EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Table of Comments (ToC) received after the 1st AHWG meeting (ToC1) for the revision of EU Ecolabel criteria for detergents

February 2025

Contents

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

1. Preliminary report (5 comments)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.12 - Summary of PR (in TR1,– specifically rows 295-296), where it says: *"However, very little information is publicly available about the environmental impacts from an LCA perspective."* Comment: Our company produces biosurfactants via industrial scale fermentation processes. We have LCA data on the processes available which are of high quality and prepared in line with the ISO standards 14040 and 14044. Calculations have been performed with the GaBi software and database (thinkstep, 2020) for most of raw materials and for energy. Primary data have been gathered for the own process (2019 or 2020 depending on the product) while secondary data have been used for upstream activities as well as energy generation and waste treatment. Based on this we received comparably low GWP (kg CO2 eq/kg) for our biosurfactants. In addition, it is worth mentioning that microbial-based biosurfactants (surfactants produced by fermentation) have several advantages for formulators and consumers, as it can offer a credible approach to the lowest possible footprint, as it has the flexibility to use different types of locally sourced raw materials. In addition, the fermentation process itself is generally known to have a high potential for further optimization in terms of productivity and carbon footprint.	Acknowledged. We would be really interested to follow up on any insights you can share with us about the LCA impacts of biosurfactant production and how sensitive this is to different factors and how it compares to industrial scale production of chemical surfactants (from oleochemical or petrochemical sources). This could be considered within the current or future revision (if not sourced in time)
p.12 - Summary of PR (in TR1, specifically rows 289-292), where it says: *"However, in terms of benefits of shifting from petrochemical to oleochemical precursors, only a marginal (ca. 5%) benefit was found in reducing fossil resource depletion. These findings should be carefully examined in the in-house LCA studies to be conducted and will also need to be considered when dealing with rationale for any criteria relating to palm oil or requirements for bio-based or plant-based ingredients."* Before taking any decision about switching from petrochemical to oleochemical or introducing percentages, a clear definition of sustainability and renewability must be given. Sustainability has different parameters than just origin and all of them should be carefully taken into consideration for a correct evaluation. These parameters should therefore be clearly defined. As noted in the report: "*Many surfactants contain a portion of petrochemical origin (e.g. dimethylaminopropyl amine that is grafted to fatty acids to obtain cocamidopropyl betaine and that originates at the beginning from propylene that is petrochemical) or are completely petrochemical (olefine sulfonates). Thus, introducing this limitation on fossil fuel feedstock could lead to the exclusion of a large number of the surfactants that are used today, and this would have an enormous impact on the surfactants industry and detergents industry in general if a well thought out roadmap is not in place to allow a feasible and sustainable transition.*" We therefore highlight the following points:	Acknowledged. While in TR1 there are no proposals for a minimum renewable material content, we can accept that if we did, the points you raise would need to be considered to some extent and our point by point responses are: 1. A sector wide socio-economic analysis (in the detergents sector) for a shift away from fossil carbon was not performed as part of the EUEL criteria revision. 2. Acknowledged. 3. Further details are needed to fully appraise intended meaning. 4. If setting minimum requirements on renewable content (which we are not) it would indeed make sense to also consider grouping

1. Whilst we support the aim for setting non-fossil targets for the chemical and energy industry in a holistic manner, the aim to be fully renewable and recycled needs a robust analysis of feasibility and a socio-economic impact assessment prior to setting targets. The total removal of fossil carbon in the chemical industry and specifically in the detergent industry is not backed by a robust analysis. 2. A holistic view and strategy over all industries in the chemical and energy sector is needed to meet realistically achievable targets. The availability and sustainable sourcing of renewable raw materials is a prerequisite. 3. The impact on the environment could be detrimental in the absence of sustainable sources. 4. "renewable and recycled" targets should include several different technologies, e.g. biobased, bio-attributed, recycled, chemcycled, carbon captured. Thus, the definition of "renewable" should be broadened. 5. There is a need to incentivize the production of sustainable feedstock.	other categories of material qualifications that have environmental benefits. 5. One such incentive would be to actually state minimum requirements for sustainable feedstock in EU Ecolabel criteria – but, as alluded to in point 4 of the comment, it is not clear exactly would be meant by "sustainable feedstock" yet.
p.12 - Summary of PR (in TR1, specifically rows 289-292), where it says: *"However, in terms of benefits of shifting from petrochemical to oleochemical precursors, only a marginal (ca. 5%) benefit was found in reducing fossil resource depletion. These findings should be carefully examined in the in-house LCA studies to be conducted and will also need to be considered when dealing with rationale for any criteria relating to palm oil or requirements for bio-based or plant-based ingredients."* Before taking any decision about switching from petrochemical to oleochemical or introducing percentages, a clear definition of sustainability and renewability must be given. Sustainability has different parameters than just origin and all of them should be carefully taken into consideration for a correct evaluation. These parameters should therefore be clearly defined. As noted in the report: "Many surfactants contain a portion of petrochemical origin (e.g. dimethylaminopropyl amine that is grafted to fatty acids to obtain cocamidopropyl betaine and that originates at the beginning from propylene that is petrochemical) or are completely petrochemical (olefine sulfonates). Thus, introducing this limitation on fossil fuel feedstock could lead to the exclusion of a large number of the surfactants that are used today, and this would have an enormous impact on the surfactants industry and detergents industry in general if a well thought out roadmap is not in place to allow a feasible and sustainable transition." We therefore highlight the following points: 1. Whilst we support the aim for setting non-fossil targets for the chemical and energy industry in a holistic manner, the aim to be fully renewable and recycled needs a robust analysis of feasibility and a socio-economic impact assessment prior to setting targets. The total removal of fossil carbon in the chemical industry and specifically in the detergent industry is not backed by a robust analysis. 2. A holistic view and strategy over all industries in the chemical and energy sector is needed to meet realistically achievable targets. The availability and sustainable sourcing of renewable raw materials is a prerequisite. 3. The impact on the environment could be detrimental in the absence of sustainable sources.	

4. "renewable and recycled" targets should include several different technologies, e.g. biobased, bio-attributed, recycled, chemcycled, carbon captured. Thus, the definition of "renewable" should be broadened. 5. There is a need to incentivize the production of sustainable feedstock.	
Summary of PR (on p.12 of TR1, specifically on rows 301-304) where it says: "*This involved a review of the CDV values for substances listed on the DID List (currently under revision) and a closer look at preservatives (because they have necessary inherent toxicity hazards) and fragrances (because they are not well covered by the DID list).*" Comment: On DID list A, there are default values for a perfume. They have been on this list for more than a decade. It treats the perfume as a whole with assigned default values for degradation and aquatic toxicity. Suggested actions: For dyes and perfumes, there is the option to provide actual data to calculate the DF and TF. It is not clear how this should be done for a complex mixture, such as a perfume, and what will be accepted by the country specific ecolabel approving body. For example, in the past we have calculated a degradation factor for the perfume based on data for the individual ingredients. However, more recently we see agencies not accepting this and instead wanting the perfume split into components e.g. DPG+perfume. Sometimes it has been necessary to also split out some of the major fragrance ingredients. Rationale: Consumer goods companies tend to use the default values but come to the fragrance house if this doesn´t allow their final product to pass the CDV criteria.	Acknowledged. These are relevant points although the current approach to allowing a default value or a specific value remains in place in the 2023 DID list (DID no. 2549). So long as the default value is conservative, it should not be an issue having this approach. Based on the last part of your comment, it seems indeed that the default value is conservative.
Requirements on manufacturing impacts? Comment: The JRC background report on ecodesign priorities identified some potential measures for detergents which are not yet reflected in the EUEL criteria, for example: - maximum limit of water consumption per kg or unit of product - design for minimising water consumption during use of the product - maximum energy consumed during manufacturing - maximum energy consumed to produce 1kg of product Suggested action: We would welcome an investigation whether further new criteria could be developed, especially on resource use (water, energy, waste) during manufacturing stage. - The preliminary report explains that the manufacturing stage is not a big environmental contributor in the LCA. This is a relative statement, since the use phase and associated energy use to heat the water are more crucial. However, if focusing on the area that the EU Ecolabel can influence with its criteria, the manufacturing stage likely becomes much more relevant to address.	Acknowledged. We acknowledge the potential measures for detergents but for this to be reflected within EUEL criteria firstly the work on Ecodesign priorities (ESPR) has to progress and be in its final form to delimit key aspects as methodology, to then consider how to best integrate with existing EUEL criteria revision procedures. Further to the previous, we have enquired about the energy consumption during the manufacturing stage (since this is a key performance indicator in the AISE sustainability reporting). However, only an industry average value is provided in their reports and the system boundaries and accounting rules are unclear to us. and we consider that the breakdown of data provided could not serve as a basis for an analysis aimed at setting an ambition level for the EU Ecolabel.

2. Product group name (20 comments)

Comments received in response to the following question embedded in TR1:

Responses to Question 1 (Q1)

Q1 asks: "Would you support the substitution of the Industrial and Institutional Professional If not, why?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.13 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: Yes. We support the substitution.	Accepted. Proposal is kept as in TR1 but conditioned to be in alignment with the revised Detergent Regulation once adopted. In this sense, any change on this terminology will only be reflected in EUEL revision documents after the final text for a revised Detergent Regulation is deemed as final. If such final legal text is different, the EUEL criteria will align with it.
p.13 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: we support	
p.13 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: We support substitution of the term "industrial and institutional" by "professional".	
p.13 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: French stakeholders are in favor of the new terminology of "professional" for IIDD and IILD product group names, which is more widely used in the profession.	
p.13-14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: Yes, we would support this substitution.	
p.14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: Yes, we support this substitution.	
p.14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: Yes, we support the substitution of the term "industrial and institutional" by "Professional".	
p.14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: I support the change to "professional"	
p.14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: I support this substitution.	
p.14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: oui je suis pour le remplacement du terme "industriel et institutionnel" par "professionnel"	

p.14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: Yes. It´s important to make the consistency with EU COM proposal for Detergent Regulation.	
p.14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: We support the proposal to use "Professional" instead of "industrial and institutional" since it is easier to understand and more generally applicable. It might also be considered to add a section on PHSC (professional hard surface cleaner) for the sake of consistency with the proposed changes.	
p.14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: Yes we support the substitution. This is more closely aligned with the term used in the profession.	
p.14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: we would support professional, because it is a common description	
p.15 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: No objection to the proposed product group name "Professional dishwasher detergents" and "Professional laundry detergents"	
p.16 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: We strongly support the substitution of the term "Industrial and Institutional" by "Professional" term more appropriate according to us.	
p.16 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: Yes Rationale: Professional is a commonly used term, easy to understand and reflects the essence of what it refers to. Also good for communication purposes in parallel with consumer.	
p.16 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: agree with the term "professional"	
p.13-14 – **Q1 on "professional" instead of "industrial and institutional"** Comment: We do not support the substitution of Industrial and Institutional to Professional for IIDD and IILD. The main reason is that in February 2024, a proposal of the regulation on Detergents is in favor to keep Institutional and Industrial instead of Professional. To continue to be in line with the detergent revision, we do not support the substitution.	Partially accepted. As indicated, this proposal derives from alignment with the EU Commission proposal for a revised Detergent Regulation. Given this and wide stakeholders support, the JRC intends to keep using the proposed terminology. However, it will ultimately align with the final text of the adopted mandatory regulation for detergent and cleaners in order to maintain the consistency of the terminology used.

3. Scope (74 comments)

General comments received plus responses to the following questions embedded in TR1 (3 comments):

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.16-17 – On scope text proposal: Comment: Biocides products: product claiming a "biocidal effect" shall be explicitly excluded in the scope to avoid any misunderstanding and different interpretations of the implementation in different member states.	Accepted. An explicit quotation has been added within the *Scope* section legal text: *"The products claiming a biocidal effect are excluded from this product group."*
p.17 – Scope (description of HSC) Comment: HSC: This table does not match the description in Section 7.6.9 in page 112 where micro-organisms are proposed for HSC and LD. According to this table, microorganism is not permitted for private use in HSC, while there is no such restriction in 7.6.9 HSC. We propose to remove restriction of micro-organisms for private in this table. Suggested action: DD, IIDD and IILD: Micro-organisms should be also used for DD, HDD, IIDD and IILD. Please see our rational in our comments in Section 7.6.9. Rationale: For both hard surface cleaners (HSC) and hand dishwashing detergents (HDD) the existing scope (4.1) specifically excludes products that contain micro-organisms that have been deliberately added by the manufacturer for private use (HSC) or for both private and professional sue (HDD). Since extensive guidance is now provided to ensure the microbial safety of added micro-organisms, we find it timely to re-assess the scientific rationale for maintaining this exclusion within the Ecolabel framework. The use of micro-organisms as active ingredient in HDD and HSC products provides an excellent opportunity to reduce environmental impact by selecting more natural and biodegradable ingredients with intrinsic beneficial properties.	Partially accepted. In the 2nd draft criteria proposal it is proposed to expand the scope so as to allow LD, IILD, HDD and HSC product groups to use microorganisms as ingredients. If the revised Detergent Regulation (in its final text) still quotes microorganisms as ingredients, then there is potential for all product groups to include such as ingredients. However, at this stage the JRC is proposing to expand the scope of those product groups for which there are evidences of products being already in the market and/or that it could foresee exerting sucg function. In this sense, for the case of DD and IIDD, the JRC had not access to evidences backing up the scope expansion.
p.24 - Line 539: Comment: typo on "heath" Suggested action: Correct the typo. Rationale: Line 539 We assume that the intended wording is "health" of those exposed	Accepted.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

On the inclusion of other additional types of detergent products (8 comments)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.15 – On scope text proposal (section 4.1): Comment: I support that the EU Ecolabel should include as many different types of detergent products as possible. The final user will not stop using their preferences so it will be better to provide ecological alternatives on the market. As an example, the cleaning EU Decisions should contemplate car wash detergents. Another example are the ultra-concentrated products. This type of products could have a problem related with its compliance with all the requirements of the criteria of the Decision in question. As it is a very concentrated product, some ingoing substances which can be classified as toxic, hazardous to the aquatic environment, respiratory or skin sensitisers, carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic for reproduction in accordance with Annex I to Regulation (EC) Nº 1272/2008 and in accordance with the list in Table 2 of the Decisions, according to the actual requirements, can't be present in concentrations above 0,01%. But as the detergent needs dilution before use, we consider that a dilution factor should be taken into account. Moreover, we should have in mind that these types of product are more easily transported (less space, less heavy) and so less carbon footprint.	Acknowledged. The JRC acknowledges that having further product formats could be advisable. The JRC is assessing the possibility of inclusion of (ultra-)concentrated products
p.17 – On scope text proposal (sub-section 4.1): Comment: In favour of including fabric softeners to the criteria as this will enable consumers to identify more sustainable options.	Rejected. Softeners (or fabric enhancers) are not included within the scope. In brief - they do not fulfil an essential function (i.e. cleaning/washing) in EU Ecolabel criteria terms and there were no means for JRC to verify if it is possible to discriminate based on their compositional profile, for example, fragrances (For full details See TR1 & TR1 rationales). The JRC welcomes the suggestions and inputs made, which are noted.
p.20 – On scope text proposal (section 4.1): Comment: Add products softener in the LD. Rationale: Adding softeners to the LD standard. The product is not essential but is very present on the market, which would make it possible to propose a more ecological solution compared to the other products of the markets. Values of our fabric softeners: Dosage max 5g/kg; CVDtox Max. 5031; Biod. aerobic max 0.02; Biod. anaeorbic max 0.4.	
p.21 - On scope text proposal, where it says: "*However, the main reasons against the inclusion of softeners are that: their function is not cleaning (core to EUEL product groups) and, even if contributing to it, their main function is aesthetic.*" Comment: We argue that fabric softeners´ function is only aesthetic. Suggested actions: We propose to include fabric softeners in the product group, since the criteria mention the term "washing" instead of "cleaning". Since it´s not possible to differentiate an EU Ecolabelled fabric softener from a traditional one considering only the cationic surfactant and fragrances represent the main ecotoxicological impact for the aquatic organisms (in terms of CDVtox values, we propose to include a restriction on the perfume to be used in the product: minimum TF (acute or chronic) value: 0,02maximum DF value: 0,15Maximum percentage used: 0,2%	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Rationale: According to Detergent Regulation (648/2004/CE), fabric softeners have been included in the definition of detergent: "'Laundry fabric-softener', intended to modify the feel of fabrics in processes which are to complement the washing of fabrics". Therefore fabric softeners have also a washing function. Actually, they also exert a removal action on alkaline and detergent residues on clothes by decreasing the pH level of the rinsing liquor.	
p.15 – On scope text proposal (section 4.1): Comment: We kindly suggest that the JRC consider adding Oven/Grill Descaler products to the Hard Surface Cleaner category. These products share similar formulations to general Descaler products and are eligible for EU Ecolabel HSC certification. Additionally, many hotels and restaurants also seek EU Ecolabel or Nordic Swan Ecolabel certification for their entire detergent portfolio, so having Oven/Grill Descalers certified would align with their sustainability goals.	Rejected. The JRC understand that the cited product types are not used for routine cleaning (thus out intended scope) and also highlights that it received insufficient evidences for proper assessment.
p.17 – On scope text proposal (section 4.1): Comment: add Oven/Grill Descaler products, including fabric softeners, dishwashing detergents, washing powder in-wash stain removers, toilet blocks in the HSC category - These products share similar formulations to general descaler products and are eligible for EU Ecolabel HSC certification. Additionally, many hotels and restaurants also seek EU Ecolabel or Nordic Swan Ecolabel certification for their entire detergent portfolio, so having such products certified would align with their sustainability goals. However, in this case, adapt the dosage requirements.	Rejected The JRC actively sourced data/information on in-wash stain removers and still the proposal was excluding them. It also proactively pursued gathering evidences about toilet blocks (e.g. consulting AISE on its work), yet it did not received sufficient evidences to support its inclusion. For the rest of product types (i.e. softeners, Oven/Grill descalers) See previous responses to stakeholders' comments
p.16 – On scope text proposal (section 4.1): Comment: p.16 - We regularly receive requests from applicants/LHs for bulk detergent products seeking EU Ecolabel certification. Suggested actions: We believe it is crucial to explore the possibility of including loose goods within the scope, and specifically to define specific requirements.	Acknowledged. The JRC could explore this option.
p.17– On scope text proposal: Comment: HSC in the scope for DD and LD there are categories for industrial users, for HSC this is not the case. So it is difficult to offer HSC products for the industry. For example, acid cleaners are only considered for sanitary facilities, the industrial cleaning cannot be considered in this narrow scope. A second claim on a sanitary cleaner label is not convincing for users in the industrial area. So we would strongly recommend an addition of the scope of HSC for industrial users.	Acknowledged

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Responses to Q2 and Q3 about microorganisms (27 comments)

Question 2 asks: "Would you support the inclusion of microorganisms in the scope of LD? If not, why?"

Question 3 asks: "Should the text of LD scope be modified to reflect that microorganism are included in the scope?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.110 – On criteria for microorganisms in section 7.6.9 and p. 25 – On scope text section with microorganisms (Q2), Comment: As a general rule, we have a positive attitude towards microorganisms in cleaners and detergents, but we think that safety issues must be taken very seriously. While microbial-based cleaning products and detergents can offer several potential benefits, there are also risks associated with their use. In the current HSC criteria, some of these risks seem to be reasonably controlled (such as allergic reactions, pathogen transmission, resistance development), but according to literature, more research is needed on human exposures to microbes and the effects on the environment (e.g. disrupting local ecosystems, including plants and natural microbial communities). These risks should be carefully considered. At this stage, we do not yet support the use of microbes in household/consumer products. We await further research and safety assessments.	Acknowledged We share the diagnostic provided with regards to certain evidences not being yet available, especially with regards to environmental impacts. However, in this 2nd draft version the JRC has aimed at tackling one of such uncertainties via TR2 proposals: the lack of information regarding species/strain as well as their traits, which should contribute to proper risk assessments.
p.17– On scope text proposal (specifically microorganisms): Comment: French stakeholders do not have an opinion on the inclusion of microorganisms in consumer (GP) textile detergents. On the other hand, French stakeholders would like to alert the fact that the current criterion on micro-organisms, in professional HSCs, is too restrictive and therefore did not allow the inclusion of micro-organisms despite the interest of some licensees.	Acknowledged. The JRC invites stakeholders to consult the 2nd draft criteria proposals and then provide feedback on suitability, inclusive of suggestions for improvement.
p.17– On scope text proposal (specifically microorganisms): Comment: We need valid data and experience for developing criteria. And at least important, the functional criteria – performance – must be at least as good as ordinary detergents. HSC: The Nordic Swan requires that products containing microorganisms shall not be used with spray applications – we suggest to add this as a requirement in the EU Ecolabel.	Partially accepted –the JRC agrees on the importance of the functional criteria. The JRC did not find any standard specifically targeting performance of products containing microorganisms. Likewise, scarce input (resources-wise) was received about performance testing in the dedicated working sub-group on the topic of microorganisms-containing product. Hence, current proposal requires performance as per any product aspiring to have the EUEL award, thus being the performance considered as part of the assessment of the product.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	The JRC is proposing in this 2nd draft versions allowing MCP in spray format conditioned to meeting new safety (risk assessment including sensitization [dermal,respiratory[]) and informational (special precautions) requirements. The understanding is that it should be feasible to complete a risk assessment and put controls in place that sould ameliorate any potential risk See TR2 for full rationale on the aforementioned points
p.17– On scope text proposal (specifically microorganisms): Comment: HSC Products for private use shall not contain micro-organisms that have been deliberately added by the manufacturer. Comment: We don´t understand why the use of microbial cleaning products should be limited to professional users. We believe that microbial cleaning products provide a sustainability advantage and therefore should be used in as many categories as possible. Experience in the cleaning products industry shows that potential risk of adverse effects can be successfully managed by identifying the hazards to be managed, carefully assessing exposure, characterizing the risk and then applying appropriate risk management. This also applies to the use of microbial cleaning products in consumer uses. - -	Acknowledged – in this 2nd Draft criteria version the JRC is proposing several requirements aimed at maximize users safety, thus enabling the use of microbial containing products for different end-users and product-types.
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: Yes, we support this change. We believe that the use of microbial cleaning products should not be limited to any use. - -	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: Yes, because the benefits of microorganisms are certain. But the evidence required for certification is too complex if it remains the same as for hard surfaces cleaning products. Particularly for the stability study, which is too long for a 'quick' market launch (see more information in the Q35-38 below).	Acknowledged The JRC invites stakeholders to consult the 2nd draft criteria proposals and then provide feedback on suitability, inclusive of suggestions for improvement.
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: We are not affected, therefor any comments.	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: I support the inclusion of microorganism in the scope, because very positive effects can be achieved with a low risk potential.	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: Yes.	Acknowledged

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: Yes, we support the inclusion of microorganisms under the scope of LD. We furthermore question the restriction on professional use only that is associated to the scope of HSC and HDD, and suggest that in fact all forms of detergent should be able to include microorganisms. Under the new Detergent Regulation, microorganisms are recognised ingredients without restriction on the kind of detergents in which they can be used. The safety of the microorganism should be a pre-requisite and this should be managed via the requirements of the Annex (see further comments and proposal in this respect).	Partially accepted – the scope of several product groups is expanded to allow the use of microorganisms. Also, the JRC acknowledges the importance of legislative alignment (revised Detergent Regulation & other as EUEL criteria). However, for some product groups it remained unclear to the JRC the viability of the mechanisms of action and/or its current presence of such products in the market at this stage. Therefore, for DD and IIDD it is not proposed this scope expansion.
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: Yes I would support the inclusion of microorganisms in the scope of laundry detergent.	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: We have no opinion about the inclusion of microorganisms in the scope of LD. Our current LH don´t use them but one our LH is interested in this possibility, so why not?	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: We support the inclusion of microorganisms into scope of laundry detergent, under the condition that safety assessment is progressed according to clear guidance. We believe that LD products with microorganisms are an ongoing innovation.	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: We are cautious about the use of micro-organisms in detergents, both in HSC and LD. Suggested actions: We agree with the conclusion made during the 1 AHWG that further investigation is needed on the safety of this option and the concrete environmental benefits through the inclusion of micro-organisms. If micro-organisms are to be kept/expanded to further sub-groups in the EU Ecolabel, the safety requirements should be further elaborated. It was mentioned during the AHWG that the list of excluded pathogens seems to be too narrow. We propose to investigate whether instead of excluding some pathogens, a list of specifically allowed micro-organisms could be a safer solution. Rationale: The fact that the revised detergents regulation includes them should not mean that the EU Ecolabel as a label of excellence necessarily needs to follow. The PR seems to imply that the environmental benefits of using microbial instead of chemical-based detergents are not well researched yet. Moreover, allowing micro-organisms leads to a trade-off with the possibility of using refillable packaging. The revised Detergents Regulation prohibits refillable packaging for microbial detergents.	Acknowledged The safety requirements have been elaborated further in order to minimize any potential risks. The JRC acknowledges uncertainties/lack of data in particular fields of microbial containing products (e.g. environmental impacts). The JRC aimed at contributing towards one of the key identified gaps: univocal microorganisms' identification. In addition, the JRC is again proposing performing a risk assessment inclusive of minimum aspects to evaluate. Even after this set of requirements, still potential risk/uncertainty could remain being this beyond the scope/influence that a particular EUEL criteria could have (e.g. absence of data/evidences in such regard).

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	See TR2 *Scope* and *Microorganisms* sub-sections for full details.
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: We think it would be important to include microorganisms in the scope of LD and clarify whether consumer products are also included.	Accepted – In this 2nd draft proposal, microorganisms are part of LD product scope. Except DD, EUEL product groups for consumers products allow microorganisms within their scope (LD, HSC, HDD)
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: In support of the inclusion of microorganisms into scope of laundry detergent. The scope of laundry detergent needs to be clearly defined which should include microorganisms. - -	Accepted
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2): Comment: I do not have experience with detergents containing microorganisms in their composition. However, taking into account the presentation during the 1st AHWG, we agree that it is necessary to collect more data to decide about the inclusion of microorganisms within the scope of the LD Decision	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q3): Comment: Comment: Yes, we support this change. We believe that the use of microbial cleaning products should not be limited to any use.	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q3): Comment: Not necessarily	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q3): Comment: We are not affected, therefor any comments.	Acknowledged
p-25 – On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q2 and Q3): Comment: We don't have an opinion on that, we do not develop this type of products.	Acknowledged
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q3): Comment: Yes, it is suggested that this section (and of all the others) should omit the restriction for professional use only of microroganisms. It could read as: "…Products shall be mixtures of chemical substances and/or micro-organisms that have been deliberately added by the manufacturer…."	Partially accepted – In DD and IIDD microorganisms are excluded explicitly in the legal text but not in the rest of EUEL detergent product groups
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q3): Comment/suggested actions: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we want to alert you that the current criterion on microorganisms in professional HSC products is too complex, with a lot of proofs to provide, in particular the study during one year (I believe) beforehand the application. So, few LH who were interested in this inclusion (in professional HSC products) were discouraged and gave up their projects and applications. If we want to keep this possibility for professional HSC products and add it for	Partially accepted – the JRC does not consider that the criterion has been simplified (actually, it could be understood as the opposite) but it has gain in safety, accuracy and feasibility of implementation. The current proposal (in TR2), potentially allows shorter testing times

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
LD, this criterion should be simplified, in particular the process: requesting less proofs and the study beforehand the application must be shorter. Rationale: Our current LH don´t use them but one our LH is interested in this possibility, so why not? Because all ingredients possible are not mentioned in this scope.	as proof of verification given the removal of the explicit wording requiring measurement along the full of the product's shelf-life)
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q3): Comment: Yes, the scope of LD needs to be clearly defined which should include microorganisms.	Acknowledged – when microorganisms are not allowed, they are explicitly excluded by the wording used in the legal text.
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q3): Comment: Yes, the scope of LD should be clearly defined, which should include microorganisms also.	Acknowledged– when microorganisms are not allowed, they are explicitly excluded by the wording used in the legal text.
p.25– On microorganisms scope text question (specifically Q3): Comment: I consider that is not necessary to change the LD scope because the use of microorganisms is currently not excluded. - -	Accepted
p.25 – Question 2: Comment: We support inclusion of micro-organisms for LD. Suggested action: Product category LD should also be available for microorganisms. Rationale: Micro-organisms can provide prolonged cleaning during the wash and the drying phrase of the laundry process. During the drying phase the micro-organisms can degrade embedded soil in the textile. The micro-organism can also contribute to the organic soil removal from the wash water.	Accepted

Responses to Q4 about low temperature laundry detergents (19 comments)

Question 4 (Q4) asks: "Current scope states that laundry detergents gave to be effective at 30 °C or below. Would you support lowering this temperature (e.g. 20 °C). If not, why? If yes, down to which temperature?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: We are not affected, therefor any comments.	Acknowledged
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4):	

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: In principle we would support a change from 30 to 20 degrees effective temperature for laundry detergents. But we would like to ensure the implications are fully understood. Suggested actions: We suggest exploring further whether this change would lead to overall environmental savings while guaranteeing high performance. It should also be understood whether it will be clear for consumers which washing option is the most environmentally friendly. For example, a washing machine might have an "eco programme" which standardly washes at 30 degrees vs. the possibility to wash in the normal programme but at 20 degrees. Rationale: A good cleaning performance still needs to be guaranteed. Also, it should be better understood if there are environmental trade-offs with other dimensions like the need for more chemicals to achieve a good performance.	Acknowledged – the outcome of the further research implied reverting to requiring 30C degrees as effective washing temperature (See full details in TR2)
p.15, 47 - p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: We believe the reduced temperature requirements for laundry detergent is the right step to take, as well as the lowered dosage level.	Acknowledged – yet other evidences lead to reverting to 30C degrees as effective washing temperature.
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: We think that there are some products on the market that are effective at this temperature. However, we have some doubts on actual effects in the use phase. Not all washing machines offer programmes at low temperatures and consumers often stick to their used washing behaviour. - -	ACCEPTED – the evidences provided to the JRC plus the additional research it carried out did not supported setting the temperature of effective wash at 20C, thus in this 2nd proposal is reverted back to 30C degrees. As indicated in TR2: "*Despite some evidences suggest that it could be feasible to achieve optimal washing performance at 20C under certain conditions, it seems this is not applicable to all cases (e.g. not optimal for oil/greases). Furthermore, necessary aspects to realise the potential environmental benefits (i.e. wash water at constant desired temperature) might not be easily attainable by users, thus not offering certainty on the benefits achievable. The former assuming "proper" consumer behaviour, but otherwise potential benefits could be easily offset.*"
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: Current scope states that laundry detergents gave to be effective at 30 °C or below. Would you support lowering this temperature (e.g. 20 °C). If not, why? If yes, down to which temperature? For powder products, the technical solutions are not necessarily available to maintain good performance at 20°C, particularly for the laundry bleaching action and the dissolution of water-soluble powders/doses. For liquid products, technical solutions exist to obtain performance at 20°C. Performance at 30°C is safe from an efficiency and health point of view and, thanks to existing technical solutions, the concentration of these products can still evolve. If the wash temperature is lowered, a target performance equivalent to the current 30°C target must be maintained. Otherwise, there is a risk that overall performance will be worse than before. This would lead to potential customer rewash and a worse image for the performance of Ecolabel products. Also, are the machines suitable for washing at 20°C? In France, we know that there are major differences from one manufacturer to another.	
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: French stakeholders are not in favour of lowering the temperature to 20 °C for LD and wish to draw attention to the possibility of guaranteeing a good efficiency and dissolution for powder	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
detergents and water-soluble capsules. Industrials would like to point out that the temperature at 20 °C could alter the activity of bleaching agents and their activators (e.g. sodium percarbonate and TAED), which could be less or not efficient. The dissolution of water-soluble films could also be affected. In addition, more active ingredient may be needed for liquid or powder products to achieve the same performance. On CB would like to point out that currently, none of the 78 certified products has been tested at this temperature of 20 °C. Furthermore, in the 2020 and 2022 "60 Millions" laundry tests, the majority of products certified under the European Ecolabel were criticised for their insufficient results for whiteness/anti-greyness and even black retention (which is not tested in the current test, only "colour retention").	
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: The effectiveness of detergents in the laundry sector is strongly characterised by soiling containing grease and oil. In order to remove oils and greases in a way that is gentle on the material, it must be as liquid as possible or at least very softened. At 20°C or less, many greases are already solid or very pasty. This makes removal very difficult and requires very long washing times. This results in abrasion, which damages the textiles and contributes to the release of microplastics. Surfactants and enzymes can only remove solid and very pasty oils and fats very slowly. Suggested actions: Keep the level of 30°C or lower.	
p.130 - p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: We do not support lowering the wash test temperature to twenty degrees because quite a few washing machines have programs that use twenty-degree water- the use of cold water may mean that more chemicals are needed. Are the enzymes effective in cold temperatures? People are advised to follow the washing instructions attached to the textiles.	
p.19 - p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: For LD Proposal to reduce the operating temperature to 20°C is too low. Suggested actions: Maintain temperature at 30°C. Rationale: A temperature decrease from 30°C to 20°C is not favorable. This temperature corresponds with cold washing and will make it difficult to impossible to pass performance tests. Moreover, cold washing is not representative to reality. It can be expected that users will, in order to improve washing performance, either not respect the 20°C recommendation, leading to a higher energy use, or will not respect the recommended dosages, leading a higher chemical impact on the environment	
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: As explained during the 1st AHWG, we don´t support a mandatory washing temperature of 20°C for laundry detergents (LD).	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested actions: Keep the criterion and the requirement as in the current decision. It is essential to change the framework in order to make it more relevant and stricter, including a test of black maintenance. It is necessary to oblige LH to specify on their labels "ONLY for white linen" if colour tests are not conducted! Rationale: Because none of our 77 awarded products were performed at this temperature. It can cause efficiency problems whereas some LD (which are currently certified) were already blamed for their insufficient efficiency (in particular for basic degree of whiteness and anti-greyish tinge; black maintenance), by consumer association, for example several articles from the French magazine "60 Millions de Consommateurs". One of license holders (LH) has already reported lowering the temperature to 20°C has negative impacts on efficiency, in particular for bleaching agents (involved in basic degree of whiteness) and powders dissolution.	
p.137 p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: As explained during the 1st AHWG, we don't support a mandatory washing temperature of 20°C for laundry detergents (LD) Suggested actions: Keep the criterion and the requirement as in the current decision Rationale: Because: - None of our 77 awarded products was performed at this temperature - It can cause efficiency problems whereas some LD (which are currently certified) were already blamed for their insufficient efficiency (in particular for basic degree of whiteness and anti-greyish tinge; black maintenance), by consumer association, for example several articles from the French magazine "60 Millions de Consommateurs". One of license holders (LH) has already reported lowering the temperature to 20°C has negative impacts on efficiency, in particular for bleaching agents (involved in basic degree of whiteness) and powders dissolution.	
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: 20°C is to low. Rationale: at 20°C it could be difficult to dissolve powder laundry detergent specifically with a tablet shape and so it could impact the efficiency.	
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: We are not in favour of lowering the temperature to 20°C for consumer textile detergents. We draw a warning point on the possibility of guaranteeing a good effectiveness and a good dissolution of certain ingredients, in particular for powder detergents and water-soluble laundry pods (water-soluble film). Based on our experience, we know that this could alter the activity of bleaching agent and	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
their activators (such as sodium percarbonate and TAED) leading to less or not effective at 20°C, and the non-dissolution of water-soluble films. Moreover, it may require more active ingredient for liquid products or powders for the same performance so more environmental impact of the formula.	
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: With a maximum laundry temperature of 20 °C, it will be more difficult for formulations to pass the current effectiveness tests (fitness-for-use criterion). We are in favour of changing the fitness-for-use criterion to make it more useful for testing laundry effectiveness at 20 °C and below. We would like to emphasize the need to verify how representative the current set of stains and range of fabrics included in the protocol are for current consumers.	
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: whilst products may be effective at this temperature, this requirement should not be the standard applied to all. Suggested actions: We are in favour of revising the fitness for use criterion to be more relevant for testing temperatures of 20 °C and below for laundry efficiency. We would like to highlight the importance of reviewing the following elements alongside the reduced wash temperature; how representative of the current consumer experience is the existing stain set and, the range of fabrics included in the protocol. Rationale: At a maximum wash temperature of 20 °C it will become more difficult for formulations to pass the current performance testing (fitness for use criterion).	
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: We propose to consider 30 C as most consumer relevant cold washing temperature. Rationale: Majority of consumer relevant washing machines do not provide special 20°C programs. Cold temperature washing is supported by machines with 30°C programs and particular special cold wash programs (means water temperature from tab water without extra heating except mechanics). It is difficult to make reproducible performance test at 20°C, because washing temperature is not constant doe by different tab water temperatures and mechanical action (differ during washing cycle above 25°C). On the other hand, 30°C is most practical. For consumer cold wash is between 15°C/20°C (without heating), 30°C and 40°C.Depending on their current individual user behaviour cold wash is a reduction from 60°C to 40°C or from 40°C to 30°C or lower. The decision on the choice of washing temperatures is made by the end consumer - so all important sustainability effects depend on this decision. And the decision is only made to permanently use lower temperatures if the washing result is satisfactory. In this sense, a washing comparison with less differentiation at 20°C is disadvantageous, as the trends are clearer at 30°C and are more favourable for end consumers. Therefore, the most consumer relevant cold washing temperature would be 30°C.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: We do not support lowering the wash temperature for LD. Rationale: Any energy gains that may arise from lowering 10ºC in temperature, may be lost with the reduction in the efficiency of these products. The Question 11 proposes to reduce the dose of detergent to be used. We consider that both changes (lower temperature and lower dosage) might result on a significant loss of product efficiency. We should bear in mind that an EU Ecolabel detergent should be as effective as its analogue on the market.	
p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: No, because for some types of dirt, washing at 20°C is insufficient for stain removal.	
p.28 p.26 – On low-temp LD scope text question (Q4): Comment: We argue the reduction of washing temperature to 20 °C. Suggested actions: We recommend to gather more data in order to support this decision, assessing the global environmental impact including an expected reduced level of cleaning performance at such low temperature (need to longer washes, additional chemical loading). Are any of such LCA studies available? Rationale: Reducing the washing temperature to 20 °C could reduce sensibly the effectiveness of washing, since most of enzymes are not effective at that temperature.	

Responses to Q5 about RTU products (17 comments)

Question 5 (Q5) asks: "Do you support maintaining RTU products as part of HSC scope? If not, why?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: yes, we would support this.	Accepted - RTU products are kept as part of EUEL scope in this 2nd draft criteria proposal mainly on the basis of their market share, practicality, safety and relevance. See full rational in TR2
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: Yes, as stated in the preliminary questionnaire, ready-to-use products are essential.	
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: We are strongly in favor to maintain RTU products in the HSC perimeter, otherwise excluding them without other alternatives could drive the consumers towards products that are not certified and therefore less virtuous. Furthermore, these products are widely used by cleaning companies. French stakeholders want ready-to-use products to remain within the scope of HSCs: indeed, out of 466 certified products screened, 223 were in RTU, i.e. 47% of the products screened. The only concession	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
that seems acceptable is to ban RTU for the sub-category of "multi-purpose" since there are many alternatives in "to be diluted" and a "ready-to-use" use can be avoided (unlike the subcategories toilet gels, sanitary sprays, windows and kitchen where the consumer, at least on the French market, "needs" these RTU products) and would limit the impact by reducing waste (packaging with spray is much heavier and generally the trigger is not recyclable) not to mention the "useless" transport of water already added to the RTU compared to the "to be diluted". Other comments: Industrials suggest the possibility of certifying dilutable products, for products other than hard surface cleaners, as well as solid bread products (dishwashing detergents, washing powder, stain removers, etc.). Those products have less water in the formula and the packaging is lighter. French industrials propose to study further in detail the possibility to include softeners in the LD perimeter.	
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: We strongly support not to exclude RTU products, because there are many products which are nearly exclusively used as RTU products, for example glass cleaners. Furthermore there is a big market share of RTU products. It could not be in the intention of Ecolabel to lose such a high amount of consumers.	
p.19 and p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: We do support maintaining RTU products as part of HSC scope. RTU all-purpose cleaners for professional users are the only type of products, which could possibly be excluded from the scope. RTU products are popular among consumers. Concentrated products are often said to be better from the environmental point of view because less transport and less preservatives are needed. On the other hand, customer usually makes at least a five-litre solution when using concentrated products. This is very big amount compared to the needed amount of a RTU product.	
p.27-28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: oui je suis pour le maintien des produits RTU dans la catégorie des HSC. Certains produits concentrés peuvent être dangereux pour les utilisateurs si les dilutions sont mal effectuées, par exemple un produit alcalin type nettoyant four.	
p.26 and 28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: We support retaining Ready-to-Use (RTU) products in the HSC category. RTU products still represent a significant portion of the HSC detergent category. Removing RTU products would result in many products currently certified with the EU Ecolabel losing their certification. There is existing demand for RTU products, and removing them would not align with EU Ecolabel requirements.	
p.30 (28) – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: Yes, it is necessary to keep RTU products in the scope.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested actions: Maintain RTU product Rationale: it is necessary to keep RTU products in the scope. This is an important product range. Very little companies and consumers are willing to switch from RTU to products that need to be diluted before use. Moreover, there could possibly be safety problems for certain more concentrated products (e.g. corrosive classification).	
p.30 (28) – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we strongly support maintaining RTU products as part of HSC scope because among almost 650 of our certified products, they represent almost 40%. The unique concession that we consider acceptable to do is supporting the proposal of Austria, namely excluding RTU "all-purpose cleaners" of HSC scope. Because there are a lot of "undiluted" alternatives for this subcategory. So, this use in "RTU form" which is less environment-friendly could be avoided (unlike toilet gel, sanitary/windows cleaners/kitchen sprays where the user, at the minimum on the French market, needs these kinds of products): it would enable reducing the impact of waste (in particular regarding the trigger) and the transport of "useless" water (including in RTU product whereas water is added by the user for "undiluted").	
p.15 p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: support RTU (Ready-to-Use) products in the HSC category of EU Ecolabel portfolio. RTU products still represent a significant portion of the HSC detergent category. Removing RTU products would result in many products currently certified with the EU Ecolabel losing their certification. There is an existing demand for RTU products, and removing them would not align with EU Ecolabel requirements.	
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: Yes, We want RTU HSC products to be maintained. If they are excluded, consumers will turn to non-ecolabel products. In the professional sector, these products are widely used by cleaning companies. - -	
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: We support keeping RTU products in the scope for most types of HSC products. – Suggested actions: We suggest considering to exclude ready-to-use all purpose cleaners. – Rationale: For those detergents which can be easily diluted at home by consumers, an exclusion of RTU formats would make sense. This would be the case for all-purpose cleaners.	
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: Yes, we believe that these products are essential for consumers. Excluding them without offering alternatives would push consumers to go for uncertified products, more environmental impacting. - -	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.30 (28) – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: Yes we support maintaining RTU products as part of HSC scope. Rationale: This is a very common form of application. Eliminating RTU products would make ecological products less common. Consumers are not yet ready for such changes, they would prefer to use traditional products. The elimination of RTUs in EU Ecolabel products would have a negative impact on the dissemination of ecological products. In addition, producers would face technical problems.	
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: We believe that no type of product should be excluded from EU Ecolabel. So, I support keeping RTU products as part of HSC. The more types of EU Ecolabel products are available to the final user, the better. - -	
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: yes, we do.	
p.28 – On RTU scope text question (Q5): Comment: Yes	

4. Definitions (73 comments)

Responses to Q6 and Q7 on the definitions of "ingoing substances" and "impurities", respectively (28 comments)

Responses to these questions have been paired together because the two terms are closely related and the opinion about one will affect the opinion about the other.

Question 6 (Q6) asks: "Ingoing substances - Do support the proposed definition? In particular, a) do you support the thresholds mentioned and; b) is the wording used clear?".

Question 7 (Q7) asks: "Impurities – this definition is complementary to "Ingoing substances" and aims to provide clarity in its interpretation. Do you support its addition (fit for purpose)? In particular, a) do you support the thresholds mentioned?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p. 30 and 36 – On definition of **"ingoing substances" (Q6) and "impurities" (Q7):**	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment on Q6: We would like to point out that there is an inconsistency and a gap of definition for substances between 0,1 % and 0,01 % of total weight product, meaning substances that are not included in the definition of Impurities nor in the definition of ingoing substances. French stakeholders do not support new definitions on impurities and ingoing substances and propose to maintain old definitions. Two industrials would like to exclude the "unintended constituents from production" from the ingoing substances definition whatever the threshold. Indeed, the impurities inherent in the manufacture of ingredients are already considered in the DID-list. In this way, they do not have to be taken into account a second time as a separate impurity, whatever the threshold of presence in the ingredient. Industrials would like to share that the proposed thresholds are too penalizing in the absence of in-depth analyses at the end of production. Comment on Q7: Industrials would like for "Unintended constituents from production" to be exempted from limitations since the toxicological and ecological data for the substances initially assessed already take account of impurities. The existing data in the DID list (n°2009) already take account of these impurities inherent in the manufacture of this ingredient. I would like to share that for "impurities", there is a typo (2 times "in the" at the end of the definition) and the definition is not clear, it does not "complete" the definition of "incoming substances" or the phrase "that remain in the raw material / ingredient" needs to be clarified by adding "less than 100 ppm etc" to know which threshold is to be considered. If it is indeed the 100 ppm threshold that applies, to clarify the definition I suggest deleting the words "and/or in the final product in concentrations …".	Partially accepted We could accept that ignoring impurities in terms of the calculation of CDV values could be justified if it is correctly understood that aquatic toxicity and biodegradability tests were done on substances that already contained these impurities. However, for the sake of the horizontal hazardous substance criteria and CLP rules of mixtures, impurities still need to be considered. We tried to strike a reasonable balance by only considering impurities present above 0,10% in ingoing substances or above 0,010% in the final product. Regarding the "unintended constituents from production", we propose to simply refer to "unintended constituents" because this is about the non-intentional presence of these substances, which can come from more sources than just "production". We has tried to make the definition much clearer and also addressing the thresholds gaps and the typo that you pointed out. See full rationale in TR2 *Definitions* section
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and "impurities" (Q7):** Comment on Q6 and Q7: we agree with the proposals	Acknowledged. Please be aware that these definitions have been modified based on feedback received from other stakeholders. See full rationale in TR2 *Definitions* section
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and "impurities" (Q7):** Comment on Q6 and Q7: We think that the "ingoing substances" definition is not aligned with the "impurities" definition, specifically with regard to the part of "unintended constituents". The "ingoing substances" definition measures the "unintended constituents" in % in the raw material, while the "impurities" definition it is measured as % in the final product. We think that the "unintended constituents" explanation is really confusing. Would it be correct to consider all substances in the detergent (also impurities) as "ingoing substances"? This will be in line with the "assessment and verification" proposal (pg. 38-39 TR), which states that "The list of all ingoing substances shall be provided to the competent body, indicating the trade name (if existing), the chemical name, the CAS No, DID No (2) (if existing), the its function, form and concentration in mass percentage regardless of	Accepted. We have considerably reworked the definitions and it should now be clear what exactly are ingoing substances and what are impurities.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
concentration in the final product formulation". Then the criteria could have exemptions for the "ingoing substances" considered as impurities and/or for the "ingoing substances" <0,01% in the final product as state in the table 1 "threshold levels…".	
p.2 - Dear Sir or Madam, Please find attached the response of Lanxess to the consultation. Kind regards, READ FULL TEXT IN SEPARATED FILE – p. 30 and 36 **– On definition of "impurities" (Q7):** Comment on Q7: In the light of the above, and in order to avoid any inconsistency, we propose that the definition of 'impurities' should read as follows: "'Impurities' means unintended constituents (residuals, pollutants, contaminants, byproducts, etc.) from production, incl. production of raw materials, that remain in the final product in concentrations less than 1000 ppm (0,1000 % w/w, 1000 mg/kg) and that were not intentionally added".	Partially accepted. The 0,100% limit for impurities has been applied to ingredients. However, the limit for impurities in the final product needs to remain at 0,010% because otherwise it would be allowing potentially hazardous substances to be present in the final product at levels up to 10x higher than ingoing substances - just because it was considered as not being intentionally added.
p. 30 and 36 **– On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and "impurities" (Q7):** Comment on Q6: The proposed definition is clear. The proposed thresholds are too penalizing in the absence of in-depth analyses at the end of production. Comment on Q7: The proposed thresholds are too penalizing in the absence of in-depth analyses at the end of production.	Partially accepted. We proposes to raise the threshold for impurities to 0,100% in ingredients (from 0,010%). The threshold in the final product remains the same (at 0,010%).
p. 30 and 36 **– On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and "impurities" (Q7):** Comment on Q6: I support the updated definition of Ingoing substances. Comment on Q7: I support the updated definition of impurities.	Acknowledged. Please be aware that these definitions have been modified based on feedback received from other stakeholders. See full rationale in TR2 *Definitions* section
p. 30 and 36 **– On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and "impurities" (Q7):** Comment on Q6: Oui je suis favorablle et la definition est claire. Comment on Q7: oui je suis favorable a cette definition et aux les seuils mentionnés.	Acknowledged. Please be aware that these definitions have been modified based on feedback received from other stakeholders. See full rationale in TR2 *Definitions* section
p. 30 and 36 **– On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and "impurities" (Q7):** Ingoing substances: In alignment with CESIO, we propose to set the threshold for impurities to be considered "ingoing substances" with the definition of nordic swan for detergents: impurities exceeding 1% in the raw material (10000 ppm or 10000 mg/kg) and not as currently proposed 0,1% (similar to EU cosmetics). This, added to other criteria which are becoming more stringent: new CLP classes, lower limits for the CDV, etc.. will lead to the ban of safe, biodegradable and performant surfactants or other additives.	Rejected. The TR2 proposals keep the limit for impurities in ingredients at 0,10% and this is more clearly stated in the revised definitions. We consider the increase of thresholds to 1% to be too high, potentially allowing many hazardous substances to pass into the EU Ecolabel product at levels which could affect the classification of the final product without these impurities being properly considered.
p. 30 and 36 **– On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6):** Comment: The differences between "Impurities" and "Ingoing substances" is not clear and I don´t understand why there are 2 thresholds	Partially accepted. We have reworked the two definitions to make the distinctions clearer. The limit for impurities in ingredients is set to 0,10%, as recommended – but the

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested actions: I suggest to have only one definition with a thresholds of 0.1% in the final product	limit in the final product is maintained at 0,010%, because this is also the limit where horizontal restrictions start to apply for all ingoing substances with certain CLP hazards.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6 and Q7: "ingoing substances" and "impurities": are confusing/difficult to understand. Need to clarify how unintended substances between 100-1000 mg/kg would be classified suggest new definition from "impurities"; to "microbial based cleaners": Contamination in these products with unintended organisms is a safety concern, much more than in conventional products as the unwanted microbial count could be higher we support the threshold of 100 mg/kg for impurities and highlight that impurities are technically unavoidable and should be allowed/unrestricted when safe. The data in the DID list were made taking into account the non-avoided impurities, counting them twice would be a mistake.	Acknowledged. The new proposed definitions fill the gap that exists currently between ingoing substances and impurities. The proposals for impurities now make a distinction between ingredients (up to 1000 mg/kg) and the final product (up to 100 mg/kg). According to existing EUEL criteria text we understand that only ingoing substances are counted towards the CDV calculation, thus there is no double counting (only ingoing substances). Nevertheless, we invite stakeholders to provide further details. In addition, with the newly refined definition for *ingoing substance* and *impurity* it should be quantitatively clear (0.100% ingredients; 0.01% final product) what counts as ingoing substance and what (potentially) as impurity. In terms of microbial containing products and the concept of impurity in this type of products, the JRC understands that the metrics and methods (e.g. microbial count of viable cells) for microorganisms are different than those for their purely chemical counterparts. In particular, concerns could arise due to unwanted presence of particular microorganisms species above certain thresholds. The JRC understand that the newly proposed requirements to control for potential cross-contamination would prevent these "microbial impurities" to be of concern. Nevertheless, the JRC welcomes further input in this regard.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6: Definitions are unclear and in addition new thresholds need to be deeper assessed as to understand potential restrictions or limitations in terms of materials used in formula	Accepted. We have reworked the two definitions to make the distinctions clearer. The limit for impurities in ingredients is set to 0,10%, as recommended – but the limit in the final product is maintained at 0,010%, because this is also the limit where horizontal restrictions start to

