

# Questionnaire on 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone

## Context of the questionnaire

Welcome to the questionnaire that will allow you to contribute to the development of the [preparatory study on textile products](#).

Deadline for submission of comments: **30 March 2026** at 23:59 CET.

On 16 December 2025, the Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission shared with all registered stakeholders the [working document of the 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone](#).

On 14 and 15 January 2026, registered stakeholders and the JRC exchanged ideas during an online workshop about Tasks 4, 5 and 6 of the working document.

On 30 January, stakeholders received a PDF version of the questionnaire providing detailed information on the content and structure of all questions related to the working document of the 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone, on which the JRC would welcome feedback from stakeholders.

From the first days of February to 30 March 2026, all registered stakeholders will be able to provide **written feedback** to the working document of the 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone via the dedicated EU Survey form.

The consultation process enables the JRC to improve the work under development and the exchange with registered stakeholders aims to:

- verify the work done to date,
- collect additional evidence on the investigated topics.

## Structure of the questionnaire

This questionnaire has 14 sections:

1. Profile of the respondent
2. Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
3. Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
4. Analysis of technologies in the context of recycled content
5. Design options (DOs) not included in the model
6. DO1 on robustness
7. DO2 on recyclability
8. DO3 on recycled content
9. DO4 on environmental and carbon footprint
10. Combination of design options: paths
11. Chemical substances in textile products
12. Environmental and economic model
13. Questions related to future stages of the project
14. Other parts of the working document

The questionnaire is designed and implemented in a way that should enable stakeholders to easily identify the sections they wish to comment, allowing them to skip those sections which they do not wish to comment.

Section 14 further allows all registered stakeholders to provide up to 10 written comments to the working document on topics not otherwise specifically covered in the questionnaire. Should you wish to provide more than 10 comments, you are welcome to **submit more than one questionnaire**. If you wish to share a document to support your position further, you may do so by sending it via email to [JRC-B5-TEXTILES@ec.europa.eu](mailto:JRC-B5-TEXTILES@ec.europa.eu), clearly indicating if

the submitted information should be treated as confidential. Please note that comments made in Section 14 or documents sent via email should not reiterate or substitute the answers on topics asked in previous sections of the questionnaire. We would be grateful if you can support the JRC in analysing the comments received by using to the maximum extent possible the structured questionnaire provided.

#### **Confidentiality of personal data and information provided**

Data and information collected via this questionnaire will be treated confidentially and complying with the Regulation on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data ([Regulation \(EU\) 2018/1725](#)). Therefore, data will be treated for the development of EU policies on textiles, and it will be of the exclusive use of the European Commission. The European Commission will process data and information complying with the referred regulation. For more information, please visit the privacy statement under this [link](#) (processing of personal data for user management purposes) and [this link](#) (processing personal data within the survey itself).

# 1 PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENT

---

First name	Last name	Email address
XX	XX	XX

\* Publication of information in my contribution

- I **consent** to the publication, by the European Commission’s JRC, of any information in my contribution, in whole or in part (which may include quotes or opinions I express), provided that the personal information submitted under “stakeholder information” is not disclosed. Publication of the information may include publication in aggregated or disaggregated form of your contributions in JRC intermediate deliverables or final reports that may be made publicly available via the JRC’s [project website](#).
- I do **not consent** to the publication of any information in my contribution.

\*  I guarantee that:

- My response does not infringe any intellectual property rights, including without limitation, copyright, database sui generis rights or trademark rights or any other third party rights;
- To the extent that my response contains materials from other sources (e.g., text, illustrations, graphs, tables), I have obtained written permission from the relevant copyright owners to include such materials in my response, in a way that allows the European Commission to publish my response;
- I can provide copies of any relevant written permissions/licences, at the request of the European Commission; If my response contains materials made available under an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), I indicate the type of licence, together with the source and author’s name, in my response;
- Nothing in my response is obscene, defamatory, violates any right of privacy or duty of confidentiality, infringes any other rights of any person or entity or is otherwise unlawful

## 1.1 NAME OF THE SUBMITTING ORGANIZATION

What is the name of the organization you represent in this questionnaire?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 1.2 TYPE OF THE ORGANIZATION

Select the type of organization you represent in this questionnaire:

