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1. WELCOME AND REMINDER OF COMPETITION LAW

The Chairman, Ad Jespers opened the meeting by welcoming all participants to the web conference.

The rules of the competition law were reminded by L. Conti and all agreed to adhere.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES & REVIEW OF ACTIONS OF LAST MEETING (19 January 2021)

The Minutes from the last meeting were approved, with the addition to text under 4.7.2. related to the Circular Plastic Alliances, as following: “see pre-reading”.

As to the actions, all have been undertaken or will be covered through the agenda.

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved. Two additional points will be included under Green Deal, as following:

Under 8.1.3. Zero Pollution: Revision of the Sewage sludge Directive

Under 8.1.1. CSS: Call by the Commission to propose candidates for the High Level Round Table

1. Short update from the Board meeting on 11 February (S.Zänker)

An update was provided on points not being on the agenda of the MC, as following:

a) Governance

- Lonza’s application to become Associated Member was accepted by the Board; this allows them to participate in the relevant groups as observer till the GA has ratified the membership.

- Dupont Bioscience and Nutrition being absorbed by IFF asked their rights as Associate Member to be maintained under the name of IFF, which was approved by the Board, for endorsement by the GA.

- UKCPI: to maintain a strong and efficient relationship for the benefit of the members of both associations, the proposal is to maintain their status as Ordinary Member with reduced membership fees for the next 2 years. The situation is to be reassessed for their membership from 2024 onwards. A proposal is underway for the GA.

- GA format: due to the COVID situation the Board agreed the GA to be organised in a virtual format.

b) Green Deal: most points are covered through the MC agenda, the Board emphasised the need to put priority on that topic and will have an Extra-ordinary Web-conference on 1 March 2021.

c) Euromonitor market data of 2020: the first published data from Euromonitor, used by A.I.S.E. for the Annual Report do show a trend of increased sales for HH products. The Board stressed that these figures, once final, should be put into perspective of the difficult situation caused by the pandemic as to obstacles in manufacturing companies. Despite the difficulties that companies faced, all efforts were undertaken to ensure products availability to society for cleanliness and hygiene.

For more details, see the [MINUTES](https://aise.wall.idloom.com/File/Preview?ID=11199) of the Board meeting 01/202.

1. KEY TOPICS *(for decisions)*
	1. Single-use plastics for wet wipes – latest developments *(M.Temsamani)*

Guidelines on scope/definition: During the past weeks, A.I.S.E. and other trade associations have been advocating to the EC and Member States in order to remove viscose from the guidelines and revert to the previous draft. The final version of guidelines document is now expected sometime in Q1 2021. Advocacy is ongoing with several DGs, Cabinets and EU member states authorities.

Marking requirements implementation: The Implementing Act on marking requirements was adopted in December 2020. Unfortunately, some (translation, and other) errors have made their way in the Act. A corrigendum should be published soon along with the markings. A.I.S.E is putting together a Q&A document that should help companies getting greater clarity on implementation, enforcement, and compliance. Once clear understanding is reached, the document may be shared with DG ENVI to ensure the industry’s understanding is the correct one.

***FOR ACTIONS*:**

***- Members were invited to comment on the draft Q&A by 3 March 2021. The document will then be finalised. Cosmetics Europe and EDANA will be consulted to ensure alignment of messaging.***

***- Mapping EU Member States position on implementation: The secretariat will develop a mapping of EU MS positions in relation to SUPD implementation.***

***- Additional advocacy will be carried out on viscose as appropriate.***

* 1. Endocrine disruptors - proposal from *ad hoc* discussion group (J.Robinson)

The MC members discussed and endorsed the points tabled for approval as follows:

1. The Management Committee agreed to the recommendation of the ad hoc expert group to leave scientific work/argumentation to Cefic and to pursue an independent regulatory strategy as A.I.S.E. The CLP WG would be the lead group for regulatory discussion, with consultation of the Biocides WG and/or RIWG as required and involvement of the Advocacy SG. A.I.S.E. would develop its own positions as required, and/or liaise with others where appropriate (e.g. Cefic, DUCC).

2. In accordance with the recommendation, the MC also agreed that A.I.S.E. should submit written comments on the French TRIS notification for a decree on information requirements for EDs (by taking over/adapting the comments developed by Afise with other French associations).

3. The MC agreed that the *ad hoc* group of experts had fulfilled its brief and relieved it of its duties, expressing thanks for its efforts.

A question was asked about any ongoing role for the *ad hoc* group, e.g. whether it would be consulted on CLP WG discussions or decisions on the regulatory arguments. The MC confirmed that it prefers not to form/retain an additional group, but relevant experts can either join the CLP WG or be consulted by their company colleagues in the CLP WG as required.