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment on Q7: A deep assessment needs to be done as to understand potential implication and/or restrictions by adopting new thresholds	apply for all ingoing substances with certain CLP hazards. The potential implications of the criteria have been considered in the rationale section of TR2, *Definitions* section.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6: We propose the following definition of ingoing substances: all substances intentionally added in ecolabel product, including additives (e.g. preservatives, stabilisers) in the raw materials. Substances known to be released from ingoing substances (e.g. formaldehyde, arylamine, in situ-generated preservatives) are also regarded as ingoing substances. Impurities are not regarded as ingoing substances and are exempt from the requirements. Impurities should be defined in a second step. Comment on Q7: We propose the following definition of impurities: residuals, pollutants, contaminants etc. from production, incl. production of raw materials that remain in the raw material/ingredient and/or in the in the ecolabel product in concentrations less than ≤100,0 ppm (≤0,01000 weight percent ≤100,0 mg/kg). Impurities in the raw materials exceeding concentrations of ≥10000 ppm (≥1,000 weight percent, ≥10000 mg/kg) are always regarded as ingoing substances, regardless of the concentration ecolabel finished product. We think that in order to be regarded as an ingoing substance, a constituent/impurity must have a content of at least 1% in the raw materials (same definition as Nordic Swan), and not as currently proposed 0,1% (similar to EU cosmetic). As surfactants used in detergents must also be strong and effective, the current proposed 0.1% limit similar to EU Ecolabel cosmetics, would lead to the ban of safe, biodegradable and effective surfactants.	Partially accepted. We have proposed new definitions that are partly inspired by the suggestion. However, the threshold for 1,0% w/w of impurities in raw materials is considered as too high and could easily lead many impurities being present in the EU Ecolabel product at levels exceeding the horizontal hazardous substance restrictions (i.e. 0,010%). Consequently, we prefer to limit this potential by keeping the limit for impurities in ingredients to 0,100%. In addition, welcome any specific insights on the particular mentioned about surfactants and the interplay of impurities with its use.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6: Definition of "ingoing substances": Based on the main chemical regulatory framework (REACH/CLP) definitions, we find the threshold for considering impurities or by-products as ingoing substances is too low by factor 10. Section 4.2 of Guidance for identification and naming of substances under REACH and CLP (December 2023, version 3.0) requests that impurities present in a concentration ≥1% should be specified. It would be consistent to align with this guidance. Moreover, in most cases data for impurities < 1 % will not be available, and will have little relevance for the environment. Suggested actions: replace 0.100%ww by 1%ww replace 1 000 ppm by 10 000 ppm replace 1 000 mg/kg by 10 000 mg/kg. Comment on Q7: Definition of impurity: We propose to consider impurities in the final product only, and not in the raw materials or ingredients.	Rejected. This guidance is for the naming of substances and the text also makes clear reference to having stricter limits on impurities in cases where they may affect the CLP classification of the product. See TR2, *Definitions* section for full details.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested actions: modify text: "that remain in the raw material/ingredient and/or in the final product"	
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6: 1. Regarding the "Proposed definitions -- Ingoing substances": We suggest using the definition of the Nordic Swan Ecolabelling by keeping the concentration of 10000ppm or 1%w/w because we are speaking about a concentration in the raw material and not in the final product, otherwise, it is too stringent. Or change the phrase like: "Unintended constituents (residuals, pollutants, contaminants, by-products, etc.) from production, incl. production of raw materials, that remain in the raw materials and are present in the final product at a concentration > or =1000ppm (> or =0.1%w/w) are always regarded as ingoing substances." Comment on Q7: 2. Regarding the "Proposed definitions – Impurities": We suggest using the definition of the Nordic Swan Ecolabelling by keeping the maximal allowed concentration expressed concerning the final product and not the raw material or ingredient (which is too stringent again). See below: "Impurities means unintended constituents (residuals, pollutants, contaminants, by-products, etc.) from production, incl. production of raw materials/ingredients, that remain in the raw material/ingredient and/or in the final product in concentrations less than 100 ppm (0,0100 % w/w, 100 mg/kg) and that were not intentionally added." We believe it is important to differentiate between a maximum tolerated concentration of a substance in an ingredient and in the final product. The applied concentration should not be the same.	Partially accepted. We have revised the definitions to make it clear that there is a higher limit for impurities in ingredients than in the final product (i..e 0,10% versus 0,010%). However, we do not propose to go as high as the Nordic Swan, because it could lead to impurities being present in levels that could easily affect the classification of the final product.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6):** Comment: This sentence should be: "Substances intended to be released". Or: "Substances known to be released from ingoing substances (e.g. formaldehyde from preservatives and arylamine from azodyes and azopigments) shall also be regarded as ingoing substances, where they exceed the limit defined under impurities."	Rejected. Intention of release is difficult to define clearly and requiring released substances to be above the threshold limit for impurities in order to be treated as ingoing substances creates a loophole for preservative releasers, where restrictions (e.g. for isothiazolines) are considerably lower than the 0,010% threshold for impurities in the final product.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6: We propose the following definition of ingoing substances: "all substances intentionally added in ecolabel product, including additives (e.g. preservatives, stabilisers) in the raw materials. Substances known to be released from ingoing substances (e.g. formaldehyde, arylamine, in situ-generated preservatives) are also regarded as ingoing substances. Comment on Q7: Impurities are not regarded as ingoing substances and are exempt from the requirements. Impurities should be defined in a second step (see below).	Partly accepted. The new definition of ingoing substances in TR2 partly take into account the suggestions here. However, the blanket exemption for impurities has not been applied.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6: Yes, partly support (Ingoing substances). Note comments though. For reference, please note that the threshold above which raw material unintended constituents from production are defined as ingoing substances (1 000 ppm, i.e. 0,1000 %) is 10 times lower compared to the corresponding threshold for Nordic Swan Ecolabel. The paragraph about foil being considered as part of the formulation/recipe could be moved to the criterion in question. Comment on Q7: Yes, support the addition (Impurities). Note comments though. Rationale: When the threshold on 100 ppm seemingly refers not only to the concentration in the final product - but also to the concentration in the raw materials - it's in direct conflict with the threshold for unintended constituents (1 000 ppm) which is mentioned in the definition of ingoing substances. The wording "not intentionally added" is unnecessary since impurities are defined as "unintended constituents". More importantly, it causes ambiguity about how far upstream the supply chain is considered.	Acknowledged. We are aware of the x10 difference between the Nordic Swan and the EUEL on impurity thresholds in raw materials. However, we believe that this increases too much the risk that impurities will be present in levels exceeding the limit for ingoing substances in the final product and to the extent that they could affect the CLP classification of the final product.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6 and Q7: p.36 - We ask to exclude unavoided constituents from the definition of ingoing substances (regardless of threshold). Indeed, the impurities inherent in the manufacture of the ingredient are already taken into account in the data of the DID List (concrete case for the ingredient did listed 2009), Then, they have not to be taken into account a second time as a separate impurity, whatever the threshold of presence in the ingredient.	Accepted. We accept in principle the point about not counting impurities when calculating CDV values. However, it is important to still consider them in terms of the CLP rules for classification of mixtures. Return question for industry: Up to what threshold did the DID list values count with unavoided impurities? Any specific examples?
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6 and Q7: A bridge is missing between the definition of substances used in the product and impurities. It appears that substances between 0.1% and 0.01% are not taken into account	Accepted. We have addressed this in the more clearly worded revised definitions for TR2.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6 and Q7: Definitions are acceptable, understandable. Thresholds should remain as before 0.01% (1000 ppm). Lowering the threshold to 100 ppm will result in the restriction of many raw materials, e.g. The very popular SLES due to its 1,4-dioxane content will not be able to be used because the impurity content is above 100 ppm. This is a technologically unavoidable impurity. The loss of such a substance in washing, laundry detergents will result in reduced effectiveness and a significant increase in the price of the product, which will not contribute to the popularization of ecological products. - -	Accepted. We appreciate the use of a specific example to illustrate your point. We have proposed to raise the impurity threshold from 100ppm to 1000ppm. Although the impurity threshold in the final product remains at 100ppm.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6 and Q7: We welcome the clearer definition but there is a gap between the two definitions (ingoing substance and impurities) that might need to be addressed.	Accepted. We have addressed this in the more clearly worded revised definitions for TR2.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested actions: We support the JRC´s proposal and recommend to slightly modify the definitions to close the gap between ingoing substance and impurity. Rationale: This update helps drawing the line between ingoing substance and impurity. It should not be possible to intentionally add a substance below impurity threshold to avoid requirements applicable to ingoing substances. It is good that the definition prevents this explicitly as only unintentional impurities can be considered as such. However, as pointed out by several stakeholders during the working group, there is a gap for substances present in the product between 100ppm and 1000ppm. There could be confusion in cases where e.g. a substance remains at 500ppm in the raw material and 200ppm in the final product regarding whether it would be an ingoing substance or an impurity.	No. 124 and 125 (exact same comment submitted for Q6 and for Q7)
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7), specifically** on: "*Unintended constituents (residuals, pollutants, contaminants, by-products, etc.) from production, incl. production of raw materials, that remain in the raw materials ≥1 000 ppm (≥0,100 %w/w ≥1 000 mg/kg) are always regarded as ingoing substances, regardless of the concentration in the final product*"; and "*impurities" - means unintended constituents (residuals, pollutants, contaminants, by-products, etc.) from production, incl. production of raw materials, that remain in the raw material/ingredient and/or in the in the final product in concentrations less than 100 ppm (0,0100 % w/w, 100 mg/kg) and that were not intentionally added.*" Comment on Q6 and Q7: The new definition of ingoing substances and impurities leaves a gap with regards to the "unintended constituents". "Unintended constituents" are ingoing substances if present above 0.1% in the raw material/product. "Unintended constituents" are impurities if present below 0.01% in the raw material/product. The range between 0.01% and 0.1% is not defined. Suggestion actions: Reconsider the limits to close the gap.	Accepted. We have addressed this in the more clearly worded revised definitions for TR2.
p. 30 and 36 – On **definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6: We agree with the proposed definition. "*See our general observations about no limit in Table 1 of the Decision and the limit considered for impurity. Is the wording used clear?*" - Yes. Comment on Q7: We agree with the definition but not with the threshold as we have transmitted on the comments to Table 1 of the Decision.	Acknowledged. However, the definition of ingoing substances has also been modified to address concerns raised by other stakeholders. With impurities, we now clearly state that the threshold in ingredients is 0,100% and definitely not 0,010% for ingredients.
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6a: Yes [we support the proposed definition]. But, the substances placed in formulation between 0.01 % w/w and 0.1 % w/w where are they placed? In the Ingoing substances or in the impurities? Comment on Q6b: Yes [the wording used is clear].	Acknowledged. We have addressed the grey area between 0,010 and 0,100% and also have more clearly worded revised definitions for TR2.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment on Q7: Yes [we support the thresholds mentioned]. But, the substances placed in formulation between 0.01 % w/w and 0.1 % w/w where are they placed? In the Ingoing substances or in the impurities?	
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities (Q7):** Comment on Q6: As indicated by several stakeholders during the 1st AHWG working group, there is an inconsistency between these two definitions because the thresholds to consider are different. For "ingoing substances", we find it clear and we are initially favourable to the proposed new threshold of 1000 ppm in the raw material (previously a threshold of 100 ppm in the final product) which is more restrictive, but we need to consult our stakeholders to get their feedback. Comment on Q7: As for "impurities," there is a typo (2 times "in the" at the end of the definition) and the definition is not clear, it does not "complete" the definition of "ingoing substances" well, or it is necessary to specify the phrase "that remain in the raw material / ingredient" by adding "less than 100 ppm etc." to know which threshold to consider. If this threshold of 100 ppm is indeed applicable, I propose to clarify this definition by removing the mention "and/or in the final product in concentrations..."	Acknowledged. We have revised the definitions to make it clear that there is a higher limit for impurities in ingredients than in the final product (i..e 0,10% versus 0,010%). Thank you for pointing out the typo. No. 86
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6) and impurities** (Q7): Comment on Q6: we support [the proposed definition] Comment on Q7: we support [the proposed definition]	Acknowledged. Please be aware that these definitions have been modified based on feedback received from other stakeholders. See full rationale in TR2 *Definitions* section No. 83 and 84
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "ingoing substances" (Q6):** Comment on Q6: disagree on threshold for the impurities regarded as ingoing substances.	Acknowledged.. The new definitions in TR2 aim to provide further clarity and they clearly set impurity thresholds at 0,010% in the final product and 0,100% in ingredients. No. 137
p.30 – **specifically about the definition of "impurities":** "impurities" means unintended constituents (residuals, pollutants, contaminants, by-products, etc.) from production, incl. production of raw materials, that remain in the raw material/ingredient and/or in the in the final product" Comment: Currently, impurities are defined as being present in the raw material/ingredient and/or in the final product, which means that an unintended constituent can be assessed at two levels either as the raw material or in the final product. In case that an unintended constituent A is present at a level >0.1% in the raw material, then A is an ingoing substance. If the raw material is used at a concentration of 1% in the final product, then A is present at a level <0.01% and per definition an impurity. If A is a SVHC, it is an ingoing substance in the raw material and	Acknolwedged - We understand the dilemma - a particular substance could be an impurity in an ingredient but also an ingoing substance in the final product -or vice versa. It all depends on the concentrations and the quantity of ingredient used in the final product. Some further considerations are presented in the rationale section of TR2.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
not allowed to be present at all, but in the final product it is an impurity and allowed at a level <0.01%. With the current definition of an impurity it is possible to come to two different conclusions. Suggested action: If the assessment should be carried out at the raw material level, remove the phrase "and/or in the final product" -	

Responses to Q8 about packaging (14 comments).

Question 8 (Q8) asks: "Do you support its addition (fit for purpose)? In particular, a) would you reduce the level of detail of the definitions?; b) do you consider useful the clarification made on what is packaging/product formulation?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p. 30,31 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: French stakeholders are in favour of packaging new definition, which is in line with PPWR regulation. A stakeholder believes that perhaps it would be better to put it in the user manual (UM) since it is not strictly speaking needed for the criteria (in the criteria only "sale/group/transport" packaging is considered). There is no need to reduce the level of detail in this case. The clarification made between the packaging and the formulation is indeed welcome. Packaging (primary/secondary/transport): A stakeholder considers that the definitions should be also mentioned in the user manual with examples for each case. Definitions are clear and more specific, stakeholders are in favour of these updates.	Acknowledged/Accepted The JRC understood, based on feedback received, the definitions were appropriate and that some definitions could be shortened and/or moved to the User Manual (UM). In this last regard, it has proposed in this TR2 to move *Packaging* definition to the UM but no change (except for *Composite packaging)* has been made to other packaging-related definitions. Instead, a comparison with the definitions of the recently adopted Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation has been included for stakeholders' consideration.
p. 30,31 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: I agree on the definitions for packaging, but the definitions shall be shortened and made more practical considering the need for the definitions in these criteria.	
p. 30,31 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: Yes, it´s important to make the consistency with other EU Regulations e.g. PPWD. The level of details should be reduced, however the clarification made on what is packaging/product formulation is useful.	
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: I agree with the addition of the definition, it is clear, the level of detail of the definitions is ok and, it is useful the clarification made on what is packaging/product formulation.	
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: The definition of "composite packaging" is useful.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested actions and rationale: We think it might be better to include the definition of packaging in the user manual (UM) since it is not strictly necessary for the criteria (the criteria only consider sale/group/transport" packaging). There is no need to reduce the level of detail in this case. The clarification between the packaging and the formulation is indeed appreciated. Regarding the packaging (primary/secondary/transport), the definitions are clear and more specific, so we are in favour of these updates. We suggest that the definitions should also be included in the user manual, along with examples for each case.	
p. 30,31 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Additional comments: Composite packaging is a useful definition according to stakeholders.	Acknowledged
p. 30,31 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: Yes, we would reduce the level of detail of the definitions, as we don't think it helps clarifying. We don't consider it necessary/useful. We think the note about the "foil" included in the "ingoing substances" definition should be sufficient. Note that some packaging may be included in various definitions depending on how they are interpreted (VCBF N87 - ongoing). We think it should be interesting to better define "sales packaging" and "smallest sales unit".	Acknowledged/Partially accepted The JRC understood, based on feedback received, the definitions were appropriate and that some definitions could be shortened and/or moved to the User Manual (UM). In this last regard, it has proposed in this TR2 to move *Packaging* definition to the UM but no change (except for *Composite packaging)* has been made to other packaging-related definitions. Instead, a comparison with the definitions of the recently adopted Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation has been included for stakeholders consideration. Given the simplification suggested by several stakeholders and little feedback on the need of further definition, the definition suggested for revision (*sales packaging* and *smallest sales unit*) have not been revised/added.
p. 30,31 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: There is an ongoing VCBF discussion on where to draw the line between sales, grouped and transport packaging. JRC should follow the soon to be made solution to this interpretation problem. The definitions should be made so clear that we avoid same kind of interpretation problems in the future. - -	Acknowledged – the JRC aims intends to align its proposal; with the outcome of the discussions held in that Virtual Competent Bodies Forum
p. 30,31 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: The proposed definition is clear and removes any ambiguity, particularly in the case of packaging innovation.	Acknowledged
p. 30,31 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):**	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment on Q8: La definition est longue et bien detaillée. Pour illustrer les propos, il faudrait ajouter plusieurs exemples par catégorie.(DD, HSC LD etc) Sinon cet eclairssissement etait necessaire. (Comment translated from original language) The definition is long and comprehensive. To illustrate these statements, it would be necessary to add several examples for each category (DD, HSC, LD, etc). Anyhow, this clarification was necessary	
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: p.36 - We find it logical to be aligns with the revised PPWD and we support all the details added. Clarifying the meaning of packaging and product formulation is essential for us.	Acknowledged
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: Yes	Acknowledged
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8a: no Comment on Q8b: yes	Acknowledged The level of detail has not been reduced but ongoing discussion could result in some definitions being "shortened" and/or moved to the User Manual
p. 30 and 36 – **On definition of "packaging" (Q8):** Comment on Q8: we agree with the proposals.	Acknowledged

Responses to Q9 about nanomaterials (10 comments).

Question 9 (Q9) asks: "Do you support the current proposal (alignment with latest EU Commission recommendation)? If not, please could you indicate: a) reasons against this alignment; b) whether you would you consider best to align with the definition in the EUEL criteria for Cosmetics?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p. 33 and 36 – **On definition of "nanomaterials" (Q9):** Comment on Q9: Industrials consider that it would be more reliable to be aligned with the definition of cosmetics regulation, which should be aligned with European Commission recommendation (according to their information). A stakeholder consider that this proposed definition is more precise than the one in the criteria of the European Ecolabel on cosmetic products and above all it is really useful for the CB, whether it knows how to discriminate between nanomaterials to be considered or not, so it is indeed to be preferred. However, according to the ecotoxicology expert from ADEME it would be possible to request a complete ban on nanomaterials. Is it possible to study this option?	Partially accepted The definitions has not been updated in this TR2 but a rationale for a potential changes is included leading to a question to stakeholders that could broaden the scope of nanomaterials definition. Please, See TR2 *Definitions* section for full details.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p. 33 and 36 – **On definition of "nanomaterials" (Q9):** Comment on Q9: We very much welcome that all nanomaterials are to be excluded from EU Ecolabel detergents, but would like to suggest improvements for the related definition. Suggested actions: We do support the setting of a quantitative threshold, but 50% is too high. Some Member States (e.g. France) have been using a lower (more protective) threshold of 10% to enforce the nano labelling obligation in the context of the Novel Food Regulation (this 10% threshold was suggested by EFSA in 2012). Rationale: We are concerned about the 50% threshold in the definition. If only materials with >50% particles qualify as nanomaterial, this still exempts materials that contain a lot of nanoparticles but below 50%. This is issue is again being discussed at the moment in the context of the revision of the Novel Food Regulation, where the same definition has been proposed. Please refer to a reaction by EEB member Veille Nanos which outlines the issues with the definition: https://veillenanos.fr/en/is-europe-about-to-torpedo-the-nano-labelling-requirements-in-food/ There is also a well-documented report by ANSES about the problems with the REACH definition: https://www.anses.fr/en/system/files/AP2018SA0168RaEN.pdf	The JRC intends to follow developments on the Cosmetic Regulation and assess nanomaterials definition for potential alignment/uptake.
p. 33 and 36 – **On definition of "nanomaterials" (Q9):** Comment on Q9: we agree with the proposals.	Acknowledged
p. 33 and 36 – On definition **of "nanomaterials" (Q9):** Comment on Q9: Yes, alignment with EC recommendation makes sense.	
p. 33 and 36 – **On definition of "nanomaterials" (Q9):** Comment on Q9: agree on nanomaterial definition - -	
p. 33 and 36 – **On definition of "nanomaterials"** (Q9): Comment on Q9: We believe that this proposed definition is more precise than the one in the criteria of the European Ecolabel on cosmetic products. Most importantly, it is highly beneficial for the CB, as it enables the discrimination between nanomaterials to be considered or not, making it the preferred choice. - -	
p. 33 and 36 – **On definition of "nanomaterials" (Q9):** Comment on Q9: Yes [to aligning with the latest EU Commission recommendation]	
p. 33 and 36 – **On definition of "nanomaterials" (Q9**): Comment on Q9: Yes, we agree with the current proposal for Nanomaterial definition aligned with the latest EU Commission Recommendation of 10 June 2022 (2022/C 229/01). We do not consider it better to align with the definition for cosmetics because these criteria are previous the EU Commission Recommendation.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p. 33 and 36 – **On definition of "nanomaterials" (Q9):** Comment on Q9: suggest aligning the definition with Cosmetics Regulation (ongoing) - -	Partially accepted The definition has not been updated but the JRC intends to follow developments on the Cosmetic Regulation and assess nanomaterials definition for potential alignment/uptake.
p. 33 and 36 – **On definition of "nanomaterials" (Q9):** Comment on Q9: We think it is better to be aligned with the definition of the cosmetic regulation, which according to our latest information will be aligned with the recommendation of the European Commission. So we believe that this the better option to prevent differences in definitions if any.	

Responses to Q10 about microplastics (15 comments)

Question 10 (Q10) asks: "This definition follows regulatory updates but also implied the addition of complementary terms [such] as "Polymers" and "Synthetic polymers". All together, these definitions clarify very accurately what is considered as "microplastics" but might also imply further complexity in the interpretation. In this sense, do you support the proposed "microplastics" definitions? If you do - which details should be in the legal text and which in the User Manual (if any)? If you don´t, which would [be] the definition you advocate for?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: Industrials consider that this definition should be aligned with the 2023/2055 (UE) commission regulation, amending Annex XVII to REACH regulation. We are not in favor of the derogation on microplastics as they are banned in REACH. All particles should be included in the definition of microplastics, not only particles from petrochemicals. We would like to add a clarification on the fact that either petrochemical microplastics and microplastics from renewable resources (biodegradable or not) must be included in this definition. We would like to propose to lower the threshold of 1% concentration of microplastics in products (as it is currently proposed in the definition). The threshold of 0.01% is proposed. We would like to point out in this definition, the omission of the nature of the microplastics. It is well known that the behaviour of particles of polyethylene, polypropylene, or polystyrene varies in the environment due to their different surface properties. For instance, microplastics resulting from polypropylene degradation are highly hydrophobic, which grants them a strong affinity for polar compounds such as PAHs or PCBs, making them significant vectors of organic pollution, particularly in marine environments.	Acknowledged The JRC confirms that the definition proposed is fully aligned with Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/2055 amending Annex XVII REACH as regards synthetic polymer micro particle. The JRC notes the comment on the nature of microplastics and its implications for environmental impacts Partially accepted A dedicated question has been included to assess feasibility of removing one clause of the definition to make it effectively applicable to any synthetic polymer irrespective of origin. Regarding lowering the threshold (from 1% w/w to 0.01% w/w), a question has been included to assess the feasibility

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	of such action. However, note that: a) intentional use of microplastics is already banned within EUEL criteria as part of *Excluded and Restricted substances* criterion, thus only present (if at all) as impurities (>0.01%); b) there was general support amongst stakeholders and this definition is in alignment with mandatory regulation (Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/2055 amending Annex XVII REACH).
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: We very much welcome that all microplastics are to be excluded from EU Ecolabel detergents, but would like to suggest improvements for the related definition. Suggested actions: There should be no lower size limit to define microplastics. Soluble and biodegradable microplastics should be included in the definition. If this is not possible, we recommend changing the threshold value for "solubility". Currently, the threshold for solubility is at 2g/L. This corresponds to only the "slightly soluble" level on the scale defined by the European Pharmacopeia. The threshold to ensure solubility should be >30g/L. Rationale: The definition should be changed, soluble and biodegradable microplastics should also be included in the definition. Importantly, there are already many detergents on the market that contain no microplastic, be it soluble or insoluble, as demonstrated by research done by Austrian NGOs AK and Global 2000: https://www.global2000.at/publikationen/waschmitteltest Besides, there should be no lower size limit if no adequate analytical methods are available. Who would check if there really was no method or documentation available? Please refer to a report by EEB and ClientEarth on the topic: https://eeb.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/the_road_to_an_effective_EU_restriction_of_intentionally-added_microplastics.pdf Which states regarding a lower size limit: "… nanoplastics are expected to be even more harmful than microplastics due to their ability to cross biological membranes and the increase in the surface/volume ratio. Nanoplastics were notably analysed in waste sludge from water treatment plants, raising the technical, economic and administrative burden of decontamination phases.(…) In addition, it is common practice to capture both nano and microplastics. In all national legislations that have been adopted to restrict microbeads in cosmetics, personal care products and/or detergents, microplastics have always been defined according to an upper size limit but without a lower size limit mentioned. These national measures should have already prompted companies marketing products in these countries to reformulate their products in order to comply with the national restrictions."	Acknowledged The JRC acknowledges the health/environmental impacts associated with microplastics. In this sense, the criteria has been formulated in a way that plastics in the "nano" scale intentionally added would be allowed (based on *nanomaterials* definition & explicit exclusion within *Excluded and restricted substances* criterion). Similarly, microplastics are not allowed within EUEL criteria, based on the definition proposed and explicit exclusion. This applies mostly to solid form and under the conditions stipulated by the definition but for those microplastics "in liquid" form still biodegradability requirements are set to ensure no/minimised environmental impact. Nevertheless, the JRC consider proper to hold a discussion on how this definition could be modified to offer further safety guarantees. Under this aim, a dedicated question has been included in TR2 for stakeholders' consideration. This is important as the practical implication of widening further the scope of the definitions is not being able to use some ingredients that are key for particular product formats and/or functionalities. In this sense, further information is required to properly assess the viability of such change.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
and regarding solubility: "Several soluble polymers (including PAMs, polycarboxylates) as well as their breakdown products are persistent and/or toxic; they can also act like flocculants and detergents in recipient waters and as conditioners of soils and sediments with long lasting ecological effects." Please also consider the growing body of evidence regarding the dangers of microplastics, both environmentally and for our health. E.g. a recent study about increased risk of strokes and heart attacks in cells infiltrated by microplastic: https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2024/mar/06/microscopic-plastics-could-raise-risk-of-stroke-and-heart-attack-study-says	
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: We agree that terms as polymers and synthetic polymers clarify what is considered a microplastic. The definition should remain in the Decision. We don't think the word Microplastic should be replaced by Synthetic polymer microparticles. We think that the definition could start as: Microplastics – are synthetic polymer microparticles that fulfil … (the definition shouldn't include the physical phase because there are also liquid polymers that may cause problems to the environment, see https://www.plasticsoupfoundation.org/en/2020/03/battle-on-the-so-called-liquid-microplastics-in-cosmetics/).	Partially accepted We acknowledge your position on the definitions *polymers* and *synthetic polymers*. About removing the phase (*solid*) from the definition, we reject the suggestion made on the following arguments: a) the definition is based on Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/2055 amending Annex XVII REACH, and in this Regulation particle is defined as means "…*a minute piece of matter, other than single molecules, with defined physical boundaries*", consequently it would imply a significant deviation from it, potentially including gaseous form as well; b) it has direct implications on the criteria to qualify as microplastic, since the traits mentioned (*particle size*) would no longer applicable and/or measurable. This in turn will have implications for verification purposes; c) the EUEL criteria already accounts for microplastics in liquid form by requesting it to be biodegradable, which is one of the exemptions for not being considered as a microplastic.
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** **Comment on Q10 and especially "Synthetic polymer" definition:** We support the alignment of the different definitions at EU level but would like to highlight that there is no official definition, to our knowledge, of synthetic polymer under Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 (REACH). The proposed definition in the Revision of EU Ecolabel criteria for detergent products (Technical report v.1.0) includes chemical modification of natural or synthetic macromolecules, making no longer difference based on their natural or synthetic origin.	Acknowledged The JRC acknowledges that both definitions (*synthetic polymer* and *polymer*) are based on EU Ecolabel criteria for Absorbent Hygiene Products. However, only the *polymer* can be directly attributed to ECHA guidance for monomers and polymers (version 3.0, February 2023). In terms of not differentiating based on origin ("natural"/ synthetic origin), the JRC considers that knowing the origin is relevant but for the purposes of current EUEL criteria,

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
The ECHA guidance for monomers and polymers (version 3.0, February 2023) refers to "chemically modified natural polymers" as one group of polymers due to their special characteristics. We propose to use this term as well within the EU Ecolabel criteria to differentiate from synthetic origin polymers.	what mainly matters are the properties of the resulting polymer since these condition the "behaviour" of such polymer, especially with regards to environmental impacts downstream. The JRC notes the suggestion of considering the nomenclature "chemically modified natural polymers" but it requires further clarity on to which aspect of the definition/s is referring this comment to.
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: The definition of microplastics is consistent with current regulations and is sufficient. There is no need to add definitions of polymers and synthetic polymers. The definitions of polymers and synthetic polymers are too far-reaching and could be the beginning of further implications, e.g., exclusion of synthetic polymers. This would significantly limit the portfolio of raw materials, and therefore effective functional additives or even surfactants.	Rejected The JRC acknowledges the comment but simultaneously has received wide stakeholder support for the inclusion of these definitions. The *polymer* definition is in fact based on the ECHA guidance for monomers and polymers (version 3.0, February 2023). There is room for considering whether *synthetic polymer* definitions is needed but conditioned to this being highlighted as an issue by other stakeholders.
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Additional comment on Q10 and especially **"Synthetic polymer" definition:** We are in favour to keep the definition in case we need them.	Acknowledged
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: we agree with the proposals.	
p. 32,33 and 36 – On definition of **"microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: It is good to have the alignment with the legal test. Why add further complexity? As the topic of microplastic already is quite complex we would rather stick to the definition of the legal text.	
p. 32,33 and 36 – On **definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: refers to microplastics Suggested actions: taking into consideration of the regulation 2023/2055 and their exemptions (solubility, biodegradability, carbon chain ..) -	
p. 32,33 and 36 – On definition **of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: suggest aligning with definition contained in revised Annex XVII of REACH in EU COM Regulation 2023/2055	
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):**	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment on Q10: Yes, however it would need to be further evaluated for potential formula implications.	
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: It is good that definition for polymers have been added.	
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: Keep the definitions in case it might be useful to us. - -	
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: agree on microplastic (SPM) definition	
p. 32,33 and 36 – **On definition of "microplastics" (Q10):** Comment on Q10: Keep the definitions "Polymer" and "synthetic polymer" in case they might be useful to us.	

About the definition of Endocrine Disruptors (6 comments).

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.33 – Comment about Endocrine Disruptor definition: A stakeholder considers that the definition is not clear on what the CB must consider or not as endocrine disruptors and what can be accepted or not.	Acknowledged – note that further information has been added in this TR2 as part of the *Excluded and Restricted* criterion aimed at providing further clarity.
p.33 – Comment about Endocrine Disruptor definition: should we have a stricter angle of approach according to https://edlists.org/the-ed-lists ?	Rejected – In this TR2 the JRC is proposing making reference only to "confirmed" endocrine disruptors substances in EU the EU legislation cited in the *Definition* and *Excluded and Restricted substances* criteria. This implies exclusion of the proposed instrument managed by EU Member states but in practical terms it could be assumed that *List I* of such instrument is included in TR2 as the cited legislation implies roughly equivalent content.
p.33 and 83– Comment about Endocrine Disruptor definition: I suggest including List I, List II, and List III in the definitions and in the requirement 7.6.1.	Partially accepted – In this TR2 proposal, whilst not explicitly quoted, in practical terms *List I* from https://edlists.org/the-ed-lists has been included by citing relevant EU legislation containing roughly equivalent content. However, List II and III have not been included. No. (part of) 97

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.33 – Comment about Endocrine Disruptor definition: We very much welcome a definition of "identified endocrine disruptors" and the associated exclusion of all such substances. Moreover, we welcome that potential EDs are excluded as well. Suggested actions: In addition to the relevant lists already mentioned, we propose to also consider the potential EDs identified on https://edlists.org/ . This list is maintained by six Member States and overlaps partly with the European lists. But it might contain further relevant and up-to-date EDs that should be banned.	Rejected – In this TR2 the JRC is proposing making reference only to "confirmed" endocrine disruptors substances in EU the EU legislation cited in the *Definition* and *Excluded and Restricted substances* criteria. This implies, in practical terms, that *List I* from https://edlists.org/the-ed-lists has been included by citing relevant EU legislation containing roughly equivalent content but that List II and III are not considered.
p.33 and 83– Comment about Endocrine Disruptor definition: the proposed definition of "substances identified to have endocrine disrupting properties" is reasonable but we are missing a definition of the "substances considered to be potential ED", which are referred as excluded substances.	Acknowledged
p.33 – Comment about Endocrine Disruptor definition: Keep the definition "endocrine disruptors" but this definition is unclear regarding what the CB must consider as endocrine disruptors and what can be accepted or not.	Acknowledged – note that further information has been added in this TR2 as part of the *Excluded and Restricted* criterion aimed at providing further clarity.

5. Assessment and verification (16 comments)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.39 - ALL – "*Changes in suppliers and production sites pertaining to products to which the EU Ecolabel has been granted shall be notified to competent bodies, together with supporting information to enable verification of continued compliance with the criteria.*" Comment: Is there a timeline mentioned for this notification? We don´t think it is feasible that every supplier change can be notified to the authority without a high administrative burden. However, we would support that EU Ecolabel criteria compliance has to be confirmed in regular time intervals to check for potential changes within this time period.	Acknowledged the JRC understands that current legal text formulation does not necessary requires such notification to happen as the changes occur. Indeed, it understands that under such formulation CBs can organise the verification procedure in a practical way for all parties. Nevertheless and also acknowledging the importance of precise text for efficient verification, the JRC has included a dedicated question to consult stakeholders on this matter.
p.38 – A+V Table 1 and footnote Comment: We suggest that the expression "*no limit*" in the Table 1 should be replaced by "*limit of detection (LOD)*". [Furthermore] "*no limit*", seems to us, ambiguous and may lead to think that it is the highest level (instead of the lower one). If the expression "*no limit*" means the analitycal limit of detection why don't use the right term which is LOD?	Acknowledged Considering all the elements mentioned in your comment as well as considering the update on the definitions *impurities & ingoing substances* proposed in TR2, the JRC has shared a question addressed to stakeholders aimed at

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Also the expression "*exception of impurities which can be present up to a concentration of 0,01% by weight in the final formulation*" might bring some problems, because impurities doesn't come out in any SDS (which are the mandatory documents) if they are in a concentration below 1%. SDS has Reach and CLP as their legal base and, Reach and CLP has a different limit to consider a substance as an impurity (0,1%) (see paragraph c) of 3.2.1 of Annex II - Requirements for the Compilation of Safety Data Sheets. EU Ecolabel is more restrict – 0,010%. So, if the producer doesn't report the presence of an impurity below 1%, it's difficult for CBs to know about the presence of impurities (that could be present in the formulation in an amount more than 0,010%). This problem is related with the difference between the definition of the minimum amount of a substance to be considered as an impurity for Reach and CLP (SDS are made according to those) and for EU Ecolabel.	delimiting which would be the most precise wording (*no limit* or *LOD*).
p.30: Comment: Ingoing substances should be indicated at or above a concentration of 0.010% weight by weight. Otherwise, identifying all ingoing substances, especially from complex ingredients like perfume, would require a significant amount of work. - -	Rejected In TR2 the definitions for *ingoing substances* and *impurities* has been updated. Since this has implications on how to interpret this legal, we invite you to re-visit it to assess whether it is acceptable.
p.37: Comment: against deletion of ingoing substances. We recommend to confirm the concentration of 0.010% weight by weight. Otherwise, identifying all ingoing substances, especially from complex ingredients like perfume, would require a significant amount of work	
p.37-41, especially on this part: *"The Detergent Ingredient Database list (DID list) available on the EU Ecolabel website, contains the most widely used ingoing substances in detergents and cosmetics formulations. It shall be used for deriving the data for the calculations of the critical dilution volume (CDV) and for the assessment of the biodegradability of the ingoing substances. For substances not present on the DID list, guidance is given on how to calculate or extrapolate the relevant data. The latest version of the DID list is available from the EU Ecolabel website (1) or via the websites of the individual competent bodies."* Comment: We call for a harmonized interpretation of the criteria by all EU members, as we still face different understandings of the decision that can impact on the award of the label. For example, when a safety factor (SF) must be derived according to the procedure described in the DID list part B, we understand that chronic study results shall be considered whenever available and even if acute studies are not or only available in part. Some authorities instead consider that these results can only be used if acute studies are available for all 3 trophic levels. This leads to a different assessment for a same formulation in different EU countries: in the most critical cases a CB has rejected a formulation that other CB´s would accept.Moreover, the proposed method to fill the water compartment is an animal test: acute fish toxicity according to OECD 203 & 210. This is in contradiction with the proposal under	Acknowledged The JRC notes your reflection about some experiences showing lack of harmonised verification at EU level. The JRC also highlights that there is an instrument to ensure CBs harmonisation at EU level (CB Forum) where all Competent Bodies discuss and agree the "way forward" in case of doubt. About alternative testing methods, generally there is the possibility of using the method indicated *or* equivalent. In addition the JRC has included dedicated comments on the use of alternative testing approaches (e.g. Biodegradability & Use of QSAR; Non-animal testing approaches to sensitization) and it is still actively engaging to identify suitable test relevant to EUEL criteria (for which welcomes specific feedback)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
the revision of the detergent regulation to avoid animal testing, which is generally also supported by the industry. In particular for polymers which are not so far subject to registration under EU-REACH, those data are not necessarily available. Alternative methods for the acute/chronic fish tests should be permitted, such as OECD 236, in silico models, ice, QSARs, Read Across, OECD 249 (RT gill W 1 cell line).	
p.40 – **Definition of "no limit" at footnote to table 1:** We call for a harmonized interpretation of the criteria by all EU members, as we still face different understandings of the decision that can impact on the award of the label. See Annex 1: Additional comments on Section 5 of the Technical Draft Report linked to Assessment and verification. The "*no limit*" definition should be rephrased as follows: *"no presence of ingoing substances (under detection limits) with the exception of by-products and impurities from raw materials, which can be present up to a concentration of 0,010 % by weight in the final formulation"*	
p.37 – Various points, consider separating into two comments. Comments: We call for a harmonized interpretation of the criteria by all EU members, as we still face different understandings of the decision that can impact on the award of the label. For example, when a safety factor (SF) must be derived according to the procedure described in the DID list part B, we understand that chronic study results shall be considered whenever available and even if acute studies are not or only available in part. Some authorities instead consider that these results can only be used if acute studies are available for all 3 trophic levels. This leads to a different assessment for a same formulation in different EU countries: in the most critical cases a CB has rejected a formulation that other CB´s would accept. Moreover, the proposed method to fill the water compartment is an animal test: acute fish toxicity according to OECD 203 & 210. This is in contradiction with the proposal under the revision of the detergent regulation to avoid animal testing, which is generally also supported by the industry. In particular for polymers which are not so far subject to registration under EU-REACH, those data are not necessarily available. Alternative methods for the acute/chronic fish tests should be permitted, such as OECD 236, in silico models, ice, QSARs, Read Across, OECD 249 (RT gill W 1 cell line). Also, we do not agree with the request for anaerobic biodegradability of surfactants. Stringent requirements regarding anaerobic biodegradability can be challenging without providing accompanying environmental benefits where it can be demonstrated that the substance is already degraded under aerobic conditions. As noted by SCHER in 2005: *"poor biodegradability under anaerobic conditions is not expected to produce substantial modifications in the risk for freshwater ecosystems as the surfactant removal in the STPs seems to be regulated by its aerobic biodegradability"*. Surfactants used in detergents need to be more effective than the ones used in cosmetics, so the criteria can not be fully compared. If such criteria must however be considered, then other relevant testing methods must also	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
be included in the DID list part B, such as the AnBUSDIC test as an equivalent test method for anaerobic biodegradability. This brings us to two other important issues linked to the DID List part A. None of the surfactants that had been proposed by CESIO as part of the DID list update have been inserted in the updated DID list version (See Annex 2 for CESIO list of proposed substances to be added to the DID). It is correct that they are not widespread, but the fact they are not listed in the DID also prevents a wider use. In order to increase their use, they should be inserted. Furthermore, if no new surfactants are added and the old ones listed are constantly challenged, then there is a risk is that no effective surfactants will be available.	
p.37 - Table 1 Comment: Threshold levels applicable to ingoing substances is difficult to decode. Please consider a different wording or description. - -	
p.40 – **"no limit" footnote at end of Table 1:** Comment: The "*no limit*" definition should be rephrased as follows:no presence of ingoing substances (under detection limits) with the exception of by-products and impurities from raw materials, which can be present up to a concentration of 0,010 % by weight in the final formulation - -	Partially accepted The text has not been modified in the understanding that with the updated on the definitions for *ingoing substances* and *impurities* in this TR2 it would solve such issue. The threshold for *impurities* is still set at 0.010% in the final formulation.
p.39 – Relating to text on the DID list: Comment: None of the surfactants that had been proposed by CESIO as part of the update to DID list part A have been inserted in the updated DID list version (See Annex 2 for CESIO list of proposed substances to be added to the DID). It is correct that they are not widespread, but the fact they are not listed in the DID also prevents a wider use. In order to increase their use, they should be inserted. Furthermore, if no new surfactants are added and the old ones listed are constantly challenged, then there is a risk is that no effective surfactants will be available.	Acknowledged The JRC is actively engaged in conversation with relevant parties concerning DID list to get further insights in how to approach this potential issue. However, it also notes that not being in the DID list does not preclude a surfactant from being used as long as the required evidences for its acceptance are provided as indicated in DID list part B.
p.40 – **"no limit" footnote at end of Table 1:** Comment: We are concerned that the definition of "*no limit*" has been changed and now excludes impurities. We recommend adjusting the definition of "*no limit*" in the case of SVHCs and excluded substances. Impurities should not be exempted from the "*no limit*" definition in these cases. We disagree to accept impurities which are SVHC or on the list of excluded substances up to 0.01% w/w (impurity threshold) in the detergent product. If there is a need to accept such an impurity, the respective company should ask for a derogation.	Acknowledged Considering all the elements mentioned in your comment as well as considering the update on the definitions *impurities & ingoing substances* proposed in TR2 (which could change the interpretation of the *no limit*), the JRC has shared a question addressed to stakeholders aimed at delimiting which would be the most precise wording that is viable (verifiable, enforceable).

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.39 – specifically about **"***list of all ingoing substances shall be provided to the competent body, indicating the trade name (if existing), the chemical name, the CAS No, the DID No.***":** Comment: There are substances that have no CAS-no, [but which] under REACH substance receive an EC-No. – [so please] change to *"CAS No and/or EC No"*	Accepted Incorporated as part of the TR2 proposals in the legal text
p.40 – **"no limit" footnote at end of Table 1, specifically** *"no limit" means: regardless of the concentration (analytical limit of detection) for all substances"*: Comment: The term *"analytical limit of detection"* is unprecise. The limit of detection depends on the method and can vary e.g. from grams per kg to nanograms per kg. *"regardless of the concentration"* may be interpreted as *"not intentionally added"*. If it is not added, any other component will be a by-product of the manufacturing process, the by-products are differentioted as ingoing subtances or impurities by the *"impurities"* definition and will be allowed as an impurity with <0.01% in the raw material and not allowed as an ingoing substance. - Define the *"analytical limit of detection"* or amend/remove the definition.	Acknowledged Considering all the elements mentioned in your comment as well as considering the update on the definitions *impurities & ingoing substances* proposed in TR2 (which could change the interpretation of the *no limit*), the JRC has shared a question addressed to stakeholders aimed at delimiting which would be the most precise wording that is viable (verifiable, enforceable).
p.40 – **"no limit" fo**otnote at end of Table 1: Comment: It is essential to properly define the minimum concentration, taking into account the limit of detection (presumably 0.01%), in order to consider a substance, thus avoiding the need to develop an amendment after publication. - -	Acknowledged This minimum concentration is set via the updated definitions for *ingoing substances* and especially *impurities* in this TR2 (0.1% w/w in raw material and 0.01% w/w in final formulation). However, the *ingoing substance* definition has no lower limit (….*regardless of amount*…) which implies that for those entries were *no limit* is quoted no amount is allowed of intentionally added substances.
p.37 – Comment: We do think that the extension of the banned substances to include impurities in raw materials could pose some risks, we have had some cases were the use as processing aids with minimal residues left in the raw material gave rise to problem according to new Blauer Engel and Nordic Eco-label criteria.	Acknowledged

6. Reference dosage (3 comments)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.42 –	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: For concentrated products (either powder/granulates or liquid concentrates) that need to be dissolved or diluted, reference dosage should be 1 Liter of the diluted "ready-to-use" product, not the concentrate. Suggested action: Add a short description how to handle concentrated products that are not applicated in concentrated from and needs to be diluted before application/use	The JRC is actively considering how to enable the use of concentrated product that need to be diluted before application in formats with comparatively lesser environmental impacts
p.42 – Comment: Dosage, general: DK suggest to harmonize the limits with the Nordic Swan Ecolabel – both labels are using the same data in the DID list and having same dosage requirements will enable producer to use both labels based on the same calculations and hence lower the administration.	Acknowledged
p.43 – Comment: We would like to bring to your attention that there appears to be an inconsistency between the decision "All products in a multi-component system shall be included with the worst case dosage when assessments of the criteria are made" (worst case dosage which means "heavy and hard water") and the current framework "If a range of recommended dosages is given, the recommended dosage for normally soiled textiles and hard water should be used." - -	Accepted The legal text has been revised to be consistent with other EUEL criteria sections.

7. Dosage requirements (23 comments)

This section was about possible changes to the dosage requirements (maximum dosages allowed) for different type of house laundry detergent and household dishwasher detergents. The proposals were basically:

- Single-function dishwasher detergent: 19.0g/wash 16.0 g/wash
- Multi-function dishwasher detergent: 21.0g/wash 18.0 g/wash
- Heavy duty laundry detergent / colour safe detergent: 16.0 12.2 g/kg laundry
- Light duty laundry detergent: 16.0 12.2 g/kg laundry
- Stain remover (pre-treatment only): 2.7 g/kg laundry no change propsoed

Responses to Q11: about proposed maximum dosage requirements (16 comments)

Question 11 (Q11) asks: "Do you support the proposed thresholds? If not, why?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.49 - Question Q11: Comment: We trust on JRC's research and considerations on this subject.	Acknowledged
p.49 – Question Q11: Comment: Yes. Moreover, we think that it would be useful to specify in this criterion whether the reference dosage includes or does not include the "soluble foil". Note that on the one hand the soluble foil is included as an ingredient (ingoing substance) and that in another hand the detergent product is the gel in the capsule, excluding the foil. The reference dosage is part of all the calculation, including the WUR calculation	Partially accepted The JRC has not modified the legal text but has modified some definitions in this TR2 which should made clear that water soluble foils/films are considered as ingoing substances in terms of EUEL criteria compliance. However, dosage threshold setting could account for this "additional" mass (water soluble foil now considered as ingoing substance) but for this data is required and not available to the JRC (e.g. which is the mass attributed to water soluble foil by product [sub-]group), thus it was not accounted for in this TR2.
p.49 – Question Q11: Comment: we agree with the proposals	Acknowledged
p.49 – Question 11 Comment: The decrease of dosage limit for laundry detergents is challenging. Suggested action: We recommend to update the reference product's formulation, according to the present market. Rationale: A decreased dosage level for laundry detergents could lead to a worsening of the washing performance, since the chemical load of an EU Ecolabelled product is much more limited than a traditional one. Furthermore, the reference detergent used for the performance assessment (IEC A*) is obsolete and contains ingredients that are more efficient than the one available for an ecolabelled product.	Acknowledged The JRC acknowledges that a decrease in the dosage, implies a decrease in performance (assuming no change on product's formulation). However, the proposal for lowering the dosage for performance testing was proposed in alignment with the maximum dosage recommended, as per TR1 and current (TR2) proposal. This maximum dosage was set based on best data available on current market reality. The JRC also acknowledges that products awarded with the EUEL have a restriction on ingredients available for their formulation that could imply comparative lower performance per unit (e.g grams) of products. However, stakeholders had a wide agreement on how important was to compare against market products and not solely those having an "EUEL profile", thus little can be done in that sense. About the reference detergent formulation mentioned for performance testing purposes, the JRC has been actively screening and requesting input on this regard
p.49 – Question 11 (Q11) Comment: We do not support the proposed dosages, especially for LD. Rationale: According to the proposal, the dosages would have to be decreased with more than 20%. It can be expected that this will have a significant impact on the washing performance. In combination with the above-mentioned decreased washing temperature, it will become difficult if not impossible to meet the required performance criteria. Moreover, it can again be expected that the end users will in reality either not respect the recommended dosages, which will lead to overdosing, or will have to wash the textiles again, leading to higher rewash rates and an even higher consumption of chemicals, energy and increased impact on the environment.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	and it has proposed the best option amongst those found, being still pending a check on forthcoming standards to be released. Finally, based on evidences the JRC had accessed, it maintained TR1 proposals in this TR2, yet being open for considering revision of heavy duty LD (12.2 to 15 g/kg for) and DD-Multifunction (16.0 to 15 g/wash).
p.47 – Question 11 Comment: In favour of new proposed criterion for dishwashing detergents	Acknowledged
p.49 – Question 11 Comment: In some cases (LD) proposed thresholds are significantly lower than current and might affect product performance.	Acknowledged
p.47-49 - Question 11 (Q11) Comment: For DD, products are becoming increasingly compact. This change is perfectly acceptable. For LD, a change in dosage involves reformulating the product, but also redoing the performance tests and adapting the packaging for liquid products (specifically graduated dosage cap). This change represents a considerable cost, which can be very significant for small manufacturers.	Acknowledged
p.49 – Question 11 (Q11) Comment: The dosage for stain removers (pre-treatment) (2.7g/kg) is not relevant because pre-treatment products are applied directly onto the stain. Suggested: In this case it is more interesting to use a recommended dosage of 1000 as is the case for RTU products to calculate the CDVtox. Valuers for our products : CVDtox: With dosage 2.7 : max 1750-> With dosage TRU : 650 000 Aerobis Biod. : With dosage 2.7 : max 0.01-> With dosage TRU : 6.0 Anaerobis Biod. : With dosage 2.7 : max 0.04-> With dosage TRU : 17.0 Rationale: The dosage for stain removers (pre-treatment) is not relevant because pre-treatment products are applied directly onto the stain. The dosage will therefore depend on the number and size of the stains.	Acknowledged Concerning pre-treatment stain removers, the JRC has not considered this proposal in this TR2 version but it is open to explore this proposal yet it would require further insights.
p.49 – Question 11 Comment: The proposed thresholds are achievable because the vast majority of textile products on the market have moved to a lower dosage. However, the maximum dosage for stain removers is not relevant because the product is applied to completely cover a stain. Suggested actions: We suggest to exclude the threshold for stain removers.	
p.51 - Q11:	Partially accepted

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: For DD: We agree with the new reference dosage (18) for "Multi-function dishwasher detergent" .As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we think we can reduce again the reference dosage for "Single-function dishwasher detergent"; for 15 because all our certified products for this subcategory have reference dosage between 10 and 15. For LD: We strongly disagree with the new reference dosage proposed for "Heavy-duty detergent, colour-safe detergent"; (12.2) because 18 of our 78 certified products have a reference dosage comprised between 14.6 and 17.We don't know for "Light-duty detergent"; because none of our certified products belongs to this subcategory. – Suggested action: For DD: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we think we can reduce again the reference dosage for "Single-function dishwasher detergent"; for 15. For LD: We propose a new reference dosage for "Heavy-duty detergent, colour-safe detergent"; (and maybe "Light-duty detergent") for 15, which decrees improvements for 18 current certified products. Rationale: DD: Because all our certified products for the subcategory "Single-function dishwasher detergent"; have reference dosage between 10 and 15. LD: Because 27 of our 77 certified products for the subcategory "Heavy-duty detergent, colour-safe detergent" have a reference dosage comprised between 14.6 and 17	The comment has been taken into consideration and the JRC has done further research on it. The outcome is that TR1 proposals are maintained in this TR2 proposal but the JRC has included two specific questions being open for considering revision of heavy duty LD (12.2 to 15 g/kg for) and DD-Multifunction (16.0 to 15 g/wash) according to new insights derived from these questions.
p.47 - Q11: Comment: DD: It seems possible to put the threshold at 15 in unique function since 10 certified products according to this category are between 10 and 15. OK for the threshold at 18 in multifunction LD: The threshold for Heavy-duty detergent, colour-safe detergent seems difficult to reach. 27 of 77 certified products are non-compliant (35%) with a threshold of 15, so this seems too ambitious. We propose a threshold of 15 instead of 12,2, which would already require 18 of certified products (24%) to improve to meet this criterion. We do not have certified "specific" detergents. Industrials would like to point out that the criteria on stain remover is not relevant and propose to re-evaluate dosage. One industrial propose to have a dosage reference for 100g of laundry instead of 1kg of laundry. Another industrial proposes to delete the threshold for stain-removers as the product is used to fully cover a stain. Industrials propose to update stain remover performance tests to test several stains simultaneously in one cycle of washing machine.	
p.49 – Question 11 Comment: Dosage requirements for DD Suggested action: new criteria could be 18.5 g/wash for example for multi-function dishwasher detergent Rationale: For manufacturer of tablet which use hydrosoluble flow pack a strict dosage could be a problem. in general competent body want us to include the flow pack in the formulation so for example	Acknowledged No change has been proposed but further comments from other stakeholders inquired whether the water-soluble film should be considered or not. As you indicate, it should be considered but one aspect that could be discussed is whether for the proposal of the new threshold it should be

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
if our tablet has a weight of 18g so 18g/wash but if we include the flow pack the dosage is 18.5 g/wash so not conform with your next criteria , the solution could be to manufacture a tablet of 17.5 g but it's not possible for us	considered the impact of this "additional" mass (water soluble film/foil) and if so how to account for it (e.g. raise threshold by X g) However for the latter, the JRC would need data to accurately determine which is the mass that should/could be allocated typically to water soluble film
p.38 – Question 11 Comment: yes	Acknowledged
p.49 – Question 11 Comment: We support that the thresholds are lowered and propose investigating whether a further reduction is possible. – Suggested action: We propose to investigate whether a further compaction of the laundry detergents would be possible to ensure the EUEL requirements keep up with this decreasing trend. – Rationale: The report by AISE about their compaction project PREP-L2 shows that the proposed threshold for laundry detergents was already widely achieved in 2019. The report states that "The participating companies represent about 60-65% of the total liquid detergents market in the region" and "Overall, in 2019, the weighted average recommended dosage for liquid detergents across all countries with PREP-L2 participation was 55.2 ml/wash. For traditional liquid detergents (i.e. excluding mono-dose) this was 57.9 ml/wash." https://www.aise.eu/documents/document/20200703154538-prep-l2_closeout_report_final_1july2020.pdf Tests of laundry detergents by consumer organisations commonly find products with a recommended dose of 35ml per wash.	Acknowledged – support to threshold proposed. Rejected – lowering further LD threshold. Indeed, stakeholders have raised concerns about the impact of this maximum dosage reduction on EUEL products performance and also on viability of existing EU ecolabelled products to comply with the proposed dosages (e.g. Heavy duty 12.2 g/kg). In this TR2 the JRC has done further research and still the outcome is that 12.2 g/kg appears as the most ambitious whilst viable maximum dosage. However, the JRC is open to discuss and revise specific cases (Heavy duty LD from 12.2 to 15.0 g/kg; Multi-function DD from 16.0 g/wash to 15g/wash)
p.49 - Question 11 Comment: I believe that more data should be collected on cleaning effectiveness for lower dosages and temperatures before setting limits that cannot be met. Question 12 – We think that the EU Ecolabel should be extended to other cleaning products that consumers use, such as car cleaning detergents and ultra-concentrated cleaning products. Rationale: Question 11 – Reducing the dosage of detergent may seem beneficial from an ecological point of view, as fewer chemicals will enter the environment. However, the performance of an EU Ecolabel detergent must be equal to or better than its market equivalents (this performance is assessed in a fitness-for-use test according to defined guidelines). A smaller amount used could mean poor performance of the detergent, leading the final user to choose products without the EU Ecolabel, which could be more effective in terms of cleaning, but less environmentally friendly. We should also consider that to reduce the detergent dosage it may be necessary to use more aggressive chemical compounds to guarantee the good performance of the detergent in the fitness-for-use for use test. On the other	Acknowledged Firstly, in this TR2 the decrease in temperature has been withdrawn being one of the arguments the impact on performance, thus now is back to the original version (30C). In terms of the proposed maximum dosages, in this TR2 proposal further research has been carried out using the data received and curated by the JRC. The results of such analysis (focused on EU ecolabelled products) is consistent with some of the findings applicable to market products (not necessarily EU Ecolabelled). In this sense and based on the evidences the JRC had accessed to, the proposal is

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
hand, this decrease in dosage combined with a decrease in temperature according to Question 4 (Q4) may even result in less effective detergents.	backed up. However, the JRC is open for revising its proposal but for this further data (e.g. from LHs in the format of EUEL application sheets) is necessary. The JRC also acknowledges that products awarded with the EUEL have a restriction on ingredients available for their formulation that could imply comparative lower performance per unit (e.g grams) of products. However, stakeholders had a wide agreement on how important was to compare against market products and not solely those having an "EUEL profile".