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Government (e.g. Member States, regions, EU Ecolabel competent bodies, national and regional agencies, etc.)
- Textile industry
- Textile industrial association
- Waste management industry
- Waste management industry association
- Consumer organization
- Environmental Non-governmental organization (NGO)

- Other Non-governmental organization (NGO)
- Research institutions, including universities
- Test laboratory
- Other

*(If the respondent selects “Industry” or “Test laboratory”)*

### **1.2.1 Size of your organization**

Select the size of the organization you represent in this questionnaire:

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

*(If the respondent selects “Other”)*

### **1.2.2 Please specify the type of organization you represent in this questionnaire**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **1.3 COUNTRY OF THE ORGANIZATION**

Select the country of the organization you represent in this questionnaire:

*(The EU Survey will have the list of the UN countries + Other to specify)*

# **2 ANALYSIS OF TECHNOLOGIES IN THE CONTEXT OF PHYSICAL DURABILITY**

---

## **2.1 CONTRIBUTION TO PHYSICAL DURABILITY**

Do you want to contribute to section 9.2.1 of the working document on description of product technologies in the context of physical durability? This section of the questionnaire contains 24 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

## **2.2 ASSESSMENT OF PHYSICAL DURABILITY 1 OF 2**

Considering:

- The legislative and technical context of the preparatory study, as reported in section 1 of the working document of the 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone,
- The knowledge and evidence presented in the working document of the 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone,
- The definition of durability reported in the ESPR (the ability of a product to maintain over time its function and performance under specified conditions of use, maintenance and repair),

Do you agree with the theoretical methodology describing the physical durability reported at lines 2969-2991?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **2.2.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.2.2 Why? How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.3 ASSESSMENT OF PHYSICAL DURABILITY 2 OF 2**

The analysis reported at lines 2992-3038 shows that the conceptual approach proposed by the JRC to describe physical durability cannot be implemented with the currently available standardized tests used by the textile industry. This results largely from the fact that there are currently no standards capable of simulating the aging process of the textile apparel.

Do you agree with the analysis on the limitations of the current implementation of the physical durability approach, as reported at lines 2992-3038?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **2.3.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.3.2 Why? How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.4 ROBUSTNESS AS PROXY OF THE PHYSICAL DURABILITY**

Assuming that the physical durability cannot be addressed as such due to limitations outlined in questions 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, robustness is proposed as proxy for physical durability at lines 3039-3157.

In this context, Robustness is defined as “the capability of a product to resist, i.e. maintain its physical structure and appearance, after undergoing external stresses, which could be of chemical or physical nature”.

Do you agree with the use of robustness as a proxy for physical durability?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **2.4.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **2.4.2 Why? Which proxy would you propose and how would it be defined and applied?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **2.5 DEFINITION OF ROBUSTNESS**

Do you agree with the definition of the robustness provided at lines 3041-3042?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **2.5.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **2.5.2 Why? How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **2.6 GENERAL LIMITATIONS OF ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK**

Considering the definitions of physical durability and robustness mentioned above, lines 3053-3064 report the general limitations of using a framework based on robustness.

Do you agree with the limitations reported at lines 3053-3064?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **2.6.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.6.2 Why? How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.7 KEY PARAMETERS IN THE PROPOSED ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK**

Lines 3080-3120 describe the robustness framework proposed in the preparatory study.

Do you agree with the selection of the key parameters?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **2.7.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.7.2 Why? Which other parameters would you rather select and why? Which standardised tests could underpin them?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.8 NUMBER OF CLEANING CYCLES IN THE PROPOSED ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK**

Lines 3080-3120 describe the robustness framework proposed in the preparatory study.

Do you agree with the selection of five cleaning cycles?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **2.8.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.8.2 Why? Which number would you rather select and why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.9 PRODUCT CATEGORIES IN THE PROPOSED ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK**

Lines 3080-3120 describe the robustness framework proposed in the preparatory study.

Do you agree with the product categories proposed at lines 3098-3100?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **2.9.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.9.2 Why? Which other product categories would you rather propose and why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.10 NON-WASHABLE TEXTILE APPAREL IN THE ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK**

Lines 3101-3103 report that the number of non-washable textile apparel placed on the EU market is negligible compared to the total number of products placed on the market in the scope of the preparatory study.

Do you agree with the estimation of the number of non-washable textile apparel?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.10.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.11 STANDARDS IN THE PROPOSED ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK**

At lines 3104-3120, product technologies are described in the framework of robustness. Table 44 reports the ISO standards proposed to measure the key parameters.