It was also queried whether A.I.S.E. interacts with the fragrance industry on this topic. The Secretariat confirmed that IFRA represents DUCC in the CARACAL Sub-Group on EDs

* 1. Hygiene communication (V.Séjourné)

MC members were informed that the joint A.I.S.E./IFH report was ready to go to design and approved by the Hygiene Communication TF. An adhoc call of the Biocides WG is schedule don 4 March to draw the attention to the Biocides experts on the key features of the report and notably, the recommendation to have an internal (and external) dialogue on the topic of terminology/vocabulary, as outlined in the recommendations of the report.

MC members also approved the proposal from the TF to launch the report on 7 April as this coincides with the WHO World Health day. The positioning vis-à-vis the Commission programme EU4Health was also endorsed, recommending a stepwise approach.

* 1. Enzymes (G.Sebastio)

The MC approved the new work program of the Enzyme WG, commenting it was key to involve associations in other countries beyond the EU and US for the creation of the global guidance on safe use of enzymes.

Regarding the peer-reviewed paper on Skin Sensitization, the following discussion took place:

* AMFEP requested the position of A.I.S.E. on collaborating to update this paper. Total cost of € 41,000 Euro.
* Creation of a factsheet on the sustainable profiling of enzymes in collaboration with ACI/HCPA the (estimated cost 1000 € for A.I.S.E.)
* The support of the MC is requested for the budget (21,000 €) to support the work. This is suggested to come from the regulatory budget (and in part from the PC&H budget 6,000 € agreed with PC&H on 19 February).

It was confirmed that there was sufficient budget for this work to progress.

The MC agreed that the skin sensitization paper was valuable work, but some comments were made:

* A.I.S.E. to enquire if other industry sectors could participate in the work.
* David Basketter should be contacted to understand if the quote could be revised considering that industry would provide expertise as well as funding for this paper.
* A Budget of ca. 15,000 € was considered more favorably by the MC for this work. A.I.S.E. would negotiate with AMFEP with this value in mind. However, the requested budget of 21,000 € was approved, if this became necessary.
1. KEY TOPICS *(for discussion)*
	1. Detergent Regulation (G.Sebastio)
		1. Roadmap on fragrance allergens

This is the proposal to increase the number of fragrance ingredients to be listed under the Detergent Regulation from 26 to 87. Due to the direct relationship between the Cosmetics Regulation and Detergent Regulation, this is a point of key impact for our sector.

The MC was updated on the developments regarding this topic. A.I.S.E. has been given a seat at the next Commission Cosmetics WG in March and is taking action to align with both the Cosmetics and Fragrance industries, where possible. Furthermore, the topic will be discussed at the next Detergent WG on 25 February.

A few questions and comments were made by the MC:

* A.I.S.E. was asked on the status of testing capabilities for the additional ingredients being considered. IFRA explained during a joint meeting between IFRA/Cosmetics Europe and A.I.S.E., that larger fragrance houses should have developed methods, since the initial discussions in 2012. However, the methods will need to be refined based on the details of the regulatory proposal. This might not be the case for smaller fragrance houses.
* The position of Cosmetics Europe is different to that of A.I.S.E. regarding digital labelling. The Cosmetics industry proposed for digital or on-pack labelling to be a choice for companies.
* The implementation date for the proposed amendment to the legal text, based on the current text is for Q4 2023.
* It was discussed that as the methods for testing of these fragrances might not be complete, this could lead to delay in information going down the supply chain. The MC suggested to provide an example to show the timing for these changes to be implemented.
* The group discussed whether estimating the number of products that will need to be updated would be valuable. However, this could be interpreted as consumers not having information of a large number of products.
* It was raised that the situation for detergents is very different to cosmetics (especially regarding the rate of allergies). IKW could share recent data from IVK. The group discussed that having a delinking to the cosmetics regulation would be preferrable. However, fragrances are cited in the main body of the Detergent Regulation, so a more likely change would be for these ingredients to be labelled digitally. This could also be used to demonstrate that industry wants to be transparent, and have clean labels without superfluous information, and then more information online.
	+ 1. Impact Assessment on the Detergent Regulation

Considering the ongoing developments related to the Green Deal and also the Detergent Regulation, in particular the impact assessment planned by the Commission to assess the policy options for the future of the Detergent Regulation, A.I.S.E. would like to be ready for the questions that will be shared during the assessment.

The A.I.S.E. position to external stakeholders remains that: The regulation is fit for purpose and the points for improvement can be resolved via minor amendments to scientific and technical progress.