Responses to Q12: about possible new maximum dosage requirements for other detergent products (7 comments)

Question 12 (Q12) asks: "Should any additional product group/format be considered for addition? If so, why?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.49 - Question Q12: Comment: Should we consider also soap nuts, laundry eggs and laundry sheets?	Acknowledged – but due to lack of information/research on this regard no proposal made in this TR2
p.49 – Q12: Comment: we have no additions	Acknowledged
p.51 - Q12: Comment: According to us, dosage requirements are not necessary in HDD, HSC, IIDD and IILD. Suggested action: However, we think: "Undiluted"; HSC: it seems to be appropriate to require for a "normally soil" a dosage of 2 caps (or equivalent), maximum. "RTU"; HSC: it could be useful to ask LH to indicate on labels what surface area corresponds one spraying, to guide users and to reduce the impact of this kind of detergents. Detergents with dosages in "cap" (at the minimum for HSC and LD): it is essential to require that the provided cap has compatible graduations with dosages mentioned on labels. It is not obvious in current criteria, so it is leaving to competent bodies' judgements. For example, if 15 ml is required, the cap can't only indicate 10 or 20 ml. Rationale: Because indicated dosages for these categories are already low	Acknowledged – on products not requiring further dosage requirements. Partially accepted – meaning that some further requirements/clarifications about dosing instructions have been proposed within the *User information criterion.*
p.47 - Q12:	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: French stakeholders are not in favor to include other product categories in this criterion. One stakeholder think that: · In "dilutable" HSC: it would be appropriate to require a dosage of "normally dirty" limited to a maximum of 2 caps. For RTU HSC: it might be useful to make manufacturers specify on their labels the surface area corresponding to one spray. For all products with a dosage in caps (HSC and LD): it seems essential to require that the cap chosen by the manufacturer has graduations compatible with the dosages recommended on the label, which is not sufficiently clear in the current criteria and is left to the discretion of the CB (e.g. if 15ml is recommended, a line must be drawn for 15ml and not leave the user to make approximately 15ml with 10ml and 20ml graduations on the cap). · One industrial would like to know if hydro soluble packaging for tab DD are included in the calculation of dosage requirement. If so, dosage requirement for DD seems too difficult to reach. The industrial would like to point out the fact that most dishwasher detergents are in the form of tablets with a water-soluble flow pack, these tablets can indeed be 18g. But if it is necessary to include the flow pack in the formulation the dosage the dosage will be above the threshold and it is only possible for the industrial to make a tablet with e.g. 17. 8 g. - -	
p.49 – Question 12 No.	Acknowledged
p.38 – Question 12 Comment: To consider dishwasher cleaning products (solid form or liquid form), products are used during the operation of dishwashers. - -	Acknowledged – note the JRC has doubts on the interpretation of this comment, thus advisable to engage with us for further clarification.
p.49 - Question 12 Comment: We think that the EU Ecolabel should be extended to other cleaning products that consumers use, such as car cleaning detergents and ultra-concentrated cleaning products.	Acknowledged

8. Toxicity to aquatic organisms (78 comments)

Responses to Q13 about whether abrasives should be counted in CDV calculations (8 comments)

Question 13 (Q13) asks: "Do you support the exclusion of abrasives from CDV calculation, as expressed in criterion legal text? If not but still supporting this exclusion, should it be aligned with EUEL criteria for Cosmetic products (use Active Content AC)?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.58 - Question Q13	Accepted

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: We believe that "abrasive" should be defined and what types of substances can be used (or not) as abrasives. As the abrasive substances are insoluble in water, it will not make much sense to include them in the CDV calculation. However, the impact of these substances on the environment should be assessed. Might be carry out a study of what is used as an abrasive in detergents and define what can and cannot be used.	*Abrasives* has been maintained as an exclusion in TR2 proposal. Furthermore, a definition for *abrasives* has been proposed for discussion, delimiting more clearly what type of substances are in or out. However, note that due to resources constraints a study on impacts of abrasives has not been carried out.
p.58-59 – Line: 1119 – 1121- Question 13 Comment: we agree with the proposals	Acknowledged
p.50-59 – Question 13 (Q13) Comment: Yes, abrasives must be excluded from the CDV as they are insoluble in wastewater.	Acknowledged
p.52-53 - Question 13 Comment: In the table Proposed criterion toxicity to aquatic organisms, section DD,HDD,IIDD,ILDD & LD, HSC : The CDV chronic is calculated ..... We would recommend to add a clear definition of abrasive substances in criterion legal text. - -	Accepted - but the definition has been included for discussion in this TR2 as part of the *Definitions* section and not as part of *Toxicity to Aquatic organisms* legal text.
p.52 – Question 13 Comment: Q13: Industrials are in favor to exclude abrasives from the CDV as they are insoluble in wastewater.	Acknowledged
p.58 – Question 13 Comment: Yes.	Acknowledged
p.60,61 – Question 13 Comment: Re. 13 yes	Acknowledged
p.60 – Question 13 Comment: Abrasive substances: only inorganic abrasive shall be excluded.	Accepted – a definition has been included for discussion in this TR2 as part of the *Definitions* section. The JRC understanding your comments as suggesting consider abrasives whose action is not effected via chemical reactions but rather via primarily physical means. In the proposed definition for abrasives this is explicitly indicated.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Responses to Q14 about the provision of CDV data (9 comments)

Question 14 (Q14) asks: "Can you provide CDV value data to help support the criteria revision process and make sure that new CDV values have an appropriate level of ambition?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.58 - Q14: Comment: · For LD Heavy-duty detergent, colour-safe detergent: Perhaps this proposed reduction is not significant enough · For LD Stain remover: A threshold of 3,500 is not sufficiently selective. · For HDD: This proposed reduction is not significant enough · For IIDD Dishwasher detergents: This proposed reduction is not significant enough · For IIDD Rinse aids: This proposed reduction is not significant enough · For IIDD Multi-component systems: This proposed reduction is not significant enough Suggested actions: · For LD Heavy-duty detergent, colour-safe detergent: Maybe we can reduce again to 21,000, or even 20,000. · For LD Stain remover: We propose to reduce this threshold to 3,000, or even 2,800. · For HDD: We propose to reduce this threshold to 1,250. · For IIDD Dishwasher detergents: We propose to reduce thresholds to 1,000; 1,250; 1,500 (soft/medium/hard water). · For IIDD Rinse aids: We propose to reduce thresholds to 2,000; 2,500; 2,750 (soft/medium/hard water). · For IIDD Multi-component systems: We propose to reduce thresholds to 1,000; 1,250; 1,500 (soft/medium/hard water). Rationale: Because · For LD Heavy-duty detergent, colour-safe detergent: almost 90% of our certified products for this subcategory have CDV values until 20,000. · For LD Stain remover: Our certified product have a CDV value of 1,200 · For HDD: all our 104 certified products have CDV values until 1,050 and we need to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary · For IIDD Dishwasher detergents: all our 76 certified products have CDV values until 251; 244; 604 and we need to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test! · For IIDD Rinse aids: all our 76 certified products have CDV values until 1,669; 2,500; 1,394 and we need to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab	Partially accepted – Please see threshold proposed in TR2 the rationale provided for full details. Suggestion on LD and IIDD have been (broadly) accepted but not for HDD (threshold kept at 1500)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
test! · For IIDD Multi-component systems: our 2 Multi-component systems have CDV values until 116	
p.58 - Question Q14: Comment: We can provide CDV value data without detailed recipe information. - -	Acknowledged – If you still would like to do so, without this implying a significant burden, we would be grateful to receive such input from you.
p.58-59 – Question 14 Comment: CDV Values: HDD =520; HSC (Sanitary)=200.000 (RTU), 580.000 (RTU), 5.000, 560.000 (RTU) HSC (All-purpose) =380, 720, 3.100 HSC (Kitchen) =165.000 (RTU), 270 HSC (glass) =17.000 (RTU) IIDD (Rinse aid) =350, 340 IIDD (Dish washer) =1.160, 1.000	Acknowledged
p.50-59 – Question 14 Comment: AFNOR will send you the information directly.	Acknowledged – and thank you!
p.52 – Question 14 Q14: 100 % of current certified formulas are compliant with new limit values. Therefore, CDV values can be further lowered because the thresholds are still largely attainable.	Acknowledged
p.58 – Question 14 Comment: Our data have already been communicated. If necessary, we can of course send you other data.	Acknowledged – and thank you!
p.60,61 -Question 14 Comment: Re14. DD single function CDV 20,000 ok, DD multifunction we propose 25,000, rinse aid 5,000 ok	Acknowledged – but also note there is a new proposal in TR2 with lower threshold than those you are proposing.
p.50 - Question 14 Comment: CDV value	Acknowledged
p.50 – Question 14 Comment: Q14 We have already provided CDV Value	Acknowledged – and thank you!

Responses to Q15 about CDV for single-function DD (10 comments)

Question 15 (Q15) asks: "Would you support reducing the CDV threshold for DD single-function to 18000 g/wash?"

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.58-59 – Question 15 Comment: We are not affected, therefor any comments.	Acknowledged
p.50-59 – Question 15 Comment: We have no opinion on this point as we do not currently offer DD single-function.	Acknowledged
p.61 – Question 15 Comment: We want to report that the CDV threshold for "DD single-function" mentioned page 54 is 20.000 and not 18.000. Reducing it to 18.000 is not enough. For Multi-function dishwasher detergents: Reducing it to 24.000 is not enough. Suggested action: We propose a new threshold 16.000 for DD single-function to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test! For Multi-function dishwasher detergents: We propose a new threshold 22.000 because we need to remain ambitious. Rationale: Because all our certified products for this subcategory have CDV values until 13.001. For Multi-function dishwasher detergents: Because all our certified products for this subcategory have CDV values until 21.486.	Partially accepted – DD threshold have been revised, with DD Multi-function being in line with proposal made (22000). However, the DD single function is not aligned with your proposal We invite you to check full details in TR2.
p.52 – Question 15 Comment Q15: We are in favor to reduce CDVchronic thresholds to 16 000 l/wash for DD single-function instead of 18 000 for DD single-function because the threshold is respected by 10 currently certified products (between 7375 and 13001) and there must be a margin in case a reformulation is necessary to meet the other criteria (e.g. revision of the performance test protocol). Suggested action: We would like to propose 22 000 l/washing instead of 24 000 for DD multi-function because this is a threshold respected by 17 certified products (between 8758 and 21486) and it is necessary to remain ambitious We would like to propose 2 000 l/washing instead of 5 000 l/washing for rinse aid because the threshold is respected by 5 currently certified products and a margin must be allowed in case a reformulation is necessary to meet the other criteria (e.g. revision of the performance test protocol).	
p.59 – Question 15 Comment: In favour of this new threshold. However, the overall proposal of new limits on CDV tox are challenging	Acknowledged
p.59 – Question 15 Comment: Yes.	Acknowledged
p.60,61 -Question 15 Comment Re.15 yes	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.59 – Question 15 Comment: yes, we support lowering the threshold. – Suggested action: We support the JRC's proposal. – Rationale: As shown by the JRC's report and the preliminary data received by license holders, lowering the threshold is possible because most license holders are already at way lower CDV values. The EU Ecolabel criteria should definitely follow this decreasing trend so they keep reflecting the highest environmental benchmark.	Acknowledged
p.59 - Question 15 Comment: (Q15) Taking into account our considerations in Q4 and Q11, we do not support this change.	Rejected – firstly, we refer to our responses to your comments on Q4 and Q11 but as highlight, 20C is no longer a proposal and it has been reverted back to 30C. Another aspect is the data analysis carried by the JRC (See TR2 corresponding rationale) and comments from stakeholders, which suggest feasibility of such change. Nevertheless, the acknowledge this could have implication with regards to Fitness for Use, but also we expect discussion held on such criterion will provide further light on feasibility to ensure a consistent EUEL criteria proposal.
p.50 – Question 15 Comment: Q15 We support	Acknowledged

Responses to Q16 about the CDV of DD rinse aid products (8 comments)

Question 16 (Q16) asks: "Would you support reducing the CDV threshold for DD rinse aid products to 1650 l/l washing solution?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.58-59 – Question 16 Comment: we agree with the proposals	Acknowledged
p.50-59 – Question 16 Comment: We have no opinion on this point as we do not currently offer DD rinse aid.	Acknowledged
p.61 – Question 16 Comment: Rinse aid: Reducing it to 5.000 is not enough.	Accepted – in TR2 it is proposed to be reduced further, yet not exactly matching your proposal

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested action: We propose a new threshold 2.000 for Rinse aid to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test! Rationale: Rinse aid: Because all our certified products for this subcategory have CDV values until 1.601.	
p.59 –Question 16 Comment: We argue that a CDV value of 1650 l/l for Rinse Aid is way too low, however we should stick to the proposal 5000.	Rejected– in TR2 the proposal has been set to 2500 based on JRC's data analysis plus stakeholders' feedback. However, the JRC acknowledges this being a significant tightening of the ambition of this requirement and remains open for discussion during the 2nd AHWG to revise the proposal made.
p.52 – Question 16 Comment Q16 : We support reducing the CDV threshold for DD rinse aid products to 1650 l/l washing solution.	Accepted – in TR2 it is proposed to be reduced further, yet not exactly matching your proposal
p.59 – Question 16 Comment: Yes.	Acknowledged
p.59 – Question 16 Comment: yes, we support lowering the threshold. Suggested action: We support the JRC's proposal. Rationale: As shown by the JRC's report and the preliminary data received by license holders, lowering the threshold is possible because most license holders are already at way lower CDV values. The EU Ecolabel criteria should definitely follow this decreasing trend to they keep reflecting the highest environmental benchmark.	Acknowledged
p.50 – Question 16 Comment: Q16 We support	Acknowledged

Responses to Q17 about CDV limits for IILD products (9 comments)

Question 17 (Q17) asks: "Would you support proposed IILD limits? In addition, would you support a simplification of the criterion? If so, why/how (e.g. not differentiating by water hardness)?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.58-59 – Question 17 Comment: We are not affected, therefor any comments.	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.50-59 – Question 17 Comment: Yes, the CDV values can be lowered in this way because the thresholds are still largely attainable. A simplification of the criteria could be considered, but for professional products, water hardness and the level of soiling remain very important and crucial parameters in the choice of product dosages. 80% of our laundry customers are equipped with water softeners, so most of them work with softened water. But the same observation is often made: the softeners are badly adjusted. So it's still important to have dosing recommendations for our products for different levels of water hardness.	Acknowledged – In this TR2 within the criterion *Toxicity to aquatic organisms* there is no simplification proposed as part of the main proposals but it is included as part of the questions shared to stakeholders. If sufficient support if achieved, then the third TR version would contain such simplification.
p.54 – (Presumably relating to Q17) Comment: Simplification des critères : ne pas différencier selon la dureté de l'eau Rationale: We support the proposed IILD limits and simplification of the criterion.	Acknowledged
p.61 – Question 17 Comment: Liquid : Soft water: Reducing them to 37.500/45.000/52.500 (light/medium/heavy) is not enough. Medium water: Reducing them to 45.000/56.250/67.500 (light/medium/heavy) is not enough. Hard water: Reducing them to 56.250/67.500/90.000 (light/medium/heavy) is not enough. Multi-component systems: Soft water: OK with 37.500/52.500 (light/medium) but for heavy, keeping 90.000 is not enough. Medium water: OK with 45.000/60.000 (light/medium) but for heavy, reducing to 75.000 is too ambitious. Hard water: Reducing them to 56.250/75.000 (light/medium) is not enough. We strongly support a simplification of the criterion in order to require less thresholds to calculate. Suggested action: We propose new thresholds: Liquid : Soft water: 20.000/35.000, even 30.000/50.000 (light/medium/heavy)Medium water: 35.000, even 30.000/50.000/65.000, even 60.000 (light/medium/heavy) Hard water: 50.000/65.000, even 60.000/85.000 (light/medium/heavy) Multi-component systems: Soft water: for heavy 72.500 Medium water: for heavy 80.000 (or at least 77.500) Hard water: 52.500/70.000 (light/medium) We propose to keep thresholds only for medium and heavy for medium and hard water. However, it is necessary to oblige LH to indicate on their labels other dosages for "soft water" (light/medium/heavy) and for "light" (soft/medium/hard water) but it is also essential you define very clearly and in advance in the decision (or Framework) how this dosages extrapolation (according to soil /water hardness) must be made by LH and what evidence must be provided by the LH and checked by the CB. Rationale: Because we need to remain ambitious and also to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test! Because it's time-consuming without added value on toxicity criteria!	Partially accepted – Please see threshold proposed in TR2 the rationale provided for full details. Most IILD threshold have not been revised since further evidences were required to further increase the ambition level. The only exception was Multi-Component systems (soft water, heavy degree of soiling) being now the proposal 68250 l/kg).

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.52 – Question 17 Comment Q17: French stakeholders support the simplification of the criterion. We propose to maintain only the "medium soiling" and "heavy soiling" thresholds for "medium" and "hard" water. IILD (liquid) Suggested action: We (according to 4 certified products) would like to propose the following thresholds in order of little/medium/very dirty: - Soft water: the proposed thresholds should be lowered from 37,500 to 20,000, from 45,000 to 35,000 or even 30,000, from 52,500 to 50,000. - - Medium water: the proposed thresholds must be lowered from 45,000 to 35,000 or even 30,000, from 56,250 to 50,000, from 67,500 to 65,000 or even 60,000. - - Hard water: the proposed thresholds must be lowered from 56,250 to 50,000, from 67,500 to 65,000 or even 60,000, from 90,000 to 85,000. IILD Multi-component system: Based on 2 certified multi-component systems, we would like to propose the following thresholds in order of light/medium/very dirty: - Soft water: proposed thresholds of 37,500 and then 52,500 OK but the proposed threshold must be lowered from 90,000 to 72,500. - Medium-hard water: proposed thresholds of 45,000 then 60,000 are good but be careful, the proposal of a threshold of 75,000 is too ambitious, so consider 80,000 or at worst, 77,500. – - Hard water: the proposed thresholds must be lowered from 56,250 to 52,500, from 75,000 to 70,000; proposed threshold of 90,000 is acceptable. One industrial would like to point out that the values for pre-soak cleaners have not been called into question, and that they are difficult to achieve. One stakeholder would like to add that there are few certified pre-soak cleaners and that this could potentially be linked to VCDchron values that are difficult to achieve. He suggests to send written data to have an input into the feasibility of these thresholds. It is essential that the JRC defines very clearly in the Decision or in the Framework for the performance test, how this dosage extrapolation should be done (according to hardness/soiling level) and what evidence the CB should check.	
p.59 –Question 17 Comment: In favour of simplifying criteria, particularly with regard to water hardness.	Acknowledged
p.59 – Question 17 Comment: We support a simplification of the criterion without taking into account the hardness of the water.	Acknowledged
p.50 - Question 17	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: Yes for both questions.	
p.50 – Question 17 Comment: Q17 We support	Acknowledged

Responses to Q18 about HSC CDV alignment with Blue Angel (12 comments)

Question 18 (Q18) asks: "Would you support aligning with Blue Angel with regards to HSC CDV toxicity limits? In addition, do you have any specific proposal for revision of each of the HSC products sub-groups?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.58-59 – Question 18 Comment: we would recommend to have a look at new results of CDV values from other stakeholder and then decide regarding to the values to a new threshold for HSC	Accepted – the JRC gathered data on ecolabelled products and performed a data analysis. This together a cross-check with other ecolabels plus stakeholder comments were the basis for TR2 proposals (See rationale for full details)
p.50-59 – Question 18 Comment: The Blue Angel values are very low. It would be preferable to align ourselves with the toxicity limits of the Nordic Swan, which would make it possible to improve the thresholds while avoiding the need to reformulate all the products. Another possibility, particularly for multi-purpose cleaners, would be to have specific limits for scented products because fragrances often generate the most toxicity.	Acknowledged – the JRC gathered data on ecolabelled products and performed a data analysis. This together a cross-check with other ecolabels plus stakeholder comments were the basis for TR2 proposals (See rationale for full details). With regards to differentiated threshold based on presence or absence of fragrances, this possibility has not been assessed in this TR2 but the JRC noted it.
p.54 – Question 18 Comment: We do not support alignment with the Blue Angel CDV toxicology limits. These are too strict regarding the HCS application and therefore this would lead to too many product restrictions. - -	Acknowledged – the JRC gathered data on ecolabelled products and performed a data analysis. This together a cross-check with other ecolabels plus stakeholder comments were the basis for TR2 proposals (See rationale for full details).
p.61 – Question 18: Comment: APC, RTU: We think keeping the current threshold (350.000) is not sufficiently strict. We don't support the proposal to define different thresholds for professional or consumer. We don't support the threshold in Nordic Swan.	Partially accepted – the JRC gathered data on ecolabelled products and performed a data analysis. This together a cross-check with other ecolabels plus stakeholder comments

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
APC, undiluted: We think keeping the current threshold (18.000) is not sufficiently strict. We don't support the proposal to define different thresholds for professional or consumer. We don't support the threshold in Blue Angel. Kitchen cleaners, RTU: We think keeping the current threshold (600.000) is not sufficiently strict. We don't support the proposal to define different thresholds for professional or consumer. We don't support the threshold in Blue Angel (and Nordic Swan). We didn't certify undiluted kitchen and window cleaners, so we have no opinion on these thresholds. Window cleaners, RTU: We think keeping the current threshold (48.000) is not sufficiently strict. We don't support the proposal to define different thresholds for professional or consumer. We don't support the threshold in Blue Angel (and Nordic Swan). Bathroom cleaners, RTU: We think keeping the current threshold (600.000) is not sufficiently strict. We don't support the proposal to define different thresholds for professional or consumer. We strongly don't support the threshold in Blue Angel (150.000). WC cleaners, RTU: We think keeping the current threshold (600.000) is not sufficiently strict. We don't support the proposal to define different thresholds for professional or consumer. We strongly don't support the threshold in Blue Angel (300.000). Bathroom cleaners, undiluted: We think keeping the current threshold (45.000) is not sufficiently strict. We don't support the proposal to define different thresholds for professional or consumer. We strongly don't support the threshold in Blue Angel (9.500). Suggested action: We propose new thresholds: APC, RTU: 250.000 APC, undiluted: 13.000 Kitchen cleaners, RTU: 250.000 Window cleaners, RTU: 35.000 Bathroom cleaners, RTU: 290.000 WC cleaners, RTU: 375.000 Bathroom cleaners, undiluted: 20.000 Rationale: APC, RTU: Because At least 75% of our certified products for this subcategory would be compliant and we need to be more demanding given that APC in RTU form could be avoided. Several of our certified products are professional and consumer. We think the threshold in Nordic Swan is not strict enough. APC, undiluted: Because The most part of our certified products for this subcategory have values until 13.000 and for the other products, the effort to make seems to be easy. For example reducing the fragrance quantity knowing that fragrances have negative impact on the environment and users! In addition, reducing this threshold will limit the possibility of certifying "superodorants" (with a lot of	were the basis for TR2 proposals (See rationale for full details). There is general alignment between TR2 proposals and your suggested threshold values. There is direct match of APC, RTU and APC, Undiluted and other values are close (e.g. window cleaners 35000 Vs 37000). However, there are differences in the thresholds for other product sub-groups, being generally less ambitious.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
fragrance). Several of our certified products are professional and consumer. We think the threshold in Blue Angel is too strict given that 75 of our certified products (about 25%) would be non-compliant. Kitchen cleaners, RTU: Because At least 80% of our certified products for this subcategory would be compliant and we need to be more demanding in particular for RTU products knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032.Several of our certified products are professional and consumer. We think the threshold in Blue Angel (and Nordic Swan) is not strict enough. Window cleaners, RTU: Because At least 80% of our certified products for this subcategory would be compliant and we need to be more demanding in particular for RTU products knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032.Define different thresholds for professional or consumer does not seem relevant to us/We think the threshold in Blue Angel (and Nordic Swan) is not strict enough. Bathroom cleaners, RTU: Because At least 85% of our certified products for this subcategory would be compliant and we need to be more demanding in particular for RTU products knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032.Define different thresholds for professional or consumer does not seem relevant to us. We think the threshold in Blue Angel is too strict. Indeed, more than 70% of our certified products would be non-compliant and we must keep in mind that the test should be modified and hopefully be more demanding, so this kind of products should be perhaps "reformulated" to be more effective. WC cleaners, RTU: Because At least 80% of our certified products for this subcategory would be compliant and we need to be more demanding in particular for RTU products knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032.Define different thresholds for professional or consumer does not seem relevant to us. We think the threshold in Blue Angel is too strict. Indeed, more than 40% of our certified products would be non-compliant and we must keep in mind that the test should be modified and hopefully be more demanding, so this kind of products should be perhaps "reformulated" to be more effective. Bathroom cleaners, undiluted: Because All of our certified products for this subcategory would be compliant and we need to be more demanding knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032.Define different thresholds for professional or consumer does not seem relevant to us. We think the threshold in Blue Angel is too strict. Indeed, almost 10% of our certified products would be non-compliant and we must keep in mind that the test should be modified and hopefully be more demanding, so this kind of products should be perhaps "reformulated" to be more effective.	
p.52 – Question 18 Comment We would like to share thresholds fro HSC: RTU (Multi-purpose): Suggested action: we propose to lower this threshold to 250,000 given that during the screening, out of our 21 certified products of this type, 70% comply with this new threshold and that it is necessary to be more restrictive as "multi-purpose" could be avoided in RTUs and therefore potentially	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
excluded from the scope. We are not in favor to make different thresholds for pro and consumer products since many products do both. We are not aligned with Nordic Swan since we propose a more restrictive threshold than Nordic Swan. To be diluted (Multi-purpose): we propose to lower this threshold to 13,000 given that during the screening, out of our 324 certified products of this type, 90% comply with this new threshold and that it seems quite easy for the remaining 10% to respect this new threshold, in particular by reducing the quantity of perfume which is to be limited as much as possible because of its negative impact on the environment but also on the user. Lowering this threshold would reduce the possibility of certifying over-smelling products; The stekolders is also thinking about banning them from the perimeter. We are not in favor to make different thresholds for pro and consumer products since many products do both. We are also not aligned to lower the threshold to 10,000 (Blue Angel threshold) since 75 of certified products would no longer be compliant (i.e. more than 23% of our products), bearing in mind that the performance test may be revised upwards and may require the formula to be strengthened. RTU (kitchen): we would like to propose to lower this threshold to 250,000 given that during screen, out of 36 certified products of this type, more than 80% comply with this new threshold and that it is necessary to be more restrictive, especially with regard to a RTU, on a criterion that will be valid until at least 2032. We are not in favour of making different thresholds for pro and consumer products since many products do both. We do not support to be aligned with Blue Angel (and Nordic Swan) since we have proposed a more restrictive threshold. RTU (window cleaners): we propose to lower this threshold to 35,000 given that during the screening, out of 66 certified products of this type, about 85% comply with this new threshold and that it is necessary to be more restrictive, especially with regard to a RTU, on a criterion that will be valid until at least 2032. We are not in favour of making different thresholds for pro and consumer products since many products do both. We do not support to be aligned with Blue Angel (and Nordic Swan) since we have proposed a more restrictive threshold. RTU (bathroom): we propose to lower this threshold to 290,000 given that during the screen, out of our 52 certified products of this type, more than 90% comply with this new threshold and that it is necessary to be more restrictive, especially with regard to an RTU, on a criterion that will be valid until at least 2032. We are not in favour of making different thresholds for pro and consumer products since many products do both. We are also not in favor to lower the threshold to 150,000 (Blue Angel threshold) since 45 of certified products would be non-compliant, i.e. nearly 87% of certified products, knowing that in addition it is necessary for the performance test to be revised upwards and may require the formula to be reinforced. Undiluted (bathroom): We propose to lower this threshold to 20,000 given that during the screen, 31 certified products of this type meet this threshold and that we must be more restrictive on a	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
criterion that will be valid until at least 2032. We are not in favor to make different thresholds for pros and consumer products since it doesn't seem relevant. We are not in favor to lower the threshold to 9,500 (Nordic Swan Pro threshold) since 2 of certified products would be non-compliant and above all that we must keep in mind that the performance test may be revised upwards and may require a reinforcement of the formula. RTU (sanitary): We propose to lower this threshold to 375,000 given that during the screening, out of 41 certified products of this type, more than 85% comply with this new threshold and that we must be more demanding, especially with regard to an RTU, on a criterion that will be valid until at least 2032. We are not in favour of making different thresholds for pros and consumers since it doesn't seem relevant. Wer are not in favor to lower the threshold to 300,000 (Blue Angel threshold) since 17 of certified products would be non-compliant, i.e. more than 41% of certified products, knowing that in addition it is necessary to keep in mind that the performance test may be revised upwards and may require the formula to be strengthened. One industrial propose, particularly for multi-purpose cleaners, to have specific limits for scented products because fragrances often generate the most toxicity.	
p.59 –Question 18 Comment: We are not in favour of aligning with the Blue Angel criteria for any of the product category. HSC RTU Cdv limits are too restrictive to comply. As soon as you add a small amount of fragrance, the limit is reached. In the opposite, the CDV limits for undiluted product are very easy to comply.	Acknowledged – the JRC gathered data on ecolabelled products and performed a data analysis. This together a cross-check with other ecolabels plus stakeholder comments were the basis for TR2 proposals (See rationale for full details).
p.58-59 - Question 18 Comment: Je ne suis pas favorable a l'alignement sur blue angel. Le parfum fait vite augmenter le taux de CDV or celui-ci permets de différencier les produits sur le marché deja trés fournis des detergents. *Translated comment: I am not in favor of aligning with blue angel. Perfume quickly increases the CDV rate, but this makes it possible to differentiate products on the already well-stocked market from detergents.*	Acknowledged
p.59 – Question 18 Comment: There is an inconsistency between the limits of all purpose cleaners and kitchen cleaners between ready-to-use products (which are difficult to respect when a little amount of perfume is added) and undiluted products (which are too permissive). If necessary we can provide a concrete example of a spreadsheet. The limits of blue Angel do not exist for all cases covered by the ECOLABEL. Our position is to align undiluted data with the 'all purpose cleaners' category, but we	Acknowledged – the JRC gathered data on ecolabelled products and performed a data analysis. This together a cross-check with other ecolabels plus stakeholder comments were the basis for TR2 proposals (See rationale for full details).

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
would rather not limit the RTU values. Instead, we would rather increase the limits as explained previously. - -	About the issue you mention on RTU versus Undiluted products, we would appreciate having further insights and the JRC might call for a bilateral meeting in this regard for clarification.
p.60,61 -Question 18 Comment: Re.18 no	Acknowledged
p.59 – Question 18 Comment: Yes, we support aligning the threshold with the lower Blue Angel values. Suggested action: We recommend reducing the CDV thresholds also for HSC. Rationale: The fact that the Blue Angel detergents in some sub-categories fulfil already with lower CDV values show that it's feasible. During the AHWG, it was mentioned by a company that fragrances in HSC are the factor driving the CDV value up. This would justify also limiting or excluding fragrances (as proposed by us in another comment). Then, a reduction of the CDV thresholds for HSC should be possible.	Acknowledged – the JRC gathered data on ecolabelled products and performed a data analysis. This together a cross-check with other ecolabels plus stakeholder comments were the basis for TR2 proposals (See rationale for full details). Note that the outcome (TR2) do not necessarily imply aligning with Blue Angel's threshold as is on a case-by-case basis according to the results of the assessment made.
p.59 - Question 18 Comment: (Q18) We do not support reducing the CDV limit. -	Acknowledged
p.50 - Question 18 Comment: No, they are very strict limits.	Acknowledged

Responses to Q19 about CDV limits being split based on water hardness (8 comments)

Question 19 (Q19) asks: "Do you think the EUEL limits for CDV should continue to be nuanced for dosages for soft, medium and hard water? And does this answer vary depending on whether referring to household or industrial and institutional products?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.58-59 – Line: 1119 – 1121- Question 19 Comment: one CDV for all water hardnesses would be sufficient	Acknowledged - we have proposed a potential simplification in the questions shared to stakeholders in this TR2.
p.61 – Question 19 Comment: Yes, we think the EUEL limits for CDV should continue to be nuanced for dosages according to soil /water hardness for : IILD but cf. response to Q17.IIDDLD and DD Not for HDD and HSC.	Acknowledged - we have proposed a potential simplification in the questions shared to stakeholders in this TR2.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested action: IILD but cf. response to Q17. For IIDD, we propose to keep only thresholds for "medium degree of soiling" for medium and hard water but look out! It should be aligned with framework which is not yet defined! As for IILD, it is necessary to oblige LH to indicate on their labels other dosages for "soft water" (light/medium/heavy) and for "light" ([soft/]medium/hard water) and also for "heavy" ([soft/]medium/hard water) but it is also essential you define very clearly and in advance in the decision (or Framework) how this dosages extrapolation (according to soil /water hardness) must be made by LH and what evidence must be provided by the LH and checked by the CB. For LD and DD we propose to define also thresholds for "medium degree of soiling" for medium and hard water but look out! It should be aligned with frameworks which shall be modified! As previously, it is necessary to oblige LH to indicate on their labels other dosages for "soft water" (light/medium/heavy) and for "light" ([soft/]medium/hard water) and also for "heavy" ([soft/]medium/hard water) but it is also essential you define very clearly and in advance in the decision (or Framework) how this dosages extrapolation (according to soil /water hardness) must be made by LH and what evidence must be provided by the LH and checked by the CB. Rationale: Because : IIDD: Thresholds for "soft water" seem useless to us. For HDD and HSC, it does not seem relevant to us.	The JRC will explore further the interaction mentioned with the *Fitness for Use* criterion (i.e. how to perform the extrapolations), possibly via bilateral exchanges. Partially rejected – current proposal does not disregard *soft water* thresholds in IIDD. However, as mentioned, there is a proposal in the form of a questions shared with stakeholders.
p.52 – Question 19 Comment Q19: We are in favor for a simplification of the criteria, but for professional products, water hardness and the level of soiling remain very important and crucial parameters in the choice of product dosages. One industrial would like to share that 80 % of its laundry customers are equipped with water softeners and that it's still important to have dosing recommendations for different levels of water hardness. Suggested action: For IILD it is necessary to maintain the requirement for manufacturers to indicate on their labels the other dosages for "soft water" and "low soiling". But it is essential that the JRC define very clearly in the Decision or in the Framework for the performance test how this dosage extrapolation should be carried out (as a function of hardness/dirt level) and what evidence the stakeholder should check. For IIDD, we would like to share that the "soft water" thresholds seem useless and propose to keep only the thresholds in "normally dirty" (i.e. in "medium water" and "hard water") but it is necessary to align with the test protocol which is not yet defined. For LD and DD, we also propose to define thresholds for "medium water" and "hard water" for "normally soiling", but would like to align them with the test protocols. For HDD and HSC it is not necessary to differenciate the CDV according to the hardness of water.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Additional comment: One stakeholder would like to point out that the "sum" methodology for the toxicity and readily biodegradable compounds could be limiting in certain cases, as it doesn't take into account the synergies and antagonisms of different active substances in formulation. One industrial would like to point out an inconsistency in HSC between limits values of RTU (difficult to reach when fragrances are included) and undiluted products (too permissive). They propose to share data if needed.	
p.59 –Question 19 Comment: No.	Acknowledged
p.59 – Question 19 Comment: No this is not necessary.	Acknowledged
p.60,61 -Question 19 Comment Re.19 no	Acknowledged
p.59 - Question 19 Comment: (Q19) I consider that limits for CDV should mention the characteristics of water (soft, medium and hard).	Partially accepted – the proposal remains split by water hardness and degree of soiling but alternative formulations (simplification) are explored via dedicated questions to stakeholders (See TR2 for full details/rationale)
p.50 - Question 19 Comment: Yes, in the professional field the differentiation for medium and hard soft water is relevant, in the domestic field, in our opinion, it is superfluous. - -	Partially accepted – the proposal remains split by water hardness and degree of soiling but alternative formulations (simplification) are explored via dedicated questions to stakeholders (See TR2 for full details/rationale)

Other comments related generally to requirements about toxicity to aquatic organisms and CDV values (14 comments)

These comments were not direct responses to the questions embedded directly in the JRC report (Q13 to Q19) but do relate to content in the same chapter.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.52 –Section 7.3 on toxicity to aquatic organisms – specifically on concentrated HSC CDV Comment: In case of HSC, there should be an extension for concentrated products. Concentrated product =granular/powder or liquid composition that needs to be dissolved/diluted in/with water to prepare the final product that will be used, otherwise there will be a misleading calculation on the product CDV compared to traditional products if you compare (I/I) ratio –	Acknowledged – The JRC is interested in exploring further how to unlock the possibility of using "concentrated" products within EU Ecolabel criteria and to ensure proportionality in requirements set for RTU and Undiluted formats. In this sense, the JRC might contact you back to further explore this matter.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested actions/rationale: Example: if you have a highly concentrated product (50g powder to be dissolved in 1 Liter water), the CDV calculation should be done on the "ready-product" to compare with criteria and other traditional products. If we calculate the CDV on 1 Liter concentrate, we will end up above limits. If we don't respect concentrated products in that way, it does not make sense to develop concentrated and sustainable products, because they will not fit into the existing limits if all evaluation is done on 1 Liter "concentrate" instead of 1 Liter "ready-to-use product". Or the other way around: If you take an existing HSC with Ecolabel (1 Liter product) and you make a concentrate for dilution of it just by letting out water, the concentrated version actually will not be suitable for Ecolabel because of the CDV calculation of 1 Liter concentrate in that way. We need to add this exemption to the CDV calculation to open Ecolabel criteria for concentrated products that needs to be diluted by consumer before use, otherwise new technical developments and future concentrated refill-products cannot have Ecolabel, although it "RTU"-family in shelf has. We can have a sperate discussion if we also want to add CDV limits for the concentrates itself. -	
p.55 – About inconsistencies with CDV calculations Comment: CDV calculation: We would like to report our concern about the calculation of the CDV and more specifically on the determination of the relevant TF value: there is an evident lack of harmonization between CB´s. In worst case, this lead ultimately to the rejection of a dossier, whereas the same dossier would be accepted in other EU countries. We call for more transparency to avoid discrepancy in the CDV calculation. (Please see rationale and also details provided by CESIO). We understand that chronic study results shall be considered whenever available and even if acute studies are not for all three trophic levels. Suggested action: Several actions may be taken: Include a more detailed description of the procedure in the user manual, than that given in the DID list. Add reference to existing guideline to the DID list, specifically for natural based products. Clarify which studies must be available to derive the chronic toxicity factor. (misinterpretation)Encourage exchange between CB's. Rationale: If a chemical name does not fit exactly to a substance described under the DID part A, the attribution of the DID number to a product is subject to interpretation, when it comes to read across. The naming of substances derived from natural raw material. Also, we see different understanding of the CB´s of the procedure described in Part B to derive a TF based on available data.	Acknowledged – The JRC is open (and eager) to jointly come up with the most accurate wording enabling swift application and verification processes within the EU Ecolabel. In this sense, the JRC could consider specific proposals for incorporation into the EUEL criteria. In addition, the JRC would like to highlight that there is a dedicated instrument for harmonisation of EUEL criteria compliance, namely Competent Bodies (CB) Forum. Any issue as the one highlighted would be brought to the CB Forum, discussed and then a conclusion would be drawn to ensure harmonised interpretation and implementation.
p.54 (p.52) about CDV values for IIDD Comment: The values for Pre-soak are very low Suggested action: CVDtox =5050 for use at 10g/L Rationale: This type of product is not available on the market with ECOLOBEL certification, as the criteria cannot be met.	Acknowledged – thank you for this information. Note that the JRC did not received any data on *pre-soak* IIDD ecolabelled product, thus not able to factor this product sub-type within its data analysis. The JRC call for further

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	insights/data on particular product sub-type (as pre-soaks) via a question dedicated to stakeholders.
p.52 – about CDV values in general Comment: the proposed new limits on CDV tox are challenging. We ask to maintain a harmonised criteria between the various eco label frames in Europe (EU ecolabel, Nordic Swan, Blaue Angel)	Partially accepted – Part of the aspects considered for TR2 proposals have been other ecolabels. CDV thresholds have been set based on: the JRC data analysis + other ecolabels + further research/considerations. In this sense, there is always the intention to align with other ecolabels but only when such alignment is deemed as the best outcome.
p.52 – about CDV values for undiluted HSCs Comment: HSC: the existing CDV tox limits for undiluted HSCs are too restricting and prohibit level of concentration due to perfume/active ingredients levels necessary to pass performance of the dilute product. This is limiting potential for Ecolabel refills and does not acknowledge the wider environmental benefits for concentration i.e. less water, less plastic packaging, and transport emissions	Acknowledged – The JRC is interested in exploring further how to unlock the possibility of using "concentrated" products within EU Ecolabel criteria and to ensure proportionality in requirements set for RTU and Undiluted formats. In this sense, the JRC might contact you back to further explore this matter.
p.50 – about CDV values in general Comment: If CDV values are significantly reduced and some substances are banned, this will reduce the performance of detergents with significant disadvantages for ecology and sustainability: More detergents and higher temperatures must be used to obtain similar washing performance (increasing CO2 +energy consumption); Higher use of bleach and rate of rewashes will also increase consumption of energy and detergents, and deterioration of textile. All aspects must be carefully examined to ensure efficiency. CDV values alone, which are based on hazard and hazard criteria, do not protect the environment when only considered in isolation. They are only one of the parameters amongst others to consider when assessing the level of protection of the environment.	Acknowledged – The JRC understand that via EUEL criteria requirements the use of particular substances might be inviable/not allowed. Furthermore, some of these could have implications with regards to detergent performance. However, the JRC welcomes (and for specific cases lacks) insights into which are these substances. In the focused discussions held with regards to *Fitness for Use* an specific question inquired about which could be such substances leading to enhanced/reduced product performance but not clear direction was provided in this regards. Consequently, the proposals made so far are based on best evidences available, as found and as provided by interested parties in the revision process.
p.52 – about CDV values in general Comment: If CDV values are significantly reduced and some substances are banned, this will reduce the performance of detergents with significant disadvantages for ecology and sustainability: More detergents and higher temperatures must be used to obtain similar washing performance (increasing CO2 +energy consumption); Higher use of bleach and rate of rewashes will also increase consumption of energy and detergents, and deterioration of textile. All aspects must be carefully examined to ensure efficiency. CDV values alone, which are based on hazard and hazard criteria, do not protect the environment when only considered in isolation. They are only one of the parameters amongst others to consider when assessing the level of protection of the environment. - -	

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.60 (seems wrong page number, should be 50?)– Comment: CDV values: for professional products the limits are lower than Nordic Swan – Suggested action: we suggest to lower these limits accordingly. CDV for HSC: suggest to align more with NS. Most of the limits in the EC are much higher than the NS where there are numerus products on the marked, hence the levels are all achievable.	Partially accepted – Some values have been aligned with NS, while all proposals have considered NS existing limits.
p.53 – About inconsistencies with CDV calculations Comment: Several LHs have expressed concerns about the lack of harmonization between CBs, which can lead to distortions of competition. Suggested action: Therefore, we propose to mandate the use of the EC calculation sheet for assessing the toxicity, biodegradability, and sustainable sourcing of palm oil criterion, and to require each CB to use it. Developing equivalent calculation sheets would not be permitted. Rationale: Because: · It can lead to distortions of competition and unfair competition. · Furthermore, this approach would facilitate the communication of data to the JRC during the revision process, or between CBs if needed. - -	Acknowledged – this aspect is considered relevant but it has not been the focus of JRC's work at this stage, since User's documentation is generally developed once the criteria is in advance stages of the revision/upon finalisation of it. Nevertheless, the JRC remains open for discussing this aspect and it will likely approach you bilaterally to understand the best channel for this discussion.
p.52 (line 955-956) Comment: Typo error: please correct the value for Water hardness: 5000 instead 4000 for medium; 7000 instead 5000 for hard	Acknowledged – it has been considered/corrected. Thank you!
p.56 (line 1048) – Comment: please complete the sentence.	Acknowledged – it has been considered/corrected. Thank you!
Additional comments: About the DID list Comment: Industrials would like to plan a regular updating of the DID list to consider new substances. One stakeholder would like to propose improvements for the DID-list: - Each entry in the DID-list must be accompanied by an INCI, CAS and EC name, even though some substances may have more than one CAS and 1 CAS may be assigned to several substances. All European regulations (REACH, CLP, etc.) face the same problem, and ECHA has published a useful guide on this point: https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/2324906/substance_id_en.pdf/ee696bad-49f6-4fec-b8b7-2c3706113c7d As companies must comply with these rules for identifying chemical substances, it would be very convenient for the DID list to apply the same rules.	Acknowledged – The JRC considers appropriate to held a discussion on how to best integrate the proposal made to improve the DID list (e.g. naming, substances in the list). Note that the EUEL shares the use of the DID list as instrument for criteria compliance with other ecolabels (Nordic ecolabelling). In this sense, coordination is required on how to best approach this aspect with relevant parties. Irrespective of the former, the JRC has pursued in current EUEL criteria proposal the incorporation/uptake of more accurate identification and naming of substances, as per the suggested ECHA's guidance.
Additional comments: About the DID list Comment: The toxicity and biodegradability values on the DID-list all come from eco-toxicological tests where the substance tested is clearly identified. It would therefore be sufficient simply to provide the INCI/CAS/EC for this substance. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that its substance	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
corresponds to the substance tested, or that it has the same toxicological properties and the same classification as the one displayed in the DID-list.	
Additional comments: About the DID list Comment: Need to increase the number of substances listed on the DID list and to harmonise the toxicity, biodegradability and classification values with those published on the ECHA website and used in the EU Product Environmental Footprint (PEF). As REACH and CLP are (compulsory - companies are obliged to comply) regulations, the values used by these regulations should be the same as those used for any other Commission-led assessment system, such as ecolabels	Acknowledged

9. Biodegradability (45 comments)

The comments in this section are split into two table, one for generally relevant comments and one on answers to an embedded question in the section on biodegradability (Q20).

General comments on biodegradability (26 comments)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.60 – Section 7.4 on biodegradability Comment: dk support the requirements on anNBO and aNBO on all surfactants.	Acknowledged
65 – **About the text saying: "***Water-soluble foil/films (e.g., Polyvinyl Alcohol (PVA) films) shall be readily biodegradable according to test method OECD 301 A-F or 310, as reported in Part B of the DID list.***"** Comment: Water-soluble foil/films (e.g., Polyvinyl Alcohol (PVA) films) shall be readily biodegradable according to test method OECD 301 A-F or 310, as reported in Part B of the DID list. I suggest to use even ISO 14852 with target biodegradability of 90% if logically is just one polymer.	Partially accepted – The ISO method 14852 has been proposed as one of the valid methods for assessing biodegradability of water soluble films/foils. However, in TR2 proposal it has been set at >60% rather than 90%. Additionally, a carbon balance and reporting of the total extend of biodegradability (as recommended by the ISO method) has been proposed for discussion.
p.65 – **About the text saying: "***Water-soluble foil/films (e.g., Polyvinyl Alcohol (PVA) films) shall be readily biodegradable according to test method OECD 301 A-F or 310, as reported in Part B of the DID list.***"** Comment: The OECD tests mentioned in the DID List part B are intended for chemical products. For plastic materials, more appropriate standards exist, such as ISO 14852. These tests should be added to the list of possible methods.	Accepted – The ISO method 14852 (alongside 14851) has been proposed as one of the valid methods for assessing biodegradability of water soluble films/foils, in addition to OECD methods mentioned in DID list Part B

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.65 – **About the text saying: "***Water-soluble foil/films (e.g., Polyvinyl Alcohol (PVA) films) shall be readily biodegradable according to test method OECD 301 A-F or 310, as reported in Part B of the DID list.***"** Comment: "water-soluble foil/films" are typically mixtures of substance. The Ecolabel criteria evaluate ingoing substances, so it is at this point not clear, how the wording should be interpreted. Option A: all ingoing substances are readily biodegradable. Option B: the foil/film should be biodegradable. If the foil/film is a mixture, option B represents a deviation of the Ecolabel approach of assessing each ingoing substance individually by assigning DID values. Moreover, OECD 301 A-F/310 test methods are for testing substances and not for mixtures, that means the foil/film cannot be tested on biodegradation by the suggested test method. The aim of the criteria should be clarified and the wording should be amended accordingly. The Blue Angel requires synthetic polymers to be at least inherently biodegradable. – Suggested action: Amend the wording to the intention of the criteria, e.g.: "All Ingredients" or "All synthetic polymers" of water-soluble foil/films (e.g., Polyvinyl Alcohol (PVA) films) shall be "readily" or "inherently" biodegradable according to test method OECD 301 A-F or 310, as reported in Part B of the DID list. -	Accepted – thank you for your input! About this particular topic, the wording of the criteria has been extensively re-worded. Certainly the EU ecolabel assess ingoing substances, assessing each for compliance and this is reflected in curren TR2 proposal. As rightly pointed out, the OECD test methods focus on substances assessment and it would be more precise to refer only to ingoing susbtances. However, further methods have been included and the possibility of using *"...equivalent methods and/or wealth of evidences.."* is part of TR2 proposal. In this sense, the wording reflects the intention to also include the possibility of assessing the biodegradability of the water soluble polymer as a whole shall an equivalent method be accepted.
p.63 – Section 7.4 Biodegradability Comment: For some sub-categories, the limits of anNBO for organic compounds are lower in the Nordic Swan, e.g. DD. Suggested action: We propose comparing the anNBO values and possibly aligning with more ambitious thresholds in other ecolabels. -	Accepted – the JRC has considered Nordic Ecolabelling limits for analogous products groups yet this does not imply direct alignment with them (See TR2 rationales for further details)
p.63 – About H400 classified surfactants being allowed if anaerobically biodegradable Comment: Proposal to remove the H400 derogation for surfactants as alternatives are possible and effective. However, JRC derogation template still needs to be evaluated. - -	Accepted – The JRC is proposing in TR2 to remove the H400 derogation on the basis of existing suitable technical alternative (See TR2 rational for full details)
p.60 - Impact of EU Ecolabel biodegradability criteria on EU manufacturers of sustainable polymer ingredients: Comment: We would like to make EU Ecolabel aware that the 'readily biodegradable' criterion limits the use of locally manufactured, sustainable, bio-based polymer ingredients in homecare products. This inhibits innovation for utilizing local circular bio-resources in favour of polymers based on food. Under the current EU Ecolabel rules, ingredients which are not readily biodegradable according to the OECD 301A-F method are restricted in dose, 3 though these methods are not always suitable to determine biodegradation of complex natural polymeric materials (Mistriotis, 2014). The OECD 301A-F method is based only on the concept of conversion to CO2, excluding other removal processes (Vikman, 2024). In practice, reliance on the	Acknowledged – The JRC notes the implications of requiring most of the ingredients/ingoing substance to be readily biodegradable, allowing only a share to be aerobically (aNBO) or anaerobically (anNBO) non-biodegradable. For the particular case mentioned on polymeric substances, there is a proposal for water-soluble films/foils, that could be informative/useful to set the basis for a discussion on this topic. In any case, the JRC would like to highlight that the requirement is intended to diminish the presence of persistent substances other than surfactants but

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
readily biodegradable criterion limits use of non-readily biodegradable ingredients to a few percent of the formulation. Functional polymers such as thickeners, dispersants and anti-scalants can make up >5% of the total formulation, so homecare product manufacturers are restricted to use only readily biodegradable polymers to qualify for EU Ecolabel.	there are exemptions in the absence of anaerobic biodegradability data which perhaps could be of application/relevant for the cited functional polymers. The JRC would also like to highlight that the criteria intention is not differentiate or discriminate particular groups of ingoing substances based on its origin (e.g. in the case you mentioned favour polymers derived from food materials over other of more recalcitrant nature as plant-based). In this sense, the JRC remains open for discussion on this particular topic.
p.60 - Impact of EU Ecolabel biodegradability criteria on EU manufacturers of sustainable polymer ingredients Comment: Polymeric ingredients, including bio-based, are significantly less biodegradable than molecular ingredients such as surfactants, and developing readily biodegradable functional polymers is a challenge. Plant matter (i.e. lignocellulosic biomass) is by nature not readily biodegradable as plants have evolved to resist microbes. This includes abundant natural biopolymers (and their derivatives) such as cellulose, lignin, and hemicellulose, which comprise the vast majority of bioresources (Parmar, 2017). The exception to this is food, particularly sugars and polysaccharides such as starch and gums (Vroman I, 2009), which are produced by plants for the purpose of rapid conversion. The current requirements in EU Ecolabel for readily biodegradable ingredients has the effect of limiting bio-based polymers made from non-food biomass in favour of readily biodegradable sugar-based polymers. Furthermore, cost-effective sugar resources are located mainly outside of the EU 4, favouring non-EU manufacturers. Requirements for readily biodegradable ingredients excludes many polymers produced in the EU from agricultural waste, manure, paper waste, and pulp & paper processing side-streams, which comprise nonreadily biodegradable materials such as cellulose, lignin and hemicellulose. These locallyavailable circular bioresources can be used to produce a wide variety of functional polymers, such as carboxymethyl cellulose5, lignosulfonates (Deneault, 1992) (Stapanian, 1986) (N. Clarke, 2023), and carboxymethyl inulin5 , which have a long history of use in a range of industries and are well-known to have low toxicity and minimal environmental impact. - -	
p.60 –General comment about section 7.4 on biodegradability Comment: In our opinion, limiting the use of benign, locally produced functionalised natural polymers in favour of polymers made from food products grown outside of the EU does not set the European cleaning products industry on a truly sustainable path. An exemption from readily biodegradable criteria for bio-based soluble polymer ingredients would allow European producers to use more local non-agricultural and waste biomass, reducing dependence on edible bio-feedstocks. - -	
p.63 – General comment about anaerobic biodegradability testing Comment: Ban of surfactants that are anaerobically non-biodegradable: we believe that aerobic biodegradation is the dominant process of interest for surfactants and therefore disagree with the	Acknowledged – In this TR2 the JRC proposes for discussion that all surfactants to also be anaerobically biodegradable. The JRC has included all the considerations

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
band of surfactants that are anaerobically non-biodegradable. It is not required to provide data on anaerobic biodegradability for chemical registration with REACH resulting in a lot of ingredients that have no data for anaerobic. It will be difficult for industry to obtain available data that would confirm whether their surfactant falls into scope of this proposed ban - -	made by stakeholders plus further research about requiring surfactant to also be anaerobically biodegradable in TR2 rationale of the *Biodegradability* criterion. Hence, we kindly refer you to consult this section for full details.
p.66 – General comment about anaerobic biodegradability testing Comment: difficult to assess when actual testing requirements are not specified, there is any benefit of adding a requirement for anaerobic conditions	
p.60-67 – Section 7.4 Biodegradability Comment: We don't agree with the request of anaerobic biodegradability of surfactants. Stringent requirements regarding anaerobic biodegradability can be challenging without providing accompanying environmental benefits where it can be demonstrated that the substance is already degraded under aerobic conditions. As noted by SCHER in 2005: "poor biodegradability under anaerobic conditions is not expected to produce substantial modifications in the risk for freshwater ecosystems as the surfactant removal in the STPs seems to be regulated by its aerobic biodegradability". Surfactants used in detergents need to be more effective than the ones used in cosmetics, so criteria can't be fully compared. - -	
p.60 – Section 7.4 Biodegradability Comment: We don't agree with the request of anaerobic biodegradability of surfactants. Stringent requirements regarding anaerobic biodegradability can be challenging without providing accompanying environmental benefits where it can be demonstrated that the substance is already degraded under aerobic conditions. As noted by SCHER in 2005: "poor biodegradability under anaerobic conditions is not expected to produce substantial modifications in the risk for freshwater ecosystems as the surfactant removal in the STPs seems to be regulated by its aerobic biodegradability". Surfactants used in detergents need to be more effective than the ones used in cosmetics, so criteria can't be fully compared. - -	
p.65 – **Specifically about the text "***In the absence of documentation for degradability described above, an ingoing substance other than a surfactant may be exempted from the requirement for anaerobic degradability if one of the following three alternatives is fulfilled:* *(1) it is readily degradable and has low adsorption (A<25%);* *(2) it is readily degradable and has high adsorption (D>75%);* *(3) it is readily degradable and non-bio-bioaccumulating (i.e. BCF <100 or Log Kow <3))* *Testing for adsorption/desorption shall be conducted in accordance with OECD Guideline 106***."** Comment: Maintaining the exemption with one of the three alternatives: adsorption/desorption/non-bioaccumulating and derogated substances for H statements is important. - -	Accepted –Note that for H-statements, within the criterion *Excluded and Restricted substances* now the JRC is proposing to remove the H400 derogation for surfactants, yet still maintaining the H412 (See TR2 rationale for full details)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.63, Table Proposed criterion (x) biodegradability row ALL (line 1138-1139) Comment: We suggest to modify the sentence All surfactants shall be readily degradable (aerobically) with All surfactants shall be readily biodegradable under aerobic conditions	Accepted – TR2 proposal includes such wording.
p.65, Table Proposed criterion (x) biodegradability row LD (line 1138-1139) Comment: Typo error: please cancel the first row LD since it is a repetition	Accepted – This has been corrected in TR2
p.65, Table Proposed criterion (x) biodegradability row ALL (line 1138-1139) Comment: Please consider to add other test method to demonstrate the water-soluble foil/film biodegradability such as EN ISO 14851, EN ISO 14852 since ready biodegradability guidelines (OECD 301 and 310) are developed for rather simple chemicals and not designed for polymers	Accepted – both ISO methods quoted (14851 & 14852) are proposed for inclusion in TR2.
p.65, Table Proposed criterion (x) biodegradability last row (line 1138-1139) Comment: We suggest to modify readily degradable with readily biodegradable	Acknowledged– it has not been included within TR2 proposal but JRC will consider changing this terminology.
p.66, Table Proposed criterion (x) biodegradability first row (line 1138-1139) Comment: We suggest to modify readily degradable with readily biodegradable	
p.66, Table Proposed criterion (x) biodegradability second row (line 1138-1139) Comment: We suggest to modify readily degradable with readily biodegradable	
p.66, Table Proposed criterion (x) biodegradability first row (line 1138-1139) Comment: typo error: modify adsorption with desorption	Accepted – in this TR2 proposal this has been corrected.
p.66, note 67 (line 1138-1139) Comment: Accordance to CLP Regulation we suggest to change BCF value from 100 to 500 and log Kow value from 3 to 4.	Rejected – The proposal is maintained as per existing (in force) EUEL criteria – BCF 100 and log Kow 3. The main reason is feasibility for compliance (as indicated by stakeholders). A question to stakeholders is included to get further insights in this matter is included. (See TR2 rationale for further details; especially in the sub-criterion *Preservatives*)
p.66 (line 1150) Comment: typo error: please correct aNOB with aNBO	Accepted – Thank you!. This has been corrected in TR2 proposal
p.66 (line 1167) Comment: please complete the sentence.	Accepted – This has been considered in TR2
p.66 Comment: "A substance is considered to be not bio-accumulating if the BCF is < 100 or log Kow is < 3,0. If both the BCF and log Kow values are available, the highest measured BCF value shall be used." Please indicate which test methods are accepted (log KOW: OECD 107 and BCF: OECD 305?).	Accepted – the JRC has modified this text to display the relevant OECD methods they refer to *("…BCF is < 100 (according to OECD 305) or log Kow is < 3,0.(according to OECD 107 or 117)…"*

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested action: Statement of the test method in the legal text. -	
p.63 - Biodegradability Comment: Exemption of micro-organisms is mentioned only in HSC. Suggested action: Following discussions/decisions on inclusion of micro-organisms, this table shall be updated. Rationale: There is on-going consultation of use of microorganisms in other product categories e.g. LD.	Accepted – The JRC has modified the legal text and this exemption is reflected in TR2 proposal.