Do you agree with the proposed standards to measure key parameters for each product category?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 2.11.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 2.11.2 Why? What would be the advantage of using alternative standards? (if so, please specify the alternative standards in question)

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 2.12 DESCRIPTION OF PRODUCT TECHNOLOGIES FOR EACH PRODUCT CATEGORY

Table 44 describes the characteristics of the two product categories (knitted and woven products). The definition of product technologies is reported at lines 2596-2600:

The Base Case of technologies (BC) represents the average product on the market.

The Best Available Technologies (BAT) provide the highest performance available on the market. BAT are implemented at scale.

The Best Not yet Available Technologies (BNAT) have the highest performance, but they are not yet implemented at scale, therefore they are considered not available on the market.

In this context, product technologies are products with defined characteristics related to key parameters of robustness.

## 2.13 VALUES PROPOSED FOR VISUAL INSPECTION IN TABLE 44

Do you agree with the values reported in Table 44 proposed for visual inspection?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 2.13.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 2.13.2 Why? Which alternative values would you use?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 2.13.3 Is your answer based on direct measurements on products in the scope of the preparatory study?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No

## **2.14 VALUES PROPOSED FOR SPIRALITY IN TABLE 44**

Do you agree with the values reported in Table 44 proposed for spirality?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **2.14.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.14.2 Why? Which alternative values would you use?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.14.3 Is your answer based on direct measurements on products in the scope of the preparatory study?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No

## **2.15 VALUES PROPOSED FOR DIMENSIONAL CHANGE IN TABLE 44**

Do you agree with the values reported in Table 44 proposed for dimensional change?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **2.15.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.15.2 Why? Which alternative values would you use?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.15.3 Is your answer based on direct measurements on products in the scope of the preparatory study?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No

## **2.16 CLEANING CYCLES IN TABLE 44**

Lines 3107- 3112 describe how to perform the cleaning cycles.

Do you agree with the directions provided on how to perform the cleaning cycles?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **2.16.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.16.2 Why? Which alternative directions would you provide?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.16.3 Is your answer based on direct experience with these test methods?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No

## **2.17 PERFORMANCE LEVEL OF VISUAL INSPECTION**

Lines 3115-3116 state that the performance level of the visual inspection is given by the worst performing sub-parameter assessed.

Do you agree with the choice of referring to the worst performing sub-parameter assessed?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **2.17.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 2.17.2 Why? Which other choice would you make?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

### 2.17.3 Is your answer based on direct experience with this test method?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No

## 2.18 INTENTIONAL COLOUR CHANGE IN TABLE 44

Lines 3117-3119 address intentional colour change in specific products.

Do you agree with the proposal to skip the analysis of colour change on products that are designed to evolve their colour over time?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

### 2.18.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

### 2.18.2 Is your answer based on direct experience manufacturing and/or testing these products?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No

## 2.19 PRODUCTS MADE OF VISCOSE IN TABLE 44

Lines 3121- 3125 address the peculiarities of products mainly made of viscose (fibre content higher than 80% by mass).

Do you agree with the proposal of ironing them before performing measurements reported in Table 44?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

### **2.19.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.19.2 Is your answer based on direct experience manufacturing and/or testing these products?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No

## **2.20 CATEGORIZATION OF PRODUCTS IN THE CONTEXT OF ROBUSTNESS.**

Lines 3130-3140 report the reasons leading to a simplified categorization and therefore the exclusion of key parameters related to abrasion, tear, and seam slip, which refer to specific products for defined applications.

Do you agree with the reasoning for the simplified categorization?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.20.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.20.2 Which would be the advantages of including more key parameters referring to specific products for defined applications?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **2.20.3 Which would be the limitations or drawbacks of including more key parameters referring to specific products for defined applications?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **2.20.4 Which are the additional parameters you would include?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.20.5 Is your answer based on direct experience with manufacturing and testing the products in the scope?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.21 THE ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK AND SERVICE LIFETIME**

Lines 3141-3154 report the views of the JRC on the limitations of the robustness framework.