However, in order to prepare for a possible opening (or recast) of the Detergent Regulation, A.I.S.E. have identified possible futures for the regulation’s requirements. These scenarios currently consider: inclusion of the Detergent Regulation requirements into REACH, in the Water Framework Directive, under the Ecodesign Regulation of the. A first discussion took place with the SSG on the 8th February, then more are planned at the next PC&H SG on the 19th February, and the Detergent WG on the 25th February.

The feedback from the SSG discussion and PC&H SG discussion was shared with the Management Committee and one specific question was raised for feedback. A.I.S.E. requested the opinion of the MC on the possible scenario where inclusion of Detergents in the Ecodesign with the Charter could be recognised as self-regulation.

The MC provided the following input:

* A situation where Detergents fall under Ecodesign was seen as a slippery slope.
* Ecodesign as an option was not seen as appealing. It could be used to extend the PEF requirements and would be problematic for industry.
* PC&H cannot rely on the Charter in the same way, due to the lower uptake within the sector.
* The value of this option would be acceptable only if there was a serious likelihood of solving issues relating to green/washing and green claims. However, the timelines of the Commission’s work could work against industry.

It was however agreed in the discussion that A.I.S.E. should take the following Action: for A.I.S.E. to i) identify the areas that are considered “core” to the Detergent regulation ii) build arguments as to why maintaining the Detergent Regulation is good for society.

* + 1. AOB Added during the meeting on Detergent Regulation testing labs

An issue has come to the attention of A.I.S.E. following publication of the Commission’s guidance on BREXIT for detergents. However, it is not strictly related to BREXIT.

The guidance states that:

Based on Articles 3 and 4, as well as Annexes II, III, IV and VIII to Regulation (EC) No 648/2004, the following tests are required:

* Primary biodegradability tests for surfactants in detergents;
* Ultimate biodegradability (mineralisation) tests for surfactants in detergents;
* Tests provided for under complementary risk assessment for surfactants in detergents.

According to Article 8(2) of Regulation (EC) No 648/2004, these tests have to be carried out by laboratories approved by a Member State. (A list with the labs is then referenced http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/chemicals/legislation\_en ).

The latest version of the list of approved labs is from 2012 and we understand that some Member states have record that there was an agreement not to update this list, since initially the list of laboratories was meant only for testing labs that would carry out the studies for the derogation procedure. Thus, it is possible that over time, testing labs that have been approved by an EU member state, have not been placed on the list.

The Detergent Regulation legal text explicitly states the obligation for continued update of this list and the Commission has explicitly referenced this in their guidance. A.I.S.E. is concerned that if the Commission decide to assess the topic and give a strict interpretation based on the legal text, then testing laboratories that have been used in the past for biodegradability testing would be out of scope.

A.I.S.E. connected with CESIO on this issue. There was a joint meeting between CESIO and A.I.S.E. on the 18th February.

Four actions were agreed between A.I.S.E. and CESIO:

• ***Action 1***: CESIO to carry out an internal “gap analysis” of labs being used by members to assess if there are any not on the Detergent Regulation 2012 list. (see following link <http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/chemicals/legislation_en> ).

• ***Action 2***: CESIO to understand if any labs on the Detergent Regulation 2012 list are no longer active/ no longer testing

• ***Action 3:*** A more thorough legal assessment to be carried out to understand if based on the “whereas clause 30” it can be argued that, based on the legal text, what is important is for a lab to be following an internationally recognised standard, namely EN/ISO/IEC/17025.

• ***Action 4:*** CESIO to revert back to A.I.S.E. towards end March.

In addition, the point was raised with the PC&H SG, where a document was shared on “WITHDRAWAL OF THE UNITED KINGDOM AND EU RULES IN THE FIELD OF GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICE (GLP)”. This is a document from the Commission that allows mutual acceptance of data for tests that are following the principles of GLP/OECD requirements.

A.I.S.E. will consider this to assess if a legal argument can be made to substantiate that what is important is for a lab to be following an internationally recognised standard, namely EN/ISO/IEC/17025.

* + 1. Impact Assessment on the Detergent Regulation

See prereadings

* 1. Digitalisation update (V.Séjourné/G.Sebastio)

Terms of Reference to this group have been developed and MC members were informed that they would have it as part of the MC presentations. Any comment should be provided to V Séjourné prior to the next MC. The call for Chair/vice Chair was reiterated (post meeting note; this is now completed).

MC members were also informed that A.I.S.E was seeking to obtain feedback from the consultant (Conpolicy/VVA) regarding the study on hazard info and e-label but this seemed to be getting a slow start. In addition, reference was made to the fact that A.I.S.E. and their IT consultant Atrify had been busy with various workshops in Jan/Feb and that the draft recommendation was due to be presented at a meeting on 9 March.