Responses to Q20 about alignment with EUEL cosmetic products (19 comments)

Question 20 (Q20) asks: "*Would you support aligning existing EUEL criteria with EUEL Cosmetics? It would imply the following addition to the text in existing criterion Biodegradability (changes marked in blue font): "All surfactants shall be readily ~~degradable (aerobically)~~ biodegradable under aerobic conditions and biodegradable under anaerobic conditions.*"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.37-41 – Relating to anaerobic biodegradability: Comment: We do not agree with the request for anaerobic biodegradability of surfactants. Stringent requirements regarding anaerobic biodegradability can be challenging without providing accompanying environmental benefits where it can be demonstrated that the substance is already degraded under aerobic conditions. As noted by SCHER in 2005: "*poor biodegradability under anaerobic conditions is not expected to produce substantial modifications in the risk for freshwater ecosystems as the surfactant removal in the STPs seems to be regulated by its aerobic biodegradability*". Surfactants used in detergents need to be more effective than the ones used in cosmetics, so the criteria can not be fully compared. If such criteria must however be considered, then other relevant testing methods must also be included in the DID list part B, such as the AnBUSDIC test as an equivalent test method for anaerobic biodegradability. - -	Acknowledged – In this TR2 the JRC proposes for discussion that all surfactants to also be anaerobically biodegradable. The JRC has included all the considerations made by stakeholders plus further research about requiring surfactant to also be anaerobically biodegradable in TR2 rationale of the *Biodegradability* criterion. Hence, we kindly refer you to consult this section for full details.
p.67 – Line 1191 – 1194 – Question 20 Comment: the criterion that all surfactants shall be readily biodegradable under anaerobic conditions could be difficult, since many surfactant suppliers have not carried out tests for it. - -	
p.67 – Line Rows 1191-1194 Question 20 – Comment: No, we do not support this change: Current degradability testing methods were developed for small molecules→ criteria are not suitable for complex molecules such as polymers. Moreover,	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
degradation may occur with or without microorganisms (e.g. with UV light) – all mechanisms should be recognized in EU Ecolabel text. - -	
p.67 – Question 20 Comment: The use of surfactants with low anaerobic biodegradability should continue to be possible. Suggested action: No changes of the old version. Rationale: Up to now, surfactants with no or low anaerobic biodegradability have been required in particular for fat removal and foam attenuation in the IILD sector. Grease removal works best with non-ionic surfactants that are ethoxylated and propoxylated. In contrast to household washing, considerably more mechanics are used. The drum diameter is up to 2.5 metres, which means that the drop height is immensely greater than in small household machines. Due to the intensive reuse of washing liquors, foaming components accumulate and the pumping processes create additional mechanics. Foam cannot break down in the short duration of an IILD washing process (5-20 minutes). This type of surfactant is currently irreplaceable in the IILD process.	
p.62-67 - Question 20 Comment: Oui pour certaines sous-catégories comme les HSC nettoyant vitre où il est facile de trouver des surfactants facilement biodégradables. Non pour un HSC nettoyant pour surface, car c'est un produit plus technique avec plusieurs tensioactifs donc c'est plus dur de se sourcer. *Machine Translation: Yes for certain subcategories such as HSC window cleaners where it is easy to find easily biodegradable surfactants. No for an HSC surface cleaner, because it is a more technical product with several surfactants so it is harder to source.*	
p.62 – Question 20 Comment: Biodegradability of surfactants: point of discussion 8 / Q 20: We do not support the alignment with the cosmetic EUEL regarding the anaerobic biodegradability of surfactants. Stringent requirements regarding anaerobic biodegradability can be challenging without providing accompanying environmental benefits where it can be demonstrated that the substance is already degraded under aerobic conditions. As noted by SCHER in 2005: "poor biodegradability under anaerobic conditions is not expected to produce substantial modifications in the risk for freshwater ecosystems as the surfactant removal in the STPs seems to be regulated by its aerobic biodegradability". Surfactants used in detergents need to be more effective than the ones used in cosmetics, so criteria can't be fully compared. They help to reduce temperature in the washing process and also to decrease the amount of detergent. Biodegradability of organic substances: Even if the reference dosage requirements are lower, we welcome the fact that a share of non-	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
biodegradable organic substances is still tolerated that allow the use of additives which are essential to reach the performance criteria. Those substances, usually added in small concentration, have a beneficial effect on performance, protecting the textiles and allowing washing cycles to be carried out at lower temperatures.	
p.67 - Question 20 – Comment: EUEL criteria should be fully aligned with Detergent Regulation requirements. Specifically for surfactants biodegradability the proposed change should be aligned with surfactants manufacturer to confirm the feasibility for proposed conditions: readily degradable (aerobically) biodegradable under aerobic conditions and biodegradable under anaerobic conditions. It is important to clarify the full implications of changing the biodegradability requirement for surfactants. Currently when reviewing the existing vs. proposed criteria in the technical report, the text appears to be the same. Would aligning with EUEL Cosmetic criteria result in all surfactants needing to be biodegradable under anaerobic conditions regardless of the assigned hazard classification?	
p.69 – Question 20 Comment: We don't support aligning existing EUEL criteria with EUEL Cosmetics for biodegradability. Suggested action: Keeping the existing criteria. Rationale: Because the new DID-List (published in March 2024) provide not much new data for surfactants biodegradability under anaerobic conditions: on 97 surfactants, 8 are identified as "N" (non-biodegradable) and more than 40 as "o" (not tested) so almost 50% so the criteria with EUEL Cosmetics should be difficult to comply.	
p.67 – Question 20 Commen: disagree on anaerobic biodegradation of all surfactants	
p.63 – Question 20 Comment: One stakeholder does not support the definition of biodegradability regarding surfactants. Since the new version of the DID-List provides very few anaerobic biodegradability values: out of 97 TAs, 8 are marked "N" (non-biodegradable) and more than 40 are marked "0" (not tested), i.e. almost 50% of TAs have not been "tested".	
p.63 – Question 20 Comment: For the criterion related to Water-soluble foil/films (e.g., Polyvinyl Alcohol (PVA) films), that shall be readily biodegradable according to test method OECD 301 A-F or 310, as reported in Part B of the DID list. Industrials would like to share that OECD tests mentioned in the DID List part B are intended for chemical products. For plastic materials, more appropriate standards exist, such as ISO 14852. These tests should be added to the list of possible methods.	Accepted – The ISO method 14852 (alongside 14851) has been proposed as one of the valid methods for assessing biodegradability of water soluble films/foils, in addition to OECD methods mentioned in DID list Part B
p.63 - Question 20	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: (Q20) Would you support aligning existing EUEL criteria with EUEL Cosmetics? It would imply the following addition to the text in existing criterion Biodegradability (changes marked in blue font)All surfactants shall be readily degradable (aerobically) biodegradable under aerobic conditions and biodegradable under anaerobic conditions. We really support the alignement of EUEL criteria with EUEL cosmetics, we want to be more restrictive about the use of certain surfactants. With the exception of H400 and H412 surfactants (that have to be biodegradable under anaerobic in the existing criteria), all accepted surfactants should be biodegradable under anaerobic conditions also. - -	Acknowledged – The JRC is proposing in this TR2 requiring anaerobic biodegradability of surfactants alongside the wording shared.
p.63 – Question 20 Comment: Industrials are in favor to align the definition of biodegradability with the one existing in European Ecolabel for Cosmetics criteria. They draw attention to the fact that the Ecolabel forms should mention that suppliers must provide the data.	
p.67 – Question 20 Comment: We have no problem with that.	
p.69 – Question 20 Comment: Yes we support	
p.67 – Question 20 Comment: We support this change. Suggested action: We recommend requiring all surfactants to be readily biodegradable under aerobic conditions and biodegradable under anaerobic conditions Rationale: This requirement is important since surfactants may accumulate in sewage sludge. Substances which are not anaerobically biodegradable may accumulate in anoxic zones in the environment and reveal toxicity there. Toxicity under anaerobic conditions is not very well tested therefore we do not properly know the potentional impact. Blue Angel, Bra Miljöval and the Nordic Swan apply this requirement and there is a large number of products being labelled, showing that it is feasible to achieve. As there are a lot of alternative surfactants which are aerobically AND anaerobically biodegradable and in addition a lot of substances which have not yet been tested all surfactants which will be used should be aerobically AND anaerobically biodegradable.	
p.67 - Question 20 – Comment: I agree aligning the existing EUEL criteria with EUEL Cosmetics. -	
p.60 - Question 22 Comment: We are in favor	
p.65 – Question 20	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: We support	

10. Sustainable sourcing (47 comments)

General comments on sustainable sourcing… (16 comments)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.68-69 – Whole criterion on sustainable sourcing Suggested actions: Removing this criterion. Rationale: A considerable amount of effort is needed to comply with it, while the benefits it offers are negligible. Furthermore, this criterion is a real white elephant!	Partially accepted – we have proposed to remove the sub-criterion on biobased raw materials other than palm oil to narrow the scope, simplify the compliance and reduce the effort for applicants. On the other hand, we have kept the criterion on sustainable sourcing of palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives, to align with other ecolabels (e.g. Nordic Swan, Blue Angel). For the same reason, we have proposed a new sub-criterion to report the renewable content, but with no minimum threshold requested.
p.30-34 and 69 – Definitions of terms Additional comments: We propose to clearly define the meaning of a sustainable raw material, biobased raw materials and sustainable sourcing. We propose to have also clear definition of RSPO (Roundtable Sustainable Palm Oil).	Partly accepted – we have proposed definitions for similar concepts *(Renewable materials* and *Sustainable sourcing)* in the legal text. In addition, definitions of *sustainable production* and *biobased products* have been included in the rationale of the criterion on *Renewable and sustainable sourcing of raw materials*. The definition of *sustainable production* has not been included in the legal text because it has been considered to be very similar to the definition of *Sustainable sourcing*, which is included. The definition of *biobased products* has not been included in the legal text because the sub-criterion on *other biobased raw materials* has been removed, thus, not appearing in the proposed version of the legal text.
p.30-34 and 69 – Definitions of terms specifically about: "*Biobased raw materials used to produce ingredients included in the final product, shall be covered by chain of custody certificates*"	Accepted – The definition of *biobased products* has been included in the rationale of criterion *Renewable and sustainable sourcing of raw materials* in TR2. The definition has not been included in the legal text because the sub-

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment:"*Biobased raw materials*" is a very wide term. A clear definition is needed what kind of raw materials should be covered by chain of custody certificates. Raw materials may be obtained by direct chemical modification of biobased substances, e.g. surfctants form natural oils or sugars. Another approachs are biochemical processes (like fermentation) that are used for the production of citric acid, lactic acid or ethanol. It should be clearly defined which group of raw materials are coverd by the term "biobased raw materials". Suggested action: Include a definition of "*biobased raw materials*"	criterion on *other biobased raw materials* has been removed, thus, not appearing in the proposed version of the legal text.
p.68. On proposal for CoC of PO and PKO, specifically: "*For palm oil and palm kernel oil derivatives, RSPO certificates or certificates of any equivalent or stricter sustainable production scheme demonstrating compliance to any of the following models shall be accepted: identity preserved, segregated, and mass balance.*": Comment: MB/SG/IP: Please clarify if this means that the raw material has to have a MG/SG/IP certification or if it is also possible to transfer claims by MB Claim Transfer Cross referencing. Suggested action: Precision of the legal text.	Acknowledged – this proposal on valid and invalid chain of custody models has been clarified.
p.68. On proposal for CoC of bio-based raw materials Comment: We are concerned about the new requirement on other biobased raw materials is not clear enough and not well defined. We fear benefits are not sufficient in relation to generated constraints. If this requirement is kept, we have a lot of questions: - What happens if a certification schemes officially recognised by the European Commission "loses" its recognition during the license? Will certified products be re-evaluated? - How do we know if the submitted certificate is genuine? Should we have examples to illustrate each certification scheme recognized by the European Commission? What information (in addition to the validity) should be checked by the CB? - What program doesn't require a "non-GMO" origin? How do we know as CB? For them [such programs without non-GMO requirements], what supplementary evidence must be provided by the LH and checked by the CB?	Acknowledged – we understand the wideness and complexity of applying the sub-criterion on biobased raw materials as proposed in TR1. To solve the raised concerns, we have added a number of clarifications in the rationale section of TR2, *Sustainable sourcing,* and we have removed the sub-criterion on biobased raw materials other than palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives
p.68. On proposal for CoC of bio-based raw materials Comment: French stakeholders are not in favor of extending the scope of this criterion to all other biobased raw materials; they indicate that sustainable sourcing for those materials does not exist. This point raises questions: - What happens if a certification program recognised by the EC during a given period "loses" this recognition (since there is a period of validity) during the validity of the European Decision concerned? Will certified products have to be reassessed?	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
- How will we know if the certificate sent is an authentic certificate, given that there are currently around fifteen certification programs recognised by the EC and another ten or so under study? Will we have a sample certificate to illustrate each program recognised by the EC? What information in addition to validity will have to be verified by the stakeholder? - Which programs do not require a "non-GMO" origin? How can this be determined? For these, what additional proof must be provided by the industry and verified by the stakeholder?	
p.68. On proposal for CoC of bio-based raw materials Comment: A requirement of a chain of custody certificate for all biobased raw material is challenging. Suggested actions: We recommend not to apply this criterion to biobased raw materials originated in EU. In order to demonstrate the EU origin, a certificate of origin should be supplied. Rationale: Due to this proposal, prices and availability of these raw material could face an increase of the costs and a more difficult availability.	Accepted – as previously indicated, we understand the wideness and complexity of applying the sub-criterion on biobased raw materials as proposed in TR1. To solve the concerns, we have removed the sub-criterion on biobased raw materials other than palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives.
p.68. On proposal for CoC of bio-based raw materials Comment: We suggest focusing on palm oil because RSPO certification is widely recognized. Other plant-based materials lack international third-party certification.	Accepted – After further research presented in TR2, we have confirmed the lack or scarcity of certifications for other biobased raw materials equivalent to those available for palm oil, palm kernel oil and derivatives. Due to the challenging assessment and verification, we have removed the sub-criterion on biobased raw materials other than palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives.
p.68. On proposal for CoC of bio-based raw materials Comment: Criterion biobased raw materials on the to be specified. Rationale: No resources available from suppliers at present or limited it is necessary to have a clear definition of have a clear definition of	Accepted – After further research presented in TR2, we have confirmed the lack or scarcity of certifications for other biobased raw materials equivalent to those available for palm oil, palm kernel oil and derivatives. Due to the challenging assessment and verification, we have removed the sub-criterion on biobased raw materials other than palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives.
p.68. On proposal for CoC of bio-based raw materials Comment: RSPO certificates: we suggest focusing on palm oil because RSPO certification is widely recognized, whereas other plant-based materials lack international third-party certification. Besides it is our concern that this would lead to change to fuel-based surfactants (which are even less sustainable)	Accepted – After further research presented in TR2, we have confirmed the lack or scarcity of certifications for other biobased raw materials equivalent to those available for palm oil, palm kernel oil and derivatives. Due to the challenging assessment and verification, we have removed the sub-criterion on biobased raw materials other than palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	Regarding the comparison between petrochemicals and oleochemicals, current studies report differing outcomes. Some sources show higher environmental impacts of oleochemicals for some indicators, while others suggest that environmental impacts of fossil-based raw materials may be currently underestimated and that, under certain conditions, oleochemicals may be beneficial. Considering this together with current criteria in other ecolabels, we have propose to add a sub-criterion to report the renewable content, but with no minimum threshold requested.
p.68. On proposal for CoC of bio-based raw materials Comment: Regarding biobased products, we currently have no information on our suppliers' supply chains and therefore do not know whether they will be able to respond positively to the proposed new criterion. The term biobased needs to be more clearly defined. For products manufactured in the European union, agricultural production rules are already in line with sustainability criteria. If we go beyond current standards, products tend to become organic. This criterion would therefore make sense for raw materials from outside Europe.	Acknowledged – After further research presented in TR2, we have confirmed the lack or scarcity of certifications for other biobased raw materials equivalent to those available for palm oil, palm kernel oil and derivatives. The term biobased has been defined. Due to the challenging assessment and verification, we have removed the sub-criterion on other biobased raw materials than palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives, regardless of the country of origin of the raw material. The differentiation between raw materials from Europe and outside Europe has not been analysed in TR2.
p.68. On proposal for CoC of bio-based raw materials specifically about "*b) Other biobased raw materials than palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives. Biobased raw materials used to produce ingredients included in the final product, shall be covered by chain of custody certificates issued by an independent third-party certification scheme officially recognised by the European Commission [1]*" Comment: The criterion relating to the use of biobased raw materials in the production of ingredients lacks clarity and framework, which can lead to confusion and inconsistencies in its implementation. Firstly, the term "***biobased***" is not clearly defined, leaving it open to interpretation. A clear definition of what constitutes a biobased raw material would provide the clarity necessary for stakeholders to determine which materials fall into this category. Furthermore, while the criterion requires chain of custody certificates for biobased raw materials, it does not specify which certification schemes are acceptable apart from those related to palm oil. This ambiguity creates uncertainty as to which certification systems are valid for demonstrating	Accepted – A detailed explanation on the rationale of the sub-criterion on biobased raw materials has been included in TR2, with a definition of the term "biobased". The challenge of certification for biobased materials other than palm oil, palm kernel oil and derivatives has been confirmed by the conducted research. Due to this, TR2 proposes to remove the sub-criterion on other biobased raw materials.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
compliance. Establishing a clear framework for acceptable certification schemes for all bio-based raw materials would alleviate this problem. In addition, the lack of clarity extends to the scope of the certification requirement. It is not clear whether all bio-based raw materials used in the production process, or only those directly included in the ingredients of the final product, are subject to this criterion. Clarification of the scope would ensure consistent interpretation and application of the requirement at different stages of the supply chain. In summary, to improve the effectiveness of this criterion, it is essential to provide a clear definition of the term "*biobased*", to establish a framework for acceptable certification schemes beyond palm oil and to clarify the scope of the certification requirement with regard to the use of biobased raw materials throughout the production process.	
p.68. On proposal for CoC of bio-based raw materials Comment: We are not in favour of extending the scope to all other bio-based raw materials because to our knowledge there is no sustainable supply chain for all these ingredients. However, if this requirement were to remain, the concepts of "bio-based" and "sustainable sourcing" should be clearly defined as well as supporting documents.	Accepted – Based on research conducted in TR2, we have proposed to remove the sub-criterion on other biobased raw materials. Definitions for "bio-based" and "sustainable sourcing" have been provided in TR2.
p.69 – On proposed A+V text, specifically the demonstration of compliance; 3rd paragraph: "*For palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives, a mass balance calculation and/or invoices/delivery notes from the raw material producer shall be provided, showing that the proportion of certified raw material corresponds to the amount of certified palm oil, palm kernel oil and/or their derivatives. Alternatively, a declaration from the producer of raw materials shall be provided, showing that all purchased palm oil, palm kernel oil and/or their derivatives are certified.*" Comment: The overall amount of palm oil and palm kernel oil and or their derivatives that are certified is subject to audit under the RSPO scheme. These are confidential information that cannot be provided to customers or competent bodies. The delivery notes confirm the compliance and can be verified on the RSPO website. We call to remove the third paragraph.	Rejected – According to the current paragraph, providing mass balance calculation and/or invoices/delivery notes are only one of the alternatives. The other alternative is to provide a declaration from the producer to the competent bodies to show that their raw materials are certified. Further details may be needed to fully appraise intended meaning.
p.69 – On proposed A+V text, specifically: "*For palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives, a mass balance calculation and/or invoices/delivery notes from the raw material producer shall be provided, showing that the proportion of certified raw material corresponds to the amount of certified palm oil, palm kernel oil and/or their derivatives. Alternatively, a declaration from the producer of raw materials shall be provided, showing that all purchased palm oil, palm kernel oil and/or their derivatives are certified.*" Comment: Surfactants are mainly obtained from palm kernel as the fatty chain guarantees best performances (solubility, foam, viscosity). The quantity of coconut is lower and switching would only	Partly accepted – Research conducted in TR2 confirmed the following: 1- Certifications for biobased raw materials other than palm oil, palm kernel oil, and their derivatives are scarce and the benefits to the environmental performance seem to be limited, so we have proposed to remove the sub-criterion on other biobased raw materials.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
change the raw material involved. Regulation 2023/1115 will ensure that products imported and exported from the EU have not caused deforestation or forest degradation. RSPO will cover the social aspect in order to guarantee human rights. There is no need to go further than the Mass Balance scheme as in this way all the aspects are covered. Segregated raw material has a higher cost and very low availability. This aspect should also be reconsidered for the cosmetics ecolabel, and it could push petrochemicals derivatives. To demonstrate compliance, the raw material producer shall not provide documents showing the proportion of certified raw material in their company directly to the label requester or competent body. These are confidential information which are part of the audit performed under the RSPO certification.	2- Regarding chain of custody schemes, compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved. 3- Comparisons between petrochemicals and oleochemicals have shown differing results, but to counterbalance potential pushing towards petrochemicals, a sub-criterion on renewable content has been proposed in TR2. 4- The current proposal on the elements to be provided to the label requester or competent body does not oblige producers to show these documents. A declaration that raw materials are certified is enough.
p.69 – On proposed A+V text, specifically: "*For palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives, a mass balance calculation and/or invoices/delivery notes from the raw material producer shall be provided, showing that the proportion of certified raw material corresponds to the amount of certified palm oil, palm kernel oil and/or their derivatives. Alternatively, a declaration from the producer of raw materials shall be provided, showing that all purchased palm oil, palm kernel oil and/or their derivatives are certified.*" Comment: Surfactants are mainly obtained from palm kernel as the fatty chain guarantees best performances (solubility, foam, viscosity). The quantity of coconut is lower and switching would only change the raw material involved. Regulation 2023/1115 will ensure that products imported and exported from the EU have not caused deforestation or forest degradation. RSPO will cover the social aspect in order to guarantee human rights. There is no need to go further than the Mass Balance scheme as in this way all the aspects are covered. Segregated raw material has a higher cost and very low availability. This aspect should also be reconsidered for the cosmetics ecolabel, and it could push petrochemicals derivatives.To demonstrate compliance, the raw material producer shall not provide documents showing the proportion of certified raw material in their company directly to the label requester or competent body. These are confidential information which are part of the audit performed under the RSPO certification.	

Responses to Q21 on CoC models (17 comments)

Q21 asks: "Would you support limiting the chain of custody models to identity preserved and segregated? JRC acknowledges that evidence gathered suggested potential difficulties with compliance, thus it encourages stakeholders commenting on the feasibility of this provision."

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: All our surfactants based on palm oil and their derivates are always MB quality, therefore we estimate, that it could be a bigger problem to get the necessary quality.	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: At the moment it is still very difficult to have certification and the right traceability measures in place for all biogenic feedstocks. I doubt that this would be feasible at the moment. However, industry is starting to put more effort into this so that I think it would be a good criterion to be included in the next revision.	Accepted – Certifications for biobased raw materials other than palm oil, palm kernel oil, and their derivatives have been found scarce and the benefits to the environmental performance seemed to be limited, so we have proposed to remove the sub-criterion on other biobased raw materials in this revision.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: The mass balance must be kept for palm oil and palm kernel oil derivatives, as the other models are not available for sale from our suppliers. We have already asked them about this, and they are not prepared to offer us Identity preserved or Segregated grades. The best way to find out more about the obstacles faced by raw materials suppliers to its supply chains model is to contact them directly.	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: Non, car la plupart des fournisseurs nous donne un certificat MB. *Translation: No, because most suppliers give us an MB certificate*	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: Industrials would like to point out that it is complicated to obtain supporting evidence for sustainable sourcing of palm oil, kernel oil and their derivatives. They are not in favor to limit the chain of custody models to identity preserved and segregated because most of suppliers use mass balanced certificates. They would like to point out that this will create raw materials availability problems because available tonnages are not sufficient to be proposed for all certified products and are too expensive.	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
One industrial is in favor of aligning with cosmetics requirements if they are compatible with the Zero Imported Deforestation Regulation: - identity preserved and segregation for palm and palm kernel oil - identity preserved, segregation and mass balance for palm oil and palm kernel oil derivatives. One stakeholder is in favour of considering only ingredients >1% in the final product. The stakeholder is not against allowing the possibility of providing e-trace certificates for ingredients derived from palm oil / palm kernel oil that do not exist in IP, SG or MP versions (thus financing the sustainable sector in another way, via RSPO "credits", in condition that manufacturers are required to choose a single method of proof: i.e. either the ingredient is IP/SG/MB certified or purchased with e-trace certificates for the % required. Using a combination of the 2 modes of proof for each ingredient makes the control by the stakeholder (and even the auditor) unnecessarily complex. We ask for a clarification in the text for supporting evidence to be provided for this criterion, not only in the User Manual. Indeed we would like to point out that it is important that all the evidence that must be provided by the industrials and all the elements that must be checked by the stakeholder are clearly specified in each European Decision (and not just in the UM). The industrials must provide a valid certificate per ingredient concerned, the n° of this certificate must be reported on the invoice / delivery note. → The use of the declared ingredient grade must be verified by the stakeholder each year n-1 on the production of year n. However, this should be done in year n-1 (on Q1) and not 12 months after certification, which would be far too restrictive and complicated for the CB to follow and makes less sense at the level of industrial production. It is necessary to specify in each European Decision (and not only in the UM) which certificate number must be shown on the invoice/delivery note, but also to allow this to be shown on the analysis report, at least for samples.	
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we agree with other participants that we should not limit to identity preserved (IP) and segregated (SG). Suggested actions: Keeping the existing criterion. Rationale: Because it [the proposed criterion] is too restrictive.	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: disagree, mass balance approach is needed:	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: Yes, we confirm that the limitation of the custody model to identity preserved and segregated raw materials would be very critical due to the short volumes available on the market. It cannot be realistically implemented, neither for PKO and their derivatives nor for other renewable raw material like coconut oil.	Accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved. For other biobased raw materials, the removal of the sub-criterion has been proposed, due to current challenges of certification.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: For palm oil and palm kernel oil derivatives, it is favorable that, as in EUEL criteria for cosmetics, following models be accepted: identity preserved, segregated and mass balance. Rationale: No comment on the proposed chain of custody models for palm oil and palm kernel oil. However, for palm oil and palm kernel oil derivatives, it is favorable that, as in EUEL criteria for cosmetics, following models be accepted: identity preserved, segregated and mass balance. The exclusion of mass balance supply chain models for PO and PKO derivatives would greatly limit the use of plant-based surfactants, as only limited options stricter than mass balance are yet offered by suppliers. A more limited choice in surfactants could have a negative impact on the performance of EU Ecolabel products.	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: Identity preserved and segregated are quite limited on the market for palm oil , so we could have difficuties to find a surfactant compliant	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: We are in favour of aligning with cosmetics requirements if they are compatible with the Zero Imported Deforestation Regulation: 1) identity preserved and segregation for palm and palm kernel oil ; 2) identity preserved, segregation and mass balance for palm oil and palm kernel oil derivatives	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: 7.5.a) We support the requirement does not include raw materials <1% (w/w) in the final product. We would rather keep the possibility for LH to provide e—trace certificates. As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we thank you for clarifications of the criterion for the part "palm oil" but we think additional clarifications/modifications should be indicated, in particular the control which should be conducted by CBs the year after the awarding and not 12 months as mentioned in this first draft. Suggestion actions: We are in favour of keeping the possibility for LH to provide e—trace certificates on condition of requiring to choose an unique scheme (either MB/IP/SG or e-trace certificate). As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we think additional clarifications/modifications should be indicated, in particular the control which should be conducted by CBs the year after the awarding and not 12 months as mentioned in this first draft. However, we think this control by CBs should be done each year during the license, at the beginning of year for the year -1. To conclude, it is important that all the evidence which must be provided by the LH and checked by the CB be specified clearly in each decision (and not only in the UM): The LH must provide a valid certificate for the concerning ingredient.The number of this certificate must be written on invoices / delivery notes of the concerning ingredient. We propose to accept both number of this certificate or number of the RSPO member. We propose to accept also that this number can be written on certificate of analysis of the concerning ingredient, at least for samples (low tonnage). The CB has to check certificate and invoices / delivery notes (or certificate of analysis) during the first application.The CB has to check these documents and bought "version" (MB, IP, SG) for each concerning ingredient each year during the license, at the beginning of year for the year -1. Rationale: Because it will be easier. Because some ingredients, derivatives of palm oil / palm kernel oil, don't exist in "version" IP, SG or MB. However combining both schemes (MB/IP/SG and e-trace certificate) for the same ingredient (or its equivalence) makes more complex the criterion in vain and specially the control by the CB (and even the auditor). Because this control by CBs is important, so it must be repeated during the license.	Partly accepted – A clarification has been proposed about the control process to assess the validity of the certificate starting twelve months after the date of awarding of the EU ecolabel license. It has been proposed to made explicit that the check on the validity shall be done on an annual basis.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: We do not support restricting chain of custody models to identity-preserved or segregated models as many suppliers/most of them use the mass balance model. This limitation will create problems of material availability, for which for a large part there is no identity preserved or segregated quality. The tonnages available for ingredients with these qualities are insufficient (to	Partly accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
allow the production of all certified products) and too expensive. This could lead to a shortage, a distortion in the accessibility of certified products, and therefore a shift in purchasing preference towards non-certified products. Our warning is about the sector's potential to meet the deforestation regulation, which is in line with this, which could lead to the reintroduction of the use of petrochemical derivatives that is not a good alternative regarding environmental impact.	considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: It is not possible to obtain palm oil derivatives used in detergents in IP or SG quality. Verification of the availability of raw materials that are palm oil derivatives (mostly PKO) confirmed the availability of only MB (mass balance) level.In addition, the requirements should not be extended to coconut oil derivatives (different source of origin, different plant). We are not aware of certifications for coconut oil derivatives. In addition, it should be borne in mind that raw materials are usually based on a mixture of coconut oil and palm oil, the ratio varies from batch to batch of raw material, when determining PKO, I give the maximum content. It would be difficult to reconcile two certificates for one raw material. The possibility of obtaining any certification for chemical derivatives of coconut oil or other biobased raw materials should be verified. Currently, the problem is the cultivation of Guinea oil, mainly for the huge demand of the food industry. As of today, the use of palm oil derivatives in MB quality is a sufficient requirement.	Accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved. For other biobased raw materials, the removal of the sub-criterion has been proposed, due to current challenges of certification that have been confirmed by research conducted for the TR2.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: Yes, we support excluding the mass-balance approach. Suggested actions: We support the JRC´s proposal. Rationale: It would be good if the EU Ecolabel can contribute to higher traceability of raw materials in supply chains. If the EU Ecolabel requires this, it can contribute to higher demand for identity preserved or segregated biomass, thereby developing also the available offer. The Blue Angel already concluded in its criteria for DD from 2022 that it should be feasible to require at least segregated palm (kernel) oil and that this will be part of the next revision: https://produktinfo.blauer-engel.de/uploads/criteriafile/de/DE-UZ%20201-202201-de-Kriterien-V3.pdf (p.29)	Partially accepted - Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: The marked situation for Palm olie shall be investigated further – experience form Cosmetic products shows that segregated or identity preserved is very hard to get for these derivatives.	Accepted – Availability of certified palm oil, palm kernel oil and derivatives has been further investigated. Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.80 - Q21: About CoC models being limited to identity preserved and segregated? Comment: PT CB agrees aligning the existing EUEL criteria with EUEL Cosmetics. However, we are concerned about the difficulty of compliance by LHs.	Accepted – Availability of certified palm oil, palm kernel oil and derivatives has been further investigated. Compliance with segregated and identity preserved models has been found challenging for palm kernel oil and derivatives and TR2 has proposed to accept mass balance scheme for these raw materials. However, for palm oil, the availability in the European market has been considered sufficient to restrict the accepted schemes to segregated and identity preserved.

Responses to Q22 – On carbon accounting (14 comments)

Q22 asks: "Would [you] suggest considering the inclusion of specific provisions targeting achieving environmental positive effects via Carbon accounting? If so, could you share specific proposals? For example, requiring a minimum share of in carbon from renewable origin from surfactants systems (as per Blue Angel ecolabel) OR set follow a particular C-footprint methodology to ensure net LCA reduction in C-footprint in ingredients and/or final product."

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting: Comment: Maybe product manufacturers could have a benefit, when they use renewable energy sources, for manufacturing their products. A verification to this could be feasible	Acknowledged
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting: Comment: Unfortunately, we don't have enough data to answer this question.	Acknowledged
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting: Comment: Yes we would support inclusion of such criteria. The limit should be discussed with different stakeholders	Acknowledged– Considering current criteria on renewable material in other ecolabels, we have propose to add a sub-criterion to report the renewable content, but with no minimum threshold requested.
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting: Comment: From the Blue Angel, we know already that the target of 50 % renewable carbon only for the surfactant system is not easy to meet in particular for dishwashing detergents (DE-UZ 201). Also, the Nordic Swan has deleted similar criteria, which could not be met. We propose to support methodology certifying mass balancing systems (e.g. REDcert2, ISCC+) within the supply chain. As a result, the proportion of renewable raw materials can be increased and specifically demonstrated in	Acknowledged– Considering current criteria on renewable material in other ecolabels, we have propose to add a sub-criterion to report the renewable content, but with no minimum threshold requested.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
the end product or at the beginning of the value chain (mass balancing systems). This is an essential contribution to sustainable development.	
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting, specifically about Comment: Blue Angel and renewable carbon: Rationale: DD are exempted from the criteria of renawable carbon because it's not possible to be compliant	Acknowledged – Considering current criteria on renewable material in other ecolabels, we have propose to add a sub-criterion to report the renewable content, but with no minimum threshold requested in order to ease compliance.
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about renewable carbon sources: Comment: Renawable sources for our raw material can be complicated to find, especially when the raw material comes from outside Europe which is sometimes a necessity in case of shortage	Acknowledged– Considering current criteria on renewable material in other ecolabels, we have propose to add a sub-criterion to report the renewable content, but with no minimum threshold requested in order to ease compliance.
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about renewable carbon sources: Comment: In favour of recognition in the EU Ecolabel criteria of non-fossil origin organic chemicals	Accepted – After research conducted by JRC in TR2, current studies on the comparison between petrochemical and oleochemical sources report differing outcomes. Some sources show higher environmental impacts of oleochemicals for some indicators, while others suggest that environmental impacts of fossil-based raw materials may be currently underestimated and that, under certain conditions, oleochemicals may be beneficial. Considering this together with current criteria in other ecolabels, we have propose, as a compromise, to add a sub-criterion to report the renewable content, but with no minimum threshold requested to ease compliance.
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about renewable carbon sources: Comment: In favour of recognition in the EU Ecolabel criteria of non-fossil origin organic chemicals	
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting and other renewable carbon sources: Comment: We do not support extending the criterion to all other biobased raw materials in the product, as these other raw materials do not have a sustainability certification circuit. Furthermore, no guidelines are provided in the text of the report to support and help manufacturers to work in that direction	Accepted – After further research presented in TR2, we have confirmed the lack or scarcity of certifications for other biobased raw materials equivalent to those available for palm oil, palm kernel oil and derivatives. The term biobased has been defined. Due to the challenging assessment and verification, we have removed the sub-criterion on other biobased raw materials than palm oil, palm kernel oil and their derivatives.
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting and other renewable carbon sources: Comment: Before taking any decision about introducing percentages a clear definition of sustainability and renewability must be given. The use of a common C-footprint is only valid using a	Accepted - JRC has conducted research on existing metrics for carbon accounting (see rationale in TR2, section on Sustainable sourcing). Definition of sustainability and renewable materials have also been provided in TR2. Due to

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
common methodology by different companies in the supply chain to avoid variation in data based on methodology. The use of a widely recognized methodology provides a common framework to avoid uncertainties in the results and conclusions.	current lack of consensus to assign priority to one carbon accounting method over the others, and based on current experience about challenges when fixing a threshold, a sub-criterion has been proposed, asking license requesters to report carbon content but with no minimum threshold to be demonstrated.
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting and other renewable carbon sources: Comment: Before taking any decision about introducing percentages a clear definition of sustainability and renewability must be given.The use of a common C-footprint is only valid using a common methodology by different companies in the supply chain to avoid variation in data based on methodology. The use of a widely recognized methodology provides a common framework to avoid uncertainties in the results and conclusions.	
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting and other renewable carbon sources: Comment: No, it is currently too early.	Acknowledged – Considering current criteria in other ecolabels, the report of renewable material content has been proposed in TR2. To ease compliance, no minimum threshold is required.
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting and other renewable carbon sources: Comment: No, we would not support provisions on carbon accounting or mandatory minimum share of carbon from renewable origin.	Partly accepted – Considering current criteria in other ecolabels, the report of renewable material content has been proposed in TR2. To ease compliance, no minimum threshold is required.
p.80 - Q22 on possible requirements about carbon accounting and other renewable carbon sources: Comment: We do not agree, it would be too demanding for economic operators.	Acknowledged– Considering current criteria in other ecolabels, the report of renewable material content has been proposed in TR2. To ease compliance, no minimum threshold is required.

11. Excluded and restricted substances (232 comments)

7.6.1. (a) Specific excluded and restricted substances (7.6.1(a)) (22 comments)

The comments refer to pages 82-83 of TR1 about the specific exclusion of substances. The main changes are the tightening of the levels of assessment, now not just being not in the formulation, but not being in mixtures added to the formulation or as impurities. The main changes in exclusions are: (i) now proposed that MIT be excluded; (ii) that nanomaterials are excluded instead of just nanosilver; (iii) that PFAS are excluded instead of just per-fluorinated alkylates; (iv) that substances identified to have endocrine disrupting properties are excluded and (vi) that substances considered to be potential endocrine disruptors are excluded.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.81 - Line 1551 Comment: 11. (h) Should read "Microorganisms" (omit "Only for HSC") - -	Rejected – This mark intends to reflect that in TR1 proposal that was applicable only to the product groups HSC, thus it is proper to be disclosed in such way. However, note that in TR2 the intention is to reflect those product groups whose scope is enlarged to include microorganisms. It this implies all product groups, then it should not specify any product group.
p.81 –Intentionally added and impurities Comment: Excluded and restricted substances should only be excluded if they have been intentionally added as an ingoing substance. We propose: The substances indicated below shall not be included in the product formulation as an ingoing substance regardless of concentration, neither as part of the formulation or as part of any mixture included in the formulation. It is crucial that a cut off limit for impurities is set, since the list of excluded substance contains many classes of substances which are not clearly defined. Therefore, many constituents may contain a small/ubiquitous amount of one or the other substance falling under the exclusion criteria. Therefore the term "nor as impurities" must be deleted, which is in accordance with the threshold defined as " no limit" and also the last published revision of the Cosmetic EU Ecolabel. Please note that exemptions to the definition of ingoing substances and impurities could also be indicated in some specific cases if necessary. - -	Accepted. Because not all impurities will be known, this is a legally doubtful requirement. So long as it is clearly defined that impurities above a certain level are treated as if they were ingoing substances, it should be ok to delete "nor as impurities".
p.82 –Intentionally added and impurities Comment: "The substances indicated below shall not be included in the product formulation regardless of concentration, neither as part of the formulation, as part of any mixture included in the formulation, nor as impurities:" "nor as impurities" ist a very tight requirement. This point was discussed in the cosmetics PG and the "impurities" were deleted. Suggested action: Delete "nor as impurities" -	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.81-96 –Intentionally added and impurities Comment: Excluded and restricted substances should only be excluded if they have been intentionally added as an ingoing substance. We propose: The substances indicated below shall not be included in the product formulation as an ingoing substance regardless of concentration, neither as part of the formulation or as part of any mixture included in the formulation. It is crucial that a cut off limit for impurities is set, since the list of excluded substance contains many classes of substances which are not clearly defined. Therefore, many constituents may contain a small/ubiquitous amount of one or the other substance falling under the exclusion criteria. Therefore the term "nor as impurities" must be deleted, which is in accordance with the threshold defined as " no limit" and also the last published revision of the Cosmetic EU Ecolabel. Please note that exemptions to the definition of ingoing substances and impurities could also be indicated in some specific cases if necessary. - -	
p.84, 85 –Intentionally added and impurities Comment: Threshold and scope for excluded substances: We see discrepancy between the threshold and scope propose for the excluded substances: we call to delete the term "nor as impurities". This is also in accordance with the latest version of the EU Ecolabel for cosmetics, correction (EU) 2023/1540). (see rationale) Suggested action: delete the term "nor as impurities" from the scope Rationale: Threshold and scope for excluded substances: We find a discrepancy between the "Threshold levels applicable to ingoing substances" for excluded and restricted substances (table 1; pdf page 42), the definition of "no limit" (pdf page 42), the definition of impurities (pdf page 32) and the scope defined for the excluded substances which shall not be present "neither as part of the formulation, as part of any mixture included in the formulation, nor as impurities". It is crucial that a cut off limit for excluded substances is set, since the exclusion list contains many classes of substances which are not clearly defined. Therefore, many constituents may contain a small/ubiquitous amount of one or the other substance falling under the exclusion criteria. Given the detection limit of 100 ppm, the term "nor as impurities" must be deleted.	
p.82 – About the wording of the general exclusion criteria (especially impurities) Comment: These specifications "The substances indicated below shall not be included in the product formulation regardless of concentration, neither as part of the formulation, as part of any mixture included in the formulation, nor as impurities" could cause confusions according to the new definition of "impurities".	

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested actions: Harmonizing definitions of "ingoing substances" and "impurities" and also this criterion.	
p.83, PBT, vPvB, PMT, vPvM - (i) Excluded substances, row ALL (line 1558-1559) Comment: We suggest to include Substances identified to have persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic or very persistent, very bioaccumulative properties and Substances identified to have persistent, mobile and toxic or very persistent, very mobile properties	Question to JRC: seems like a reasonable proposal – but be aware that these are associated with EUH codes, which means suppliers from outside the EU might not give this information in the same clear way in an SDS.
p.83 - Nanomaterials Comment: We are in favor to exclude nanomaterials. - -	Acknowledged
p.81 – All skin sensitizing substances Comment: It should be investigated whether the criteria could exclude any substance classified as skin sensitizing. Suggested Actions: Considering the health angle and the possibility for EUEL detergents to be sold via refill stations, it would be desirable to exclude any skin sensitizing substance from EUEL detergents. Rationale: The revised CLP mandates that hazardous substances or mixtures shall not be provided at a refill station if the criteria for classification as "Skin sensitisation, any category" are met. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CONSIL:ST_5280_2024_INIT (p.67)	Rejected. The EUEL criteria, already has provisions to avoid the product being considered as skin sensitizer and restrict the use of substances under such denomination to the necessary ones. In its The *Hazardous Substances* in its clause *(i) Final* Product already bans the final formulation as being H317. Additionally, there are many necessary ingredients that have an H317 classification (e.g. Enzymes) – yet generally their use is restricted.
p.84, 85 –Endocrine Disruptors Comment: Exclusion of endocrine disruptors: BASF agrees that substances identified to have endocrine disruptor properties can pose a risk for human health and/or environment but we do not support the proposal to exclude also the "potential ED´s" which are not clearly define. We call for the deletion of potential ED´s in the list of excluded substances. (see rational) Suggested action: exclude only identified Endocrine disruptors, not the "potential" still under assessment. Rationale: Exclusion of endocrine disruptors: Whereas the list of "defined ED´s" is clear and the substances already evaluated, the substances "considered to be potential ED in Category 1 or 2 on the EU's priority list of substances" cannot currently be assigned without further information on what the "EU's priority list" refers to. For the time being, we only consider the implementation for the "Substances identified to have ED properties" to be regulatory binding. In case of the EU's priority list mentioned refers to the ECHA's endocrine disruptor (ED) assessment list, this list includes the substances undergoing an ED assessment that have been brought for discussion to ECHA's ED Expert Group. An ECHA disclaimer explicitly states: The information and views set out in the ED assessment list and in the hazard assessment outcome	Accepted: The JRC proposes excluding substances classified as Endocrine Disruptors in Category 1 (Known or Presumed EDs) and Category 2 (Suspected EDs). In 2023, endocrine disruption was incorporated into the CLP Regulation as a hazard class with two categories: — Category 1: Known or presumed endocrine disruptors for human health (ED HH 1) and environment (ED ENV 1). — Category 2: Suspected endocrine disruptors for human health (ED HH 2) and environment (ED ENV 2). Substances in Category 2 are defined as endocrine disruptors with sufficient but weaker evidence compared to Category 1. Classification in Category 2 may also result from

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
documents are those of the evaluating authority and do not necessarily reflect the position or opinion of the other Member States or ECHA. Therefore, we see a high risk of banning substances at an early stage which may finally be found to have no ED adverse effect. Finally, the EU Ecolabel for cosmetic (EU) 2021/1870 only prohibit the substances "identified to have ED properties", not those under assessment. A more precise definition of what is meant with "potential ED in Category 1 or 2 on the EU's priority list" is needed.	inconclusive data preventing Category 1 classification, but current data supporting Category 2. No reference is proposed to other lists, such as ECHA's ED assessment list, as these assessments reflect the evaluating authority's views, not necessarily ECHA or Member States, and hold no legal value. The outcomes of substances in the assessment list are uncertain, and conclusions on potential endocrine disruption properties could be negative.
p.83,88-89 – Endocrine Disruptors Comment: The text proposed the exclusion of both the "identified", i.e. known and presumed EDs (category 1) and the "potential", i.e. suspected EDs (category 2): whereas known substances are clearly listed, it is not clear which substances are meant to be "potential ED´s". Also, under the EU Ecolabel for cosmetics such potential ED´s are not mentioned. Exclusion should be limited to those substances which have been clearly identified as having an ED effect. - -	
p.88 – Endocrine Disruptors Comment: The text proposed the exclusion of both the "identified", i.e. known and presumed EDs (category 1) and the "potential", i.e. suspected EDs (category 2): whereas known substances are clearly listed, it is not clear which substances are meant to be "potential EDs". Also, under the EU Ecolabel for cosmetics such potential ED´s are not mentioned. Exclusion should be limited to those substances which have been clearly identified as having an ED effect.	
p.83 – Endocrine disruptors Comment: In the section ALL of the table concerning the excluded substances, could it be possible to add the link to the lists of endocrine disruptors ? As an end note or link – Suggested action: Suggestion to add those links in the table : https://echa.europa.eu/hot-topics/endocrine-disruptors https://edlists.org/the-ed-lists -	Accepted – currently, the legal text cites relevant legislation, being CLP the most relevant. Links are provided to these legislation.
p.81 Endocrine Disruptors Comment: Question: For ED there is a reference to class 1 and 2. How is this linked to the 3 official EU lists (List I, List II and List III)? Fragrance. I am in favour of every restriction for the use of fragrances in ecolabelled products. I would like to suggest the total exclusion of the use of fragrances in all detergents. Fragrances don't add anything to the function or performance of the product, but contributes to environmental and health issues. I cannot support any derogations to fragrances. Fragrances have no effect on the detergents cleaning performance and are so by default unnecessary chemicals in ecolabelled products.	Acknowledged (EDs) – In principle, it would correspond to List I. For full details see TR2 Rationale. Acknowledged /Rejected (Fragrances) – your position about fragrances is noted but note that fragrances have not been totally excluded in current proposal (TR2). No derogation is proposed to be granted to any fragrance. Acknowledged /Partially accepted (Colouring agents) – The JRC is proposing banning the use of colorants for non-

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
With regards to derogations, it might be relevant to recall Article 6 (7) in the EU Ecolabel regulation: "*For specific categories of goods containing substances referred to in paragraph 6, and only in the event that it is not technically feasible to substitute them as such, or via the use of alternative materials or designs, or in the case of products which have a significantly higher overall environment performance compared with other goods of the same category, the Commission may adopt measures to grant derogations from paragraph 6*" So derogations are relevant only if a chemical cannot be technically substituted and the absence has a clear negative impact on the environment. Coloring agents. Should be excluded from ecolabelled products since they do not have a function.	professional products, since in this last case (professionals) they normally/could have a safety role
p.81 On excluded substances: phosphonic acid derivatives Comment: We believe the ban of phosphonates is a good step and endorse the proposal.	Acknowledged – However, note that the ban of phosphoric acid derivatives and their salts. is no longer maintained in this TR2 proposal. Please, see TR2 rationale for full details.
p.93 - On excluded substances: phosphonic acid derivatives Comment: We support to exclude phosphonic derivatives and their salts. Suggested action: We support the JRC's proposal to exclude phosphonic acids. Rationale: Since the Blue Angel already excludes phosphonic acids, it should also be feasible to implement under the EU Ecolabel.	Rejected –Note that the ban of phosphoric acid derivatives and their salts. is no longer maintained in this TR2 proposal. The main arguments focus on the technical difficulty for substitution and also given their environmental performance. However, the JRC is proposing to significantly lowering the threshold of phosphorus content. Please, see TR2 rationale for full details.
p.87 – On excluded substances: phosphonic acid derivatives Comment: We found very few Blue Angel detergent products, whereas EUEL counts a few hundreds. We are concerned that the exclusion of phosphonates will severely impact the number of EUEL in all detergents groups, and confuse end consumers. Suggested actions: please, no exclusion of alkyl phosphonic acid dervitaoves and their salts, and limited restriction on total P content (max 15%). -	Partially accepted – based on the evidences gathered so far, the JRC is no longer proposing the exclusion of alkyl phosphoric acid derivatives and their salts. However, the JRC is proposing to significantly lowering the threshold of phosphorus content. Please, see TR2 rationale for full details.
p.83 – alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives Comment: Alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives: we suggest not banning alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives but instead imposing limits. Alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives are still widely used in the industry, and a complete ban would lead to certain products being phased out of Ecolabel registration. We understand motivation behind it (ex. limitation of eutrophication) but worry about the alternates. Common alternates to reach similar performance (par example complexing water hardness) are less effective and often also not degradable. That leads to an	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
increase of substances which are not degradable and reaching of the threshold and decrease of performance at same time	
p.83 – alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives Comment: We suggest not banning alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives but instead imposing limits. Alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives are still widely used in the industry, and a complete ban would lead to certain products being phased out of Ecolabel registration.	
p.84 – alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives Comment: The exclusion of alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives and their salts is not favorable. Rationale: Phosphonates have a beneficial effect on the washing performance in case of for example high water hardness levels. The available alternatives do not offer the same performance level, even at higher dosages. This can cause a decrease in wash performance or higher rewash rate, leading to a higher use of chemicals and increased impact on the environment.	
p.85 – - alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives Comment: We propose not to exclude alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives and their salts from detergents until a reliable and economically viable alternative is found. The sector is not ready and requires more time. Suggested actions: no exclusion of alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives and their salts please Rationale: Phosphonates, or alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives (e.g. ATMP, HEDP, DTPMP) and their salts, are essential components of LD, DD, HSC and HDD. The combination of properties they offer remains unmatched by any other chemical. Phosphonates is an all-in-one chemical, there is to date no single alternatives offering together: 1/ the complexation property 2/ the anti-scaling property 3/ the ability to disperse insoluble metals 4/ corrosion inhibition on metal surfaces These properties are essential in detergents to - Prevent mineral deposits (for example, scale) in washing machines and dishwashers, and on the clothes and tableware being washed. Phosphonates modify the properties of calcium and magnesium salt deposits in hard water, which stops these deposits from adhering to surfaces. This increases the lifespan of the machine and maintains the eco-efficiency of the appliance - Reduce re-deposition of dirt on cleaned textiles - Stabilise peroxide bleaches - Contribute to the removal of stains in bleach-free detergents - Protect the fragrances and natural (bio-derived) ingredients in detergents from oxidation - Prevent colours from fading. The potential combination of chemical additives needed to fulfil these properties is not yet available. It will have to be stable, and the additives must not produce unwanted side chemical reactions. In addition, such additives will have to have a better tox/ecotox profile than alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives and their salts.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.83 and p.93 – lines 1557-58 - alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives, specifically: *"The substances indicated below shall not be included in the product regardless of concentration, neither as part of the formulation, as part of any mixture included in the formulation, nor as impurities:""- Phosphate""- Alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives (e.g. ATMP, HEDP, DTPMP) and their salts"* Comment: We suggest the following: 1) Laundry Detergent (LD) : the Nordic Swan Ecolabelling and Ecolabel exemption applied for IILD should be applicable for LD too: An exemption should be mentioned for phosphate, as it exists today for IILD : "phosphates used to stabilize H2O2 are allowed in concentration < 0.01%w/w in the final product". 2) We suggest adding the same derogation for alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives for IILD and LD. Regarding the Phosphorus restrictions (1799/1800) "Nordic Swan prohibits the use of phosphate in industrial and institutional detergent products (IILD and IIDD), with an exemption for those used to stabilize H2O2 (allowed in concentrations < 0.0100 w-% in the final products) in the case of IILD. " We suggest to apply the same approach for laundry detergents (LD).Moreover, the new amendment repealing Detergent Regulation (EC) No.648/2004 (Proposal for a regulation (COM(2023)0217 – C9-0154/2023 – 2023/0124(COD)) and especially its new article 6 (1b), or its Amendment 53, should be introduced in both revised Decisions 2017/1218 & 2017/1219 for ECOLABEL : "The unintentional presence in surfactants and detergents of phosphates and other phosphorus compounds that stems from impurities of ingredients, from the manufacturing process or storage or from migration from packaging, shall be tolerated if that presence is technically unavoidable in good manufacturing practice and, notwithstanding such presence, those surfactants and detergents are safe". - -	Rejected- the JRC is no longer proposing the exclusion of alkyl phosphoric acid derivatives and their salts, which is the main reason for rejection of the suggestion made. However, it noted the comments shared for consideration.

