#74

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*:	ACEA - European Automobile Manufacturers' Association
Town/City:	Brussels
Country*:	Belgium
Contact name:	Peter Kunze
E-mail address:	
Transparency Register ID number (if applicable)	0649790813-47
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 , f) is a manufacturer of articles containing nanomaterials without intended release , i) is a distributor of articles 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):	C29 - Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers
Secondary business sector (NACE 4 digit code):	G45 - Wholesale and retail trade and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles

Q7: Please indicate the number of employees.	≥ 250 employees
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	3
f) Ensure the proportionality of the information requirements and the associated costs and administrative burden.	5
g) Protect confidential business information	5

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	3
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)	3
d) Ensure consumer trust in products containing nanomaterials	3
e) Ensure the availability of relevant information on the presence of nanomaterials or products containing nanomaterials on the market	3
f) Ensure the proportionality of the information requirements and the associated costs and administrative burden.	3
g) Protect confidential business information	3
Please provide additonal comments	There is a lack of information in the SDS for chemicals we use in internal process (i.e. in paint). In some cases it's quite normal because the substance is not dangerous but in some others the nano state is not really mentioned. ACEA believes there is a need of information/ transparency on this area with the confirmation of the need or not of adequate RMM (safety protection).

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	3
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	3
d) The available information on the presence of nanomaterials and products containing nanomaterials on the market is presented in an incoherent or ineffective way	4
e) The establishment of national registries and notification schemes causes market fragmentation and hampers trade within the internal market	5

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
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: ACEA believes that the risks out of nanomaterials (NMs) can be controlled by applying the existing regulatory framework (REACH and CLP), even if some amendments would be required. Most important for the automotive industry as a downstream user would be to have unique identifiers in order to be able to distinguish between a bulk and a nanoscale material. Safety data sheets should provide information on proven hazardous nanoscale material on a more prominent place.

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: Actually, press makes the customer think that all NMs are extremely hazardous. This is not true. So, for the time being the declaration with “Nano” makes people step back from buying a NM containing product.
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: See above

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: The implementation of the French national registry system could led to a mistrustful per-ception from economic partners and consequently to a negative impact on competitiveness and innovation.
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

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	1
b) with respect to nanomaterials in mixtures	5
c) with respect to articles with intended release of the nanomaterials	3
d) with respect to articles containing nanomaterials in general (i.e. in case also articles without an intended release of nanomaterials were to be covered)	5
Please explain:	The automotive industry is not using NM as such. Only in mixtures or articles. A notification would be an additional administrative burden with questionable effect.

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): E. g. competitors could draw conclusions on the composition of used materials.

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? Besides the administrative burden, that has to be done several times, the different databases require different data. These data have to be collected separately.
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"?

The first question should be if such a notification system is necessary at all.
If yes, than the requirements and definitions should be harmonized (e.g. same scope (substances, mixtures or articles containing NM), what can be excluded from NM (pigments?), not intentionally added NM etc.).

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.

For workers and downstream users, the best information should be found in the safety data sheets and would then be related to a substance or mixture notification.

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, Please explain: Notification according to existing regulatory requirements.
Q30: The following should be subject to notification requirements (tick all that apply):	a) Substances, b) Mixtures containing nanomaterials, c) Articles with intended release of nanomaterials , Please explain: Notification according to existing regulatory requirements.
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.) Notification according to existing regulatory requirements, but if an additional notification is necessary, e.g. some naturally available NMs or pigments might 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.)
See above

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

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

Specific information on the ECHA Webpages would be appreciated.

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)
ACEA is expecting the supplier of NM to provide information on hazards by using the safety data sheet. So, this would be needed for workers protection, safe use etc.

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):

n/a

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

ACEA estimates the administrative burden higher than the benefit to EU industry, environment and consumers.

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

Respondent skipped this question