Ingredient messaging:

A short update was given. A.I.S.E. is progressing with this work and are aware that for the database to be considered a trusted source by consumers it should be submitted for an external review. A.I.S.E. has been brainstorming internally which external stakeholder could be consulted for support/approval of the work. This would involve an external validation (for example as was done in some of the HERA projects), with the aim of enhancing consumer trust for messaging of the database.

1. for information
	1. A.I.S.E. in vitro project – progress update *(D.Byrne)*

The Secretariat summarised the pre-reading for this information point and stated that work will continue using the available budget already assigned. This update was welcomed by the MC.

* 1. LDC PSP – 2021 update (D.Byrne)

See prereadings

* 1. Advocacy on skin sensitising active substances *(M.Temsamani)*

The topic of preservatives/skin sensitisers has been discussed at the last Biocides CA meeting in December 2020. Member States were invited by the Commission to provide feedback, confirming (or not) their interest in the topic and whether they believe there is an issue with in-can preservatives.
DG SANTE has specifically mentioned that the topic will only be addressed in the future if EU member states demonstrate interest/concerns during the upcoming Biocides CA meeting of 10-12 March 2021.

A position was put together by the PT6 technical task force. National Associations have been asked to reach out to their Biocides CA in order to raise concerns by leverage the position and fact sheet/arguments previously developed. The secretariat will also follow-up with the Commission, and individually with selected National Associations to share the written feedback of their Biocides CA already available.

* 1. Microplastics – update (J.Robinson)

See prereadings

* 1. Ethanol – status of CLH dossier and advocacy (J.Robinson)

See prereadings
W. Aulmann informed briefly about the alignment meeting held on 16 February between the ethanol REACH and biocides consortia and some other organisations including A.I.S.E. Agreements reached at the meeting included the establishment of a common platform for sharing of information and ongoing liaison to support advocacy.

* 1. REACH Review Action 3 – consequences of ECHA withdrawal (J.Robinson)

See prereadings. The Secretariat informed that the industry position would be developed as a reaction to the ECHA document CA/05/2021 for the 38th meeting of CARACAL on 3 March.

* 1. Biocides: BIT status (N.Hanon)

See prereadings

* 1. Air Quality VOC (G.Sebastio)

See prereadings

* 1. Charter: Membership and finances *(S.Nissen)*

See prereadings

* 1. Corporate Website update (A.O’Kane)

MC members supported the plan shared in pre-reading.

1. GREEN DEAL (13:45 - 15:15) (S.Nissen, M.Temsamani, J.Robinson, L.Conti)

Update, recent developments & next steps

* 1. Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability and Zero-pollution action plan
		1. CSS priority activities, sector collaboration and impact assessment (J.Robinson)

Impact assessment project

The MC discussed the project proposal for A.I.S.E. received from the consultant, in particular its anticipated value in light of the substantial cost. The public affairs perspective was emphasised: good data are needed to advocacy towards policy-makers (e.g. in Commission impact assessment studies) but are particularly important for political discussion. It was remarked that prior experience suggests such investments may be of limited effectiveness, e.g. the A.I.S.E. socio-economic analysis for microplastics was not sufficient to convince SEAC. It was noted however that the latter is an advisory committee and had merely deferred to policy-makers to decide (whilst not ruling out the favourable longer transition period).

Various options to reduce the cost were discussed and noted as questions to be explored with the consultant:

* reduced number of participating companies (but with care to avoid impacting on statistical representativeness)
* removal of some modules (e.g. polymer registration, although it was noted that the specificities of (former) downstream users would not be differentiated in Cefic’s project)
* a phased approach, to re-consider after Phase 1.

It was noted that the commitment of companies to contribute their data is also a key pre-requisite.

The impact assessment proposal will also be discussed in the CSS/ZP SG on 26 February and in an extraordinary Board meeting on 1 March. MC members were encouraged to consult with colleagues, to reflect on the relative risk of this project vs. not doing it and to signal any additional questions.

***ACTIONS*:**

***- MC members to discuss with colleagues in the CSS/ZP SG and Board***

***- A.I.S.E. team to raise questions with consultant for further refinement of proposal.***

High-level round table

The MC agreed that some representation of formulating sectors was important in this new expert group to support and advise the Commission on the implementation of the CSS (having previously been influential for REACH). There was a preference for this to be on the level of DUCC, and ideally at least two seats (A.I.S.E. + another sector). Since the chair of DUCC works in A.I.S.E. this could be a good fit. This proposal would be raised in the DUCC CSS TF on 24 February to seek agreement (otherwise an application could be made on behalf of A.I.S.E.). It was also suggested that the role and nature of the group (and hence the ideal profile of participants) be explored further with the Commission, including DG GROW.