Responses to Q23 about a proposed exclusion list for additional substances (16 comments)

Referring to a list of 12 substances or substance groups that are explicitly excluded in Blue Angel and Nordic Swan ecolabel criteria, Question 23 asks: "Would you support the exclusion of any of the substances reported in the list of "additional substances" from the EU Ecolabel for detergents?"

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.90 - Line 1672-1673 - Question 23: Comment: No we do not support the exclusion of any of the substances. - -	Acknowledged – note the JRC has not concluded investigations with regards to these substances, so no proposal is made at this stage (TR2) yet all feedback was noted and considered for the purposes of the additional research.
p.90-96 – Line 1672 – 1673- Question 23 Comment: We would support following substances to be excluded: - Methyldibromo glutaronitrile- Phthalates- BHT (butylated hydroxytoluene- Benzalkonium chloride-34 bisphenols- Halogenated flame retardants- DADMAC- Benzotriazole and benzotriazole derivatives- Parabens- Butylphenyl Methylpropional (2-(4-tert-Butylbenzyl)propionaldehyde; Lysmeral; Lilial	
p.81-96 - Question 23 Comment: Would you support the exclusion of any of the substances reported in the list of "additional substances" from the EU Ecolabel for detergents? Yes	
p.90 - Question 23 Comment: oui je suis favorable au rajout des substances signalées. *Machine translation: yes I am in favor of adding the substances indicated.*	
p.90 – Question 23 Comment: We have no problem with that.	
p.90 - Question 23 Comment: I agree with the proposal. - -	
p.90 – Question 23 Comment: I'm sorry, we haven't received any feedback of our LH about these additional substances.	
p.81 – Question 23 Comment: We support	
p. – Question 23: Comment: not supportive of the exclusion of additional substances - -	
p.94 – Question 23 comment: VOCs restrictions: against restricting/banning these substances: Hexyl salicylate, Sodium laureth sulphate, Sodium lauryl sulphate - -	
p.82 – Question 23: Comment: We are in favor of the exclusion of substances listed in "additional substances list" from the JRC.We would like to warn you on the hexyl salicylate, we have had several alerts	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
concerning this substance. Indeed, the hexyl salicylate seems to have a health risk, causing allergies and damaging foetal development. ANSES (The French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety) has proposed to the ECHA (European Chemicals Agency) to classify this substance under the CLP Regulation (Regulation on Classification, Labelling and Packaging). If the ANSES proposal is adopted, products containing hexyl salicylate will have to carry the words: - "May cause skin allergy; category 1 (H317)" - Suspected of harming the foetus; category 2 (H361d) The commission has asked the SCCS (Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety) to carry out a safety analysis on this substance. The SCCS opinion released the 11th March 2024, concludes that hexyl salicylate is safe when used up to a certain maximum concentrations. The Applicant did not provide any specific scenarios for children applying cosmetic products on their skin (dermal exposure), and there were no differences between age categories. (source: 17f43404-596c-4b87-a74a-cd1ea68ef17a_en (europa.eu)) No decision regarding hexyl salicylate has yet been taken by the commission but we would like to keep it in mind for the revision of criterion. We propose to exclude limonene and linalool substances. Indeed,, a test realised in 2019 on 25 detergents and carried out by UFC Que Choisir highlighted that detergents were labelled "hypoallergenic", "sensitive skin", or "dermatologically tested" while analyses reveal the presence of fragrances classified as allergens such as limonene and linalool.	
p.90 – Question 23 Comment: Yes, we support the exclusion of all listed additional substances. – Suggested actions: Ban all additional substances proposed by the JRC in the list of banned substances. Ban in addition Borates and Perborates. – Rationale: These additional substances are already banned in other ecolabels, as explained in the TR. It is generally desirable to align when other ecolabels have a higher ambition. The existence of these bans in Nordic Swan, Blue Angel & Co shows that it is feasible to exclude these substances. Many of these substances are also in the focus of consumer organisations and environmental NGOs and products containing these receive bad rating in their product tests. Organic chlorine compounds, hypochlorites and hypochlorous acid are used as disinfecting/antibacterial substances and bleach. They contribute to AOX in water which is linked to persistent halogenated and toxic organic chemicals. We therefore propose to add this substance. Methyldibromo glutaronitrile. A preservative – 35691-65-7; According to the background document of Nordic Swan (025) MG (CAS 35691-65-7) it is a highly allergenic substance.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Studies show it to be so allergenic that it can cause allergic reactions even when present in products that are washed off immediately. According to the classification provided by companies to ECHA in CLP notifications this substance is fatal if inhaled, is very toxic to aquatic life, is very toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects, causes severe skin burns and eye damage, is harmful if swallowed, causes serious eye damage, causes skin irritation and may cause an allergic skin reaction. We therefore propose to add this substance. Phtalates: many phthalates have endocrine disrupting properties and show reproductive toxicity. They may be present in fragrances according to the PR by the JRC. According to the background report of Nordic Swan (025) phthalates are judged not to be relevant for the product group and are not included on the list of prohibited substances. However, they are restricted via other requirements due to their undesirable properties. For example, many phthalates, halogenated solvents and so on can be found on the SVHC list. To be clear these substances could be added in a separate criterion. BHT butylated hydroxytoluene 128-37-0: a synthetic antioxidant that helps maintain the properties and performance of products when exposed to air and is widely used in cosmetics. The European Union regulation (EU) Nr. 2022/2195 (2023) restricts the use of BHT in mouthwash to 0.001% concentration, in toothpaste 0.1% concentration, and to 0.8% in other cosmetics. According to the classification provided by companies to ECHA in REACH registrations this substance is very toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects and is very toxic to aquatic life. It is under assessment as Endocrine Disrupting (ED list). According to Nordic Swan (025) BHT (butylated hydroxytoluene, CAS 128-37-0) is classified by some as muta., carc., repr., and it is thus excluded via its hazard classification, but for clarity it also remains there on the list of prohibited substances. The EU Ecolabel criteria for cosmetics already exclude BHT. Benzalkonium chloride is classified H302, H312, H314 and H400. The following description is provided by ECHA: “According to the EU harmonized classification and labelling (CLP00) approved, this substance causes serious skin burns and eye damage, is highly toxic to aquatic organisms, is harmful if swallowed and is harmful by skin contact”. According to Nordic Swan (080) Benzalkonium chloride is also associated with bacterial resistance. Bisphenols: many of these substances have endocrine disrupting properties. Germany had submitted a restriction proposal for many bisphenols under REACH. Please refer to the EEB response in favour of a restriction: https://eeb.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/EEB-CE-RP-comments-bisphenols-Jan-23-3792.pdf Halogenated flame retardants: These substances are persistent and of course relevant in general for health and the environment (carcinogenic, toxic to aquatic organisms). According to	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Nordic Swan (093) flame retardants may occur at laundries, since specialist textiles impregnated with flame retardants usually must be re-treated to retain their flame-retardant properties, and this may be done at a laundry. Therefore we recommend to prohibit halogenated flame retardants. DADMAC: The background report of the Nordic Swan states that DADMAC (dialkyldimethylammonium chloride) encompasses a group of cationic surfactants with very high ecotoxicity, slow aerobic biodegradability and no anaerobic biodegradability (there is little data on this), which is why DADMAC is undesirable and prohibited Nordic swan 080. However, no source is given. We recommend investigating this information further. Benzotriazole and benzotriazole derivatives: According to the classification provided by companies to ECHA in REACH registrations this substance is toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects, causes serious eye irritation, is harmful if swallowed and causes skin irritation (ECHA). Therefore we recommend to prohibit these substances. Parabens: According to the classification provided by companies to ECHA in REACH registrations this substance is toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects, causes serious eye irritation, is harmful if swallowed and causes skin irritation. Allergenic properties are not clear; endocrine disrupting properties are likely. As a minimum, parabens already banned in the EU Cosmetics Regulation should also be banned in EU Ecolabel detergents. Formic acid: According to the harmonised classification and labelling (CLP00) approved by the European Union, this substance causes severe skin burns and eye damage. In the Blue Anges the substance is only allowed up to a total concentration in the end product of 0.50 % free acids. The EU Ecolabel could follow this requirement. Borates and perborates (on page 150 of the TR): these substances are not (yet) in the list of additional substances and are not explicitly prohibited as substances because they are SVHCs. Perborates are sometimes used as bleaching agents. Many perborates are classified as toxic for reproduction. Nordic Ecolabelling listed these as prohibited. However they are already excluded because they are SVHCs. (Borates, and perborates are classified as toxic to reproduction. They are included in the SVHCs list and in accordance with the Ecolabel Regulation (EC) No 66/2010 they cannot be use in ecolabel products). To be clear we recommend to prohibit Borates and Perborates. Butylphenyl Methylpropional (2-(4-tert-Butylbenzyl)propionaldehyde; Lysmeral; Lilial: Butylphenyl methylpropional is a suspected endocrine disruptors and also suspected of harming fertility and the unborn child. Lillal is toxic to reproduction (category 1B) and is banned in cosmetics.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.84, 85, 92, 93, 98 – Comment: No, we do not support the exclusion of the substances listed under "additional substances" (either not relevant or not justified). We would like to note that formic acid was granted a derogation under blue angel to use 0,5% in the final product. (see also comment on preservation).	Acknowledged. We are considering whether formic acid should be explicitly allowed in EU Ecolabel products due to its relatively "good" hazard profile. Targeted questions are shared with stakeholders to assess feasibility and in which form.
p.82-86 - Question 23 Comment: Would you support the exclusion of any of the substances reported in the list of 'additional substances' 1672 from the EU Ecolabel for detergents? We support the exclusion of the substances in the list. Moreover, we would be in support also to add 1,2-Benzisothiazol-3(2H)-one in the list of excluded substances. - -	Rejected. We are already excluding MIT and CMIT/MIT, so it is important to continue to allow BIT to keep isothiazoline action as an option for formulators to vary their preservation strategies and help reduce the risk of microbial resistance developing (if using only the same preservative(s) all the time). BIT is considered as less sensitising than MIT and CMIT/MIT as well.
p.92 – Question 23 Comment: Exclusion of substances from the list of additional substances that are currently excluded in Blue Angel and Nordic Swan, and are not in EU Ecolabek - yes Adding MIT to the list of excluded substances - NO it should be allowed to be present in raw materials, since raw materials are preserved with various preservatives, reducing the number of preservatives used will lead to microbial resistance and may cause more infections, which will be a greater threat to the consumer than the minimal amount of MIT coming from raw materials. In addition, cosmetic products cannot be compared with detergents in the context of the bans. Detergents are more diverse, including in terms of pH value, which determines the use of certain preservatives. - -	Rejected. We maintain MIT exclusion in the TR2 butallow the use BIT and OIT in limited quantities.
p.91 - Line 1697 Comment: please add and HDD after LD and before products	Acknowledged

Responses to Q24 and Q25 about the exclusion of isothiazolines (27 comments)

Responses to both Q24 and Q25 are taken together because they are both about the topic of excluding isothiazoline preservatives. Q24 is about two specific isolthiazolines and Q25 is about the whole family of isothiazoline compounds.

Question 24 asks: "Do you agree with the exclusion of MIT and CMIT/MIT from all EU Ecolabel detergent product groups?".

While Question 25 asks: "Would you agree with the complete exclusion of isothiazolinones from all detergent product groups?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.91 - Line 1724-1725 - Question 24 Comment on Q24: No, we do not agree to the exclusion of CIT/MIT from all EU Ecolabel detergent product group. CIT/MIT still is one of the top three preservatives used in cleaning applications (2022 AISE survey). Based on the limited number of preservatives available that are efficient at a broad pH range and at the same time compliant with BPR, we don´t think that CIT/MIT should be excluded. - - Comment on Q25: No, we do not agree to the exclusion of isothiazolines from all EU Ecolabel detergent product group. Three Isothiazolines are in the top 5 of preservatives used in cleaning applications (2022 AISE survey). Based on the limited number of preservatives available that are efficient at a broad pH range and at the same time compliant with BPR, we don´t think that isothiazolines should be excluded.	Rejected. We believe that still allowing BIT is a suitable compromise while restricted the more sensitising isothiazolines (MIT and CMIT/MIT).
p.91 – Line 1724 – 1725 – Question 24 and 25 Comment on Q24: we agree Comment on Q25: we agree	Acknowledged. However, note that we are proposing to continue allowing BIT to maintain different preservation strategies both for the final product and in the supplied ingredients.
p.91 – Question 24 Comment: If it is decided to exclude the MIT and the CMIT/MIT from the EU Ecolabel detergents, then it would be interesting to include the CMIT/MIT in the excluded substances in order to avoid confusion. - -	Accepted. This proposal has been incorporated into the new proposals for TR2 and helps make the requirement clearer.
p.91 – Question 24 Comment: MIT and mixtures of CMIT/ MIT should not be banned from all products groups. – Suggested actions: Keep the requirement of a maximum concentration for MIT. Exclude CMIT for all product groups Rationale: The mixture of MIT and BIT has a synergistic effect and the active spectra complement each other. This means that significantly lower quantities of preservative can be used. The mixture can be used universally in a wide pH range without any problems. When used in the IILD process, there is generally no skin contact with the preserved product. The washed product contains only extremely small quantities. 2-Phenoxyethanol does not have such a broad spectrum of activity and requires significantly higher dosages. It is therefore often used in combination with other preservatives, e.g. MIT, BIT, formaldehyde releasers, parabens or quaternary ammonium compounds. A ban only makes sense in applications with direct skin contact.	Acknowledged. We appreciate the specific reasoning although MIT and CMIT/MIT remain banned in the TR2 proposal. While skin sensitisation is the main hazard of concern, these substances have many other restricted hazards related to mammalian and aquatic toxicity that are also a concern independently of skin contact exposures.
p.81-96 - Question 24 and 25	Acknowledged. a derogation for BIT is perhaps actually not needed because the permitted limit for BIT of 0,005% is still

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment on Q24: Yes, but we still need a derogation/threshold authorisation for the BIT because it enables us to preserve certain raw materials, particularly enzymes. Comment on Q25: No, see above.	less than the horizontal hazardous substance limit of 0,010%. So this is why it is included in the specific RESTRICTIONS section (and not the EXCLUSIONS section). These percentage limits always apply at the level of the final detergent product. So even higher quantities of BIT could potentially be used in supplied ingredients.
p.91 –Question 25 Comment: BIT: support keeping BIT as an allowed substance - -	Accepted. This is still the case in the TR2 proposals.
p.90 – Questions 24 and 25 Comment: While we are agreeable to excluding MIT and CIT/MIT, we suggest not banning all Isothiazolinone preservatives. The industry needs to retain some choice in preservative options. - -	Accepted. BIT is still permitted in the TR2 proposals (as is OIT up to its H317 classification threshold of 0.0015%).
p.91 – Question 25 Comment: Comment from the Association of Manufacturers and Formulators of Enzyme Products (AMFEP): Q 25: We would support a similar approach as with the concentration limits in line 1719 - 1720. It is currently difficult to remove isothiazolinones completely from all product types and incoming products. The approach with the thresholds should provide sufficient safety to consumers. Suggested Action: AMFEP rejects a complete exclusion of isothiazolinones from all detergent product groups. Instead of a an exclusion, the criteria could specify a concentration limit in the formulation, as is currently the case with benzisothiazolinone (BIT). - It should be noted that there are few preservatives left on the market. All of them differ from a technical application perspective. A concentration limit is therefore preferable to an exclusion.	Partially rejected. BIT (and indirectly OIT) is still permitted in the TR2 proposals.
p. 92 – Questions 24 and 25 Comment on Q24: Rather than exclude MIT and all isothiazolinone it is important to allow alternative. MIT and CMI/MIT should not be excluded but restricted to concentration that have been proven to be safe in the evaluation of the BPR dossier. Comment on Q25: Also isothiazolinones should not be completely excluded. Many of the alternative preservative suggested during the 1st AHWG are not suitable for some or all detergent application: Sodium benzoate/ sodium sorbate are active in their acidic form (pH> 6), which is not suitable for most detergents. Lactic acid does not show sufficient activity. Sodium Pyrithione is a skin sensitizer and therefore do not pass the EU Ecolabel criteria. DBNPA is under assessment as endocrine disruptor (would be forbidden as potential ED). Glyceryl Laurate & essential oils are not approved as preservative for these applications.	Rejected/Acknowledged. We appreciate the additional details regarding potential alternative preservatives. We would like to highlight that submitting a derogation request is an option if you think an alternative BPR approved biocidal active substance would need to be used in levels exceeding 0,010% in the final product,. Additionally, a targeted question has been raised about whether or not formic acid should be explicitly allowed up to a certain extent (as well as other preservatives like EGForm,

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested action: Align permitted preservative with the substance evaluation/ approved under BPR, no matter whether these substances fulfill the EU Ecolabel criteria or not: Preservatives are regulated under the BPR and should be considered independently. Rationale: Almost all preservatives do not meet the EU Ecolabel criteria due to their hazard classifications. However, since they are regulated under BPR and are officially tested and approved under this legislation, the substances that have been approved for PT6 should be allowed to be used. Both formic acid and glutaraldehyde are already approved. Formic acid: Formic acid is approved as a biocide under the BPR for use in detergents. A risk assessment with a 5% deployment concentration is available and accepted by the authorities. In addition, the H331 label is omitted for 75% formic acid, which makes it difficult to interpret this criterion. Glutaraldehyde: The substance has been authorized under BPR as a biocide for use in detergents since 2014. A risk assessment is available: 979 ppm is approved for this use under BPR. This value applies to both the input material and the final product (preservation for detergents including detergents). In our opinion, there is therefore no reason to exclude the substance from the Blue Angel. In addition, the use of glutaraldehyde is accepted in the Nordic Ecolabel for paper.	and (benzyloxy)methanol – due to their better hazard profiles than other preservatives.
p.90 – Question 25 Comment on Q25: Isothiazolinones can be used for surfactant preservation. Many alternative preservatives are prohibited due to their C&L, even when they are approved under BPR for use in detergents. Furthermore, isothiazolinines can guarantee a good product preservation. If they are banned and only few other preservatives can be used, then microbial resistance could increase. The concentration cannot be further reduced.	Acknowledged. To be discussed in the 2nd meeting. The idea of banning MIT and CMIT in the supply chain sends a clear signal, but surfactant suppliers need to state that they can do this. MIT and CMIT are not universally banned by Nordic Swan or Blue Angel.
p.90 – Question 24 and 25 We strongly support exclusion of MIT and isothiazolinones for all detergent groups. It seems that it is permissible to exclude them altogether as effective alternatives are available. Moreover MIT or BIT are classified as H317 and responsible for many cases skin allergy in detergent products. The criteria will be valid until at least 2032 and these substances are strongly attacked by consumer associations, e.g. https://www.60millions-mag.com/2019/05/10/le-guide-des-lessives-ecolos-13323 , therefore, keeping them in the European Detergents Ecolabels would harm the exemplary image targeted by the European Ecolabel, especially since there are viable alternatives. One industrial points out that isothiazolinones have been totally banned from formulas for 21 years without having any problem of conservation.	Partially accepted. We will continue to ban MIT and CMIT/MIT, but also to allow BIT at a very low level (0,005%) which is well below its proposed threshold of skin sensitisation (0,036%).

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.91. Question 24 and 25: Comment: We have no problem with that. We have great preservatives alternatives free of isothiazolinones	Acknowledged.
p.91. Question 24 and 25: Comment: Yes, isothiazolinones have been completely banned from our formulas for 21 years and we have no conservation problems. CMIT/MIT, MIT or BIT are classified H317 and responsible of many cases of skin allergy in detergents. It makes sense for us to completely eliminate them from ECOLABEL detergent products as there are effective alternatives available.	Acknowledged. However, we still propose in this TR2 that at least BIT can be used up to 50 ppm to maintain a range of preservation strategies.
p.90-91 Question 24 and 25: Comment: Isothiazolinones can be used for surfactant preservation. Many alternative preservatives are prohibited due to their C&L, even when they are approved under BPR for use in detergents. Furthermore, isothiazolinines can guarantee a good product preservation. If they are banned and only few other preservatives can be used, then microbial resistance could increase. The concentration cannot be further reduced. Phenoxyethanol may be an alternative to isothiazolinones but if it is the only remaining preservative to be used in formulation with Ecolabels, it will increase the development of new resistance. - -	Acknowledged. It is partly for this reason that we continue to propose the allowance of BIT at least up to 0,005%.
p.93 – Question 24 and 25: Comment: We do not oppose the proposal to exclude MIT and CIT/MIT from all detergent groups with the EU Ecolabel, but we would not want this exclusion to apply to all isothiazolinones. We support the current proposal to maintain the existing requirements for BIT, which include a limitation of 0.005% w/w concentration in the formulation. However, it should be allowed to be present in raw materials, since raw materials are preserved with various preservatives, limiting the number of preservatives used will lead to microbial resistance and may cause more infections, which will be a greater threat to the consumer than the minimal amount of MIT coming from the raw material.	Partially accepted. We continue with the proposal on isothiazolines in the final product as you suggested.
p.91 – Question 24 and 25: Comment: We agree with the proposal to exclude MIT and CIT/MIT from all EU Ecolabel detergent product groups but would not like to see this exclusion be applied to all Isothiazolinones. We are in favour of the current proposal to maintain the existing requirements for BIT which includes limiting the concentration in the formulation to 0.005 % w/w.	Accepted. This is in line with the TR2 proposals.
p.91 – – Question 24 and 25: Comment: Yes, we agree. Suggested actions: We support the exclusion of MIT and CMIT/MIT.	Accepted. This is in line with the TR2 proposals.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Rationale: This would be consistent with the recent EU Ecolabel criteria for cosmetics and absorbent hygiene products. Many consumer organisations test for the presence of isothiasolinones in consumer products including detergents and warn consumers where it is present in the test results. Since alternatives exist, it is appropriate to ban these classified preservatives.	
p.92 - Question 24 and 25 comment Q24: Yes comment Q25: YES	Acknowledged. Although we keep BIT as an allowed preservative up to 0,005% in the final product.
p.91 – Question 24 and 25: Comment on Q24: Agree Comment on Q25: Agree Rationale: I agree with the exclusion of isothiazolinones and their derivatives from all groups of detergent products because phenoxyethanol is a good substitute because it has low bioaccumulation potential and ready biodegradable under aerobic conditions. However, on the 2023 DID List this compound was not tested for anaerobic degradation. So, the derogation provided for this type of compounds should be maintained	
p.91 – Question 25 Comment: We do not agree on the complete exclusion of isothianlinones from all detergent product groups. Rationale: There are less and less preservatives available on EU market. Therefore we agree on the approach with the concentration limits in Line 1719 - 1720. It is currently difficult to remove isothiazolinones completely from all product types and incoging products.	Acknowledged. This is why we continue to allow BIT up to 0,005% in the TR2 proposal.
p.90 - Question 24 Comment: No, because it is a preservative that works very well at low dosages and at gives excellent performance.	Rejected. We have continued with the proposal to exclude MIT and CMIT/MIT in TR2 because other stakeholders have supported the availability of less sensitising alternatives (including BIT).
p.90 – Question 24 Comment: We strongly support exclusion of MIT and isothiazolinones for all detergent groups. Rationale: It appears that it is permissible to completely exclude them as effective alternatives are readily available. Furthermore, MIT or BIT are classified as H317 and are responsible for numerous cases of skin allergies in detergent products. The criteria will remain valid until at least 2032, and these substances are strongly criticized by consumer associations,	Partially accepted. We propose in TR2 to ban MIT and CMIT/MIT, but we continue to allow BIT in order to keep some different preservation strategies open for formulators.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
for example, at https://www.60millions-mag.com/2019/05/10/le-guide-des-lessives-ecolos-13323 . Therefore, retaining them in the EU Ecolabel for detergents products would tarnish the exemplary image sought by the EU Ecolabel, especially since viable alternatives exist. - -	
p.90 – Question 24 and 25 Comment on Q24: We agree Comment on Q25: We agree	Acknowledged. Although we keep BIT as an allowed preservative up to 0,005% in the final product.
p. – Question 24-25: Comment: disagree on isothiazolinones& - -	
Question 24-25 Comment: Our experience is positive to an overall exclusion of all isothiazolinones, including no derogations for any isothiazolinone! The experiences from the Nordic Swan are that alternatives exist, e.g. phenoxyethanol.	Acknowledged, but we need to be aware of more difficult preservation owing to climate/geographical conditions (for example in hotter countries). Partly for this reason we continue to propose BIT to be used in limited quantities. The other reason is the importance of having more choice in preservation combinations, aiding in tackling antimicrobial resistance.

Responses to Q26 about phenoxyethanol as an isothiazoline substitute (17 comments)

Question 26 asks: "Phenoxyethanol does not have any EU Ecolabel restricted hazards. Do you believe that phenoxyethanol could serve as a viable alternative to isothiazolinones? If not, why?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.91 - Line 1728-1729 Question 26 Comment: Phenoxyethanol has not yet been approved as active substance under the BPR. So far, only transitional measures apply to phenoxyethanol products used as preservatives. Nevertheless, phenoxyethanol is stable at a broad pH range and in the top 2 of preservatives used in the cleaning industry (2022 AISE survey). - -	Acknowledged. Thank you for this information as it is useful to be aware of the "popularity" of phenoxyethanol.
p.91 - Line1728 – 1729 – Question 26 Comment: yes	Acknowledged.
p.81-96 - Question 26 Comment: No, because it's optimal pH range of use is between 4 and 5 (like sodium benzoate for example, which is biodegradable under anaerobic conditionfor s). Isothiazolinones are widely used in formulations with a pH comprise between 5 and 8.	Acknowledged.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.90 – Question 26 Q26: We would like to share that some studies have pointed the safety of phenoxyethanol, particularly its use in baby products: - European Scientific Committee for Consumer Safety: Opinion on phenoxyethanol, SCCS/1575/16, October 2016: https://hal.archivesouvertes.fr/hal-01493557/document Cosmetic Ingredient Review: Phenoxyethanol assessment report from 1990, re-evaluated in 2011: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.3109/10915819009078737 One industrial doesn't think that phenoxyethanol could serve as a viable alternative to isothiazolinones because it's optimal pH range of use is between 4 and 5 (like sodium benzoate for example, which is biodegradable under anaerobic conditions). Isothiazolinones are widely used in formulations with a pH comprise between 5 and 8.	
p.91 - Question 26 Comment: Nous utilisons pas cette technologie au sein de notre société, je ne peux donc pas me prononcer sur ce sujet. *Machine translation: We do not use this technology within our company, so I cannot comment on this subject.*	Acknowledged.
p.91 Question 26 Comment: Some studies have questioned the safety of phenoxyethanol especially on the use in baby products. Indeed, there is still no clear position. So we are divided on this ingredient and have an opened opinion. - -	Acknowledged.
p.91 – Question 26 Comment: Comment from the Association of Manufacturers and Formulators of Enzyme Products (AMFEP) Q26: We believe that phenoxyethanol is a viable alternative to isothiazolinenes. Ingoing ingredients like enzymes in liquid formulations need to be preserved otherwise enzymes are quickly biodegraded. Nevertheless, AMFEP considers that all currently available preservatives, including isothiazolinones, should be allowed according to the criteria for cleaning products, as there are few left on the market, and they differ from a technical application perspective. Suggested action: All currently available preservatives, including isothiazolinones, should be allowed according to the criteria for cleaning products, as there are few left on the market, and they all differ from a technical application perspective. - Ingoing ingredients like enzymes in liquid formulations need to be preserved otherwise enzymes are quickly biodegraded. Phenoxyethanol is a very gentle preservation agenda without a problematic classification in the	Acknowledged. It is partly for this reason that we continue to propose in this TR2 the allowance of BIT but up to 0,005%.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
CLP Regulation. it is also used in detergent formulations to avoid more harmful preservation agents like isothiazolinones. In addition there are only limited options to preserve detergents with substances listed as PT6 in the biocidal product regulation.	
p.92 – Question 26 Comment on Q26: Phenoxyethanol (PE) is more or less the only preservative that does not fall under one or the other criteria of the EU Ecolabel. It is for sure an alternative to MIT but leaving PE as the only possible preservative might trigger new resistance. Instead, derogation to allow other preservative should be considered. For example: Formic acid has a low toxicological profile but cannot be used due to H331. A derogation has been granted under Blue Angel. Glutaraldehyde is prohibited although approved under BPR. It can be used at low concentration showing not risk even for children. We call for a better alignment with the BPR.	Acknowledged. It is partly for this reason that we continue to propose the allowance of BiT up to 0,005% in TR2. However, according to the CLP inventory, formic acid has a harmonised classification of H314, so this should usurp any joint entry that refers to H331. It is unlikely that a case could be made for glutaraldehyde because of its double sensitisation classification.
p.90 – Question 26 Comment on Q26: Phenoxyethanol may be an alternative to isothiazolinones but if it is the only remaining preservative to be used in formulation with Ecolabels, it will increase the development of new resistance. - -	Acknowledged. It is partly for this reason that we continue to propose the allowance of BIT up to 0,005% in TR2.
p.91 – Question 26 Comment: We believe that phenoxyethanol could serve as a viable alternative to isothiazolinones.	Acknowledged.
p.91 – Question 26 Comment: Yes, phenoxyethanol can be a good alternative to isothiasolinones. Suggested actions: We support the JRC's proposal. – Rationale: Since it is not classified with restricted hazard classes, we would support using phenoxyethanol instead of more hazardous substances.	Acknowledged.
Question 26 (Q26) Comment: YES	Acknowledged.
p.91 – Question 26: Comment: We believe that phenoxy ethanol is a viable alternative to isothiazolinenes. Rationale: Ingoing ingredients like enzymes in liquid formulations need to be preserved otherwise enzymes are quickly biodegraded. Phenoxyethanol is a very gentle preservation agent without problematic classification. It is also used in Detregent formulations to avoid more harmful preservation agents like Isothiazolinones. Over that there are limited options to preservate detergents with other PT6 listed substances.	Acknowledged.
p.91 Question 26	Acknowledged.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: We agree that it is a good alternative, maintaining the derogation already provided for in the current Decision for products that are readily aerobically biodegradable and that have not yet been tested under anaerobic conditions.	
p.90 - Question 26 Comment: Yes, although you have to put higher dosage and the cost of the finished product increases significantly.	Acknowledged.
p.90 – Question 26 Comment: We have no specific knowledge on phenoxyethanol. We let experts and LH provide their expertise and feedback. We will try to question our LH on the subject.	Acknowledged.
p. - Question 26: Comment: We believe that phenoxyethanol can be a viable alternative to isothiazolinones, but not always, since it does not provide microbiological protection in all formulations, formulations with a pH of 10 or above are a problem. - -	Acknowledged. This limitation has been considered.

Responses to Q27, Q28 and Q29 about phosphorus and phosphate in detergents (19 comments)

Responses to these questions are grouped together because they are all related to phosphates and phosphorus-containing ingredients. Some major changes were proposed regarding maximum allowable P concentrations, such as: (i) total allowable P content in HDD going from 0.08 0.01 g/L of washing water; (ii) total allowable P going from 0.02 0.01 or from 0.10 0.01 g/L for different HSC products, and (iii) from 0.04 0.03 g P/kg laundry for household laundry detergents.

Question 27 asks: "Would you support proposed LD, DD, HDD, HSC limits? In addition, would you support a further reduction of the limits?"

Question 28 asks: "Can you provide P-content value data for IILD and IIDD to help support the criteria revision process and make sure that new values have an appropriate level of ambition?"

Question 29 asks "Would you support the exclusion of phosphate from IILD and IIDD in line with Nordic Swan?"

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.94 – Line 1824 – 1825 – Questions 27, 28 and 29 Comment Q27: we support proposed limits, further limitations could be a problem Comment Q28: the mean value is 0.01 g/l total phosphorous content Comment Q29: we would support the exclusion of phosphates, but not the exclusion of phosphonic acids. Since the market share of vegan products is growing, detergents with high performance are needed, because there is a high amount of vegetable protein in such products, which is very resistible in the cleaning process.	Q27 – Acknowledged – Note the ambition of the limits proposed in TR2 is higher (See TR2 rationale) Q28 – Acknowledged Q29 – Acknowledged/Accepted – the JRC is no longer proposing the exclusion of alkyl phosphoric acid derivatives and their salts but as counterpart is proposing tightening total P threshold.
p.81-96 - Question 27, 28 and 29 Comment Q27: Yes, a higher reduction is possible because, for example, all our Eco labelled products (apart from IILD and IIDD) are P-free. Comment Q28: IILD : multi-component system < 0.01g/L regardless of water hardness IIDD : dishwasher detergent < 0.01g/L regardless of water hardness ; Rinse aid = P-free Comment Q29: Yes, because phosphate-free technical solutions exist to achieve good performance results.	Q27 – Acknowledged – Note the ambition of the limits proposed in TR2 is higher (See TR2 rationale) Q28 – Acknowledged Q29 – Acknowledged/Accepted – the JRC is no longer proposing the exclusion of alkyl phosphoric acid derivatives and their salts but as counterpart is proposing tightening total P threshold.
p.87 – (Question 27) Comment: Total Phosphorous content (P): we are against to any limit of P both for IILD and LD (see studies in attachment)	Q27 – Acknowledged
p.85-87 – (Question 27) Comment: Seriez-vous favorable aux limites proposées pour les LD, DD, HDD et HSC ? Seriez-vous également favorable à une nouvelle réduction des limites ? oui c'est envisageable, mais pas une réduction aussi significative. Peut etre qu'une diminution par 5 au lieu de 10 est plus raisonnable pour chaque catégorie de produit. *Translation: Would you support the proposed limits for LD, DD, HDD and HSC? Would you also be in favor of further reduction of the limits? yes it is possible, but not such a significant reduction. Perhaps a reduction by 5 instead of 10 is more reasonable for each product category.*	Q27 – Acknowledged
p.87 – (Question 27) Comment: For the IIDD and IILD groups, we propose lowering the total phosphorus (P) content limits by 20% to allow the industry to improve phosphorus usage performance while still being capable of using phosphorus. - -	Q27 – Partially rejected – the total P content limits have been reduced but further than the proposed 20% (See TR2 rationale for full details)
p. 87 – Questions 27, 28 and 29 Comment Q27: it seems that there are alternatives for phosphate and phosphonates in detergents. We would like to share propositions on phosphorous values:	Q27 – Acknowledged – Note the ambition of the limits proposed in TR2 is higher (See TR2 rationale) Q28 – Acknowledged

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
DD: not ambitious enough, propose a total content of 0.01 for dishwasher detergents since only 2 of 16 currently certified product formulas have a content higher than 0.01. HDD: not ambitious enough, propose a ban since 98 currently certified products do not contain them. - HSC: not ambitious enough, propose a ban since in the screen of 563 certified products, only 36 products (and which represent only 4 different formulas), contain 0.01. – LD: not ambitious enough, propose a ban since only 2 of 78 currently certified products contain 0.01. Comment Q28: One CB would like to share the current Phosphorus maximum values in IIDD and IILD: Phosphorous IIDD: Maximum value (in g/l of washing solution) Water Hardness Soft Medium Hard Dishwasher detergents 0.01 0.02 0.03 Phosphorous IILD: Maximum value (g/kg of laundry) Soil Light Medium Heavy LD Multi component system 0 0.05 0.1 Another industrial would like to share P- content value: IILD: multi-component system < 0.01g/L regardless of water hardness; IIDD: dishwasher detergent < 0.01g/L regardless of water hardness; Rinse aid =P-free. Comment Q29: We are in favor to exclude phosphates and derivatives for IILD and IIDD, except for unavoidable impurities present in enzymes. One industrial explain that they completely exclude these substances from these products.	Q29 – Acknowledged/Accepted – the JRC is no longer proposing the exclusion of alkyl phosphoric acid derivatives and their salts but as counterpart is proposing tightening total P threshold. The JRC welcomes any additional insight into what is considered as "*…unavoidable impurities present in enzymes.*"
p.88, 89 – Question 27 Comment: We do not support further limitation of total P content, as it would limit the use of alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives. alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives are already used at low concentrations. For efficiency purposes, we recommend not to reduce the total P-content by more than 5 to 15 % max compared to the actual EUEL levels. – Suggested actions: for efficacy purposes, we should recalculate the new limits at max 15% reduction compared to existing values. Rationale: alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives are already used at low concentrations.	Partially rejected - the JRC is no longer proposing the exclusion of alkyl phosphoric acid derivatives and their salts but as counterpart is proposing tightening total P threshold beyond the proposed range (5-15% compared to existing EUEL threshold)
p.94 – Question 27 Comment: It is important to limit the use of P 'in general', to preserve long-term availability of phosphate rock, a non-renewable resource. The total P demand for detergents has notably declined in the last decade and should not be further restricted. P compounds play an essential role in hygiene products due to their unique properties, and are difficult to substitute. The contribution of detergent products to hygiene and public health justifies their continued use where necessary. It is important to balance environmental concerns with the essential needs	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
served by these products. - not to be too much restricted (max 5-15% decrease vs current values) - efficient and hardly substituted	
p.94 – Question 27 (and general exclusion of substances: phosphonic acids) Comment: Phosphonates are different from phosphates, and their P content is not significant to eutrophication. - please do not exclude alkyl phosphonic acid derivatives and their salts, and restriction on total P content of max 5-15% vs current values. - - phosphonates are already effective at very low concentrations, with a very low P content - phosphonates degrade slowly, so that the P does not contribute to rapid algal growth - most of the phosphonates is removed in the biological process in the sewage (secondary treatment) - the new UWWTD sets new P removal limits (tertiary treatment), and minimum P recycling rates are expected by Delegated Act in 2027. The P removal is easily achievable with aluminium- and iron-based coagulant, and multiple projects are ongoing regarding its recovery (see ESPP website). - any remaining phosphonates reaching surface waters will tend to adsorb to sediments - when the sludge is used for agricultural purposes, the P content will generally be absorbed by soil or plants, and will not reach surface waters The quantity of P ending in surface waters coming from detergent phosphonates is insignificant compared to the quantity originating from human faeces, urine, animal manures, agricultural fertiliser run-off or other sources.	
p.94 Questions 27,28 and 29 Comment Q27: Knowing that there are effective alternatives to phosphates and phosphonates in detergents, we support proposed limits. Comment Q28: Our data have already been communicated. If necessary, we can of course send you other data. Comment Q29: We completely exclude all phosphorus derivatives (excluding unavoidable impurities present in enzymes) from our products for 21 years with effective alternatives. It is preferable to limit the presence only to those impurities that are inevitable. - -	Q27 – Acknowledged – Note the ambition of the limits proposed in TR2 is higher (See TR2 rationale) Q28 – Acknowledged – with thanks for your collaboration so far Q29 – Acknowledged/Accepted – the JRC is no longer proposing the exclusion of alkyl phosphoric acid derivatives and their salts but as counterpart is proposing tightening total P threshold The JRC welcomes any additional insight into what are considered "inevitable" impurities.
p.94 Questions 27 and 29: Comment: Phosphate is not necessary as an ingredient in liquid detergents. In the case of powder detergents, at least a reduced phosphate content is advisable to achieve good washing results. Phosphate-free detergents do not achieve the same performance on all types of soiling as products with phosphate. It is not possible to dispense with alkyl phosphoric derivatives (e.g. ATMP, HEDP, DTPMP...). In the IILD area, we work with a modular system. The bleaches themselves are always stabilised with a small amount, usually HEDP or DTPMP. In the washing process, further stabilisation of the bleach is absolutely necessary in order to achieve a uniform	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
bleaching process over the entire washing time. Catalysts such as iron, manganese and copper destroy significant proportions of the bleach in the liquor. These metals are introduced into the washing process via blood, for example. Laundry from the healthcare sector (hospitals) and food processing companies (slaughterhouses) would no longer be reliably washable. Suggested actions: No further restrictions. Keep the text as it is. Rationale: see attachments	
p.96 - Question 29 Comment: Phosphates should not be banned for professional detergents and we would like to know the P content requirements for IIDD and ILDD.	Accepted – Phosphates are not banned in TR2 proposal and the limits for total P have been significantly tighten (See TR2 for full details)
p.94 - Questions 27 and 29 Comment Q27: We support the proposed limits and would also support a further reduction. - Comment Q29: Yes, we support the exclusion of phosphate from IILD and IIDD.	Q27 – Accepted – limits have been significantly tightened. Q29 – Rejected – Phosphates are not banned for in this TR2 proposal
p.94 – Questions 27, 28 and 29 Comment Q27: Yes Comment Q28: No experience Comment Q29: No experience	Q27 – Accepted – limits have been significantly tightened. Q28 – Acknowledged Q29 – Acknowledged
p.91 – Questions 27, 28 and 29 Comment Q27: Would you support proposed LD, DD, HDD, HSC limits?No because fot HDD and HSC the limits are too strict and the finished products lose effectiveness. In addition, would you support a further reduction of the limits? No. Comment Q28: We have no phosphorus in our Ecolabel products. P=0 Comment Q29: We have already replaced phosphates in our formulations with sequestrants such as MGDA and GDLA.	Q27 – Accepted – limits have been significantly tightened. Q28 – Acknowledged Q29 – Acknowledged
p.91 – Question 27: Comment: We can still make efforts and reduce limits of P concentration. Suggested actions: We would like to propose the following phosphorus value options: · DD dishwasher detergents: 0.05 or even 0.01 · DD rinse aids: 0 · HDD: 0 · HSC APC, RTU: 0 · HSC APC, undiluted: 0 · HSC Kitchen cleaners, RTU: 0 · HSC Bathroom cleaners, RTU: 0	Q27 – Partially accepted – limits have been significantly tightened, generally at or close to level/concentration suggested in your comment (See full details in TR2).

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
· HSC WC cleaners, RTU: 0 · HSC Bathroom cleaners, undiluted: 0.02 · LD laundry detergents: 0.01 or even 0 · LD stain removers: 0? Rationale: Because it appears that there are alternatives to phosphates and phosphonates in detergents. We would like to propose the following phosphorus value options because: · DD dishwasher detergents: the proposal is not ambitious enough and only 7 (but one formula) out of our 27 currently certified products for this sub-category have a content at 0.04. · DD rinse aids: the proposal is not ambitious enough, so we propose a ban since our 5 (but 3 formulas) currently certified products for this sub-category do not contain P. · HDD: the proposal is not ambitious enough, so we propose a ban since our 104 currently certified products do not contain P. · HSC APC, RTU: the proposal is not ambitious enough, so we propose a ban since our 42 certified products for this sub-category do not contain P and we need to be more demanding in particular for RTU products knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032. · HSC APC, undiluted: the proposal is not ambitious enough, so we propose a ban since less than 5% of our 361 certified products contain 0.01 or 0.02 (for 16 products, 2 formulas) and we need to be more demanding knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032. · HSC Kitchen cleaners, RTU: the proposal is not ambitious enough, so we propose a ban since our 36 certified products for this sub-category do not contain P and we need to be more demanding in particular for RTU products knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032. · HSC Bathroom cleaners, RTU: the proposal is not ambitious enough, so we propose a ban since our 52 certified products for this sub-category do not contain P and we need to be more demanding in particular for RTU products knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032. · HSC WC cleaners, RTU: the proposal is not ambitious enough, so we propose a ban since our 41 certified products for this sub-category do not contain P and we need to be more demanding in particular for RTU products knowing this criterion will be practical at least until 2032. · HSC Bathroom cleaners, undiluted: the proposal is not ambitious enough given that 44 products out of our 46 certified products for this subcategory contain 0.01 of P, so we propose new value but we have to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary · LD laundry detergents: the proposal is not ambitious enough, so we propose a ban since only 3	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
(but one formula) out of our 77 currently certified products for this sub-category contain 0.01. · LD stain removers: we propose a ban since our currently certified product doesn't contain P but we have only one product so you have to check with other products for this sub-category. - -	
p.91 – Question 28 Comment: We can effectively make efforts and reduce limits of P concentration. Suggested actions: We would like to propose the following phosphorus value options: · IIDD dishwasher detergents: 0.02 for soft water ; 0.04 for medium water; 0.06 for hard water · IIDD rinse aids: 0.01 for soft water ; 0.02 for medium water; 0.03 for hard water · IIDD multicomponent system: 0,04 for soft water ; 0,06 for medium water; 0,08 for hard water · IILD laundry detergents: 0.01 for light soil; 0.02 for medium soil; 0.03 for heavy soil · IILD multicomponent system: 0.1 for light soil; 0.2 for medium soil; 0.3 for heavy soil Rationale: Because it appears that there are alternatives to phosphates and phosphonates in detergents. We would like to propose the following phosphorus value options because: · IIDD dishwasher detergents: all our certified products for this subcategory have values until 0.01; 0.02; 0.03, so we propose new values but we have to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test! · IIDD rinse aids: all our certified products for this subcategory don't contain P so we propose new values but we have to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test! · IIDD multicomponent system: all our certified products (but they are few in number) for this subcategory have values until 0.02; 0.03; 0.03, so we propose new values but we have to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test! · IILD laundry detergents: all our certified products (but they are few in number) for this subcategory don't contain P so we propose new values but we have to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test! · IILD multicomponent system: all our certified products (but they are few in number) for this subcategory have values until 0; 0.06; 0.1, so we propose new values but we have to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test! - -	Q28 – Partially accepted – limits have been significantly tightened, generally at or close to level/concentration suggested in your comment (See full details in TR2).
p.91 – Questions 27 and 28 Comment Q27: We support the proposed limits, also we support a further reduction	Q27 – Acknowledged – Note the ambition of the limits proposed in TR2 is higher (See TR2 rationale)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment Q28: We have already provided P-content value for IILD and IIDD	Q28 – Acknowledged – with thanks for your collaboration so far
p.94 – Line 1828-1829 - Question 30 Comment: We support reducing phosphate to a minimal level. However, we have made the experience that it is not always easy to completely omit phosphate in the production , especially when it is introduced as a catalyst. It should be defined if minimal residues from process aids would still be allowed. - -	Acknowledged – for this it would be necessary (for us) to further understand the process and especially what are "unavoidable" residues (e.g. in terms of type and levels/quantification)

Responses to Q30, Q31 and Q32 about restrictions on VOCs in detergents (27 comments)

Responses to these questions are grouped together because they are all related to requirements about VOCs. There are several different definitions of VOCs used in different technical contexts and the precise definition is important to bear in mind when comparing to any VOC limits. Some very significant changes to the allowed VOC content were proposed in TR1. Namely: (i) APC HSC from 30 1 g/L; (ii) Kitchen cleaners from 60 10 g/L, and (iii) Sanitary cleaners from 60 10 g/L. There are also additional VOC limits for additional types of detergent products set in the Blue Angel which have no corresponding limits in EUEL criteria, even though the products are in the scope of the EUEL (i.e. bathroom cleaner, toilet cleaners and hand dishwashing detergents).

Question 30 asks: "Would you support alignment with Directive 2004/42/EC and change the current VOC definition from 150°C to 250°C VOC?"

Question 31 asks: "Do you support proposed limits? If not, why? In addition, would you support a further reduction of the limits?"

Question 32 asks "Would you support the inclusion of VOC limit for HDD products in line with Blue Angel?"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.96 – Line 1897 – 1898 – Questions 30, 31 and 32 Comment Q30: we agree Comment Q31: we agree, but no further reduction of the limits Comment Q32: we agree with this proposal	Q30 – Acknowledged – but the definition for VOC has not been modified except for explicitly indicating that boiling point should be measured at 1 atmosphere.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	Q31 – Acknowledged – but threshold have been revised in the light of new evidences (i.e. JRC data analysis) which for some product sub-groups have resulted in lower limits Q32 – Acknowledged – as per previous response, there is alignment in some product sub-groups but not in others
p.81-96 - Questions 30, 31 and 32 Comment Q30: No because: - We do not systematically have information for values >150°C. - We have too few data for substances that are sold in water. For example, some alkylpolyglucosides (APG) are sold as a solution in 50% water. The boiling point of the mixture is < 150°C, and our supplier does not know the boiling point of the substance. We are therefore constrained to consider APG as a VOC. Many materials are in this situation and increasing the limit to 250°C will accentuate this problem due to the lack of information. - Cleaning products for hard surfaces are used at room temperature. some may come into contact with hot surfaces (kitchen), but temperatures do not exceed 150°C. Products containing materials with boiling points between 150 and 250°C will not evaporate under normal conditions of use.	Accepted. The definition for VOC remains as it was before except for explicitly indicating that boiling point should be measured at 1 atmosphere.
p.94-96 - Question 30 Comment: Oui car cette politique COV de 2004/42/CE est deja en vigueur dans notre groupe. *Translation: Yes because this VOC policy of 2004/42/CE is already in force in our group.*	Acknowledged – but note that to difficulty in technical implementation of adopting the new definition the change has not been proposed in this TR2.
p.92, 93, 98 – Question 30 Comment: We are not in favor of the change of temperature limit without a clarification of the method to determine the content of VOC´s in detergents. Whereas most of the active ingredients should not be impacted, some impurities may be concerned. Suggested action: No change of the definition of VOC´s –	Accepted. We have proposed to not change the definition, but have added the pressure at which the boiling point should be measured (1 atmosphere).
p.88 – Question 30 Comment: We do not support change VOC definition : Alignment with Directive 2004/42/EC and change the current VOC definition from 150°C to 250°C VOC Rationale: Exclusion of ingredients with a boiling point lower than 250°C would greatly limit the use of fragrances and certain solvents	Accepted. We have proposed to not change the definition, but have added the pressure at which the boiling point should be measured (1 atmosphere).
p. – Question 30 Comment: French stakeholders propose to exclude ethanol from the VOC calculation (specifically for window cleaners). Otherwise, according to industrials, the criterion would be	Accepted (Definition). We have proposed to not change the definition, but have added the pressure at which the boiling point should be measured (1 atmosphere).

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
complicated to reach. They also point out that the modification of VOC boiling point to 250 °C seems to be ambitious. Industrials would like to point out that changing the boiling point to 250 °C would include much more raw materials than currently. They are not in favor to align with Blue Angel, which is to difficult to reach because of the use of ethanol and fragrances. One industrial explains that he does not support the boiling point at 250 °C because they do not systematically have information for values >150°C and have too few data for substances that are sold in water. For example, some alkylpolyglucosides (APG) are sold as a solution in 50% water. The boiling point of the mixture is < 150°C, and the supplier does not know the boiling point of the substance. The industrial is therefore constrained to consider APG as a VOC. Many materials are in this situation and increasing the limit to 250°C will accentuate this problem due to the lack of information. Cleaning products for hard surfaces are used at room temperature. some may come into contact with hot surfaces (kitchen), but temperatures do not exceed 150°C. Products containing materials with boiling points between 150 and 250°C will not evaporate under normal conditions of use.	Acknowledged (BA alignment). The position against aligning with the lower limits of Blue Angel. After revision of evidences (i.e. JRC data analysis) some values are alignment whilst others not. Acknowledged (Ethanol exemption). We are considering this exemption but requires stakeholders inputs, thus a dedicated question has been included within TR2
p.96 – Question 30 Comment: A potential change of the boiling point value at 250°C in the definition of VOCs could much more raw materials than currently. Whatever definition is chosen, we require the exclusion of ethanol from the VOC criterion, the criterion will be impossible to achieve otherwise. - -	Accepted. We have proposed to not change the definition, but have added the pressure at which the boiling point should be measured (1 atmosphere). Acknowledged (Ethanol exemption). We are considering this exemption but requires stakeholders inputs, thus a dedicated question has been included within TR2
p.94 – Questions 30 Comment: We support	Acknowledged.
p. - Question 30: Comment: disagree on change of definition for VOC´s - -	Accepted. - We have proposed to not change the definition, but have added the pressure at which the boiling point should be measured (1 atmosphere).
p.94 – Question 30: Comment: We think that the adjustment of the VOC boiling point to 250 °C appears to be too ambitious and incompatible with the significant reduction in the proposed thresholds. Suggested actions: 1) Keeping the current definition. 2) Furthermore, as mentioned during the 1st AHWG, a derogation is absolutely necessary to not consider ethanol as a VOC, especially for window cleaners.	Accepted (Definition). We have proposed to not change the definition, but have added the pressure at which the boiling point should be measured (1 atmosphere). Acknowledged (Ethanol exemption). We are considering this exemption but requires stakeholders inputs, thus a dedicated question has been included within TR2

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Rationale: We would like to emphasize that altering the boiling point to 250 °C would encompass a significantly larger amount of raw materials than at present. Because this ingredient (ethanol) is truly essential and beneficial, especially for window cleaners, and we do not perceive any risk in its usage. - -	
p.94 - Questions 30 Comment: Yes.	Acknowledged.
p.98 - Questions 30, 31 and 32 Comment: Changing the definition of VOCs will have the effect of increasing the number of substances included in this scope. We propose to Change the definition while leaving the limits. Changing both parameters may result in unknown effects and loss of formulations. We suggest lowering the limits to be taken into account in the next review of the criteria.	Rejected -. We have proposed to not change the definition, but have added the pressure at which the boiling point should be measured (1 atmosphere). In addition, the threshold have been revised considering this and further evidences gathered by the JRC.
p.96 – Questions 30,31 and 32 Comment Q30: Agree Comment Q31 and Q32: We need more data to be able to evaluate these proposals. Rationale: Q31; Q32 According to Question 30, aligning the definition of VOC with Directive 2004/42/EC, more SIs are included in the calculation of VOC. Combining this change with the reduction in VOC limits, several Ecolabel products no longer meet this requirement. Could it be that instead of calculating the VOC in the Excel sheet, an analytical determination of the VOC in the final product could be requested?	Acknowledged. Since we are not proposing to change the VOC definition, the number of EU Ecolabel products failing on this requirement will be much less now. An analytical determination of VOC content is perhaps possible, but would be an additional cost compared to just counting the individual substance contents that are VOCs.
p.94 – Questions 31 Comment Q31: We support the proposed limits	Acknowledged.
p.96 – Question 31 Comment: Only if ethanol is excluded from the VOC calculation, we support the proposed limits but not an additional reduction of limits - -	Acknowledged. We are considering the ethanol exemption but requires stakeholders inputs, thus a dedicated question has been included within TR2. The limits have been revised in the light of new evidences, this we invite you to check them (See TR2 for full details).
p.94-96 - Question 31 Comment: Les COV sont principalement apportés par les solvants qui ont une utilité dans les détergents, ou en réduisant d'autant les fourchettes, cela impacte directement l'efficacité du	Acknowledged.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
produit. Cela peut donc etre compliqué voir impossible d'avoir un produit labelisé aussi performant qu'un produit du marché… *Machine translation: VOCs are mainly contributed by solvents which are useful in detergents, or by reducing the ranges accordingly, this directly impacts the effectiveness of the product. It can therefore be complicated or even impossible to have a labeled product that performs as well as a product on the market…*	
p.94 - Questions 31 Comment: No, they are very strict limits.	Acknowledged. – Note that the limits have been revised in the light of new evidences, this we invite you to check them (See TR2 for full details).
p.94 – Question 31 Comment: We don't support proposed limits for VOC, except for the limit for undiluted multi-purpose cleaners. Suggested actions: We propose new thresholds: · APC, RTU: 15g/l if the VOC definition is set at < 250°C and provided that ethanol is exempted · Kitchen cleaners, RTU: 30g/l if the VOC definition is set at < 250°C and provided that ethanol is exempted · Window cleaners, RTU: 25g/l if the VOC definition is set at < 250°C and provided that ethanol is exempted · Bathroom cleaners, RTU: 40g/l if the VOC definition is not set at < 250°C and provided that ethanol is exempted · WC cleaners, RTU: 30g/l if the VOC definition is not set at < 250°C and provided that ethanol is exempted · Bathroom cleaners, undiluted: 5g/l Rationale: Because · APC, RTU: the proposed threshold (1g/l) is too ambitious given that almost all of our 42 certified products for this sub-category have a VOC content >> 1g/l and even > 10g/l and would meet this new VOC threshold (15g/l). However, as mentioned previously, perhaps multi-purpose RTU which can be avoided should must be excluded. · APC, undiluted: we support the proposed threshold (1g/l) because more 95% of our 361 certified products would meet this new VOC threshold. · Kitchen cleaners, RTU: the proposed threshold (10g/l) is too ambitious given that 31 out of our 36 certified products for this sub-category have a VOC content > 10g/l and almost 80% of our	Acknowledged. Firstly, thank you for the analysis that supports your feedback. Secondly, the limits have been revised in the light of new evidences, some been aligned with your proposal but other may not be. Therefore, we invite you to check them (See TR2 for full details).

