compared to a notification per substance? – Please consider the usefulness of the information for public authorities, downstream user companies, workers and consumers.

Fecc believes that the notification system should use existing information provided in SDS or national notifications for instance. It is important to ensure that information is not provided twice therefore notification per use can have a value if there are exemptions of specific uses due to covering by other legislations (cosmetics etc.)

Q29: Which actors along the supply chain should be subject to notification requirements? (tick all that apply):	a) Manufacturers of nanomaterials, b) Importers of nanomaterials, c) Downstream users (e.g. re-formulators, manufacturers of products containing nanomaterials) , Please explain: Fecc supports Cefic's answer.
Q30: The following should be subject to notification requirements (tick all that apply):	Please explain: Fecc supports Cefic's answer.
Q31: Is there a need to exempt certain types of nanomaterials?	Yes, certain types of nanomaterials should be exempted from a notification system , If yes, which types should be exempted and why? (in terms of specific properties, available knowledge, absence of hazards, etc.) Substances and mixtures which contain nanomaterials covered by other legislations should be exempted.

Q32: Is there a need to exempt certain uses of nanomaterials?

Yes, certain uses of nanomaterials should be exempted from a notification system

,

If yes, which uses should be exempted and why? (in terms of specific exposure scenarios, available knowledge, absence of hazards, etc.)
Fecc supports Cefic views that nanomaterials notification done for the purpose of other legislations should be exempted like they are under the Danish notification system.

PAGE 10: Section IX – Nanomaterials Observatory

Q33: If a Nanomaterials Observatory is established instead of an EU-wide registry, what type of information should be collected? (please tick all that apply)

a) Information from existing notification systems,

b) Information from market studies on nanomaterials and products containing nanomaterials

,

c) Information on the use of nanomaterials across Europe

,

d) Information concerning products containing nanomaterials

,

e) Information on the hazards and risks of nanomaterials

,

f) Other (please explain):
Fecc supports Cefic's answer.

Q34: How should the information in a Nanomaterials Observatory be presented in order to reach the consumers, workers and authorities?

The way information is organised on the German website www.nanopartikel.info/ is a good example of consumer friendly presentation.

PAGE 11: Section X - Potential use and benefits of a nanomaterial registry

Q35: In what ways could the information on nanomaterials from registries be potentially useful (tick all that apply):

f) General education of the public,

g) Other purposes (please specify)
Workers and downstream users are already supplied with information on safe use via the SDS.

Q36: Please give a justification for your views (presented in the previous question) and describe which data would be necessary to allow the desired use (e.g. would information on substances alone be enough for informed consumer purchase decisions, or would this require information for each concerned product):

Fecc supports Cefic's answer.

Q37: What would be the added value of a European nanomaterial registry beyond the current framework of chemicals legislation, including REACH registration?

We don't see any added value. However if each Member States develop their own system, in that case a harmonised format would be a better solution.

Q38: Please provide any other comments that you would like to share regarding transparency measures for nanomaterials on the market.

Fecc supports Cefic/UIC's comments submitted in the Cefic contribution.