[*Post-meeting note:* it was subsequently agreed in the Cefic Partner Associations meeting and in DUCC to nominate candidates on a higher level, e.g. CEO or VP of R&D, product safety etc., to ensure the group remains strategic/political and does not duplicate the work of other expert groups such as CARACAL.]

* + 1. A.I.S.E. position and advocacy to EU Council *(M.Temsamani)*

The EU Council is developing Conclusions on the Chemical Strategy for Sustainability with a view to be adopted at the next ENVI Council on 18 March. A.I.S.E. has decided to develop a position paper highlighting the industry’s priorities, as well as suggestions for NEW paragraphs to be added to the Council Conclusions. In addition to the position paper, an annex proposing cosmetics/content changes to already existing paragraphs developed by the German Presidency (as per the first iteration document of the Council Conclusions) is also available.

National Associations were asked to share these documents and engage with local representatives as early as possible. Industry rational and justifications are clearly identified in the position paper. A.I.S.E. secretariat will engage with the PT presidency to promote these comments, and close the loop with the PT association. An assessment of this exercise will be carried out at the next NAC meeting and when conclusions are published.

* + 1. Zero Pollution: A.I.S.E. position and COM activities *(J.Robinson)*

No questions were raised on the pre-reading.

A.I.S.E. had been approached by a consultant conducting targeted stakeholder consultation for a revision of the Sewage Sludge Directive. This legislation forms part of the acquis that will be evaluated and potentially revised under the Zero Pollution Action Plan, expected in Q2 2021.

It was agreed that A.I.S.E. should maintain this topic for active monitoring under the ZPAP, but is not in a position to respond to the current consultation. If any relevant actions arise in the ZPAP these can be addressed by the CSS/ZP Steering Group and raised to the MC as required; the Plan may focus attention on the volumes of cleaning products that go down the drain.

* 1. Circular Economy Action Plan (CEAP)
		1. A.I.S.E. position on PEF *(S.Nissen)*

See prereadings

* + 1. EU Consumer Agenda – A.I.S.E. position *(M.Temsamani)*

During the December 2020 Board meeting, it was decided that A.I.S.E. should develop a statement on the Commission’s initiative regarding the EU Consumer Agenda (pledges for companies). The aim of the statement is to explain how our sector is approaching sustainable consumption, is supportive of voluntary action in general, but that in this specific case, the framework proposed is deemed too prescriptive and focused on PEF.

The statement was drafted but before being finalized, the secretariat wishes to re-engage once more with DG JUST to understand and clarify certain aspects of the proposed voluntary action. On the basis of these exchanges with the Commission, intelligence gathered from a number of companies (outside the industry) that have decided to join the Commission initiative, A.I.S.E. will reassess its statement and course of action.

* + 1. A.I.S.E. horizontal position paper *(L.Conti)*

A quick update on the development of the A.I.S.E. horizontal position paper on CEAP was made on the basis of the pre-reads / annotated agenda. The objective of the paper is to address the overarching political messages of A.I.S.E. regarding CEAP ahead of the upcoming legislative initiatives (particularly substantiation of green claims, empowering consumers in the green transition, and sustainable product initiative). The paper is meant to be shared and circulated with relevant EU policy-makers (EP, COMM and Council) and used for advocacy activities to ensure A.I.S.E.’s contribution to shaping the relevant legislative and policy initiatives. The paper will be finalised by beginning of March. No further questions were raised during the call.

* 1. Climate Action *(V.Séjourné, S.Nissen)*

Nothing was added to the prereadings

* 1. Other developments
1. OTHER BUSINESS/ QUESTIONS
2. NEXT MEETING DATES

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tuesday 23 March 2021 (+ joint lunch with NAC)  | 10:00 – 13:0 | Webconference  |
| Tuesday 23 March (joint meeting with NAC) | 13:30 - 16:30 | Webconference |
| Tuesday 20 April 2021 | 10:30 - 15:30 | Webconference |
| Tuesday 18 May 2021 | 10:30 – 15:30  | Webconference |
| Tuesday 29 June 2021 | 10:30 - 15:30 | Webconference |
| Tuesday 7 September 2021 | 10:30 – 16:00 | Brussels (A.I.S.E.)  |
| Tuesday 19 October 2021 | 10:30 - 15:30 | Webconference |
| Tuesday 23 November 2021 | 10:30 – 16:00 | Brussels (A.I.S.E.) |
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