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
36 certified products would meet this new VOC threshold (30g/l). · Window cleaners, RTU: because the main ingredient for products of this sub-category is ethanol or another alcohol which be replaced by ethanol if ethanol is exempted! · Bathroom cleaners, RTU: the proposed threshold (10g/l) is too ambitious given that 29 out of our 52 certified products for this sub-category have a VOC content > 10g/l and almost all of our certified products would meet this new VOC threshold (40g/l). [CAUTION if the VOC definition is not set at < 250°C] · WC cleaners, RTU: the proposed threshold (10g/l) is too ambitious given that 11 out of our 41 certified products for this sub-category have a VOC content > 10g/l and all of our certified products would meet this new VOC threshold (30g/l) [CAUTION if the VOC definition is not set at < 250°C] · Bathroom cleaners, undiluted: all our 46 certified products for this subcategory have COV until 1.8g/l so we propose a new limit (5g/l) but we have to keep a margin if reformulation are necessary for example if the test criterion require a new lab test. - -	
p. – Question 31 Comment: We would like to share the following propositions: - Multi-purpose (RTU): too ambitious threshold given that 34 certified products of this type have a VOC content >> 1g/l and even > 10g/l. Perhaps Multi-purpose RTU must be excluded. - Multi-purpose (undiluted): in favor of this threshold, perhaps it is not ambitious enough given that 9 of 303 certified products of this type have a VOC content > 1g/l. - Kitchen (RTU): too ambitious threshold given that 31 of 36 certified products of this type have a VOC content > 10g/l. - Window cleaners (RTU): The current threshold of 100g/l may be lowered to 90g/l, if the definition remains the same, as it is currently given that 55 of 66 certified products of this type have a VOC content < 90g/l.	Acknowledged. Firstly, thank you for the analysis that supports your feedback. Secondly, the limits have been revised in the light of new evidences, some been aligned with your proposal but other may not be. Therefore, we invite you to check them (See TR2 for full details).
p.81-96 - Question 31 Comment: The proposed limits are too restrictive to allow the use of substances essential for surface cleaning/degreasing (e.g. ethanol). This substance is also very useful for stabilising formulas, replacing more harmful substances of petrochemical origin. Alternatives exists but are not well known in terms of degradability (not tested in the DID List) and are less interesting from an economic point of view.	Acknowledged. We are considering the ethanol exemption but requires stakeholders' inputs, thus a dedicated question has been included within TR2. In addition, the limits have been revised in the light of new evidences, this we invite you to check them (See TR2 for full details). Lastly, the JRC would welcome insights on alternative ingredient enabling products having lower VOCs concentration.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.96 - Question 31 Comment: For Sprays RTU which are ready to use VOCS at max 10g/L (=1%) will mean less fragrance than today considering on top the presence of alcohols in product. Proposed limits are too narrow, then product performance might be affected - -	Acknowledged. The JRC would welcome specific insights on typical VOCs profile in RTU spray products, inclusive of which share from that amount belong to alcohols.
p. – Question 32 Comment: Industrials are not in favour to include HDD in the VOC criteria as the risk of breathing in VOCs is limited for this category of products. One industrial is in favor to include HDD in the VOC criteria but with two different thresholds depending on whether the product is intended for professionals or the general public (so as not to block the use of perfume). Additional comments: We support the name modification for per- and polyfluoroalkyls. A stakeholder would like to add that specify the scope of the product that must not contain excluded substances could be problematic under the new definition of "impurities".	Acknowledged.
p.81-96 - Question 32 Comment: Yes, but with two different thresholds depending on whether the product is intended for professionals or the general public (so as not to block the use of perfume).	Acknowledged. This would require further elaboration on which end-user product is required to have higher limit and especially why, for which the JRC welcomes insights.
p.96 – Question 32 Comment: We are against the inclusion of VOC limit for HDD products because makes no sense for us.	Acknowledged.
p.94 – Questions 32 Comment Q32: We would support	Acknowledged.
p.94 – Question 32 Comment: We don't support the inclusion of VOC limit for HDD products in line with Blue Angel Rationale: Due to the limited risk of inhaling VOCs for this category of products. - -	Acknowledged.
p.94 - Questions 32 Comment Q32: No.	Acknowledged.

7.6.2. (b) Horizontal CLP restrictions and derogations (21 comments)

This table here focuses purely on responses….

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.99. Table 2 – About CLP hazard ordering (H304)	Accepted – Firstly, thank you. Secondly, It has been incorporated into Table 2 as *Aspiration hazard*

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: In table 2 "Restricted hazard classifications and their categorisation", H304 is wrongly listed under "Acute toxicity" hazards. – Suggested action: Corrective action: Create Aspiration hazard in Table 2 and place H304 under it: Aspiration Hazard Category 1 H 304 May be fatal if swallowed and enters airways – Rationale: It should get his own category (Aspiration hazard), to stay consistent with the CLP Regulation 1272/2008 (EU). According to CLP, heading 3.10 - 3.10.1.4, aspiration toxicity is not part of the acute toxicity hazards (3.1 - 3.1.1.2). (Maybe it was confused with acute inhalation toxicity?)	
p.90 – Question 23 Comment: [...] we propose to remove the derogation for enzymes classified H317 due to their use in textile detergents that may be in direct contact with the skin. Enzymes themselves are not classified as H317 but additives or preservatives can be. Nevertheless, there are safe and effective alternatives without these H317 ingredients, so the exemption can be removed.we ask for the elimination of the H400 exemption for surfactants because there is effective alternatives on the market that are less impactful on the environment (only H412 or not classified with respect to the environment). The H412 exemption must be maintained on surfactants because the majority of effective surfactants are classified H412.We request an exemption for benzoic acid classified H372. Indeed, sodium benzoate is a preservative widely used in detergents and an excellent alternative to isothiazolinones. Nevertheless at a pH below 7 (pH of many detergents), it partially dissociates into benzoic acid, effective for preservation but is classified H372 and so currently prohibits if >0.01% in the finished product. -	Acknowledged (H317 – enzymes) – no change on H317 derogation for enzymes has been proposed at this stage. Accepted (H400 & H412 – surfactants) – the H400 has been removed from derogated substances list (See Table 3) but H412 has been maintained. Accepted (benzoic acid) – the H372 associated with Benzoic acid is derogated but only as *in-situ* generated substance when added sodium benzoate is added as a preservatives and only up to 1.0% w/w of the final product formulation.
p.90 – Question 23 Comment: [...]we ask for the elimination of the H400 exemption for surfactants because there is effective alternatives on the market that are less impactful on the environment (only H412 or not classified with respect to the environment). The H412 exemption must be maintained on surfactants because the majority of effective surfactants are classified H412.	Accepted (H400 & H412 – surfactants) – the H400 has been removed from derogated substances list (See Table 3) but H412 has been maintained.
p.90 – Question 23 Comment: [...] We request an exemption for benzoic acid classified H372. Indeed, sodium benzoate is a preservative widely used in detergents and an excellent alternative to isothiazolinones. Nevertheless at a pH below 7 (pH of many detergents), it partially dissociates into benzoic acid, effective for preservation but is classified H372 and so currently prohibits if >0.01% in the finished product. -	Accepted (benzoic acid) – the H372 associated with Benzoic acid is derogated but only as *in-situ* generated substance when added sodium benzoate is added as a preservatives and only up to 1.0% w/w of the final product formulation
p.100 –7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions, derogation for subtilisin	

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: Comment from the Association of Manufacturers and Formulators of Enzyme Products (AMFEP) Subtilisin in the table is allowed for 4 product types, but not for hard surface cleaners (HSCs). Subtilisin is an enzyme, with the same safety profile as other enzymes. All other enzymes are permitted for all 5 product types, we believe that subtilisin can be used also for HSCs. Suggested actions: Extend the derogation exempting subtilisin from the exclusion of substances toxic to the environment to cover HSCs as well, on top of the other 4 categories. – Rationale: All enzymes are derogated from the exclusion of known respiratory sensitisers and known skin sensitisers for all 5 product types (DD, HDD, HSC, IIDD, IILD). We believe the derogation exempting subtilisin from the exclusion of substances toxic to the environment should also apply to HSCs, on top of the other 4 categories, as the safety profile of subtilisin does not differ from that of other enzymes.	Acknowledged – this derogation has not been proposed in this proposal (TR2) but JRC remains open for considering it.
p.100 – 7.6.2. CLP restrictions, derogation for subtilisin Comment: Product categories for subtilisin should be expanded. Suggested action: Add HSC to the product category. - Subtilisin in the table is permitted to 4 product types, but not for HSC Rationale: Subtilisin is an enzyme and safety aspect is the same as other enzymes. All other enzymes are permitted for all 5 product types, we believe that subtilisin can be used also for HSC.	
p.100 – 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions, classification of enzymes and stabilisers Comment: Comment from the Association of Manufacturers and Formulators of Enzyme Products (AMFEP) Footnote (*1): explanation text for enzymes. It is our industry's experience that the table and the explanatory text lead to confusions, with readers understanding that enzymes are skin sensitizers. Enzymes are not skin sensitizers, but auxiliary substances such as stabilizers can be skin sensitizer. To make it clearer, we propose the following text: Enzymes (H334) including other auxiliary substances (H317) in enzyme preparations. Suggested actions: The text of footnote (*1) on page 100 should be replaced with the following: "Enzymes (H334) including other auxiliary substances (H317) in enzyme preparations." – Rationale: Enzymes are not skin sensitisers, even if auxiliary substances such as stabilizers can be skin sensitizer. Footnote (*1) needs to be amended to properly reflect it.	Accepted – the suggestion has been accepted and the text in TR2 includes the modifications suggested.
p.100 - 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions, classification of enzymes and stabilisers Comment: *1 explanation text for enzymes is not clear.	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested action: In order to make it clearer, we propose the following text. Enzymes (H334) including other auxiliary substances (H317) in enzyme preparations. Rationale: Re. *1 explanation text for enzymes. It is our industry's experience that the table and the explanatory text lead to confusions that enzymes are skin sensitizers. Enzymes are not skin sensitizers, but auxiliary substances such as stabilizers can be skin sensitizer.	
p.88 – (more like p.99-100) 7.6.2. (b) on new CLP hazards Comment: A clear definition of the new CLP classes, including a transition period of several years and harmonization with GHS requirements in the rest of the world will be needed to prevent legal uncertainty and trade barriers for industry. We stress that a clear definition of the new CLP classes is needed & that the unilateral introduction of new hazard classes in the EU via delegated act in parallel to the start of discussions about their introduction into the UN GHS will result in a long transition with non-harmonized GHS requirements in the EU compared to the rest of the world, and final harmonization between UN GHS and EU CLP is not at all ensured. This will result in legal uncertainty and trade barriers for the chemical industry. - -	Acknowledged
p.101, 104 – 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions – especially on the new CLP hazards Comment: Introduction of new hazard classes, including ED: A clear definition of the new CLP classes, including a transition period of several years and harmonization with GHS requirements in the rest of the world will be needed to prevent legal uncertainty and trade barriers for industry. We stress that a clear definition of the new CLP classes is needed & that the unilateral introduction of new hazard classes in the EU via delegated act in parallel to the start of discussions about their introduction into the UN GHS will result in a long transition with non-harmonized GHS requirements in the EU compared to the rest of the world, and final harmonization between UN GHS and EU CLP is not at all ensured. This will result in legal uncertainty and trade barriers for the chemical industry. Concerning the reference to ED classification (i.e. Category 1, 2 or no classification) in the revised CLP Regulation, we would like to highlight, that currently a guidance on how to apply the respective criteria is under development (expected oct 2024) and to our knowledge, the application and interpretation of these criteria to distinguish between these categories is still under debate.	Acknowledged
p.100-101 – 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions – on derogations Comment: We would like to maintain H400-H412 derogation for surfactants. In fact, after the introduction of the 2nd ATP to CLP Regulation, usually a stricter labelling was required without any changes of surfactants properties. No increase of risk, just changing of limits. Substances classified as H400-H412 are readily biodegradable and have always been used for their excellent performances. Substitution is difficult as cleaning performances of not classified	Partially accepted (H400 & H412 – surfactants) – the H400 has been removed from derogated substances list (See Table 3) but H412 has been maintained (See TR2 for full details), also awaiting the necessary discussion on the proposal for the legal text requirement on surfactants biodegradability, expected during the 2nd AHWH. Based on

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
surfactants are not so good. If a derogation is not applied, products will not be so effective at satisfying performance criteria. As classification of some surfactants could change based on new information or testing results in the future, we suggest to wait until the future revision of the CESIO C&L recommendations to further consider needed derogations. We could be obliged to ask for more derogations in order to have effective products and also keeping in mind that surfactants are readily biodegradable, and so the aquatic toxicity risk is very low. - -	the outcome, a more informed decision and/or re-evaluation of the current JRC proposal (keep H412) will be made.
p.101, 104 – 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions – on derogations Comment: Existing derogations: We support the proposal of CESIO to maintain H400-H412 derogation for surfactants. In fact, after the introduction of the 2nd ATP to CLP Regulation, usually a stricter labelling was required without any changes of surfactants properties. No increase of risk, just changing of limits. Substances classified H 400-H 412 are readily biodegradable and have always been used for their excellent performances. Substitution is difficult as cleaning performances of not classified surfactants are not so good. If a derogation is not applied, products will not be so effective at satisfying performance criteria. Also the derogations for Enzyme, Substilisin and NTA in MGDA/ GLDA must be maintained	
p.97 – 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions – on derogations Comment: We would like to maintain H400-H412 derogation for surfactants. In fact, after the introduction of the 2nd ATP to CLP Regulation, usually a stricter labelling was required without any changes of surfactants properties. No increase of risk, just changing of limits. Substances classified H 400-H 412 are readily biodegradable and have always been used for their excellent performances. Substitution is difficult as cleaning performances of not classified surfactants are not so good. If a derogation is not applied, products will not be so effective at satisfying performance criteria. As classification of some surfactants could change based on new information or testing results in the future, we suggest to wait until the future revision of the CESIO C&L recommendations to further consider needed derogations. We could be obliged to ask for more derogations in order to have effective products and also keeping in mind that surfactants are readily biodegradable, and so the aquatic toxicity risk is very low.	
p.82 (more like page 100,101…) – 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions – on derogations Comment: Industrials are in favour to keep the derogation for H412 in surfactants as most of efficient surfactants are classified H412. Industrials propose to delete the derogation for H400 surfactants because efficient alternatives exist with less impact on the environment (only H412 or not classified). Industrials support the deletion of H317 derogation of enzymes because they can be used in LD which can be in direct contact with skin. Plus, efficient alternatives of H317 exist. Industrials would like to ask for a derogation of H372 classification for benzoic acid, as	Accepted (H400 & H412 – surfactants) – the H400 has been removed from derogated substances list (See Table 3) but H412 has been maintained (See TR2 for full details), also awaiting the necessary discussion on the proposal for the legal text requirement on surfactants biodegradability, expected during the 2nd AHWH. Based on the outcome, a

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
sodium benzoate is a preservative widely used in detergents and is a good alternative to isothiazolinones. But at a PH below 7 it partially dissociates in benzoic acid, efficient for preservation but classified H372 currently prohibited if superior to 0.01 % in the final product.	more informed decision and/or re-evaluation of the current JRC proposal (keep H412) will be made. Acknowledged (H317 – enzymes) – no change on H317 derogation for enzymes has been proposed at this stage. Accepted (benzoic acid) – the H372 associated with Benzoic acid is derogated but only as *in-situ* generated substance when added sodium benzoate is added as a preservatives and only up to 1.0% w/w of the final product formulation
p.98 – 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions – regarding the text: *"The final product shall not be classified as being acutely toxic, a specific target organ toxicant, a respiratory or skin sensitiser, carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic for reproduction, or hazardous to the aquatic environment, as defined in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 and in accordance with the list in Table 2."* Comment: [Regarding the] Proposed sub-criterion hazardous substances (i) Final product, we would recommand to add the terms: "endocrine disruptors, PBT and PMT in the sentence concerning the final product." - -	Accepted – the wording of this sentence has been modified to explicitly cite the relevant terms (inclusive of the ones you have suggested).
p.100 – 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions – on derogations Comment: The revision should be the moment to review the granted derogations and assess whether these are still necessary. Suggested actions: We suggest to withdraw the derogation for H400 and H412. We suggest to investigate whether the derogations for phthalimido-peroxy-hexanoic acid (PAP) are still necessary and adequate. Rationale: H400: there are many detergents that are formulated without H400. H412: Surfactants which are aerobically readily biodegradable and anaerobically biodegradable are not classified as H412 - Toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects. This derogation could therefore then be deleted. phthalimido-peroxy-hexanoic acid (PAP) CAS 128275-31-0 According to the harmonised classification and labelling (CLP00) approved by the European Union, this substance is very toxic to aquatic life, causes serious eye damage and if heated may cause a fire. No data on biodegradability could be found. We would like to know for which purpose the presence of this substance is necessary in detergents.	Accepted (H400 & H412 – surfactants) – the H400 has been removed from derogated substances list (See Table 3) but H412 has been maintained (See TR2 for full details), also awaiting the necessary discussion on the proposal for the legal text requirement on surfactants biodegradability, expected during the 2nd AHWH. Based on the outcome, a more informed decision and/or re-evaluation of the current JRC proposal (keep H412) will be made. Acknowledged (PAP – IILD) The JRC carried out a preliminary analysis of the validity of the existing PAP derogation and it appeared as still being relevant under the same arguments provided in the previous EUEL criteria revision (Please See section 2.10.2.1.3 & 2.10.2.1.4 of the Final Technical Report of the previous revision). However, this was not reflected in TR2 and it is an aspect the JRC is

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	intending to consider in further detail in forthcoming versions.
p.98-101 - 7.6.2. (b) CLP restrictions Comment: Suggested actions and rationale: For this criterion, we have additional remarks: · It is important to enforce compliance with H statements for both substances AND MIXTURES due to the cumulative effect. · We should require declarations from manufacturers rather than from suppliers - -	Partially accepted – An explicit sentence has been included triggering the classification rules for mixtures in the absence of information on substances. The declarations are still requested from suppliers in this TR2 proposal.
p.99, Table proposed sub-criterion (b) hazardous substances - Line 1905-1906 Comment: Please consider to introduce the hazard statement H360	Accepted – The cited hazard class has been specifically quoted within Table 2 Restricted hazard classes…

Responses to Q33 and Q34 on Titanium dioxide (18 comments)

This table here focuses purely on responses received relating to the potential use of TiO2 in detergent products and if its derogation might be needed for EUEL detergent products.

Question 33 asks: "Is titanium dioxide used in detergent products? If so, in which products, for what purpose and at what levels?"

Question 34 asks: "Would you support a derogation for TiO2 in EUEL criteria for the classification of H351? If so, please also clarify if your support is only for liquid detergent products or also for powder detergent products. Note that this assumes that the harmonised classification for TiO2 is maintained as a result of the ongoing legal disputes"

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.102 – Line 1942 – 1947 Question 33 and 34 Comment: We are not affected, therefor any comments.	Acknowledged
p.96-102 - Question 33 Comment: Is titanium dioxide used in detergent products? If so, in which products, for what purpose and at what levels? Titanium dioxide is currently used in enzymes in powder form, to give the product a white appearance. Alternatives are beginning to be proposed by suppliers, thanks in particular to the	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
prohibition of titanium dioxide in Ecocert products. It represents < 0.5% in final products. - -	
p.96-102 - Question 33 Comment: Non le TiO2 n'est pas utilisé dans nos formules de detergent. *Machine translation: No, TiO2 is not used in our detergent formulas.*	Acknowledged
p.102 – Question 33 Comment: Comment from the Association of Manufacturers and Formulators of Enzyme Products (AMFEP) Question 33: Titanium dioxide is used as pigment for enzyme granulates for LDs and DDs (solid form). Since enzyme granulates are encapsulated (Section 7.6.7 Line 2172, page 110), inhalable titanium dioxide is negligible or very low. The main function is pigmen.	Acknowledged
p.104 - Question 33 and 34 Comment: TiO2 is used in enzyme granulation, which is relevant for detergents in powder or other solid form (tablets or the solid part of a capsule). We support the proposed exemption.	Q33 - Acknowledged Q34 - Accepted – We are proposing a derogation for titanium dioxide forms as specified in CLP (See TR2 rationale for full details)
p.102 Comment: We do not support a derogation for TiO2 for the H351 classification. Suggested actions: We suggest not to include a derogation for titanium dioxide. If a derogation is considered, it should not be given to products where inhalation can be an exposure route (e.g. spray, powder,...). We would recommend narrowing the derogation only for essential uses. This would be in line with the criteria for EU Ecolabel cosmetics which have a narrow derogation only for products with UV filter function and not in products that come in powder or spray form. Rationale: H351 means a suspected carcinogen and such a serious hazard should not be derogated in the EU Ecolabel. Moreover, tests from consumer organisations of detergent products found that titanium dioxide is not a common ingredient in detergents at all.	Rejected – We are proposing a derogation for titanium dioxide forms as specified in CLP (See TR2 rationale for full details).
p.102 - Question 33 Comment: Yes, powder enzymes contain a small amount of titanium dioxide (about 10% of the enzyme) which is introduced to an amount of <1% in the finished product. However, alternatives without TiO2 in enzymes are beginning to exist but not for all references. TiO2 is also present in packaging as a white dye. Given the absence of migration risk, we would like to emphasize that if the restriction/prohibition is validated, it should only be applied to the formula and not to the packaging of the product.	Accepted – We are proposing a derogation for titanium dioxide forms as specified in CLP (See TR2 rationale for full details). Note no specific mentioned is made about the packaging so we would welcome any further comment/insight on how the formulation of current EUEL draft criteria proposal in this TR2 interacts could affect TiO2 use in packaging
p.102 – Question 34	Accepted

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: Until we can confirm their availability without TiO2, we support the derogation for TiO2 in EUEL criteria for the classification of H351 of powder LD and DD - -	
p.104 – Question 33 Comment: Answer: Titanium dioxide is commonly used in detergent products, primarily to enhance the appearance as well as performance of the detergent. It is used as a whitening agent and pigment in detergent products, helping to improve the brightness of the product, as well as assist in dispersing other ingredients evenly throughout the detergent formulation. It can be found in various detergent products such as laundry detergents (both liquid and powder), dishwashing detergents, and household cleaning products. The exact concentration of titanium dioxide in detergent products can vary, however, generally, it is used in relatively small amounts, typically less than 1% of the total formulation by weight. - -	Acknowledged
p.104 – Question 34 Comment: Answer: The CLH classification of certain forms of titanium dioxide (CAS# 13463-67-7) as a suspected carcinogen (cat. 2) by inhalation applies only to substances or mixtures in powder form containing 1% or more of titanium dioxide which is in the form of, or incorporated in, particles having an aerodynamic diameter ≤10 µm. Nonetheless, the classification of certain forms of titanium dioxide "Category 2 Carcinogen by inhalation" has been reviewed and annulled by the General Court of the European Union on 22 November 2022 due to an error found in the assessment of the reliability and acceptability of the study on which the classification was based on, and the justification that the classification can only be applied to a substance that has the intrinsic property to cause cancer. This is not the case for many titanium dioxide products. Titanium Dioxide used in consumer products does not meet CLH definition and it may be used without need for derogation. Therefore, should a restriction/derogation come in place it should only apply to titanium dioxide in powdered form containing 1% or more particles with aerodynamic diameter ≤10 µm. Furthermore, the TDMA requests a pause on the consideration of a restriction of titanium dioxide, as it filled in May 2023 a response to the EU Commission and France's appeal against the EU court decision. Thus, the legal process surrounding the classification of titanium dioxide will probably continue until the end of 2024 while the European Court of Justice determine merits of the appeal. - -	Acknowledged
p.102 - Question 33 Comment: Titanium dioxide is used as pigment for enzyme granulates for LD and DD (solid form). Rationale: Since enzyme granulates are encapsulated (Section 7.6.7 Line 2172, page 110), inhalable titanium dioxide is negligible or very low.	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.102 – Question 33 and 34: Comment Q33: No experience. Comment Q3: No experience.	Acknowledged
p.96 – Question 34 Comment: We do not support	Rejected - We are proposing a derogation for titanium dioxide forms as specified in CLP (See TR2 rationale for full details).
p. – Question 34: Comment: agree on derogation for TiO2 Please refer to the full comment in the different sections. -	Accepted
p.96 – Questions 33 and 34 Comment: We have no prior experience with titanium dioxide, but based on the feedback from our LH, we support the exclusion of titanium dioxide at least in the formulation. Rationale: Because they informed us that this substance can be replaced, and we need to be more demanding, as the criteria will remain valid until 2032.	Rejected - We are proposing a derogation for titanium dioxide forms as specified in CLP (See TR2 rationale for full details).
p.102 – Questions 33 and 34 Comment Q33: Yes, Used in powder detergents products Comment Q34: TiO2 is used in the granulation of enzymes, relevant for powder detergents. AISE EU Ecolabel TF support the proposed derogation.	Q33 - Acknowledged Q34 - Accepted – We are proposing a derogation for titanium dioxide forms as specified in CLP (See TR2 rationale for full details)
p.102 – Questions 33 and 34 Comment Q33: Industrials mention that TiO2 is used in powder enzymes as a coating agent. One industrial would like to share that Titanium dioxide is currently used in enzymes in powder form, to give the product a white appearance. Alternatives are beginning to be proposed by suppliers, thanks in particular to the prohibition of titanium dioxide in Ecocert products. It represents < 0.5% in final products. One industrial would like to share that enzymes contain a low amount of titane dioxide (about 10% of the enzyme that it is introduced at a quantity <1% in the finished product) but alternates without TiO2 in the enzymes are starting to exist, but not for all references. Comment Q34: We support the exclusion of titanium dioxide at least in the formulation. It seems that this substance can be replaced, it is necessary to be restrictive and to exclude it, as criteria will be valid until 2032. - -	Q33 - Acknowledged Q34 - Rejected – We are proposing a derogation for titanium dioxide forms as specified in CLP (See TR2 rationale for full details)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p. 102 – Question 34 Comment: We would support a derogation for TiO2 in line with the decision of CLP (depending on the outcome of the dispute). If TiO2 shows some effects, those are limited to powder at a certain granulometry. This should be considered in the requirements. Also, a specific concentration limit may be introduced, different from those set in the EUEL.	Q34 - Accepted – We are proposing a derogation for titanium dioxide forms as specified in CLP (See TR2 rationale for full details)

7.6.6. (d) Fragrances (15 comments)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.104 – Fragrances – specifically the text: *"Products marked as "mild/sensitive" shall be fragrance-free."* Comment: If fragrances are formulated without allergens, why can't they be present in products for people with sensitive skin? This claim must be validated by a toxicologist and skin tests must be carried out. Removing the fragrance will not guarantee user safety.	Accepted. We now propose a series of restrictions on fragrances in detergent products marked as mild/sensitive which are more severe than other EU Ecolabel detergent products without this marking. But fragrances can now in principle be used in mild/sensitive detergents.
p.104 - Fragrances Comment: although we know that perfumes do not contribute to cleaning performance, we are convinced that in certain products perfumes are needed. They are part of "soft" properties of a product, for example for laundry detergents for delicate line against making "mild-sensitive" free of fragrance, we want to retain fragrances for mild/sensitive products due to the following reasons: 1) mild-sensitive claims are different scope than ecolabel criteria and shouldn't be discussed as part of eco-label; 2) Approximately 1/3 of the perfume palette contains fragrances that are classified as skin sensitizers (skin "allergens"). So 2/3 of the palette are not regarded as allergens so it would be disproportionate and misleading to ban mild or sensitive claims for a detergent that has been formulated with fragrances that are not allergens; 3) Also, current regulations governing the labelling of detergents (CLP Regulation & Detergent Regulation) have set labelling thresholds for fragrance allergens to ensure those allergic are aware of where allergens are contained at levels that can elicit an allergic reaction. Therefore formulating fragrance allergens at very low levels below these labelling thresholds is generally acceptable --	Accepted in principle. We now propose a series of restrictions on fragrances in detergent products marked as mild/sensitive which are more severe than other EU Ecolabel detergent products without this marking. But fragrances can now in principle be used in mild/sensitive detergents. We understand that for claims made on EU Ecolabel products, the criteria could set requirements alongside the scope of the EU Ecolabel, thus there should not be incompatibility. In this sense and as per TR2 proposal, it implies certainty on the absence of particular fragrances in order to qualify (for EUEL purposes) as "mild/sensitive". The JRC would welcome further insights on the cited fragrances palette.
p.104 – Fragrances	Accepted. We agree about the differences in Northern and Southern Europe and that this is a real issue. We will also

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: Additional comments: French industrials are not in favour to exclude fragrances for products marked as "mild/sensitive" but are in favour of the fragrance's limitations. Industrials would like to point out that allergens criteria secures the risk of using fragrances. They explain tha the exclusion of fragrances will decrease the purchase of products from the scope of the European Ecolabel, in favor of non-certified products. Industrials add that consumers from southern countries of Europe expect fragrances in products, for the cleaning feeling and to avoid unpleasant odours from substances in detergents. One stakeholder would like to add that it is necessary to pays attention to the consumption habits of Northerns European countries, which are more accustomed to fragrance-free products (unlike Southern European countries). He also would like to point out that it is therefore necessary to remain vigilant and not systematically align with the Nordic Swan criteria, as consumers in Northern and Southern Europe do not have the same habits. He specifies that cosmetic products (for which this requirement is in force) which carry these indications and which do not contain fragrances, have difficulty passing the consumer test. He would like to share that some cosmetic products bearing this label have been certified, but only a few. Industrials notes that since the application of the new decision on cosmetic products, there are fewer and fewer products with the EU Ecolabel and the "skin" sensitive/sweet" since perfume is essential to the sense of "clean" that the fragrance achieves. Industrials are in favor to replace the table 13-1 of the SCCS opinion by the Annex III of 1223/2009 cosmetic regulation which has been reviewed to include this extended list (82 substances). One industrial would like to ask the following question: If fragrances are formulated without allergens, why can't they be present in products for people with sensitive skin? The industrial would like to add that this claim on "mild/sensitive" must be validated by a toxicologist and that skin tests must be carried out. Nevertheless it would be interesting that the manufacturer should be required to provide the CB with proof of this claim (e.g. hypoallergenic test) if it is made. In addition, the CB point out that it is essential to have more general requirements for all detergents that may contain fragrances than the limited requirements set out in the current European decisions. One CB would like to share data related to fragrances presence in detergents formulas: HDD: 82 % of formulas contain fragrances IIDD: 0 % of formulas contain fragrances IILD: 57 % of formulas contain fragrances DD: 47 % of formulas contain fragrances HSC: 80 % of formulas contain fragrances LD: 100 % of formulas contain fragrances - -	propose to refer to Annex III of 1223/2009 instead of table 13-1 of the SCCS Opinion, since it is a more solid reference. And in the TR2 proposals, we now do allow for fragrances to be used in detergent products marked as "mild/sensitive", but would like to know more about what evidence is exactly needed to support these claims (particularly welcomed insights into EUEL licensed products containing already this claim).
p.104 - Fragrances	Accepted.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: We are strongly opposed to the ban on perfumes in products marked as "mild/sensitive". Since the implementation this on ECOLABEL criteria of cosmetic products, we've noticed that there are fewer and fewer European Ecolabel products marked as "mild/sensitive". The fragrance is essential to provide the 'clean' feeling expected by the consumers and sometimes to mask some unpleasant smells of necessary ingredients used in the product. The ban on perfumes will certainly lead to the elimination of certain EUEL products, instead opting for non-certified products. Moreover, fragrance is not automatically synonym of risk allergy and skin sensitization. For 21 years we proposed fragrances free of skin sensitizing and skin allergen substances, perfectly adapted to sensitive skin, and allergic suffered people. We believe that the notion of risk related to the use of fragrances is already more secure thanks to the new allergen restriction criteria. - -	We have now proposed to allow fragrances to be used in detergent products marked as "mild/sensitive", but with more restrictions than for other detergent products.
p.104 – Fragrances Comment: We support that the JRC proposes excluding fragrances listed in the SCCS opinion or prohibited in the Cosmetics Regulation. Furthermore, it can be questioned whether fragrances are necessary at all in detergents. Suggested action: We suggest to exclude fragrances completely. However because in some European countries fragrances seem to be more relevant than in others, a compromise could be to exclude fragrances at least from professional products. Rationale: Fragrances can be toxic to aquatic life, non-readily biodegradable, bioaccumulative and sensitizing. Stakeholders at the AHWG highlighted that the use of fragrances drives the CDV value up significantly. This would in our view be another argument to restrict fragrances much further. They fulfil no essential function in detergents.	Rejected. Due to other feedback received, we will be changing the reference of the exclusion to Annex III of the Cosmetics Regulation. We have also received multiple arguments for why fragrances are in fact advisable (e.g. Southern European consumer expectations, masking of chemical odours, availability of non-allergenic fragrances for use in mild/sensitive products, pooled/aggregated net positive environmental effects versus users opting for conventional products in the market).
p.105 – Fragrances – specifically about the text *"Due to the vast number of fragrance substances and the data gaps that still exist in testing for allergenic and sensitising properties, it is proposed that any EU Ecolabel detergent products claiming "mild" or "sensitive" properties must also be fragrance free."* Comment: On what basis is the statement made on data gaps? The RIFM program has nearly completed the assessment of the majority of fragrance ingredients in use for various endpoints, including sensitization. With regard to claims, they should always follow high scientific and ethical criteria, whether addressing products with fragrances or not. Often products are not labelled with 'fragrance/perfume', and may be labelled as 'fragrance-free', but actually contain single individual fragrancing components (which are separately listed by their INCI name). - -	Acknowledged. We now propose to remove the fragrance-free requirement from mild/sensitive claim products in line with your arguments and those provided by other stakeholders. In addition, the JRC would welcome insights on the the state-of-the-art with the RIFM program?
p.104 - Fragrances	Accepted. We will propose this change in TR2.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: We fully support the extension of the list and we propose to replace the «table 13-1» of SCCS opinion by «annex III of the cosmetic regulation 1223/2009» which has been revised to include this extended list of 82 substances. - -	
p.104 – Fragrances, specifically about the text: *"Products marked as "mild/sensitive" shall be fragrance-free. Substances listed under Table 13-1 of the SCCS opinion on 'Fragrance allergens in cosmetic products' (172) shall not be present in EU Ecolabel products in concentrations higher than 0,010% (by weight) per substance. Fragrances which are prohibited according to Annex II to the Cosmetics Regulation (173) shall not be present in EU Ecolabel products in concentrations ≥ 0,010 % (by weight) per substance."* Comment: IFRA is not in favour of banning fragrance in products marked as mild/ sensitive. IFRA would also like to question what is considered 'fragrance-free'. Often products are not labelled with 'fragrance/perfume', and may be labelled as 'fragrance-free', but actually contain single individual fragrancing components (which are separately listed by their INCI name). Suggested actions: IFRA promotes the safe use of fragrances (safety for health/the environment), but if there is a need to provide an additional level of reassurance/ safety for sensitive/ mild products, additional limitations can be proposed by further reducing the thresholds for example. Rationale: Most of the fragrance ingredients prohibited in the Cosmetics Regulation are also prohibited by IFRA. Proposing to ban fragrances for mild/sensitive products does not guarantee any user safety though. A good sensoriality of the use of a detergent is possible, combined with a limited risk of developing irritation, sensitization, or skin allergy (as hypoallergenic labelled products can for example guarantee the possible use of scented products even if consumers have sensitive skin, atopic, or if they are sensitized or allergic to certain skin allergens).	Accepted. We have proposed to no longer require a ban of fragrances with the mild/sensitive claims, but instead we place additional conditions for fragrance substances that can be used.
p.104 - Fragrances – specifically about the text *"which is available at available at http://www.ifraorg.org. "* Comment: The link mentioned in the report is incorrect. This is the correct link to the IFRA website: https://ifrafragrance.org/ Suggested actions: https://ifrafragrance.org/ -	Accepted. Thanks for the correction.
p.105 – Fragrances – specifically about the text *"The SCCS opinion identified over 80 fragrance allergens but no "safe use concentrations" for these substances have been determined for their use in cosmetics products. This was part of the reasoning why EU Ecolabel criteria for cosmetic products introduced this restriction on "Table 13-1 fragrance substances""*	Acknowledged. We will take the input into account in the rationale text in TR2.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: The allergen labelling is to inform the already sensitized consumer, to prevent products containing those. Safe thresholds if considered necessary should be derived based on induction data. Rationale: Here is an extract of the Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/1545 of 26 July 2023 amending Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 as regards labelling of fragrance allergens in cosmetic products in relation to the SCCS conclusions: "In light of the SCCS opinion, it can be concluded that there is a potential risk to human health arising from the use of the additional fragrance allergens identified by the SCCS and that it is necessary to inform consumers about the presence of those fragrance allergens. Therefore, an obligation to individually label those fragrance allergens should be introduced in Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 when their concentration exceeds 0,001 % in leave-on products and 0,01 % in rinse-off products. Furthermore, fragrance substances, such as prehaptens and prohaptens, that can be transformed to known contact allergens via air oxidation or bioactivation should be treated as equivalent to fragrance allergens and be subject to the same restrictions and other regulatory requirements."	
p.105 – Fragrances – specifically about the text *"Further research is proposed to look at which of the ca. 400 entries in Annex III correspond to fragrance substances and to see what types of hazardous properties these substances exhibit before making any general blanket restrictions."* Comment: There should not be restrictions on fragrance ingredients - and in principle not on any ingredient based on hazard but on risk assessment. - -	Rejected. The whole EU Ecolabel approach, stemming from Article 6(6) of the EU Ecolabel Regulation (EC) No 66/2010, is hazard-based and only in very well justified cases a deviation from such approach could be possible. We deem there are enough tools/information to actually proceed with a hazard-based approach for the case of fragrances.
p.105 – Fragrances – specifically about the text: *"Fragrances are banned altogether in IIDD products and allowed in household DD products mainly because they can be used to mask the smell of certain ingredients. Consumers generally do not need or want their washed utensils to "smell" clean. The extent to which fragrance substances are actually used in EUEL licensed DD products will be evaluated before deciding on how valid this supported argument for allowing fragrances in DD products is."* Comment: It is worth noting that in the revised Commission proposal on the Detergents Regulation, the definition of a "detergent" is the following: "– a substance, mixture or micro-organism, or two or more such materials in combination, which is intended for cleaning of fabrics, dishes or surfaces; – a mixture intended for soaking (pre-washing), rinsing or bleaching fabrics or dishes;	Acknowledged. We understand that there is no uniform conclusion to consumer preferences that can be applied at European level, especially given the North-South differential preference highlighted by other stakeholders. However, there should be a clear order of importance of fragrances in different types of detergent product in terms of how commonly they are used. This is reflected in TR2 using the insights provided by other stakeholders.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
– a mixture intended to modify the feel of fabrics in processes which are to complement the washing of fabrics;" Suggested actions: IFRA would like to request clarifications on the rationale for this statement. Rationale: The market reality confirms that consumers actually prefer fragranced products. Fragrance free products are available but have a minor market share.	
p.106 – Fragrances – specifically about *"While the impacts of fragrance formulations are therefore significant for some impact categories, LCA is not the best tool to justify any specific recommendations. However, given the fact that 2 of the most affected impact categories are toxicity-related, this would support any specific hazard substance or CDV value-related restrictions for individual fragrance ingredients."* Comment: Most of the conclusions are based on Ecotoxicity, Human toxicity, Ozone depletion and Mineral resource. Ecotoxicity environmental indicator is based on an older UseTox model where the available characterization factors cover a limited set of ingredients and consequently is bias and inappropriate to be used for complex chemistry such as fragrance. Most of the conclusion are made on these four indicators which are, combined, not covering more than 20% of the weighting factor for a PEF single score. Driving these conclusions on those minors elements is misleading and methodologically questionable.	Acknowledged. We are aware of limitations of impact assessment methods related to toxicity impact categories. We would like to point out that the methods used in our assessment correspond to those of Environmental Footprint 3.1, which is the most updated version available. Though we agree that the characterization factors used in this version are based on older USEtox versions, updates have been applied in 2022 that can be found in Andreasi Bassi et al (2023). Hence, the conclusions that were found are based on the most recent method available. Furthermore, it should be noted that the limitations of the Ecotoxicity indicator have low influence in the total result, given that the category has a very low weighting factor of just 1.92% in PEF scoring. Likewise, human toxicity (cancer) and (non-cancer), get weightings of 2.13% and 1.84% respectively. Other categories for which fragrances were found to have a notable relative contribution according to results considered to support conclusions in TR1, namely ozone depletion and mineral resources, do have high weighting factors of 6.31% and 7.55%, respectively. Moreover, according to updated results reported in TR2, additional impact categories have been found to also have a relevant contribution from fragrances, namely particulate matter and land use. The removal of a fragrance representing 1.36% of the total weight could lead to impact reductions of 4% and 6%, respectively for these categories.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	Again, these categories have relevant weighting factors of 8.96%, in the case of particulate matter, and 7.94%, in the case of land use, which supports our conclusions.
p.104 - Fragrances Comment: · We strongly support a limitation of fragrances. · In particular it is crucial to enhance the regulation of detergents intended for areas with children (such as those used in daycare centers, schools, and households), especially products labelled as "special for babies". · We do not know whether to require the removal of fragrances for claims such as "mild/sensitive" for detergents products. Suggested actions: · At least, we should request that LV provide evidence to the CB to prove this claim (e.g., hypoallergenic testing) if it is made. Additionally, we think it is essential to have more stringent requirements in general for all detergents that may contain fragrances than the limited ones currently requested in EU Ecolabel decisions. · For detergents intended for areas with children: we can consider prohibiting the use of fragrances, or at the very least, the use of classified fragrances. Additionally, we should prohibit detergents that claim to have "super fragrant" effects, especially in areas with children. Rationale: · Because the current limitations on fragrances are not adequate. · However LH would like to emphasize that the allergen criterion mitigates the risk associated with using fragrances. They explain that excluding fragrances will lead to a decrease in the purchase of products within the scope of the European Ecolabel, in favour of non-certified products. They also add that consumers in southern European countries expect products with fragrances for a sense of cleanliness and to mask unpleasant odors from detergent substances. In addition we would like to emphasize the need to consider the consumption habits of Northern European countries, where fragrance-free products are more common, unlike in Southern European countries. We also suggest that it is important to remain vigilant and not automatically align with the Nordic Swan criteria, as consumers in Northern and Southern Europe have different preferences. - -	Partially accepted. We could consider the hypoallergenic testing for products with sensitive/mild claims but this would certainly and significantly increase the resources required, thus the burden to EUEL applicants. Instead, we would like to wait until 2nd AHWG discussion are concluded to assess whether it could be beneficial to include such hypoallergenic testing. Note that the proposals made in this TR2 imply a compromise by which fragrances can be used but conditioned to showing enhanced levels of certainty and reduced presence of substances which may have sensitising potential . We are not sure if concepts as “special for babies” and/or “super fragrant” can be clearly/explicitly defined in a Commission legal text. However, claims made on the product should be (ideally) backed up by a rationale and proofs sustaining such claims.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.104 - Fragrances Comment: Suggested actions: IFRA certificates for fragrances should be mandated, not just a declaration.	Accepted. This has now been proposed in TR2.

7.6.6. (e) Preservatives (6 comments)

This was a general condition for any preservatives used, and not to be mixed up with other parts of the proposals that talk about exclusions and restrictions of certain types of preservatives. The only real change here that was proposed in TR1 was to make the bioaccumulation requirements less stringent than before (i.e. BCF of <100 changing to <500, and Log Kow changing from <3.0 to <4.0). The reasons for this would be to simply align with the CLP thresholds.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.108 – – 7.6.5. proposed sub-criterion (e) on preservatives Comment: Beside the change of limits it would be great to add in the criteria, that BCF and/or log Kow do not need to be measured experimentally by each raw material supplier and that it is sufficient to use the existing data in ECHA substance database – Suggested action: Beside the change of limits it would be great to add in the criteria, that BCF and/or log Kow do not need to be measured experimentally by each raw material supplier and that it is sufficient to use the existing data in ECHA substance database -	Partially accepted. We agree that it is a good idea to add this information about being able to refer to data already available in the ECHA database. Hence, whilst not proposed, a dedicated question to gather stakeholders feedback on its suitability has been included. In addition, note that in the TR2 we are proposing to resort back to the initial and more ambition limits for BCF (<100) and log Kow (<3.0).
p.108 – 7.6.5. proposed sub-criterion (e) on preservatives Comment: No objection to the change of limit for BCF and Log Kow: the lower value so far were not restrictive, so the change will most probably have no impact. - -	Acknowledged.
p.106 – 7.6.5. proposed sub-criterion (e) on preservatives Comment: BFC threshold: in favour of new increase in BFC threshold (< 500 and log Kow < 4.0 for a preservative or colouring agent to be considered bioaccumulative) - -	Rejected – The JRC is reverting to its initial values for BCF and log Kow
p.106 – 7.6.5. proposed sub-criterion (e) on preservatives Comment: We do not support adjusting the factors defining bioaccumulation, BCF and log Kow, to the new definition in the CLP Regulation. Suggested action: Keep the criterion text as it is: cut-off values for BCF is < 100 or log Kow is < 3,0. The same applies for the sub-criterion on colourants.	Accepted

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Rationale: The revision should not be an occasion to make requirements less ambitious. Current license holders are able to comply with the current stricter values, so there is no need to change this.	
p.106 – 7.6.5. proposed sub-criterion (e) on preservatives Comment: Additional comments: We are not in favor of these thresholds has the current thresholds are easily met by 1,000 currently certified detergents - -	Accepted
p.106 – 7.6.5. proposed sub-criterion (e) on preservatives Comment: for BCF and log Kow Suggested actions: Keeping the current thresholds for BCF and log Kow Rationale: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, it is not necessary to changes these thresholds because the current thresholds are easily met by our 1,000 detergents currently certified. - -	Accepted

7.6.6. (f) Colourants (3 comments)

The only real change here that was proposed in TR1 was to make the bioaccumulation requirements less stringent than before (i.e. BCF of <100 changing to <500, and Log Kow changing from <3.0 to <4.0). The reasons for this would be to simply align with the CLP thresholds.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.108 –7.6.6. proposed sub-criterion (f) on colourants Comment: Against banning colours: color coding of the products itself (with dye), of the product label, of the label on the refill bottle and on the dispenser is an important piece to give the users guidance in any kind of handling of the product e.g. warehousing, refilling and the right usage Additional safety reasons: In some countries it is mandatory to mark corrosive products with color it is easier to guide the employees of customer that for instance "'red' product concentrate needs to be given into the 'red' labeled reservoir in the dispenser and the button with the 'red' label need to be pushed to refill product in the 'red' refill bottle. And the 'red' product needs to be used for sanitary cleaning." Prevention of contact of products not compatible. Customer requires certain products be dyed to see if they are in the tubing for dispensing equipment. This is a safety factor to ensure tubes are not disconnected with potentially dangerous chemistry inside - -	Partially accepted – The use of colouring agents is still maintained but only for products inherently of professional nature (IILD and IIDD product groups) and those marketed as professional products (for the case of HDD and HSC). We acknowledge the function that colour coding exerts and we understand it has an important role in favouring safer working patterns. Since this is mostly applicable to the "reality"/"needs" of products in the professional sphere, thus the restriction to professional products only.
p.108 –7.6.6. proposed sub-criterion (f) on colourants	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: Colourants do not contribute any essential function to detergents and are therefore unnecessary chemical load. Suggested action: Assess the possibility to exclude colourants from consumer detergents, professional detergents, or both. Rationale: One stakeholder at the AHWG mentioned the necessity for colourants in professional products because some cleaning services may rely on a colour code to quickly identify the intended use of the specific detergent. We acknowledge this point but also wonder how wide-spread such colour-dependent services are and whether there could be ways to distinguish the products other than based on the colour of detergent.	
Coloring agents. Should be excluded from ecolabelled products since they do not have a function	
p.108 - 7.6.6. proposed sub-criterion (f) on colouring agents Comment: We do not support the proposed changes for BCF and log Kow Suggested actions: Keeping the current thresholds for BCF and log Kow Rationale: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, it is not necessary to changes these thresholds because the current thresholds are easily met by our 1,000 detergents currently certified. - -	Accepted – In the TR2 the values are maintained as per existing (in-force) EUEL detergents criteria (BCF < 100; Log Kow <3.0)

7.6.7. (g) Enzymes (9 comments)

The comments are focused entirely on section 7.6.9 of TR1

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.109 – 7.6.7. Enzymes Comment: AMFEP, Association of Manufacturers and Formulators of Enwyme Products: Line 2159 - 2172: we propose the below alternative text. "Indeed, enzymes were introduced in detergent products in the mid-1960s and due to the dusty form at that point in time they were causing allergies and irritation to employees during the manufacturing processes. Also a few isolated cases among end users were reported. In order to eliminate this issue, dust-free forms of enzymes were developed and are available for detergent formulations. Liquid and slurry forms can also be safely used."	Accepted – the corresponding TR2 rationale has been modified to reflect the suggestion made.
p.109 – 7.6.7. Enzymes	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: Comment from the Association of Manufacturers and Formulators of Enzyme Products (AMFEP). On line 2155-2156, it would be relevant to replace the wording "enwyme scattering" with "enzyme dust". Suggested action: Replacing the wording "enwyme scattering" with "enzyme dust" in lines 2155-2156. Rationale: A.I.S.E's 2018 guidance on the safe handling of enzymes refers to enzyme dust generally when addressing control measures to prevent inhalation by employees during the manufacturing process or end-users.	
p.109 – 7.6.7. Enzymes Comment: Comments from the Association of Manufacturers and Formulators of Enzyme Products (AMFEP) Line 2159 - 2172: we propose the below alternative text. "Indeed, enzymes were introduced in detergent products in the mid-1960s and due to the dusty form at that point in time they were causing allergies and irritation to employees during the manufacturing processes. Also a few isolated cases among end users were reported. In order to eliminate this issue, dust-free forms of enzymes were developed and are available for detergent formulations. Liquid and slurry forms can also be safely used." Suggested action: Replacing the paragraph in lines 2159 to 2162 by the following text: "Indeed, enzymes were introduced in detergent products in the mid-1960s and due to the dusty form at that point in time they were causing allergies and irritation to employees during the manufacturing processes. Also a few isolated cases among end users were reported. In order to eliminate this issue, dust-free forms of enzymes were developed and are available for detergent formulations. Liquid and slurry forms can also be safely used." Rationale: The paragraph s grammatically incorrect and needs rewriting. As highlighted in the attached statement on the safety of industrial enzymes. Indeed, for more than 50 years no consumer incidences have been reported, and for workers or workers a few cases of enzyme allergies have been reported over the years where the derived minimal effect level has not been complied with. We feel the wording of the paragraph in lines 2159-2162 should be revised to be grammatically correct and to properly reflect the history of industrial enzymes for workers and consumers.	
p.110 – 7.6.7. Enzymes Comment: Comments from the Association of Manufacturers and Formulators of Enzyme Products (AMFEP). Line 2166 - Enzyme encapsulates. We want to draw your attention that enzyme granulates are coated to reduce enzyme aerosol.	
p.109 – 7.6.7. (g) Enzymes	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: Enzyme scattering - Probably it is more straight forward to call it "enzyme dust". Suggested action: Change 'enzyme scattering' to 'enzyme dust'. Rationale: Enzyme dust has been widely used, for example A.I.S.E.'s guidance documents on enzyme safety.	
p.109 – 7.6.7. (g) Enzymes. Line 2159 - 2177: Comment: we propose the alternative text. Suggested action: Change the test as below. Indeed, enzymes were introduced in detergent products in the mid-1960s and due to the dusty form at that point in time they were causing allergies and irritation to employees during the manufacturing processes. Also a few isolated cases among end users were reported. In order to eliminate this issue, dust-free forms of enzymes were developed and are available for detergent formulations. Liquid and slurry forms can also be safely used. Rationale: The reference is old. The detergent and enzyme industry have been accumulating suvillance data.	
p.110 – 7.6.7. (g) Enzymes. Line 2166 Comment: Enzyme encapsulates Rationale: We want to draw your attention that enzyme granulates are coated to reduce enzyme aerosol. It does not mean that it is encapsulated in microplastics.	
p.109 – 7.6.7. Enzymes Comment: Propose amendment of the text by erasing the part mentioning the white papers published by Novozymes: Not relevant info for explaining the criteria The sources referenced are not scientific, peer reviewed and we do not agree with the data LATAM and ASIA markets are not comparable with Europa. Formulations and wash process are not the same, We do not agree with the message that enzymes can reduce/substitute surfactants. These ingredients have different functions. End result can be that the reader thinks that enzymes can also be replaced by using more surfactants. Enzymes are not replaceable, they are essential for use.	Partially accepted – We acknowledge that the text might have not conveyed comprehensive or clearly the intended message: enzymes as ingredient contributes to detergent formulations more closely aligned with EUEL goals/criteria. This section has been extensively re-worded making clear that those two cases were examples to illustrate a concept and they should be interpreted with care. We acknowledge that each ingredient can have one (or more) functions but if we fix the intended use (cleaning/washing) as the main parameter for comparison, then when doing permutations on formulations focusing on ingredients substitution we understand is relevant and proper to comment which relevant ingredients and which are cases (amongst many others) of what happen when you substitute one/few by another/another few. In this sense, we do not consider that

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
	the content of the text needs to be removed, thus we have maintained part of it.
p.109, - 7.6.6. Proposed sub-criterion (g) on enzymes - line 2135 Comment: Typo error: modify with desorption Proposed sub-criterion (e) enzymes - -	Accepted –

7.6.9. (h) Microorganisms (23 comments)

The comments are focused entirely on section 7.6.9 of TR1 where a proposal was made to update the criteria for microorganisms in detergent products, and also to expand the allowed scope from just HSC products to also household laundry detergent products.