Do you agree that the proposed robustness framework is not capable of providing an estimate of the envisaged service lifetime of an item of textile apparel based on its intrinsic properties?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **2.21.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.22 THE ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK AND THE AGING OF PRODUCTS**

The proposed robustness framework is capable to describe only the resistance to external stresses and therefore only provides a partial picture that does not correspond to what should be agreed by experts as the real combination of stresses that occur during product aging.

Do you agree with this statement?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **2.22.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.23 THE ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK AND THE INCREASE OF THE SERVICE LIFETIME**

In the proposed robustness framework, claims regarding any expected increase of the service lifespan of textile apparel currently can only be based on expert judgements, which will not be verifiable. Textile experts cannot base their judgement on direct experience, because nobody performs such measurements due to lack of aging tests (Lines 3150-3154). Do you agree with this statement?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **2.23.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.23.2 Is your answer based on experience with manufacturing and testing products in the scope of the preparatory study?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.24 PRODUCT AGING AND STANDARDS**

In your view, should a testing standard be developed that would simulate the ageing of textile apparel, thereby capturing, to the extent feasible, a representative range of stresses to which a product is subjected during its service life?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.24.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **2.25 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TWO POTENTIAL FRAMEWORKS: PHYSICAL DURABILITY AND ROBUSTNESS**

In Table 45, the two potential frameworks are described.

Do you agree with the description reported in Table 45?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.25.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **2.25.2 How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 3 ANALYSIS OF TECHNOLOGIES IN THE CONTEXT OF REPAIRABILITY

---

### 3.1 CONTRIBUTION TO REPAIRABILITY

Do you want to contribute to section 9.2.3 of the working document on description of product technologies in the context of repairability? This section of the questionnaire contains 1 main question.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.)*

*(If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

### 3.2 FRAMEWORK FOR REPAIRABILITY

The analysis reported in section 9.2.3 leads the JRC to propose a framework that reports only information to the user regarding the location and contact of available repair services.

Do you agree with the conclusion that only information to the user regarding the location and contact of available repair services can be part of the framework describing repairability?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### 3.2.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### 3.2.2 How can this analysis be improved?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 4 ANALYSIS OF TECHNOLOGIES IN THE CONTEXT OF RECYCLED CONTENT

---

### 4.1 CONTRIBUTION TO RECYCLED CONTENT

Do you want to contribute to section 9.2.5 of the working document on description of product technologies in the context of recycled content? This section of the questionnaire contains 1 main question.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.)*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

## **4.2 DEFINITION OF RECYCLED CONTENT**

Lines 3958-3960 reports that the analysis of the ecosystem suggests the refinement of the definition of recycled content for the purpose of this PS as *the proportion, by mass, of recycled fibres, from post-industrial, pre- and post-consumer waste, in a textile product*. Lines 3961-3966 reports some additional reasoning.

Do you agree with this definition?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **4.2.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **5 DOS NOT INCLUDED IN THE MODEL**

---

### **5.1 CONTRIBUTION TO DESIGN OPTIONS NOT INCLUDED IN THE MODEL**

Do you want to contribute to section 11.1 of the working document on design options not included in the model? This section of the questionnaire contains 10 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

### **5.2 INCLUSION OF VOLUNTARY INFORMATION ABOUT REPAIR SERVICES**

At lines 5143- 5165, arguments for the inclusion of voluntary information about repair services are reported.

Do you agree with the arguments used for the inclusion of voluntary information on repair services?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 5.2.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 5.2.2 Do you agree with establishing an information requirement on repair services directly offered by the brand (if any), including their details and contact information, via the Digital Product Passport?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- No, I do not agree
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 5.2.3 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 5.2.4 How can the requirement on repair service be improved?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 5.3 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS ON REPAIRABILITY

Can you propose any other requirements to address repairability?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I want to propose more requirements
- No, I cannot propose more requirements
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose more requirements”)*

### 5.3.1 Please, carefully describe the reasoning and the characteristics of the requirement

Information on corresponding costs would be highly appreciated. If the respondent considers such information confidential, could directly send it to the functional mailbox [JRC-B5-TEXTILES@ec.europa.eu](mailto:JRC-B5-TEXTILES@ec.europa.eu).

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 5.4 EXCLUSION OF REQUIREMENTS ADDRESSING SUSTAINABLE SOURCING

Lines 5166 - 5183 provide arguments about why it is currently not possible to propose requirements on sustainable sourcing of materials used in textile apparel.