NOTE TO THE READERS

The topic on microorganisms-containing products (MCP) has been extensively discussed since the 1st AHWG in a dedicated working sub-group (sub-AHWG). In this MCP sub-AHWG the comments received from stakeholders following the 1st AHWG were considered, discussed and replied to, thus stakeholders are referred to the corresponding sub-AHWG background document (in this case on MCP) for full details. Hence, **to avoid redundancy, in this Table of Comments all the responses display "Acknowledged"**, in the understanding that such background documents will be consulted.

In addition, experts' discussions and feedback received in this sub-AHWG could have played a role in shaping the proposals made in the 2nd draft EUEL criteria. Consequently, stakeholders are advised to jointly consider the background document of this sub-AHWG alongside the rationales contained in the 2nd draft version of the Technical report (TR2) for full awareness on the process conducive to 2nd draft EUEL proposals.

All the previously cited draft documents are accessible via the website dedicated to the revision of the EUEL criteria for detergents in its "*Documents*" section within the folder "*2023 revision documents*", namely here: https://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/product-bureau/product-groups/411/documents

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.46 – Typo correction Comment: Line 844 / Table 11 In the table "Excluded and restricted substances", the line should read "microrganisms" (omit "Only for HSC)")	Acknowledged
p.112 – p.114 – 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms Comment: Now it's stated in the (x) user information the product shall not be used with a spray trigger mechanism. (for micro organisms topic). This is some restrictions that makes it hard because there are a lot of customers requestion spraying. I would purpose that you can spray the product containing micro organisms if you can state that there are no enzymes produced/ made while spraying the product. I would like to see something change in the restriction that it cannot be used with a spray trigger mechanism. –	Acknowledged
p.113 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms Comment: user information "the product shall not be used with a spray trigger mechanism". If safety is a key consideration throughout product development, this statement is not required for microbial based cleaning products. Suggested action: Ensure that concerns related to spray use are addressed in the proposed standardised approach for the microbial risk assessment Rationale: Inhalation exposure can be mitigated by careful product design. Using a safe-by-design approach we can minimise the generation of aerosols from a spray. This includes choosing formulation and trigger spray hardware combinations that produce fewer small droplets that could be inhaled. Technology exists to measure the size of droplets or particles generated by a spray product and provides a means to achieve this in the design phase.	Acknowledged
p.113 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms Comment: User information: "the product should not be used on surfaces in contact with food" If safety is a key consideration throughout product development, this statement is not required for microbial based cleaning products Suggested action: Ensure food contact concerns are addressed in the proposed microbial risk assessment Rationale: Residues on food contact surfaces would not pose a risk to human health provided they are QPS and any qualifications within the QPS listing are met, for example, they do not produce toxins and are not pathogenic and are of low risk in the transmission of antimicrobial resistance	Acknowledged
p.110 – Line 2180 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: Should omit "(Only for LD, HSC)". A consolidated proposal for re-drafting the existing sub-criterion (h) micro-orgasnism is provided in Annex	
p.114 Comment: A consolidated proposal for re-drafting the existing sub-criterion (h) micro-organism is provided in attachment	Acknowledged
p.110 – 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"(i) Identification: all intentionally added micro-organisms shall have an American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) number, belong to a collection of an International Depository Authority (IDA) or have had their DNA identified in accordance with a 'Strain identification protocol' (using 16S ribosomal DNA sequencing or an equivalent method)."* Suggested action: (i) Identification: The name and taxonomic classification of all intentionally added micro-organism shall be provided, according to the latest published information in the International Codes of Nomenclature (ICN). Microbial strains shall be deposited in an internationally recognised culture collection (preferably in the European Union) and maintained by the culture collection for the authorised life of the detergent. Rationale: Justification a) Reference to a single (furthermore non-EU) culture collection is not adequate. Identification requirements are also not up to state of the art. Proposal is aligned on requirements by EC and EFSA in Food/feed context. c) Proposal is more comprehensive than original text that refers only to QPS. When the microorganism is listed in the EFSA QPS list and fulfils any relevant qualification, no further safety assessment would be required (as proposed in the original text). The QPS is however not an exhaustive tool, so a path should be provided to allow for the use of other microorganisms that have not been scrutinized under the QPS approach. It is then proposed to refer in this case to the EFSA guidance on the characterization of microorganisms (see full reference above) , which is the regular EFSA assessment recommendation for the microorganisms that have not gone through / are not listed in the QPS. This guidance provides a high level of safety, equivalent to the QPS assessment.	Acknowledged
p.110-111 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"(ii) Safety: all intentionally added micro-organisms shall belong to both of the following:* *— Risk Group I as defined by Directive 2000/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (1) — biological agents at work,* *— the Qualified Presumption of Safety (QPS) list issued by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)."* Suggested action: (ii) Safety: all intentionally added micro-organisms shall — Belong to Risk Group I as defined by Directive 2000/54/EC of the European Parliament and	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
of the Council (1) — biological agents at work, - Have a safety assessment carried out by the placer on the market and available to authorities. When the microorganism is included in the Qualified Presumption of Safety (QPS) list issued by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and it fulfills the qualifications provided by it, this shall be considered as a sufficient safety assessment. When the microorganism is not listed in the QPS list a safety assessment shall be documented according to relevant sections of the EFSA guidance on the characterisation of microorganisms used as feed additives or as production organisms (j.efsa.2018.5206).-	
p.111 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"(iv) Intentionally added micro-organisms shall not be genetically modified microorganisms (GMMs)"* Suggested action: (v) Antibiotic susceptibility: all intentionally added micro-organisms shall be assessed for their antimicrobial susceptibility and their antimicrobial production, according to EFSA Guidance on the characterisation of microorganisms used as feed additives or as production organisms. (EFSA Journal 2018;16(3):5206, 24 pp) Rationale: Justification These requirements are included under the safety requirements provided in section ii of the Annex either under QPS or under the safety requirements of the EFSA guidance. So this paragraph could as well be omitted. If maintained, the requirements regarding antibiotic resistance should be re-drafted through the proposed paragraph that make reference to the state-of-the-art EU regulatory reference in this respect, i.e the EFSA guidance on characterization of microorganisms	Acknowledged
p.111 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"(v) Antibiotic susceptibility: all intentionally added micro-organisms shall be, with the exception of intrinsic resistance, susceptible to each of the five major antibiotic classes (aminoglycoside, macrolide, beta-lactam, tetracycline and fluoroquinolones) in accordance with the EUCAST disk diffusion method or equivalent."* Suggested action: (V) Antibiotic susceptibility: all intentionally added micro-organisms shall be assessed for their antimicrobial susceptibility and their antimicrobial production, according to EFSA Guidance on the characterisation of microorganisms used as feed additives or as production organisms. (EFSA Journal 2018;16(3):5206, 24 pp) Rationale: Justification These requirements are included under the safety requirements provided in section ii of the Annex either under QPS or under the safety requirements of the EFSA guidance. So this	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
paragraph could as well be omitted. If maintained, the requirements regarding antibiotic resistance should be re-drafted through the proposed paragraph that make reference to the state-of-the-art EU regulatory reference in this respect, i.e the EFSA guidance on characterization of microorganisms	
p.111 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"(vi) Microbial count: products in their in-use form shall have a standard plate count equal to or greater than 1 × 10 5 colony-forming units (CFU) per ml in accordance with ISO 4833-1:2014."* Suggested action: (Vi) Microbial count and shelf life: The microorganism count/concentration in the detergent (CFU/ml – Colony Forming Unit for liquids or CFU/g for dry products) shall be guaranteed accordingly and the shelf life and manufacturing date of the detergent indicated on the packaging. Rationale: Justification There seem to be no a priori justification for requiring a specific plate count (equivalent to concentration) since the efficacy of microbial detergent is specific to each strain and purpose. This information should be part of the labelling requirement but without any fixed threshold . One have to bear in mind that certain products are sold in solid form for mixing with water before use, so in this case concentration should be expressed as CFU/g.	Acknowledged
p.111 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"(vii) Shelf life: the minimum shelf life of the product shall not be lower than 24 months and the microbial count shall not decrease by more than 10 % every 12 months in accordance with ISO 4833-1:2014."* Suggested action: (delete) Rationale: Justification As for the plate count, there is no a priori justification for imposing any specific shelf life. It is however relevant that the shelf life of any microbial detergent be transparently communicated through the product labelling and this requirement is included in (proposed/amended) section vi	Acknowledged
p.111 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"(viii) Fitness for use: the product shall fulfil all the requirements set out in Criterion 6 on fitness for use and all claims made by the manufacturer on the actions of the micro-organisms contained in the product shall be documented through third-party testing."* Suggested action: (viii) Fitness for use: the product shall fulfil all the requirements set out in Criterion 6 on fitness for use and all claims made by the manufacturer on the actions of the micro-organisms contained in the product shall be objective, verifiable by the competent authority and understandable by the user of the detergent. The placer on the market of the	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
detergent shall provide at the request of the competent authority, scientific substantiation of the claim. Rationale: Justification The testing by third parties is required only for micro-organisms detergent products in Ecolabel. That creates market distortions for detergents under the scope of Ecolabel. It would be appreciated to accept a similar approach than for feed materials and compound feeds according to EU Regulation No 767/2009: scientific substantiation of the claim(s) that could be requested at the request of the competent authority that is based on either by reference to publicly available scientific evidence or through documented company research.	
p.111 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"(x) User information: the product label shall include the following information:* *— that the product contains micro-organisms,* *— that the product shall not be used with a spray trigger mechanism,* *- that the product should not be used on surfaces in contact with food,* *— an indication of the shelf life of the product."* Suggested action: (x) User information: the product label shall include the following information: — that the product contains micro-organisms, — an indication of the micro-organisms concentration and shelf life of the product. - Use instructions and/or special precautions, where relevant, e.g. a precautionary statement in case of use via spray format Rationale: Justification The restriction on spray format should be omitted. This format is an important application for microbial detergents, allowing ease of use and to reach areas that would otherwise be difficult to reach and where such detergent bring an added value. In that case, it should be requested to mention on the label use instructions and/or special precautions where relevant for the safety of the users based on its risk assessment. The restriction regarding the use on food contact surfaces should also be omitted. There is not safety justification for this, bearing in mind in particular that the microorganisms are for their majority already authorised for use in food and feed, or are proposed -under section (ii)- to be assessed according to the food/feed safety assessment reference. It should be appreciated that these microbial detergents are on the contrary particularly suitable for the cleaning of surface in food workshop context, where they provide a safe and efficient alternative to traditional chemicals, with prolonged action. They also offer a very suitable tool for the cleaning of	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
complex surfaces or appliances (refrigeration exchangers, etc) that are otherwise difficult to clean. In addition to the indication of the shelf-life, the concentration of added micro-organisms should be added according to the proposal for section Vi.	
p.111-112 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"(i) The name (to the strain) and identification of all micro- organisms contained in the product with ATCC or IDA numbers or documentation on DNA identification.* *(ii) Documentation demonstrating that all micro-organisms belong to Risk Group I and the QPS list.* *(iii) Test documentation demonstrating that the pathogenic micro- organisms are not present in the product.* *(iv) Documentation demonstrating that all micro-organisms are not GMMs.* *(v) Test documentation demonstrating that all micro-organisms are, with the exception of intrinsic resistance, susceptible to each of the five major antibiotic classes indicated.* *(vi) Test documentation of CFU per ml of in-use solution (for undiluted products, the dilution ratio recommended for 'normal' cleaning shall be used).* *(vii) Test documentation of CFU per ml of in-use solution every 12 months for a product stored until the end of its shelf life.* *(viii) Test results from a third-party laboratory demonstrating the claimed actions of the micro-organisms and artwork of the packaging or a copy of the product's label highlighting any claims made on the actions of the micro-organisms.* *(ix) and (x) Artwork of the packaging or a copy of the product's label."* Suggested action: Assessment and verification: the applicant shall provide: (i) The name (to the strain) and identification of all micro- organisms contained in the product according to requirements of section i (ii) Documentation demonstrating that all micro-organisms belong to Risk Group I and have been assessed for their safety according to EFSA guidance. (iii) Test documentation demonstrating that the pathogenic micro- organisms are not present in the product. (iv) Documentation demonstrating that all micro-organisms are not GMMs. (v) Test documentation demonstrating that all micro-organisms have been assessed for their antimicrobial susceptibility , with the exception of intrinsic resistance, and their antimicrobial production, according to EFSA Guidance (vi) Test documentation of the concentration in CFU of in-use solution (for undiluted products, the dilution ratio recommended for 'normal' cleaning shall be used).	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
(vii) Test results demonstrating the claimed actions of the micro-organisms and artwork of the packaging or a copy of the product's label highlighting any claims made on the actions of the micro-organisms. (viii) and (ix) Artwork of the packaging or a copy of the product's label. Rationale: Justification It is suggested to omit the third party laboratory requirement (vii) for documenting the claimed action. This bring little added value while increasing red tapes	
p.113 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: Comment: Refers to: user information "the product shall not be used with a spray trigger mechanism". Comment: If safety is a key consideration throughout product development, this statement is not required for microbial based cleaning products. Suggested action: Ensure that concerns related to spray use are addressed in the proposed microbial risk assessment. - Inhalation exposure can be mitigated by careful product design. Using a safe-by-design approach we can minimise the generation of aerosols from a spray. Together with a robust and evidence-based risk assessment this ensures that spray products containing micro-organisms are safe.	Acknowledged
p.113 - 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms, regarding the text: *"User information: [...] the product should not be used on surfaces in contact with food".* Comment: If safety is a key consideration throughout product development, this statement is not required for microbial based cleaning products Suggested action: Ensure food contact concerns are addressed in the proposed microbial risk assessment. Rationale: Residues on food contact surfaces would not pose a risk to human health provided they are QPS and/or qualifications within the QPS listing are met, for example, they do not produce toxins and are not pathogenic and are of low risk in the transmission of antimicrobial resistance.	Acknowledged
p.114 – 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms Comment: In support of the threshold set to prove product performance and would like to recommend the inclusion of additional methodology standards to determine microbial count. Suggested action: Review ISO 21149:2017 methodology for its application to determine microbial count of microbial based cleaning products. Rationale: There is no specific standard available for detergents, however, there are other standards available for cosmetic and non-sterile pharmaceutical products i.e., ISO 21149:2017 Cosmetics Microbiology Standard. These concerned products are more familiar with the unique	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
nature of detergents than foods and so we believe that ISO 21149 is appropriate for the purpose of determining microbial count in a Detergent product.	
p.114 – 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms Question: We do not believe that a percentage threshold is suitable for determining microbial count reduction. Suggested action: Due to this challenge, rather than emphasizing a specific reduction level for microorganisms, our recommendation would be to prove that your product is maintaining/ achieving a microbial count above the threshold for product performance (equal to or greater than 1x10^5 cfu per ml) at the end of the shelf-life. Rationale: Microbial colonies are counted in Log scale and represented as Log X CFU/ml. Any reduction in the count is represented as log reduction e.g, 10-fold reduction as 90%, 100-fold as 99% and so on. However, a 10% decrease poses a challenge for precise measurement due to the margin of error inherent in methodologies. Moreover, applying percentage units in this scenario without specifying a scale becomes insignificant in terms of log scale. Additionally, natural decay of microorganisms in certain conditions e.g. in presence of certain actives, can make meeting these requirements impossible, adding complexity to the process.	Acknowledged
p.114 – 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms Question: If micro-organisms are to be kept in the scope/extended to LD, additional safety requirements should be introduced. Suggested action: We support that the JRC intends to investigate this topic further and propose taking experience from the Bra Miljoval ecolabel into account. Rationale: Further inspiration could be taken by the requirements set by the label Bra Miljoval for chemical products: https://cdn.naturskyddsforeningen.se/uploads/2021/06/22173951/Criteria_Bra_Miljoval_Chemical_Products_2018-1_20181125_0-1.pdf While similar to the criterion proposed for the EU Ecolabel two additional precautionary measures are included: 1) micro-organisms may not be added to spray products because health effects by inhalation were assessed to be too poorly researched. 2) for products likely to come into contact with surfaces where food is prepared, only micro-organisms that have been approved by EFSA for use in food may be used. This could be a relevant addition for the HSC.	Acknowledged
p.112 – 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms Comment: "shelf life: the minimum shelf life of the product shall not be lower than 24 months and the microbial count shall not decrease by more than 10 % (measured in logarithmic scale) every 12 months in accordance with ISO 4833-1:2014." To ensure the understanding of this	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
criterion: starting from an initial CFU of 1x10^5, then the CFU will be after 2 years:Linear scale: 0.8x10^5 ;> decrease to 80% of the initial CFULogarithmic scale: 1x10^4 ;> decrease to 10% of the initial CFUThe decrease on the logarithmic scale gets even worse for every added year to the minimum shelf live. According to the "2nd Technical report" (2015) the CFU of 1x10^5 is the minimum microbial content to ensure that there are sufficient micro-organsims present, therefore it seems logical to assume that the CFU should never be lower then 1x10^5 until the end of the shelf live. It is required that all products fullfil the fitness for use test. At the end of the claimed shelf live a product should pass the fitness for use test as well. Suggested action: Clarify if the CFU of 1x10^5 is the minimum value that has to be exceeded during the whole shelf live or not. If this is not the case then it should be ensure that the performance of the product is tested at the end of the shelf life to demonstrate the required fitness for use. -	
p.110 – 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms Comment: List of safe micro-organisms. Rationale: At the first Ad Hoc meeting, it was discussed if the criteria should refer to a list on safe microrganisms which is reasonably often updated. We believe that it is difficult to find such a list for the purpose of the EU Ecolabel. The risk assessment e.g. proposed by the industry should give sufficient measures for safety.	Acknowledged
p.112 – 7.6.9. proposed sub-criterion (h) on micro-organisms Comment: I am open to allow microorganism in detergents, but only and only if MOs have the same or better performance in combination with a lower chemical load (CDV) – which is the explanation for the use of MOs. I would like to see research experiences comparing ordinary detergent products with products where surfactants are substituted with MO. The use shall clearly make a difference in performance and shall be included in the performances testing. Also the addition of microorganisms shall have an impact on the CDV value – less chemicals are needed hence a lower CDV value can be introduced. Guidance to applicants and CB´s are needed to document and verify these requirements – this guidance shall be included in the User Manual. Also, if a detergent's better performance AND lower CDV due to MOs requires extraordinary measures from the user/consumer, this should be clearly stated on the product and marked as an alternative washing/cleaning product. Such measures could e.g. be longer washing cycles, special washing programs or presoaking, and the product and these measures should be tested	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
against a reference detergent according to the test conditions specified in the criteria. Consumers will feel misguided in choosing an ecolabelled product with a modus operandi and performance different from ordinary products.	

Responses to Q35, Q36, Q37 and Q38 on micro-organisms (19 comments)

These responses have been grouped together because they all ask about different aspects of the same topic, namely requirements for microorganisms used in detergent products.

Question 35 asks: "do you support requiring a microbial risk assessment as a proof of safety? If not, do you have any proposal to assess microbial containing products safety?"

Question 36 asks: "do you have any suggestion to complement the microorganisms list in (iii)"

Question 37 asks: "do you support the threshold set (equal or greater than 1 × 105 CFU) to prove product performance via microbial counts? If not, could you share reasons?"

Question 38 asks: "do you support current shelf-life requirements (vi)? Do you consider it represents properly also products falling under LD scope?"

NOTE TO THE READERS

The topic on microorganisms-containing products (MCP) has been extensively discussed since the 1st AHWG in a dedicated working sub-group (sub-AHWG). In this MCP sub-AHWG the comments received from stakeholders following the 1st AHWG were considered, discussed and replied to, thus stakeholders are referred to the corresponding sub-AHWG background document (in this case on MCP) for full details. Hence, **to avoid redundancy, in this Table of Comments all the responses display "Acknowledged"**, in the understanding that such background documents will be consulted.

In addition, experts' discussions and feedback received in this sub-AHWG could have played a role in shaping the proposals made in the 2nd draft EUEL criteria. Consequently, stakeholders are advised to jointly consider the background document of this sub-AHWG alongside the rationales contained in the 2nd draft version of the Technical report (TR2) for full awareness on the process conducive to 2nd draft EUEL proposals.

All the previously cited draft documents are accessible via the website dedicated to the revision of the EUEL criteria for detergents in its "*Documents*" section within the folder "*2023 revision documents*", namely here: https://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/product-bureau/product-groups/411/documents

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.114 – Questions Q35, 36, 37 and 38: Comment Q35: Yes, we do support requiring a microbial risk assessment as a proof of safety. Comment Q36: In our opinion, this issue should be discussed with microbiology experts. Comment Q37: Yes, we do support the threshold set to prove product performance via microbial counts. Should also the highest limit for microbial density be determined? Comment Q38: We think that the current shelf-life requirements are in the right direction, but this issue needs to be discussed with microbiology experts. Also, we would like to point out that applicants often wish to use accelerated tests at elevated temperatures.	Acknowledged
p.114 - Line: 2217 – 2223 – Questions 35 to Question 38 Comment: We are not affected, therefor any comments.	Acknowledged
p.114 - Questions 35, 36, 37 and 38 Comment Q35: We believe that ensuring safety of the products lies in the responsibility of the manufacturer and should be ensured according to the existing regulations. Safety and risk assessments should only be needed to be provided to authorities upon request. Comment Q36: No, this should be in alignement with the draft on the revision of the detergents regulation. Comment Q37: We believe that there should be no preset requirements for product concentration (CFU - Colony Forming Units), concentration should be transparently declared on the label for the intended effect. –	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment Q38: Stability for the duration of the declared shelf life should be the main requirement. The 24-month shelf-life requirement creates a differentiated approach for microbial and traditional cleaners.	
p.110-114 - Questions 35, 36, 37 and 38 Comment Q35: Should the risk assessment be carried out on the formula or on the raw material containing the microorganisms? What is the scope of the risk assessment? ingestion, cutaneous, respiratory, mutation, etc.? It needs to be more specific about what needs to be assessed, to facilitate the process and harmonization between different countries. Comment Q36: No Comment Q37: No, the microbial count is not sufficient to prove the effectiveness of the microorganisms. Depending on the strain and the rest of the formulation, a higher or lower microbial count will be required. Performance should be demonstrated through specific tests. Comment Q38: This criterion does not allow a product to be brought to market quickly. A 2-year stability study takes a very long time. We need to validate an accelerated ageing method that could reduce the study to 6 months max.	Acknowledged
p.114 - Question 35 Comment: We support the requirement of a microbial risk assessment and would like to see a standardised approach proposed. Suggested action: Propose a standardised approach for the microbial risk assessment which includes criteria for the report and how to identify a third-party expert that would be accepted by EU Ecolabel. Rationale: A microbial risk assessment will demonstrate the safety of individual microbial based cleaning products with consideration to the product format and routes of exposure during use	Acknowledged
p.114 – Question 37 Comment: We are in support of the threshold set to prove product performance and would like to recommend the inclusion of additional methodology standards to determine microbial count. Suggested action: Review ISO 21149:2017 methodology for its application to determine microbial count of microbial based cleaning products. Action: There is no specific standard available for detergents, however, there are other standards available for cosmetic and non-sterile pharmaceutical products i.e., ISO 21149:2017 Cosmetics Microbiology Standard.	Acknowledged
p.114 - Question 38	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: Stakeholder Question 38 - Do you support current shelf-life requirements (vi)? Do you consider it represent properly also products falling under laundry detergent scope? We do not believe that a percentage threshold is suitable for determining microbial count reduction. Suggested action: Due to this challenge, rather than emphasizing a specific reduction level for microorganisms, our recommendation would be to prove that your product is maintaining/ achieving a microbial count above the threshold for product performance (equal to or greater than 1x10^5 cfu per ml) at the end of the shelf-life. Rationale: Microbial colonies are counted in Log scale and represented as Log X CFU/ml. Any reduction in the count is represented as log reduction e.g, 10-fold reduction as 90%, 100-fold as 99% and so on. However, a 10% decrease poses a challenge for precise measurement due to the margin of error inherent in methodologies. Moreover, applying percentage units in this scenario without specifying a scale becomes insignificant in terms of log scale. Additionally, natural decay of microorganisms in certain conditions e.g. in presence of certain actives, can make meeting these requirements impossible, adding complexity to the process.	
p.114 – Line 2217 – Questions 35, 36, 37 and 38 Comment: We support the proposal to replace the existing requiremenbt on QPS by a safety assessment requirement. It is suggested that this assessment should be based on the guidelines provided by EFSA for the assessment of microorganisms for use in food and feed. A proposed phrasing is provided in the attached proposal for modyfying the section 7.6.9 - - Comment Q36: This list provides a supporting information, but the core of the safety assessment lays in the previous paragraph. It is obvious (and it is its purpose) that this safety assessment will exclude pathogenic microorganisms. It is then suggested to keep the existing list as it is. Comment Q37: No. There is no a priori reason to set a fixed threshold/concentration. Depending on the strains/purposes, the concentration needs to be adapted. The concentration should be adapted to the effect. We support transparent information (via the label) on the microroganism concentration, but no pre-set value. Comment Q38: No. Like for any detergent the shelf life of the product should be transprently communicated. It is anticipated that in most cases this shelf life will be above one year, but we see no a priori reason not to allow lower period. This might be relevant to the fact that microorgansims are living and so limited shelflife might be an aspect in some cases. The 10% requirement does also no fit to the management of microorganisms. Practice is that for microorganisms stability/counts are assessed on a Log10 basis. In practice a variation of 0,5	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Log 10 is generally considered as acceptable variability (see e.g. EFSA for the stability of feed additives based on MO).	
p.112 - Questions 35, 36, 37 and 38 Comment Q35: French industrials are not in favour of the risk assessment methodology to be performed for the safety criterion. Industrials would like to ask if the risk assessment should be carried out on the formula or on the raw material containing the microorganisms? What is the scope of the risk assessment? ingestion, cutaneous, respiratory, mutation, etc.? Industrials would like to point out that it needs to be more specific about what needs to be assessed, to facilitate the process and harmonization between different countries. Comment Q36: We would like to share that there are no microorganisms currently included in formulas. It is then difficult to validate this criterion. Indeed the current requirements for HSC pros products seem too restrictive and have not allowed for the inclusion of microorganisms. In particular, the current requirement on shelf life by a test phase of 24 months is far too long in view of the duration of the criteria but also and above all the needs for innovations and product launches on the market (manufacturers already find that 6 months to obtain certification is too long). Comment Q37: One industrial would like to share that the microbial count is not sufficient to prove the effectiveness of the microorganisms. Depending on the strain and the rest of the formulation, a higher or lower microbial count will be required. Performance should be demonstrated through specific tests. Comment Q38: One CB would like to point out the difficulty to achieve the 12 months test on microbial count for shelf life. One industrial would like to share that the criterion on shelf-life does not allow a product to be brought to market quickly. A 2-year stability study takes a very long time. Industrials propose to validate an accelerated ageing method that could reduce the study to 6 months max. French stakeholders support the inclusion of microorganisms in the scope of LD but don't think that it is necessary to modify the text of LD scope to reflect that microorganism are included.	Acknowledged
p.116 - Questions 35, 37 and 38 Comment Q35: We support the requirement for microbiological risk assessment as proof of safety: there should be a scientifically sound approach to risk assessment that takes into account exposure from product use and risks posed by microorganisms. We would like to know more details about this requirement, in particular the verification process, for example, what are the criteria for identifying a third-party expert recognized by the EU Ecolabel?	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment Q37: Re 37: Methodology: is it possible to include more appropriate test methods in the criteria? ISO4833-1:2014 in the current and proposed criteria applies to (a) products intended for human consumption and animal feed; (b) environmental samples in the area of food and feed production and handling. There is no specific standard available for detergents, but other standards are available for cosmetic and non-sterile pharmaceutical products, i.e. ISO 21149:2017 Cosmetics Microbiology Standard. These products are more familiar with the unique nature of detergents than foods, so we believe that ISO 21149 should be used to determine microbial counts in detergents. Comment Q38: Re 38: Given standard microbial plate counts, a 10% decrease will be difficult to measure certainly because of the margin of error, and also because it is difficult to use percentage units in this scenario without specifying a scale. h. Rather than emphasizing a specific level of microbial reduction, our recommendation would be to prove that every 12 months the product maintains/achieves a microbial count above the product performance threshold (equal to or greater than 1x10^5 cfu per ml).	
p.114 – Questions 35, 36, 37 and 38 Comment Q35: We don't have an opinion on that, we do not develop this type of products. Comment Q36: We don't have an opinion on that, we do not develop this type of products. Comment Q37: We don't have an opinion on that, we do not develop this type of products. Comment Q38: We don't have an opinion on that, we do not develop this type of products.	Acknowledged
p.116 - Questions 35, 36, 37 and 38 Comment Q35: I would suggest that a microbial risk assessment is necessary for mo that are not on the EFSA list If they are on the list then they are good for use in food; so certainly also for cleaning — Comment Q36: No Comment Q37: YES Comment Q38: YES (min 2 years)	Acknowledged
p.114 – Question 35 Comment: In support of a microbial risk assessment and would like to see a standardised approach. Suggested action: Propose a standardised approach for the microbial risk assessment which includes criteria for the report and how to identify a third-party expert that would be accepted by EU Ecolabel.	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Rationale: A microbial risk assessment will demonstrate the safety of individual microbial based cleaning products with consideration to the product format and routes of exposure during use.	
p.114 – Question 35 In HSC and LD, the outcome of a microbial risk assessment should be that the risk associated with the use of a product containing microorganisms is deemed to as acceptable. (Line 2180, page 112) Suggested action: We support the JRC proposal to remove the requirement that microbial strains must be eligible for the QPS approach (for HSC and LD). We also support a requirement for microbial risk assessment as a proof of safety and agree with the wording: "The outcome of a microbial risk assessment should be that the risk associated with the use of a product containing microorganisms is deemed as acceptable." We do not find it necessary to stipulate that the microbial risk assessment must be certified by an independent third-party expert since manufacturers may have sufficient internal capacity and expertise to achieve this internally. Rationale: The purpose of the qualified presumption of safety (QPS) is to provide a generic pre-assessment approach to facilitate strain safety assessments of microorganisms intended for use in the food and feed chains, to support the work of EFSA's Scientific Panels. Thus, the QPS framework allows a fast-track evaluation of strains belonging to certain QPS taxonomic units (i.e. all strains of a species), provided specific qualifications are met, such as lack of acquired antimicrobial resistance genes. Importantly, this does not disqualify non-QPS strains from being approved provided sufficient safety assessment of the strain is provided. The scope for QPS assessment is microorganisms intended for use in the food and feed chains, which raises different/other concerns than for approval of microorganisms to be added to detergents (not to intentionally enter the food chain).	Acknowledged
p.114 – Question 36 Comment: We find that the current list of pathogens (Escherichia coli, Streptococcus spp., Staphylococcus aureus, Bacillus cereus and Salmonella spp.) is sufficient to screen for the most common human pathogens found in foodstuff. Suggested action: The list should be aligned with other control regimes within food safety. Rationale: Generally, we find it unlikely that the microbial component in detergents would add significantly to the risk of human pathogens being present in the final product, since production at the manufacturers is performed in very controlled environments.	Acknowledged
p.114 – Question 37	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: A minimum content equal or greater than 1x10exp5 CFU/mL seems a bit arbitrary since it will depend on the performance of the included strains. Suggested action: Remove the threshold of 10exp5 CFU. Rationale: The value would however, in our opinion, be a reasonable lower limit in most cases. It may be considered to expand the criteria to permit a lower CFU count provided that microbial-driven product performance can documented.	
p.114 – Question 38: Comment: The ISO 4833-1:2014 provides methods for the enumeration of microorganisms in the food chain. We agree that the existing criterium "the microbial count shall not decrease by more than 10 % every 12 months" is not appropriate since 10% reduction of the number of viable cells (CFU/mL) is not meaningful for counts of live microbes, which generally are better represented on a logarithmic scale. Additionally, some species may have a considerable natural decay rate while still being an appropriate choice due to high performance. We find that the microbial count at the end of shelf-life to be a more important parameter than decay rate and therefor suggest merging points (v) and (vi). Additionally, it may be considered to reduce the minimum shelf-life requirement to 12 months to accommodate the potential use of more sensitive strains if needed. Suggested action: Proposed new text: "When placed on the market, detergents containing micro-organisms shall have a standard plate count equal to or greater than 1x105 colony-forming units (CFUs) per ml in accordance with ISO 4833-1:2014. During the shelf life of at least 24 [or 12] months the CFU count shall remain equal to or greater than 1x105."Alternatively, we suggest clarifying the proposed text to be unambiguous on the meaning of "measured in logarithmic scale". "Shelf life: the minimum shelf life of the product shall not be lower than 24 [or 12] months and the microbial count shall not decrease by more than one log10 unit (10-fold) every 12 months in accordance with ISO 4833-1:2014."	Acknowledged
p.110 – Questions (35-36-37-38): Comment: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG and in my first comments on BATIS, we want to alert you that the current criterion on microorganisms in professional HSC products is too complex, with a lot of proofs to provide, in particular the study during 24 months beforehand the application. Suggested actions: If we want to keep this possibility for professional HSC products and add it for LD, this criterion should be simplified, in particular the process: requesting less proofs and the study beforehand the application must be shorter. Rationale: So, few LH who were interested in this inclusion (in professional HSC products) were	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
discouraged and gave up their projects and applications. Indeed the current requirement for a shelf life test phase of 24 months is excessively long considering the duration of the criteria, as well as the requirements for innovation and product launches in the market (LHs already find that 6 months to obtain certification is too long). - -	
p.110 – Question 35 Comment: We agree	Acknowledged

12. Packaging (90 comments)

7.7.1. Recycled content in packaging (incl. Q39) (26 comments)

The responses here are about a completely new requirement for recycled content in packaging (section 7.7.1 of TR1). The requirements are basically:

- Paper/cardboard primary (sales) packaging ≥80% recycled material
- Paper/cardboard secondary (grouped) packaging ≥70% recycled material
- PET plastic primary (sales) packaging of ≥70% recycled material.
- HDPE plastic primary (sales) packaging of ≥50% recycled material.

Question 39 is also included here and asks: " Should there be a requirement on recyclability of plastic in the grouped packaging (secondary packaging)?"

NOTE TO THE READERS

The topic on Packaging (PACK), particularly related to the *Recycled content* and *Design for Recycling* criteria, has been extensively discussed since the 1st AHWG in a dedicated working sub-group (sub-AHWG). In this PACK sub-AHWG the comments received from stakeholders following the 1st AHWG were considered, discussed and replied to, thus stakeholders are referred to the corresponding

sub-AHWG background document (in this case about packaging) for full details. Hence, to avoid redundancy, in this Table of **Comments all the responses display "Acknowledged"**, in the understanding that such background documents will be consulted.

In addition, experts' discussions and feedback received in this sub-AHWG could have played a role in shaping the proposals made in the 2nd draft EUEL criteria. Consequently, stakeholders are advised to jointly consider the background document of this sub-AHWG alongside the rationales contained in the 2nd draft version of the Technical report (TR2) for full awareness on the process conducive to 2nd draft EUEL proposals.

All the previously cited draft documents are accessible via the website dedicated to the revision of the EUEL criteria for detergents in its "*Documents*" section within the folder "*2023 revision documents*", namely here: https://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/product-bureau/product-groups/411/documents

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.115– 7.7.1. Recycled content – specifically regarding: *"Sales packaging (primary packaging) made of PET shall contain a minimum of 70% recycled material (PCR - recycled plastic made from post-consumer recycled), other plastics (e.g. HDPE) shall contain a minimum of 50% recycled material (PCR)"* Comment:. To this day, we are not certain that the recycled HDPE packaging proposed by our suppliers is approved for hazardous materials for all types of formats. In addition, we do not have sufficient experience of the potential migration of chemicals through HDPE packaging as it is recycled.	Acknowledged
p.115– 7.7.1. Recycled content - Comment: We recommend not requiring primary packaging made of PET to contain a minimum of 70% recycled material, and other plastics (e.g., HDPE) to contain a minimum of 50% recycled material. This rule should specifically be exempt from the HSC category, as many professional products fall into this category and require virgin plastic for safety reasons. - -	Acknowledged
p.117– 7.7.1. Recycled content Comment: In the proposed new criterion, HDPE and PET should consist of 50% and 70% of PCR (post-consumer recycled) material, respectively. It is important to keep in mind that PCR materials are not yet widely available in the market and that in some cases there might be supply issues.	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.115 – 7.7.1. Recycled content Comment: Recommend not requiring primary packaging made of PET to contain a minimum of 70% recycled material, and other plastics (e.g., HDPE) to contain a minimum of 50% recycled material. This rule should specifically be exempt from the HSC category, as many professional products fall into this category and require virgin plastic for safety reasons.	Acknowledged
p.115 – 7.7.1. Recycled content Comment: Clarification is needed on whether labels are exempt from min 50% or 70% recycled material and clarity on what (%) constitutes to cardboard packaging	Acknowledged
p.115– 7.7.1. Recycled content Comment: Need to highlight specific exclusions of % recycled material for closures, triggers, dosers, pouches in the criteria	Acknowledged
p.116– 7.7.1. Recycled content, specifically about: *"Recycled content and recyclability of sales packaging (primary packaging) and grouped packaging (secondary packaging) shall be indicated on the sales packaging. The recycled content stated on the packaging shall refer to the total weight (body, closure, label/sleeve and trigger closure"* Comment: Question to JRC: How is "recyclability" going to be measured?	Acknowledged
p.116 – 7.7.1. Recycled content Comment: Different requirements should be aligned with PPWR: multiple targets will result in logistic and supply chain complexity at packaging supplier and filling plant level	Acknowledged
p.115 - 7.7.1. Recycled content Comment: We welcome a minimum recycled content in paper/carboard packaging and recommend it could be set even higher. Suggested actions: We recommend increasing the share to 80% and specify that it should be post-consumer waste. Rationale: The min. content should be increased from the proposed 70% to 80%. This would be in line with the recently adopted EU Ecolabel criteria for AHP. It should be specified that the recycled content must be from post-consumer waste (as it is already specified for plastic content)	Acknowledged
p.116 - 7.7.1. Recycled content, specifically regarding *"Invoices demonstrating the purchase of the recycled material shall be provided."* Comment: Please indicate if it is necessary to provide invoices once with the application or if the purchase of sufficient material for the packaging of the manufactured products within a year should be demonstrated. Suggested action: Clarify the compliance verification. -	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.114 - 7.7.1. Recycled content Comment: I find it important that the soon agreed EU Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation (PPWR) will function as the baseline for the ecolabel criteria when these are agreed. Using the PPWE regulations principles as a baseline will also ensure that manufactures of ecolabelled products are prepared. E.g. 'Recital 13' of PPWR: "*Packaging should be designed, manufactured and commercialised in such a way as to allow for its re-use or high-quality recycling*". As well as 'Recital 15' in that regulation: "*Accordingly, substances of concern as constituents of packaging material or of any of the packaging components should be minimised with the objective to ensure that packaging, as well as materials recycled from packaging, do not have any adverse effect on human health or the environment, throughout their life-cycle.*" So 'should be minimised' will in the ecolabel criteria mean that substances of concern (SVHCs and Annex VI substances in CLP) are excluded (considering some acceptable residual content in recycled materials). E.g. 'Article 5 Requirements for substances in packaging', paragraph 2: " … the sum of concentration levels of lead, cadmium, mercury and hexavalent chromium resulting from substances present in packaging or packaging components shall not exceed 100 mg/kg." And in line with paragraph 5 of Article 5: "…lower the sum of concentration levels of lead, cadmium, mercury and hexavalent chromium resulting from substances present in packaging or packaging components referred to in paragraph 2". E.g. this lower concentration could be 10 mg/kg. JRC and member states will be able to build upon this baseline, and propose further specific sub-criteria for the detergent product groups (e.g. based on the current criteria), propose stricter criteria (e.g. on which materials to use, no use of composite material and the amount of recycled material, sleeves etc.). I already propose the exclusion of PET and r-PET as packaging material for ecolabelled products as this should be reserved for food contact material. If fractions of r-PET cannot be approved as food contact material, it could be considered to open for the use as packaging material in ecolabelled products. It might also be relevant with a stepwise change of the packaging criteria e.g. 1 or 2 years before the PPWR regulation applies, ensuring that the ecolabel criteria are ahead legislation. Question: Cardboard packaging for liquid products is allowed – are there any requirements on the inner/plastic-coating of this type of packaging?	Acknowledged
p.115 - 7.7.1. Recycled content Comment: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we do not support these requirements of 70% (PET) and 50% (other plastics like HDPE). Moreover, these requirements of 70% (PET) and 50% (other plastics like HDPE) must be clarified in	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
order to know if they are for the bottle or for all the packaging. Suggested actions: requiring less recycled materials (after your assessment of our data) and providing clarifications Rationale: Because these requirements of 70% (PET) and 50% (other plastics like HDPE) are too ambitious. Indeed, according to our initial assessment, they seem to be unachievable by our currently certified products. Furthermore, we share our LH's concern regarding the availability and quality of certain disputed recycled materials. - -	
p.116 - 7.7.3. Recycled content Comment: Mistake? *Pouches ?	Acknowledged
p.115 - NEW sub-criterion (x) recycled materials content - Line 2252 Comment: We support this new sub-criterion	Acknowledged
p.119 – Line 2347-2348 – 7.7.1. Recycled content - Question 39 Comment: we agree, but the content of recycled material in HDPE products should be observed. A higher content could impact the quality and stability of the HDPE products. - -	Acknowledged
p.119 – 7.7.1. Recycled content - Question 39 Comment: In our opinion, there can be some packaging that may be included in various definitions depending on how they are interpreted (VCBF N87 - ongoing). We think it is necessary, to promote harmonization, to assess the possibility of an exemption or incorporating an order of priority for those cases. - -	Acknowledged
p.115-119 – 7.7.1. Recycled content - Question 39 Comment: Yes, because there could be more and more secondary packaging on the market with the arrival of concentrated, dilutable refills.	Acknowledged
p.114-119 - Question 39 Comment: oui Machine translation: *Yes.*	Acknowledged
p.119 - 7.7.1. Recycled content - Question 39 Comment: In principle we propose aligning with the PPWR recycled criteria. However, there are some difficulties interpreting the impact of such a question and would like to obtain additional information on the following points: (1) Should the question be referring to a requirement on recyclability or a recycled materials content target for plastic secondary/ grouped packaging? Reasoning for this query	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
is due to the placement of question 39 in the overall report under "Rationale for the proposed (x) recycled materials content". (2) An example of what would be defined as plastic grouped packaging?	
p.115 - 7.7.1. Recycled content – Question 39 Comment: It can be interesting to have a requirement on recyclability of plastic in the grouped packaging because there could be more and more secondary packaging on the market with the arrival of concentrated, dilutable refills. But it seems that very few cases of secondary packaging exist. We do not know if in these marginal cases, the incorporation of recycled material is possible without altering the quality of the grouping (grouping film, etc.) CITEO[1] is in favor to have an objective on secondary packagings and add that it is important for this criterion to precise if "mass balanced" material is authorized or not. Additionnal comments: Industrials would like to ask to clarify if the definitions on required percentage of recycled materials content are related to the global packaging or to the materials category of packaging. Industrials do not support the inclusion of recycled PE for liquid products because of the potential migration of contaminants from the previous life of recycled PE. Industrials would like to point out the availability of recycled resins which can be a problem to responds to the demand of certified detergents products. Specifically on the PET with food-packaging quality, which has a low availability for non-food packaging. Industrials would like to point out that it is not always possible to have recycled content materials for the transport of hazardous substances. They would like to highlight to fact that for some hazardous substances, HDPE packaging is the only technical possible solution. They also would like to point out that recycled HPED can contain compounds from his former life which is a risk for the quality of the packaging. Finally, they highlight that there are problems of availability for certain recycled resins. Industrials would like to ask for refills to be exempted from the monomaterial requirement for two reasons: - Refills with capacities >1L have stand-up problems. This is a problem for in-store marketing and for the safety of the packaged product, with a significant risk of dropping. - If a cap is present on the pouch, the monomaterial has a weakness in the good welding of the cap to the pouch, which is a safety problem and against current regulations. One CB would like to share that according to their initial screen, the requirements of 70% recycled content for PET and 50% for other plastics (e.g. HDPE) seem unattainable, so is not in favour of such recycled content levels. CITEO would like to share that proposed thresholds of recycled material for PET and cardboard are not too excessive but also not easy to reach. The threshold of 50 % of recycled plastics on other plastics is difficult to reach as there is only one recycler in France able to provide such recycled content (excluding HDPEF bottles). [1] Citeo is a mission-driven french company created by companies in the consumer goods and distribution sector to reduce the environmental impact of their packaging and paper, by offering them reduction, reuse, sorting and recycling solutions. - -	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.119 - 7.7.1. Recycled content - Question 39 Comment: For us, very few cases of secondary packaging in plastic exist. It remains to be seen if recycled material can be incorporated in these marginal cases without affecting the quality of the grouping (grouping film).	Acknowledged
p.121 - 7.7.1. Recycled content – Question 39 Comment: NO, the License Holders are having difficulty interpreting the impact of such a question and would like additional information on the following:(1) Should the question refer to the recyclability requirement or the target recycled content for secondary/group plastic packaging? The reason for this inquiry is the inclusion of question 39 in the general report under the section "Justification for the proposed (x) recycled content". (2) An example of what can be defined as plastic bulk packaging?	Acknowledged
p.119 - 7.7.1. Recycled content – Question 39 Comment: Yes, there should be at least recyclability requirements, and possibly plastic grouped packaging should be prohibited. Suggested actions: We recommend prohibiting plastic grouped packaging in the EU Ecolabel. Generally speaking, the EU Ecolabel criteria for packaging (possibly of any material or type) could be linked to the future packaging recyclability grades upcoming under the PPWR. Rationale: The PPWR mandates that all packaging needs to be recyclable by 2030. Please note that the PPWR bans single-use plastic for grouped packaging by 2030. The JRC preliminary report on ecodesign priorities also identified for detergents as a possible measure a prohibition of secondary packaging in certain cases Besides, the PPWR requires that the Commission shall adopt a delegated act to define recyclability performance grades from A to C by 2028. The EU Ecolabel criteria could require e.g. that its packaging meets the highest grade A of this future recyclability score.	Acknowledged
p.119 - 7.7.1. Recycled content – Question 39 Comment: I agree with a requirement on reciclability in the grouped packaging, but a market evaluation should be done.	Acknowledged
p.116 - 7.7.1. Recycled content – Question 39: Comment: We do not see the point of having a requirement on recyclability of plastic in the grouped packaging Rationale: Because, based on our experience, grouped packaging is typically made of paper/cardboard	Acknowledged
p.115 - 7.7.1. Recycled content - Q39 Comment: We support the requirement on recyclability of plastic in the grouped packaging (secondary packaging).	Acknowledged

7.7.2. Weight to Utility Ratio (WUR) of packaging (7 comments)

The main changes proposed here were to decrease some of the WUR values, namely: DD from 2.4 2.0; DD rinse aids from 1.5 0.4; HDD from 0.6 0.3; undiluted HSC from 1.5 1.0; HSC RTU with trigger from 200 175; powder LD from 1.2 1.0, and liquid/gel LD from 1.4 1.1.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.119 – 7.7.2. WUR Comment: A WUR for HSC of 1g/L instead of 15g/L would be very challenging for undiluted products. So why not lower it, but not to 1, perhaps to 5g/L, for example. - -	Partially accepted – The threshold in TR2 is higher (from 1 to 2 g/L) yet still not at the level suggested (5g/l). This is based on new evidences sourced by the JRC (See full details in TR2 rationale)
p.119 – 7.7.2. WUR Comment: We think that it would be interesting to include in this criterion a new "product type", especially in the HSC category, for the undiluted products in a packaging that allows múltiple dilutions. There is innovative packaging that contains concentrated products and that are designed to be filled with water for the dilution of the product by the end user. The WUR values of these packaging use to be larger than the WUR of a traditional packaging because they have capacity for much more product (RTU) that what they contain (concentrated).	Acknowledged – We find this packaging quite aligned with the EUEL criteria goal/aspiration but we have not included a proposal in this direction in TR2. However, we remain open for considering a change along the lines suggested. For this, we welcome any specific insight/input.
p.120 - 7.7.2. WUR Comment: The new WUR requirement for the HDD category on page 120 is excessively low and would be extremely difficult for companies to meet. All other WUR requirements are reduced by only 20%-50%. We suggest just lower 3 times (still the highest ratio for dropping the limit) and make the new WUR limit as 5.	Acknowledged – however, note that the limits have been tightened even further according to new evidences gathered by the JRC (See TR2 rationale for full details). We remain open for discussion on feasibility but conditioned to additional insights/specific inputs
p.120 – 7.7.2. WUR Comment: New WUR requirements for HDD and HSC are extremely low. Especially on the increase of WUR for undiluted products from 15 to 1: after calculation of several products, we think that "1" is not achievable, but "5" is more realistic (what already means only a third of previous limit)	Acknowledged Partially accepted – The threshold in TR2 is higher (from 1 to 2 g/L) yet still not at the level suggested (5g/l). This is based on new evidences sourced by the JRC (See full details in TR2 rationale)
p.120 – 7.7.2 WUR Comment: We would like to share comments based on current data for this criterion: - DD and LD: new thresholds seem quite ambitious. - HDD: threshold not ambitious enough so propose to reduce it to 0.2. - HSC to be diluted: threshold too ambitious because during the screen, more than 30% of currently	Partially accepted – LD/DD – Threshold have slightly increased HDD – The threshold has been tightened to 0.3 and not to 0.2 HSC – the threshold has increased from 1 to 2 g/l but not to 1.5

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
certified products have an RPU > 1 so proposed to reduce it to 1.5. - IISD, liquid: propose to reduce to at least 0.28, 0.3 and 0.4.	IILD -
p.119 – 7.7.2. WUR Comment: I will send more data but suggest lower the limit considerably. The new requirement on recycled content will lower the values for most of the present products. Finally, we find it important to analyze which type of products will not fulfill stricter limits – is this only small volumes?	Acknowledged – Thank you for offering further insights in the form of data. Partially accepted - In many cases the limits have been decreased considerably, but this depends on the particular product group. Acknowledged – In our analysis, we took a conservative approach to data analysis, by which we account for the "worst" (highest) WUR possible within a particular formulation. To our understanding, this implies that we are already considering which product would not be able to comply, as reflected in TR2 rationale (e.g.Quartile 3 [75% of pooled data] implies that potentially a 25% of the products would not be able to comply (according to data received by the JRC)
p.120 – 7.7.2. WUR Comment: · LD powder: Perhaps this proposed reduction is too strict · LD liquid: Perhaps this proposed reduction is not sufficiently selective. · LD Stain remover: A threshold of 1.2 is not sufficiently selective. · DD dishwasher detergents: Perhaps this proposed reduction is too strict · DD rinse aids: Perhaps this proposed reduction is a bit stringent · HDD: Perhaps this proposed reduction is not sufficiently selective. · HSC undiluted: we rather agree with your proposal · HSC RTU: A threshold of 150 is not sufficiently selective · HSC RTU spray: A threshold of 175 is not sufficiently selective · IIDD liquid: Thresholds of 1; 1.8; 2.5 (soft/medium/hard water) are not sufficiently selective. Suggested actions: · LD powder: Perhaps we can maintain a WUR limit of 1.2 g/kg · LD liquid: Perhaps we can propose a WUR limit of 1 g/kg · LD Stain remover: We propose to reduce this threshold to 1 g/kg	Partially accepted – The limits were revised in the light of new evidences and values proposed are aligned with TR2 proposal yet not exactly equivalent (See below and in TR2 rationale for full details) · LD powder & liquid: limit set to 1.1 g/kg · LD Stain remover: set to 0.7 g/kg · DD dishwasher detergents: set at 2.2 g/wash · DD rinse aids: limit set at 0.4 g/wash · HDD: set to 0,3 g/l · HSC RTU: Accepted (to 140g/l) · HSC RTU spray: limit set to 170g/l · IIDD liquid: Accepted (to 0.15; 0.21; 0.3 (soft/medium/hard water))

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
· DD dishwasher detergents: Perhaps we can propose a WUR limit of 2.3 g/wash · DD rinse aids: Perhaps we can propose a WUR limit of 0.5 g/wash · HDD: We propose to reduce this threshold to 0,2g/l · HSC RTU: We propose to reduce this threshold to 140g/l · HSC RTU spray: We propose to reduce this threshold to 120g/l · IIDD liquid: We propose to reduce these thresholds of 0.2 or even 0.15; 0.21; 0.3 (soft/medium/hard water) Rationale: Because · LD powder: 8 out of our 21 certified products for this subcategory have WUR values > 1g/kg. · LD liquid: 5 out of our 56 certified products for this subcategory have WUR values > 1,1g/kg or 8 out of our 56 products for this subcategory have WUR values > 1g/kg. · LD Stain remover: Our certified product have a WUR value of 0.5 · DD dishwasher detergents: 12 out of our 27 certified products for this subcategory have WUR value of 2.3 g/wash · DD rinse aids: our 5 certified products for this subcategory have WUR value of 0.4 g/wash but we need to keep a margin · HDD: 6 out of our 104 certified products for this subcategory have WUR values > 1g/kg. · HSC undiluted: 83 out of our 104 certified products for this subcategory have WUR values > 1g/l but it is acceptable that 20% of our certified products have to be improved, especially we expect the reduction of WUR values in relation to the required proportion of recycled materials · HSC RTU: 24 out of our 100 certified products for this subcategory have WUR values > 140g/l but it is acceptable that 25% of our certified products have to be improved, especially we expect the reduction of WUR values in relation to the required proportion of recycled materials · HSC RTU spray: 13 out of our 107 certified products for this subcategory have WUR values > 120g/l but it is acceptable that less 15% of our certified products have to be improved, especially we expect the reduction of WUR values in relation to the required proportion of recycled materials · IIDD liquid (wash): 5 or 7 out of our 76 certified products for this subcategory have WUR values > 0.15 or 0.2g/l (soft); 4 out of our 76 certified products for this subcategory have WUR values > 0.2g/l (medium); 12 out of our 76 certified products for this subcategory have WUR values > 0.3g/l (hard) · IIDD liquid (rinse): all our certified products have WUR values < new proposed limits. - -	

7.7.3. and 7.7.4. Design for recycling (31 comments)

General comments regarding changes to this existing criterion are included here:

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

NOTE TO THE READERS

The topic on Packaging (PACK), particularly related to the *Recycled content* and *Design for Recycling* criteria, has been extensively discussed since the 1st AHWG in a dedicated working sub-group (sub-AHWG). In this PACK sub-AHWG the comments received from stakeholders following the 1st AHWG were considered, discussed and replied to, thus stakeholders are referred to the corresponding sub-AHWG background document (in this case about packaging) for full details. Hence, to avoid redundancy, in this Table of **Comments all the responses display "Acknowledged"**, in the understanding that such background documents will be consulted.

In addition, experts' discussions and feedback received in this sub-AHWG could have played a role in shaping the proposals made in the 2nd draft EUEL criteria. Consequently, stakeholders are advised to jointly consider the background document of this sub-AHWG alongside the rationales contained in the 2nd draft version of the Technical report (TR2) for full awareness on the process conducive to 2nd draft EUEL proposals.

All the previously cited draft documents are accessible via the website dedicated to the revision of the EUEL criteria for detergents in its *"Documents"* section within the folder "*2023 revision documents",* namely here: https://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/product-bureau/product-groups/411/documents

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.124 – 7.7.3. – Design for recycling Comment: We think it necessary to include a "barrier coating" definition and we wonder if the body/material part of the criterion overlaps with the barrier coating part.	Acknowledged
p.127 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Excluded Pounch/bag laminates with layer of different materials (composite packaging) isn't possible Rationale: At this moment, the market is not able to offer a good solution .The film is not the difficulty but to produce a multilayer bag .The welding process is so critical that you need specific	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
equipment for it.If the welding is not done on the correct temperature and not cooled afterwards, you will not succeed to produce a multilayer bag.	
p.128 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Design for recycling labels Rationale: There is little technical information on these criteria and it is therefore premature to add these new exclusions for labels. This poses a problem in terms of CLP regulations, which require the label to be firmly attached to the can. Il est nécessaire de définir clairement les preuves requises pour les critères de recyclage.	Acknowledged
p.125 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Body material: it necessary to clarify whether this is a total ban (0%) or whether there is a threshold for pigments (other than black) that may have a small percentage of carbon pigment? In any case, our recommendation is that, in the event of an exclusion, this should be based on whether or not the material is detectable at NIR rather than on colour	Acknowledged
p.126 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: HDPE: disagree that glued cellulose-based (wet-strength) paper labels with HDPE should be excluded as wet-strength is fully compatible with HDPE streams	Acknowledged
p.127 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: EVOH: need further clarification and explanation if it is allowed or not	Acknowledged
p.127 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Pouches: making pouches of monomaterials (to facilitate recycling) is a too strict requirement given current availability of material that are compatible with concentrated chemistries	Acknowledged
p.125 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: The proposed sub-criterion offers only a accepted/non-accepted guide for packaging components. As seen from multiple third party organizations' desing for recycling guidelines (e.g. Recyclass) the reality is not as black and white. PE labels can be used on PP packages and vice versa with limitations to the label size and weight. A specific threshold should also be introduced into the EU Ecolabel guideline. Suggested actions: A specific threshold should also be introduced into the EU Ecolabel guideline similarly to what is in Recyclass guideline. Rationale: As seen from multiple third party organizations' desing for recycling guidelines (e.g. Recyclass) the reality is not as black and white. PE labels can be used on PP packages and vice versa with limitations to the label size and weight.	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.125 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Latest studies are showing that pressure sensitive labels are being removed already in the grinding step of mechanical recycling on HDPE packages. Labels which are removable in grinding should be accepted on at least HDPE packaging. Most probably later studies also show this to be true on other polyolefin packaging, but this is still speculation at this stage. Suggested actions: Labels which are removable in grinding should be accepted on at least HDPE packaging. Rationale: Latest studies are showing that pressure sensitive labels are being removed already in the grinding step of mechanical recycling on HDPE packages.	Acknowledged
p.125 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Metallized pressure sensitive labels should be allowed with wash-off adhesives. If the metal doesn't end up in the recyclate, it has no negative impact on the quality. Wash-off adhesives ensure this. Suggested actions: Metallized pressure sensitive labels should be allowed with wash-off adhesives. Rationale: With wash-off adhesives metallized pressure sensitive labels don't end up in the recyclate and thus do not hinder recyclate quality.	Acknowledged
p.125-126 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: We request clarification on whether the required percentages pertain to the overall package or only the category of materials in the package. Regardless of the definition, we find that the minimum percentages of recycled materials proposed are very ambitious at this stage. We do not support the inclusion of recycled PE for liquid products due to the potential migration of contaminants from the previous life of the PE. Unwanted compounds can be released in ECOLABEL products due to PE being a 'sponge' material. For now, there is no quality that meets the requirements of the European ECOLABEL, nor availability. We are concerned about the availability of recycled resin in certified detergent products, which is dependent on food industry, which has already alerted PET to a shortage of food quality in favor of non-food packaging products. We are asking for refills to be exempted from the mono-material requirement, because most refills can not for now be mono-material for two reasons: capacity refills >1L have stand-up problems. This therefore is a problem for a placing on the market in stores and the safety of the product with a significant risk of falling.If a cap is present on the refill, the monomaterial has a weak welding from the cap to the bag, which is a safety problem and doesn't meet the regulation constraints already in force.	Acknowledged
p.127-128 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: We have identified that the language used in section 7.7.3 of TR1, concerning the proposed sub-criterion on design for recycling, currently lacks alignment with widely-recognized	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
industry standards and guidelines. Specifically, this concerns the definitions, testing methodologies, and protocols outlined in several key documents and initiatives: The ongoing work by CEN-CENELEC on design-for-recycling guidelines for packaging, with a completion deadline set for 2 August 2025.The provisions of Article 6 of the PPWR regarding Recyclable Packaging and its Annex II, which detail the Categories and Parameters for the Assessment of Recyclability of Packaging. These are critical components of the PPWR, anticipated to be adopted shortly. The RecyClass Guidelines, which are in the process of being updated and aim to present clear, actionable advice for enhancing the recyclability of packaging materials, are expected to be finalized later this year. One example of this is the element "non-removable washable adhesive applications (in water or alkaline at 80°C) for PET bottles" listed in the table of excluded materials and components in section 7.7.3. This language is different from that used in the RecyClass Guidelines - "alkali/water non-soluble or non-releasable adhesive at 60-80°C for PET bottles". Suggested action: Amend the language within section 7.7.3 of the TR1 to ensure its alignment with the terminology, definitions, testing methodologies, and protocols as established by CEN-CENELEC standards, the upcoming PPWR provisions, and the RecyClass guidelines. Ensure the governance structure is in place to update EcoLabel standards based on the changes in the recycling infrastructure or the latest scientific evidence (for example, in line with the current RecyClass procedures). Rationale: Aligning the language of the Design for Recycling sub-criterion with CEN-CENELEC standards, PPWR provisions, and RecyClass guidelines is crucial for ensuring legal certainty, harmonizing different rules, and providing clarity for the industry. All these initiatives are being developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders and are informed by the latest scientific evidence and technological developments. This approach not only facilitates a cohesive understanding across the industry but also ensures that the guidelines and standards will be readily integrated and utilized, enhancing the effectiveness of recycling initiatives.	
p.125 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Dyed black, using soot-carbon-based pigments: It is our recommendation that the exclusion be based on whether or not the materials are NIR detectable rather than colour.	Acknowledged
p.126 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Glued cellulose-based labels for PP, HDPE, LDPE, PS packaging, that cannot be removed in cold washing: Is it possible to consider fibre loss during recycling on this point about glued cellulose-based labels?	Acknowledged
p.125 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Comment: What is the impact on compatible materials? Is the focus on mechanical recycling or is chemical recycling also being considered?	
p.127 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: This combination is very widely used in our sector, as well as PP bottles with PE labels. According to the French recycling organizations, these combinations have no recycling problems (https://www.cotrep.fr/etapes/bouteilles-et-flacons/), so they should be added to the authorizations. - -	Acknowledged
p.127 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: We are aware that adhesives are often not washable and can cause problems with recyclability. There are only a few technical elements in these criteria for now. Water-washable adhesives at room temperature have issues with respect to the CLP regulation, which requires that the label be firmly fixed and legible in all circumstances of product use. The COTREP recommendations currently require HDPE bottles to meet these requirements, but they are working on a new protocol and washability conditions. For PET bottle, 80°C washable adhesive is required. These adhesives are just beginning to be put on the market by label suppliers. However, they are still few and still have technical problems in good positioning on the bottles. For all the reasons it seems to us very premature to add these new requirements. Suppliers are currently working on the subject, but at the moment few solutions are successful, whether for PET, HDPE or PP bottles.	Acknowledged
p.128 – 7.7.3. Design for recyclability Comment: Given the ambiguity surrounding the definition of "non-removable washable adhesive applications (in water or alkaline at 80°C) for PET bottles" listed in the table of excluded materials and components for the design for recycling sub-criterion, we would advise to align with the language in the RecyClass guidelines. Specifically, the RecyClass refers to alkali/water non-soluble or non-releasable adhesive at 60-80°C" in their latest guidelines for PET bottles (source: here and here). Suggested action: Align the language with the RecyClass guidelines and change the wording to "alkali/water non-soluble or non-releasable adhesive at 60-80°C for PET bottles". Rationale: This ensures clarity and consistency in the criteria, facilitating better understanding and application by stakeholders involved in PET bottle design and recycling processes.	Acknowledged
p.128 – 7.7.3. Design for recyclability Comment: The phrase "any other plastic materials for sleeves/labels with a density < 1 g/cm^3 used with a PP or HDPE packaging", contained in the table of the excluded materials and components in the design for recycling sub-criterion under Section 7.7.3., generates confusion due to its vague and seemingly contradictory nature.	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Suggested action: Replace the phrase "any other plastic materials for sleeves/labels with a density < 1 g/cm^3 used with a PP or HDPE packaging" with "pressure sensitive labels in non PP, PE or PO material or with density <1g/cm3 with non releasable adhesive for HDPE packaging" in the table of the excluded materials and components in the design for recycling sub-criterion under Section 7.7.3. Rationale: The ambiguity arises when this provision is considered alongside the other excluded plastic components listed before it in the same table, creating uncertainty about whether PP, PO, and PE labels are also restricted with a PP or HDPE packaging. This specification appears to conflict with most recycling guidelines, which tend to favor PP/PE/PO labels for HDPE/PP packaging. These labels typically have a density of less than 1 g/cm^3. Such a contradiction undermines the consistency of guidelines across different frameworks.Empirical data (please refer to the attached NTCP study, page 8) suggests that PO labels do not perform any worse in the recycling process for HDPE bottles compared to PP and PE labels. Therefore, categorizing PO under "any other" materials for these packaging types based on the density criterion contradicts both practical evidence and established guidelines.	
p.129 – 7.7.3. Design for recyclability Comment: We believe that the design for recycling sub-criterion as outlined in section 7.7.3 of TR1 should not exclude pressure-sensitive labels (PSL) and, in particular, should not exclude PSL that do not comply with the washing conditions of the recycling process. This approach is consistent with the JRC's recommendations as detailed in lines 2466- 2483 of the report. In this regard, we strongly support the proposal to not align the design for recycling requirements on PSL for detergents with those provided in the EU Ecolabel criteria for cosmetics. The cosmetics criteria require PSL adhesives to be water-releasable under washing conditions of the recycling process—a requirement that does not fit with existing recycling streams and is not reflective of the latest scientific evidence regarding the recycling of (HDPE) packaging. Suggested action: Given the scientific evidence presented, we support the decision outlined in TR1 to keep pressure-sensitive labels (PSL) off the table of excluded materials and components for packaging design for recycling. However, should there be future consideration to add PSL to this table, the specific requirements on PSL should not follow those mentioned in the EU Ecolabel criteria for cosmetics, which require the adhesive to be water-releasable under the washing conditions of the recycling process. If anything is to be added to the table with excluded materials, we recommend for the guidelines to be: "Pressure sensitive labels in PP, PE or PO material (with density <1g/cm3) unless the adhesive is releasable in the recycling process for HDPE packaging Pressure sensitive labels in PP, PE or PO material (with density <1g/cm3) unless the adhesive is releasable in alkali water at 60-80 C	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
for PET packaging. Labels in PS (polystyrene) on PET, HDPE, PP packaging.Non-releasable labels with paper facestock." Finally, we recommend alignment with the upcoming RecyClass protocol. Rationale: Our position is supported by the latest scientific evidence from a collaborative study with the National Test Center Circular Plastics (NTCP) in the Netherlands (see attached). This recent semi-industrial trial (50,000 bottles or 2 tons of material), designed to assess the releasability of PSL during the rigid HDPE packaging recycling process, has demonstrated that standard adhesion filmic label solutions, commonly used in Fast-Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) applications, do not interfere with the recycling process. PSLs were observed to fully release from the HDPE packaging during the recycling process even under cold wash conditions, resulting in clean high-quality HDPE flakes. Until this study, the industry has operated on the basis of the assumption that self-adhesive labels do not separate from HDPE packaging during the cold temperature washing step in the recycling process. However, this widely held belief has now been challenged. The findings of this study provide a clear indication that the stringent requirements for water-releasability of adhesives in the cosmetics Ecolabel criteria may not be representative of the real-world capabilities of modern label technologies or the nuances of the HDPE recycling process. Notably, the study proves that mechanical friction is a critical step that enables labels to release, hence, the guidelines and the testing protocols should include it into account. Our study represents one of the largest and most thorough label releasability trials conducted on an industrial scale in Europe. We believe that it offers solid evidence for reevaluating existing guidelines and test protocols for labels in recycling processes, and we have, therefore, already shared the study results with RecyClass and CEN. To conclude, by aligning the EU Ecolabel criteria for detergents with these findings and the upcoming RecyClass protocol, we can ensure that the criteria are scientifically grounded and conducive to the practicalities of effective recycling.	
p.129 – 7.7.3. Design for recyclability Comment: We strongly support the current proposal detailed in TR1, which does not exclude pressure-sensitive labels (PSLs) from the design for recycling criteria as outlined in section 7.7.3. based on the water-releasability of their adhesives. Imposing the requirement of PSL adhesive water-releasability on the detergents product group would directly conflict with the Classification, Labelling, and Packaging (CLP) Regulation. The CLP Regulation mandates that labels must remain securely attached throughout a product's lifecycle to protect human health and the environment by providing clear and consistent information about the hazards of chemicals. Since detergents fall under the scope of the CLP Regulation, the detergent producers are required to comply with this rule making it impossible for them to use labels with water-releasable adhesives. Additionally, there's potential conflict with British Standard 5609, which specifies requirements for marine and laboratory	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
performance of pressure-sensitive, adhesive-coated labels for marine use, including durability in harsh environments. Suggested action: We suggest maintaining the current approach of not excluding pressure-sensitive labels (PSLs) from the design for recycling criteria. However, should there be consideration to exclude some of the PSLs based on specific conditions, we recommend not to include the requirement that the PSL adhesive is water-releasable at washing conditions of the recycling process but instead that the PSL adhesive is releasable in the recycling process of the HDPE packaging. In particular, we recommend for the guidelines to be: "Pressure sensitive labels in PP, PE or PO material (with density <1g/cm3) unless the adhesive is releasable in the recycling process for HDPE packagingPressure sensitive labels in PP, PE or PO material (with density <1g/cm3) unless adhesive is releasable in alkali water at 60-80 C for PET packaging." Rationale: Removing this requirement is crucial for maintaining compliance with safety regulations that protect human health and the environment while promoting the sustainability goals of recycling.	
p.128 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: The PPWR foresees the development of recylability/design for recycling criteria through delegated acts. In the meantime, inspiration could be taken from the German experience to calculate EPR fees for packaging based on recylability: https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/themen/recyclingfaehigkeit-von-verpackungen and related overview of recycling incompatabilities per material: https://www.verpackungsregister.org/fileadmin/files/Mindeststandard/Minimum_standard_Packaging-Act_Edition_2023.pdf We also suggest considering to ban SVHCs in packaging to facilitate recycling and avoid toxic loops.	Acknowledged
p.129 – **7.7.3. Design for (reuse)…** Comment: Additional comment: We would like to support the inclusion of a new optional criterion on packaging re-use for buck sale. For example we would like to propose to decrease the threshold in WRU criterion for refillable packaging. Nevertheless it is important to keep in mind that some products are prohibited from being sold in bulk in France. Products bearing the hazard symbol of Acute toxicity, category 4 / harmful if swallowed and the bulk sale of products (including detergents) classified as H317 (skin sensitization, any category) and H318 (serious eye damage, category 1) are prohibited. - -	Acknowledged
p.124– 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Table p124 Materials and components excluded from packaging elements is difficult to decode. Consider a different approach so that it is clear which combinations are actually allowed. Glued cellulose-based labels for PP, HDPE, LDPE, PS Packaging, that cannot be removed in cold water"	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
- please specify the temperature of "cold water".Closures made of silicone – please specify what is meant by a silicone closure – you usually don't see a closure exclusively consisting of silicone?	
p.125 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: We have a question: can non-recyclable pouches be certified? Suggested actions: The criterion, especially the prohibition of certain plastic combinations, should be rewritten to be more understandable.	Acknowledged
p.125 - – 7.7.3. Design for recycling Comment: Please, specify better the terms body/material. Is packaging body (bottle, pouch/bag/box…)?	Acknowledged
p.125 - – 7.7.3. Design for recycling, specifically: *"Pounch/bag laminates with layer of different materials (composite packaging)"* - Line 2444 Comment: We support this but we suggest to modify with all packaging (Pouch/bag/bottle….)	Acknowledged
p.125 - 7.7.3. Design for recycling, specifically: *"Pounch/bag laminates with layer of different materials (composite packaging)"* - Line 2444 Comment: Typo error: modify Pounch with desorption Pouch	Acknowledged
p.127- 7.7.3. Design for recycling Body/ Material - Line 2456-2458 Comment: therefore body/material refers to the pouches. Maybe it should be all about packaging. - -	Acknowledged
p.128 – 7.7.4. Design for recycling (products in spray bottles) Comment: The European Ecolabel (EE) stipulates that spray bottles must be designed to be refillable and reusable, explicitly indicating the method by which they can be recharged. It is not specified that refills must be commercially available. However, according to the French Consumer Code Regulation, declaring an item as refillable when no refills are available on the market could be construed as a misleading claim: Article L121-2 - Code de la consommation - Légifrance (legifrance.gouv.fr) . Industrials would like to ask to delete the requirement on the obligation to specify the rechargeable aspect on spray packaging if the marketer does not offer refills on the market.	Acknowledged
p.128 -7.7.4. Design for recycling (products in spray bottles) Comment: HSC Spray bottles: The Nordic Swan requires that spray products must have a permanent aerosol reducing foaming nozzleThe Nordic Swan requires that products containing microorganisms shall not be used with spray applications.	Acknowledged

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Responses to Q40, Q41 and Q42 (related to design for recycling) (17 comments)

Q40: "PP labels with HDPE packaging are currently not allowed. Are stakeholders currently utilizing PP labels with HDPE packaging? Do any constraints or considerations exist related to the recycling process for this combination?"

Q41: "Do you employ water-soluble adhesives for plastic labels in your products? If not, what type of adhesive is utilized?"

Q42: " Should any additional material combinations that could potentially hinder the recycling process be considered? If yes, why?"

NOTE TO THE READERS

The topic on Packaging (PACK), particularly related to the *Recycled content* and *Design for Recycling* criteria, has been extensively discussed since the 1st AHWG in a dedicated working sub-group (sub-AHWG). In this PACK sub-AHWG the comments received from stakeholders following the 1st AHWG were considered, discussed and replied to, thus stakeholders are referred to the corresponding sub-AHWG background document (in this case about packaging) for full details. Hence, to avoid redundancy, in this Table of **Comments all the responses display "Acknowledged"**, in the understanding that such background documents will be consulted.

In addition, experts' discussions and feedback received in this sub-AHWG could have played a role in shaping the proposals made in the 2nd draft EUEL criteria. Consequently, stakeholders are advised to jointly consider the background document of this sub-AHWG alongside the rationales contained in the 2nd draft version of the Technical report (TR2) for full awareness on the process conducive to 2nd draft EUEL proposals.

All the previously cited draft documents are accessible via the website dedicated to the revision of the EUEL criteria for detergents in its *"Documents"* section within the folder *"2023 revision documents"*, namely here: https://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/product-bureau/product-groups/411/documents

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.119 – 7.7.3. Design for recycling - Question 40 Comment: PP labels with HDPE packaging are currently not allowed. Are stakeholders currently	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
utilizing PP labels with HDPE packaging? Do any constraints or considerations exist related to the recycling process for this combination A: Yes, PP labels are currently being widely used with HDPE packaging. The constraint of transitioning from PP label to PE label is that a PE label requires more basis weight (for example: from 60MIC to 85MIC), therefore more material usage, therefore more environmental impact. Currently a study published by Avery Dennison, PP labels are proven not to interfere with recycling processes given that all end-of-life parameters are taken into consideration (meaning: that the focus is not only on washing but on the entire end-of-life steps), see link to press release below. PP labels should be allowed as long as they can be removed (density below < 1 g/cm³ & water soluble adhesive). This would be inline with widely accepted Design for Recycling Guidlines as RecyClass etc. Warning! The test protocol for PE to establish the adhesive is water soluble is actually at room temperature that is for now not relevant (taking into account CLP regulation), a new protocol is under studying, but for now we don't know if it will be suitable to comply. It can be challenging to ask guarantee on water soluble adhesive without view on the future protocol. For PET bottles, labels with water soluble adhesive are for now difficult to find on the market depending to the label properties. This constraint is important to achieve the recyclability process efficience, but the adhesives and labels suppliers are still working on it. - -	
p.128 – Line 2501-2503 – Question 40 Comment: we are not using PP labels with HDPE packaging	Acknowledged
p.124-128 - Question 40 Comment: PP labels with HDPE packaging are currently not allowed. Are stakeholders currently utilizing PP labels with HDPE packaging? Do any constraints or considerations exist related to the recycling process for this combination? The labels we use are mainly made of coated paper, so we have no experience of recycling HDPE packaging combined with PP labels.	Acknowledged
p.125 – Question 40 Comment: Industrials would like to share that the combination of PP labels with HDPE packaging is frequently used (and the opposite, PP packaging with HDPE labels). According to French recyclers those combinations are not a problem for recycling systems (https://www.cotrep.fr/etapes/bouteilles-et-flacons/). One industrial would like to share that the labels used are mainly made of coated paper, so he has no experience of recycling HDPE packaging combined with PP labels.	Acknowledged
p.129-130 – Question 40: Comment: PP labels with HDPE packaging are currently not allowed. Are stakeholders currently utilizing PP labels with HDPE packaging? Do any constraints or considerations exist related to the recycling process for this combination? Yes, all Polyolefin labels are used with HDPE packaging (PP, PE	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
and PO). Extensive studies (please refer to slide 8 of the attached document) confirmed that: PP or PO labels do not hinder sorting (provided the label follows the principles on the size).PP and PO labels are fully compatible with the HDPE recycling process. We also note that the material density of PSL labels does not necessarily determine its impact on the recycling process of rigid PP or HDPE, since most labels are removed in the wind shifting process. The label flakes are significantly lighter than the packaging flakes and can be easily separated. Hence, the exclusion of PP/PE labels with density <1g/cm3, which would exclude the majority of PSL labels currently on the market, should not be maintained as material density is not a key recyclability indicator for those recycling streams - -	
p.129,130 - Question 40 Comment: Yes, PP labels are now widely used in HDPE packaging. The limitation of switching from PP labels to PE labels is that the PE label requires a higher grammage (for example: from 60MIC to 85MIC), and therefore a higher material consumption and thus a higher environmental impact. Now a study published by AveryDennison has shown that PP labels do not interfere with recycling processes, considering all end-of-life parameters (meaning that the focus is not only on washing, but on all end-of-life stages). Link to press release below: https://packagingeurope.com/news/study-indicates-avery-dennison-label-solutions-hdpe-recycling-compatibility/11009.article Re 41: NO, for an industrial group dealing with products for professional users, consisting mainly of dangerous goods or otherwise considered hazardous substances bearing CLP symbols, a water-soluble adhesive would not provide sufficient performance to ensure that the label would withstand the entire value chain, thus potentially endangering the health of people and the planet. Fast-moving consumer products have different label qualification standards than products for professional users, where user safety throughout the value chain is paramount, and the distinction must be taken into account.	Acknowledged
p.125 – Question 40 Comment: CITEO are not in favour to exclude PO – Polyolefins as: · Sleeves in partial PO is the best suitable material for PET bottle. · Sleeves in partial or integral PO is the best suitable material for HDPE and PP bottle. CITEO are not in favour to exclude LDPET as sleeves made of this material allows the bottle to be recyclable. We would like to highlight the fact that LDPET is a brand and not a material name. CITEO are in favour to exclude Pouch/bag laminates with layer of different materials (composite packaging) if the definition of plastic is “at least 50 % of plastics in the packaging”. Otherwise, if the definition is the one from the regulation “the slightest trace of plastic”, they are not in favour to exclude them. Indeed, this criterion becomes false because it prohibits packaging made of 99% paper and 1% plastic that can be recycled very well, with a good LCA. CITEO would like to share that for PP label on PE, thousands of tons are recycled every day. They try to limit the PP in the PE to improve quality, the difficulty is that	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
the alternative is paper and that it's not better. There are PE labels but still rare on the market. CITEO are not in favour to exclude EVOH - Ethylene vinyl alcohol as it is easily recyclable in PE and PP bottles. CITEO – French Competent Body has classified EVOH in green according to a consensual decision at CEN (CEN TC261 SC4 WG10) level. One industrial would like to add that the exclusion of EVOH – Ethylene vinyl alcohol is a problem because it is used for barrier coatings.	
p.128 – Question 40 Comment: I do not have applications utilizing PP labels with HDPE packaging Q41 –I have plastic labels (pressure sensitive labels) with water soluble adhesives Q42 – We don't have opinion on this matter.	Acknowledged
p.125 – Question 40: Comment: We do not agree with your declaration "PP labels with HDPE packaging are currently not allowed" because it is mentioned in the current user manual p 66 "Please note that the combination of PP with HDPE, as well as the combinations of PE with LLDPE, LDPE, HDPE are allowed be used in the EU Ecolabel products". We do not support the removal of this exemption Suggested actions: keeping the current exemption. Rationale: Because we have numerous detergent products with this combination of plastics and according to French recyclers this combination is not a problem for recycling systems (https://www.cotrep.fr/etapes/bouteilles-et-flacons/). - -	Acknowledged
p.124 – Question 40 Comment: yes. We have no recycling process considerations for this combination	Acknowledged
p.128 – Line 2504-2502 – Question 41 Comment: no	Acknowledged
p.124-128 - Question 41 Comment: Do you employ water-soluble adhesives for plastic labels in your products? If not, what type of adhesive is utilized? We don't know whether our label adhesives are water-soluble, and our suppliers don't have any standardised tests to confirm this. Our adhesives are acrylic based.	Acknowledged
p.125 – Question 41 Comment: We are completely opposed to the requirement on adhesive labels - which is inapplicable as it stands to the Cosmestics EE – being included in this revision of the Detergents EE. Moreover washable adhesives are the opposite of the CLP regulation for hazardous products. It seems that adhesives are not always washable and can be a problem for recyclability. Also, washable adhesives in water or alkaline at 80 °C are new on the market, in low quantity and have technical problems to be glued on the bottle. CITEO would like to share that water-soluble adhesives are available for PET	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
packaging. This does not exist for PE and PP packaging. As a result, a virtual temperature, not representative of reality, has been defined at 40° by Recyclass so that washable glues (wider than water-soluble) are aligned with the standard, but it works in 6 factories in Europe out of more than 100.	
p.129-130 – Question 41: Comment: Do you employ water-soluble adhesives for plastic labels in your products? If not, what type of adhesive is utilized? The semi-industrial study conducted by Avery Dennison together with the National Test Centrum Circulaire Plastics confirmed that the terminology 'water-soluble adhesive' is not correct. We recommend to refer to adhesive as releasable (without reference to temperature or water), as mechanical friction in the recycling process is a critical enabler for label releasability. In addition, there are several detergent segments using HDPE where there are existing EU regulations, for example, the CLP Regulation, stipulating that the labels on the package must not be water soluble or water releasable. Hence, this definition would be also in conflict with existing requirements on product/packaging safety. - -	Acknowledged
p.125 – Question 41: Comment: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we strongly do not support the addition of "PSL requirement" as in EU Ecolabel for cosmetics. Suggested actions: keeping the current criterion. Rationale: because there are numerous issues with cosmetic products, and CBs were compelled to find a solution to circumvent this criterion. - -	Acknowledged
p.128 – Line 2506-2507 – Question 42 Comment: no	Acknowledged
p.128 - Question 42 Comment: Should any additional material combinations that could potentially hinder recycling process be considered? If yes, why A: Fast moving consumer goods products have different label qualification standards versus products aimed for professional users (mostly comprised of dangerous goods or otherwise considered hazardous substances carrying CLP symbols), where safety to users during the entire value chain is paramount, and there must be a differentiation taken into consideration - -	Acknowledged

7.7.5. Packaging take-back systems and responses to Q43 (9 comments)

There are already existing requirements for packaging take-back systems for HSC, IIDD and IILD products. It is an optional requirement that can also be used as an alternative to complying with the other requirements on WUR and Design for Recycling requirements set out in 7.7.2 and 7.7.3.

Q43 asks: " Would you support the extension of this criterion to other product groups such 2535 as LD, DD and HDD? Please specify why."

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.128 – 7.7.5. Packaging take-back systems (for HSC, IIDD and IILD) Comment: Suggested actions: As explained several times we should require that LHs provide a truly convenient dosage system and in line with the tested dosages	Acknowledged – and also a requirement set as part of *Information to User* to ensure appropriate dosage system is provided.
p.129 – Line 2535-2636 – Question 43 Only where it is possible	Acknowledged
p.129 – Question 43 Comment: Yes, we would support the extension of this criterion to other product groups.	Acknowledged
p.128-129 - Question 43 Comment: Yes, because these product groups are also concerned by professionals. But the current difficulty is that these systems are not sufficiently developed in the country to be used. There is also the question of products sold by distributors, particularly via the internet: as the end customer is not known, it is currently totally impossible to take back packaging.	Acknowledged – we understand that take-back systems might be immature but also that expanding the scope to other product groups could aid in priming this way, ideally having synergistic effects with internet sales practices.
p.129 – Question 43 Comment: One industrial support the extension of this criterion to other product groups because these product groups are also concerned by professionals. But the current difficulty is that these systems are not sufficiently developed in the country to be used. There is also the question of products sold by distributors, particularly via the internet: as the end customer is not known, it is currently totally impossible to take back packaging. Additionnal comment: One stakeholder would like to share that this criterion is not currently followed by any of its certified detergents, so the CB question its relevance. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to define a well-defined "bulk" criterion. --	Acknowledged – In TR2 there is no specific proposal for "bulk" detergents, but certainly this is a route we are open to explore for inclusion. In addition, we would like to have a clarification of your comment – do you imply that there are no packaging take-back systems in the products of a EUEL LH? We welcome any insights in these matter.
p.131 – Question 43 Comment: We would like to emphasize that fast-moving consumer products have different label qualification standards than products for professional users (mostly consisting of dangerous goods or	Rejected – This criterion could be understood as complementary to WUR and *Design for Recycling (DfR)*, in the sense that if you comply with these, then there is no

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
otherwise considered hazardous substances bearing CLP symbols), where the safety of users throughout the value chain is paramount, and the distinction must be taken into account. Currently it is not possible to implement such a measure in the polish consumer market. We recommend to leave this criterion as an option not a requirement, and this applies to all consumer market groups.	obligation to comply with *packaging take-back system (PTBS)*. However, if someone can't comply with WUR and DfR but can comply with PTBS criterion, then they have a way to be compliant. We understand the trade-offs in professional products with regards to the "needs" that the packaging should suit (e.g. safety specifications) and we have tried to the extend feasible to accommodate such necessary reality into EUEL criteria. However, this could not serve as way to be exempted of a significant share of EUEL criteria, as in such case it would not yield the desired/expected environmental benefits (yet it could still resort to be a non-ecolabelled product).
p.129 – Question 43 Comment: We generally support any measure that can incentivise take back systems for any type of detergent packaging. We also support including LD, DD and HDD in this criterion. Suggested action: We support extending the criterion to consumer detergents and recommend introducing an additional requirement to incentivise that consumers do bring back the packaging. We would welcome further possibilities to foster refill detergents. Rationale: Take-back systems can bring substantial environmental savings, and thus it would be desirable to also establish these for consumer detergents. However, environmental savings are only reached if consumers actually return the packaging. Therefore, there should also be an incentive to do so, e.g. by a complimentary deposit scheme. Besides, refillable options might bring even higher environmental benefits. The sales format is of course an aspect that is difficult to influence by a detergent producer. But the PPWR final agreement also states that by 2030, final distributors with a sales area of more than 400m2 shall endeavour to dedicate 10% of that sales area to refill stations for both food and non-food products. This means we can expect large distributors to take steps in this direction already in the coming years. To prepare for this development, EU Ecolabel detergent packaging could e.g. be designed in a way that could enable refill.	Acknowledged – There is no specific mention to refil in TR2 but this is an area we would like to incorporate/discuss within the current revision. However, feedback so far suggest the take-back systems are still immature/not-widespread and this could difficult its feasibility, meaning being implementable at EU level at the time this EUEL revision is occurring.
p.129 – Question 43 Comment: It could be a good idea because it would somehow decrease the amount of wasted plastic. Final users could reuse their own packaging.	Acknowledged
p.129 – Question 43 Comment: "We support the extension of this criterion to other product groups such as LD, DD and HDD.	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Reusable packaging may offer a more sustainable alternative to single-use packaging. Ecolabel detergents LD, DD, HDD, could also use also the refillable system via dispenser."	

13. Fitness for use (10 comments)

NOTE TO THE READERS

The topic on Fitness for Use (FfU), has been extensively discussed since the 1st AHWG in a dedicated working sub-group (sub-AHWG). In this FfU sub-AHWG the comments received from stakeholders following the 1st AHWG were considered, discussed and replied to, thus stakeholders are referred to the corresponding sub-AHWG background document (in this case about FfU) for full details. Hence, **to avoid redundancy, in this Table of Comments all the responses display "Acknowledged"**, in the understanding that such background documents will be consulted.

In addition, experts' discussions and feedback received in this sub-AHWG could have played a role in shaping the proposals made in the 2nd draft EUEL criteria. Consequently, stakeholders are advised to jointly consider the background document of this sub-AHWG alongside the rationales contained in the 2nd draft version of the Technical report (TR2) for full awareness on the process conducive to 2nd draft EUEL proposals.

All the previously cited draft documents are accessible via the website dedicated to the revision of the EUEL criteria for detergents in its *"Documents"* section within the folder *"2023 revision documents"*, namely here: https://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/product-bureau/product-groups/411/documents

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.131 – Fitness for use, specifically: *"The applicant shall also provide documentation demonstrating compliance with the laboratory requirements included in the relevant harmonised standards for testing and calibration laboratories, if appropriate"* Comment:.ù I suggets ISo 17025 Lab requirements	Acknowledged
p.130-132 – Fitness for use Comment: Performance protocols need to be revised in particular: - All : When generic formulas are not available and tests are based on target formulas validated by certification bodies, this can create differences between countries and manufacturers. It's also time-consuming for both manufacturers and certification bodies. Some generic formulas are obsolete: certain raw materials no longer exist on the market. Generic formulas should be revised and established for all standards. - LD : if the temperature of effectiveness is lowered to 20°C, the test must demonstrate that the new product, which can be used at 20°C, gives equivalent performance to products marketed for use at 30°C. Also, the availability of certain soils and soils ballast is not stable, which may delay the development of new products. - IILD and IIDD : For both of these standards, efficacy targets and protocols need to be defined, as there may be too great a disparity between different countries. This makes certification more complicated because : - in the absence of precise lab tests, the number of laboratories able to propose protocols is very limited - validation of target products and protocols by certification bodies takes time	Acknowledged
p.113 (should be 131) – Fitness for use Comment: DD conditions: need to update this protocol due to its outdate and inconsistency with the current market (cycle temperature, cycle time, machine models that no longer exist). Need for flexibility in these parameters, which change very regularly depending on the machine market. In view of market trends in recent years (inflation, etc.), it would be appropriate to review the wording of the European IEC target IILD conditions: welcome the current conditions, they allow us to compare the product to be certified with the most relevant benchmark. However, we are opposed to any proposal to compare products using an 'artificial' formula as it would involve double effort because it is not relevant to assessing the performance of our product HDD conditions: test protocol should include degreasing capacity. For the moment, it is based solely on foam. Ask to update the performance target, as some ingredients are no longer manufactured or	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
available, and review its formulation in light of market developments. Hard surface cleaners Need for a specific test for recurring HSC conditions: we are in favour of creating a working group specifically for 'fitness for use' protocols. It is preferrable to initiate this working group early on so that initial inputs can be reflected in the 2nd EUEL draft criteria Fitness for use testing protocols: we are in favour of creating a working group specifically for 'fitness for use' protocols. It is preferrable to initiate this working group early on so that initial inputs can be reflected in the 2nd EUEL draft criteria Performance tests: they are currently carried out according to old protocols and need to be updated. For each Ecolabel, in order to avoid distortions in the performance to be achieved, companies must be able to test themselves, for each product category, each galenic formulation and each type of market (consumer/professional), against a target common to the whole of the European Union and updated each time the criteria are revised. For professional products, we would like to see user testing maintained - -	
p.131 – Fitness for use Comment: Additional comments: We would like to point out that old protocols must be updated. It is essential to carry out an in-depth review of all performance tests. We would like to highlight that companies should be able to compare their products with a target product (according to the product category and market type, professional or domestic), common to the whole European Union, and updated at each revision of the criteria. For IILD and IIDD products, industrials would like to maintain user testing. They also would like to develop a specific tests protocol because the machines are specific. One stakeholder would like to add that only a few IILD and IIDD products are certified because of a lack of protocols. One stakeholder would like to add that the criterion on "customer visit (in IIDD and IILD) poses a number of difficulties in terms of applicability (particularly for B-to-C products) and should therefore be rewritten or even deleted. For HDD, industrials would like to point out that the test protocol should include the degreasing capacity. The performance target should be updated as some ingredients are not manufactured nor available anymore. Protocols dedicated to solid formulas for HDD should also exist. For LD and the stain removal tests, a general reflexion should be undertaken on the AISE test protocol: - These tests are not always relevant: some stains pass the test objective without the use of detergent (tea, red wine and chocolate, but also to a lesser extent fruit juice and make-up). This can be explained either by the irrelevance of the stain, or by the calculation method. - According to the changes in the detergent market in recent years (compaction, inflation...), it would be relevant to review the formulation of European IEC targets. A powder target should not be used to test a liquid product candidate. It would seem appropriate to have a liquid target for these products. The cycle time	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
and machine to be used are restrictive and not necessarily in line with the machines currently available on the European market. For HSC, there is a need for a specific test for recurring creams and steel cleaners, as current tests are not relevant for characterising product performance. Test methods for kitchen cleaners would be more appropriate for multi-surface cleaners and test methods for multi-surface cleaners more appropriate for kitchen cleaners. For DD, there is a need to update the protocol, which is old and not consistent with the current market (cycle temperature, cycle time, machine models that no longer exist). There is a need for flexibility in these parameters, which change very regularly depending on the machine market. According to the market developments in recent years (inflation, etc.), it would be appropriate to review the wording of the European IEC target. Industrials would like to add that tests for DD (liquid) favour foaming products (which use more water), so the criterion concerning the number of plates washed could be improved or modified. The tests on dishwashers describe machine models that no longer exist on the market, the protocols should be rejuvenated. The descaling test requires vertical descaling, which means that the products are rated as ineffective. Industrials also highlight the problem of targets for DD (liquid), as some of the ingredients described in the tests are no longer used. The calculation method should also be reviewed, as the current calculation in the methodology means that the target is achieved by washing certain tasks with water only. It might be interesting to review the way in which the standard deviation is taken into account. Industrials add that there is a need of tests protocol for softeners with a target. One CB is not in favour of authorising internal tests, at the very least for main effect claims, as they do not provide the same guarantees as external tests and may give rise to differences in performance and harm the image of the EA. Each secondary effect claim including "concentrated", "high performance" etc. must be proven. Each test protocol should specify for which degree of soiling and which water hardness (when relevant) and how extrapolation should be carried out and verified. Generic targets should be used wherever possible, and where they do not exist, the target product, which should be the market leader, should score well in the test. Test protocols must be discussed upstream and made available and published at the same time as all the necessary documents. Industrials propose to update stain remover performance tests to test several stains simultaneously in one cycle of washing machine.	
p.132 – Fitness for use Comment: Here is our proposition for discussion: Performance tests are performed according to old protocols that need to be updated. For each Ecolabel decision, companies must be able to test against a common target for the whole European Union. The target must be updated with each revision of the criteria, for each product category, geographical area, and type of market (public/professional). About tests: -	Acknowledged

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
For HDD: The test protocol should include degreasing capability. Currently it is based only on foam. The performance target needs to be updated as some ingredients are no longer manufactured or available and its formulation needs to be reviewed in light of market developments. A protocol specifically for solid formulas (such as dish soap) should be established - For LD: The AISE test protocol for soil removal needs a global reflection. Below are some elements to consider: Some stains achieve the test objective without the use of detergent (tea, red wine and chocolate, but also at a lower level fruit juice and makeup). This can be explained either by the non-relevant stain or by the calculation method: for the candidate product, the average +standard deviation, and for the reference target, the average - standard deviation. Given the evolution of the laundry market in recent years (compaction, inflation, etc.), it would be relevant to review the formulation of the European IEC targets. A powder target should not be used to test a liquid candidate product. It seems relevant to have a liquid target for these products. The cycle time and washing machines used are restrictive and not in line with the current available machines on the European market. For HSC: A specific test is necessary for scouring creams and stainless steel cleaners, as the current tests are not relevant to characterize the product's performance. We also point out that the test methods for kitchen cleaners would be more appropriate for multi-surface cleaners and the test methods for multi-surface cleaners would be more appropriate for kitchen cleaners. For DD It is necessary to update the protocol, which is outdated and not in accordance with the current market (cycle temperature, cycle time, and machine models that are no longer available). Flexibility is required in these parameters, which change regularly depending on the market of the machines. The European IEC target's formulation should be revised in light of recent market developments like inflation. For IDD A specific test is necessary because the machines are specific. A test protocol for softeners with a target is necessary for multi-component products.	
p.132 – Fitness for use Comment: In favour of creating a working group specifically for 'fitness for use' protocols. It is preferrable to initiate this working group early on so that initial inputs can be reflected in the 2nd EUEL draft criteria.	Acknowledged
p.45 (wrong page reference) – Fitness for use Comment: Develop new reference detergent which fit the current market trend and Ecolabel criteria. Rationale: Reference Detergent for Laundry (Fit for Use): IEC 60°C was developed to compare washing machines and it is suitable and good for this purpose. But it has no consumer relevance as it is not reflecting any market detergents and/or consumer needs. Therefore it is not suitable as benchmark for detergents in sense of Ecolabel. Over that it doesn´t fulfill or reflect any Ecolabel	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
criteria. With view on ensuring consumer acceptance of sustainable detergents this reference detergent does not support the development of well-performing green detergents. The same is relevant for Detergents working at 20°C to 40°C.Therefore we strongly recommend to use an other more suitable reference detergent.	
p.131 – Fitness for use Comment: Comment, suggestions actions and rationale: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG: We are not in favour of allowing internal tests, especially for the primary function, as they do not provide the same level of assurance as external tests. This could lead to different results and damage the reputation of the EU Ecolabel certification. We would appreciate it if you could precisely define the requirements for accepting a laboratory and the leader product. Every claim, including "concentrated..." and "high performance...", must be substantiated. IDD+IILD: Protocols are currently missing, so they need to be defined and should not be left to the discretion of CBs, as there is a risk of yielding different results and tarnishing the image of EU Ecolabel, as well as creating a distortion of competition. Frameworks must also specify the level of soiling and water hardness for which the test must be conducted, as well as how the dosage extrapolation (based on soil/water hardness) should be carried out by the LH, and what evidence must be provided by the LH and verified by the CB. It is important to prioritize the definition of a generic formulation when it exists and is recognized. If not, the leader product should have a good rating (for example, 7/10). Frameworks should be discussed in advance, then defined and published simultaneously with all necessary documents (decisions, UM, all declarations, and calculation sheets).	Acknowledged
p.131 – Fitness for use Comment: Suggested actions: Each framework itself should include the following text and not a new link to SOFW etc.	Acknowledged
p.131 – Fitness for use Comment: Suggested action and rationale: It is essential to change the framework in order to make it more relevant and stricter, including a test of black maintenance. - -	Acknowledged

14. Automatic dosing systems (4 comments)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.133 Comment: In the context of B to C products, it would be appropriate to specify the requirements to be provided to the certifying body and their frequency. Suggested actions: Providing declarations of conformity only during certification should be sufficient in B to C. Furthermore, the declarations of conformity indicate the person responsible for the visits, and the certifying body can directly contact the retailer and its customers if visit reports are needed. Rationale: The manufacturer may not always have direct links with the users of the products sold to retailers. In the case of B to C products, the declaration of conformity can be provided annually by the retailer, but not the visit reports, which are difficult to obtain (even if the visits are conducted).	Acknowledged – the JRC did not reach a conclusion on which course of action could be more beneficial and practical: removing the criterion OR simplifying it. For this, a dedicated question has been included in TR2 and based on its outcome the legal text will be formulated accordingly (or removed)
p.133 Comment: Our professional customers who use automatic dosage products are supported by our technical sales staff, whether they buy ecolabel products or not. In fact, we visit them several times a year to ensure that the dosing system is operational and properly adjusted. What's more, these systems can be remotely controlled, particularly in the event of breakdowns. For new customers, a visit is mandatory for the 1st installation of the dosing system and products. Verification of this criterion is complicated: there are many customers (several hundred), and not all of them can be examined by the certification body. As these checks are carried out for all professionals using automatic dosage products, this criterion does not bring any additional quality to IILD and IIDD Ecolabel products. It would be preferable to simplify it by doing away with annual checks.	
p.133 Comment: Additionnal comments: One stakeholder point out that the current criterion poses numerous difficulties of applicability (in particular for B-to-C products) and should therefore be rewritten or even deleted.	
p.133 Comment: Suggested actions: As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, the criterion "automatic dosing system" needs to be rephrased, especially the requirement for "customer visits", particularly for products B to C. Rationale: A considerable amount of effort is needed to comply with it, while the benefits it offers are negligible. Furthermore, a signed declaration of compliance along with	

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
a description is not sufficient to prove that customer visits are really performed, each year but in fact, this criterion is difficult to prove. - -	

15. User information (10 comments)

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
p.134 Comment: We ask to remove the recommended minimum temperature requirement on products/categories when the water temperature cannot be precisely controlled (hand washing, multi-surface cleaner to be diluted) or is not relevant (WC gel, sprays or ready-to-use products). We also ask to remove the obligation to affix on spray packages that they are refillable if the marketer does not offer refills.	Partially accepted – In this TR2 the requirement on disclosing the minimum temperature requirements is proposed to be removed from the legal text.
p.137 Comment: This product is not intended for a large-scale cleaning' – Suggested actions: Delete this sentence or at least harmonizing sentences between French and other languages Rationale: We don't understand the purpose of this sentence. The translation between French and other languages is not equivalent : In french: "ce produit n'est pas destiné à un nettoyage industriel»;this product is not intended for industrial cleaning Other langage: "This product is not intended for a large-scale cleaning'"	Partially accepted – The wording has been modified using the contrary meaning: instead of indicating for what is not intended (large scale) now reads what is intended for (small-scale; small surfaces, spot cleaning). We understand this will provide the intended meaning and clarity while avoiding any issue associated with translating to other languages.
p.137 Comment: HSC: A text shall appear on the primary packaging indicating the importance of using the correct dosage and the lowest recommended temperature in order to minimize energy and water consumption and reduce water pollution. Rationale: owest recommended temperature is not applicable for RTU products, so this should be deleted from the user information.	Accepted – In this TR2 the requirement on disclosing the minimum temperature requirements is proposed to be removed from the legal text.
p.136 Comment: LD environmental user information: propose to change the current user information due to lack of space on labels and for possible mis translations for multilingual labels. In addition, remove the minimum recommended temperature requirement from products/categories where the water	Partially accepted – In this TR2 the requirement on disclosing the minimum temperature requirements is proposed to be removed from the legal text.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
temperature cannot be precisely controlled (hand dishwashing, dilutable multi-surface cleaners) or is irrelevant (toilet gel, sprays or ready-to-use products)	Environmental information it is still required on sales packaging but focused discussion can happen on this aspect. JRC remains open for solutions leading to simplification and use of innovative tools (as digital means).
p.135 Comment: Additionnal comments: Industrials would like to delete the requirement on the minimum temperature recommended on products when water temperature cannot be controlled precisely (HDD, undiluted HSC) or when it is not reliable (e.g sanitary detergent products, RTU and sprays). CB would like for each side effect claim to be tested including "concentrated, ultra-concentrated…" (or equivalent), "high performance, excellent degreasing power…" (or equivalent). e.g., each side effect must be tested at least in-house (with protocol to be validated upstream by the CB); "concentrated etc." claims must be backed up by a comparison with market-leading products which may or may not make this claim; "high performance etc." claims must be backed up by results superior to the external test conducted. They also ask for this criterion to be rewritten and harmonized for all EE Detergent Decisions, so as to include: information on recommended dosage, degree of soiling, water hardness (where relevant), and to provide a real dosing system that is adapted to and compatible with the dosages required by the user. - -	Accepted – the requirement on minimum temperature is proposed to be removed. Claims related to performance are verified as part of *Fitness for Use* criterion scope. Any other claim can also verified by the CB and only then, information on such claim can be provided to users (see new sub-section *d) Special information and/or precautions*. In this way verification of any claim is required prior to being able to use such claim. Finally, wording has been revised in order to be harmonized and comprehensive.
p.134 Comment: User Information: The requirement for HSC and HDD that the Dosage instructions shall include the recommended dosage for at least two levels of soiling" does not make sense for these two product groups	Accepted – such text is now (TR2) proposed to be removed.
p.135 Comment: Comment, suggestions actions and rationale: As already partly mentioned during the 1st AHWG, · Rewrite and standardize this criterion across all EU Ecolabel decisions to include information on dosage, degree of soiling, water hardness if relevant (for DD, LD, IIDD, and IILD), provide a truly convenient dosage system and in line with the tested dosages, and ensure compatibility with dosages that must be performed by the user. · Each claim for secondary functions, as well as claims including "concentrated, ultraconcentrated," (or equivalent) and "high performance, excellent degreasing capacity…" (or equivalent), must be substantiated. Specifically, each secondary effect must be tested (at least with an internal test, whose protocol must be validated by the CB beforehand); "concentrated, ultraconcentrated, etc." should be supported by a comparison of several leader market products with this claim and without this claim; "high performance, etc." should be supported by higher results in the externally conducted test.	Accepted – the requirement on minimum temperature is proposed to be removed. Claims related to performance are verified as part of *Fitness for Use* criterion scope. Any other claim can also verified by the CB and only then, information on such claim can be provided to users (see new sub-section *d) Special information and/or precautions*. In this way verification of any claim is required prior to being able to use such claim. Finally, wording has been revised in order to be harmonized and comprehensive. The assessment and verification requires providing means to verify information provided via digital means, amongst which technical datasets could be present.

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
· Specify the mandatory statement, for example, "using the correct dosage and the lowest recommended temperature in order to minimize energy and water consumption and reduce water pollution." · Add a requirement to compel applicants/LHs to provide a technical data sheet in addition to the label, when such a technical sheet exists, and specify the type of information that should be included in this document.	
p.135 Comment: User information on HSC: Suggestions actions and rationale: We think: "Undiluted" HSC: it seems to be appropriate to require for a "normally soil" a dosage of 2 caps (or equivalent), maximum. "RTU" HSC: it could be useful to ask LH to indicate on labels what surface area corresponds one spraying, to guide users and to reduce the impact of this kind of detergents. Detergents with dosages in "cap" (at the minimum for HSC and LD): it is essential to require that the provided cap has compatible graduations with dosages mentioned on labels. It is not obvious in current criteria, so it is leaving to competent bodies' judgements. For example, if 15 ml is required, the cap can't only indicate 10 or 20 ml.	Acknowledged – but not included in TR2
p.135 Comment: 7.10 User information on LD: Suggestions actions: As mentioned earlier, it is necessary to require LH to specify on their labels "ONLY for white linen" if color tests are not conducted! - -	Partially accepted – this would be implicitly included as part of the new sub-clause *d) Special information and/or precautions*. This requirement requires verification of any other claim that product manufacturer's would like to associated with their product explicitly. The verification should be triggered (ideally) by the *Fitness for Use* criterion but even if such would fail, still there would be an information requirement by which a claim would need to be verified (and accepted) by the Competent Body.
p.General Comment: One stakeholder would like to propose that manufacturers should be obliged to indicate on their labels that the detergent is for white only if the two "color" tests have not been carried out One stakeholder suggest that the Framework should be modified to make it more relevant in terms of testing: it might be appropriate to include a black test and that manufacturers should be obliged to indicate on their labels that the detergent is for white only if the two "color" tests have not been carried out.	

Other more general remarks (10 comments)

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Prolongation of existing criteria? Comment: Process: voting is intended in Q4 in 2025 – but the validity is until June 2026 – hence the transition of 12 month is not possible – is a prolongation attended? - -	Acknowledged – The end of the revision is now schedule for voting happening during Q22026
EU-wide auditing of testing bodies Comment: Industrials would like to harmonize practices at European level and propose to: - Plan periodic audits of licensees to obtain/maintain certification (already effective in France). - Plan audits of external performance testing laboratories (some have not been audited for 10 years). With this in mind, CB would like to propose the addition of specific rules concerning regular on-site audits in the next version of the European Ecolabel directives. These rules should establish minimum standards for the frequency and scope of on-site audits, as well as monitoring and verification mechanisms to ensure their effective implementation. - -	Acknowledged – we welcome suggestions for improvement but these seem to us better to be addressed/communicated at CB Forum level firstly, to then integrate within different EUEL criteria revisions via their revision procedures and upon agreed consensus on ways for change.
EU-wide auditing of testing bodies Comment: Certifying bodies/ Testing laboratories We call for harmonization of practices at European level: - Set up regular audits for stakeholders to obtain/maintain certification (as already done in France). -Set up a regular audit of external performance testing laboratories (some have not been audited for 10 years). - -	
EU harmonization of application process Comment: We also call for harmonization of certification methods between certifying bodies: -Each organization has its own method of certification (documentary filing frames, justifications, or documents to be completed by suppliers of ingredients or packaging) which is likely to lead to distortions between candidates for the Ecolabel. These methods should be standardized and simplified to facilitate the certification process. -Certifying bodies should ensure systematic availability of all documents, including calculation sheets, user manuals, and digital versions in English, national languages, and digital formats. -It is important to communicate changes to documents systematically to certifying bodies and certified companies. -In order to facilitate the management of their files by applicants, we propose the establishment of a platform for filing and managing files at European level, available in English and in national languages. - -	
Unrealistic requirements for suppliers in some areas Comment: In general we support comments that have been submitted by CESIO. As raw material supplier of surfactants and additives, we cannot answer all questions, some of them concerning clearly the formulations. - -	Acknowledged -

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE
Directorate B – Fair and Sustainable Economy
Circular Economy and Sustainable Industry

Comments received in AHWG1/written form	JRC Dir. B response
Transition period alignment Comment: Deadlines for compliance Suggested action: The working documents must be edited at the same time as the new decisions. 2-year deadline once all the documents are available. Rationale: Extending compliance deadlines	Acknowledged -
Transition period Comment: There are elements that are significant to us but not covered by the scopes but for us, it seems important to address: Time to comply with new requirements We ask for a minimum of 24 months after the revision is in force and all documents are available (calculation sheet, DID list, user manual, performance test protocols, attestation template to be completed by suppliers) so that labeled companies can comply. Renewing all products without a break in certification was not possible despite an 18-month transition period during the last revision of the 6 repositories. - -	Acknowledged -
Transition period Comment: Additional comments: Timeframe for compliance with the new requirements: Industrials would like to allow a minimum of 24 months after the revision comes into force and all the documents (calculation sheet, DID list, user manual, performance test protocols, attestation form to be completed by suppliers) are made available for labelled companies to comply. During the last revision of the 6 standards, despite the 18-month transition period, this did not allow all products to be renewed without a break in certification.	Acknowledged -
Transition period Comment: Suggested action and rationale: It is essential to publish simultaneously all necessary documents (decisions, UM, all declarations, and calculation sheets) As mentioned during the 1st AHWG, we are requesting a minimum of 18 months after the publication of all documents, as we have approximately 1000 detergent products to renew. - -	Acknowledged -
Animal testing Comment: Competent bodies/ Tests We are in favour to banish animal testing as cosmetics products.	Acknowledged -