Do you agree with these arguments?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### 5.4.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 5.5 INCLUSION OF VOLUNTARY INFORMATION ABOUT FIBRES IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE REGULATION (EU) 2018/848 ON ORGANIC PRODUCTION AND LABELLING OF ORGANIC PRODUCTS

At lines 5184- 5194, the working document proposes the voluntary information about cotton, wool, and silk fibres in compliance with Regulation (EU) 2018/848 on organic production and labelling of organic products.

Do you agree with including voluntary information about fibres in compliance with the Regulation (EU) 2018/848?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### 5.5.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### 5.5.2 How can it be improved?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 5.6 SCHEMES CERTIFYING COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATION (EU) 2018/848

Can you name certification schemes that would allow verification of the content of cotton, wool, and silk fibres in textile apparel compliant with Regulation (EU) 2018/848?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I can
- No, I cannot

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### 5.6.1 Report references to the certification scheme

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 5.7 EXCLUSION OF REQUIREMENTS ON THE FRAGMENTATION OF TEXTILE APPAREL

Section 10.2 reports an assessment of pollution generated by textile fragmentation. In particular, section 10.2.1 reports about the lack of standardised definition of biodegradability of pollution generated by textile fragmentation. This lack of definition does not allow to define the scope of the problem and therefore its magnitude. Lines 5195-5211 present the rationale for not proposing requirements on the fragmentation of textile apparel.

Do you agree that the definition of particulate matter biodegradability should be standardised?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree

- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **5.7.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **5.8 DEFINITION OF BIODEGRADABILITY (1 OF 2)**

Do you agree that a standardised definition of biodegradability should specify the aspects that are reported in lines 5200- 5205?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **5.8.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **5.9 DEFINITION OF BIODEGRADABILITY (2 OF 2)**

Would you add more characteristics of the biodegradability definition?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would
- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **5.9.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **5.10 COMPARABLE MEASUREMENTS OF FRAGMENTED TEXTILES ALONG THE VALUE CHAIN**

In section 10.2.4, the JRC expresses the view that the lack of standardised methods for sampling, characterization, and quantification in all release points of the value chain does not allow to identify the hotspots for the pollution generated by the fragmentation of textiles.

Do you agree that in order to collect reliable and comparable measurements along the whole value chain, standardised methods should first be developed for the sampling, characterization and quantification of these pollutants in all release points of the value chain?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **5.10.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **5.11 POTENTIAL REQUIREMENTS ADDRESSING POLLUTION GENERATED BY TEXTILE**

### **FRAGMENTATION**

Considering the currently available standards, would you propose requirements to address the problems generated by the fragmentation of textile apparel?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I want to propose requirements
- No, I cannot propose requirements
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose requirements”)*

#### **5.11.1 Please, describe the reasoning and the characteristics of the requirement**

Information on corresponding costs would be highly appreciated. If the respondent considers such information confidential, could directly send it to the functional mailbox [JRC-B5-TEXTILES@ec.europa.eu](mailto:JRC-B5-TEXTILES@ec.europa.eu).

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **6 DO1 ON ROBUSTNESS**

---

### **6.1 CONTRIBUTION TO DESIGN OPTION ON ROBUSTNESS (DO1)**

Do you want to contribute to section 11.1.1 of the working document on design option about robustness? This section of the questionnaire contains 25 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

### **6.2 REASONS TO PROPOSE THE DESIGN OPTION 1 (DO1) ON ROBUSTNESS**

DO1 was proposed because the extension of the service lifetime would tackle between 81% and 90% of the total lifecycle environmental impacts of the products.

Lines 5213-5230 report justifications and collect relevant information from previous sections.

Based on the information and the rationale provided at lines 5213-5230, do you agree with the proposal of DO1?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **6.2.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.3 OBJECTIVES OF DO1 AND LIMITATIONS OF THE ROBUSTNESS FRAMEWORK**

The DO1 aims to establish a framework that: (1) empowers consumers to make informed purchases of more durable products, and (2) encourages manufacturers to produce more durable products. The DO1 relies on the robustness framework proposed.

Do you agree that the limitations of the robustness framework influence the objectives of DO1?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **6.3.1 Please elaborate on your response**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.4 EFFECT OF DO1 ON ROBUSTNESS**

Do you consider that an information requirement based on robustness would lead to:

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- A significant service lifetime extension (e.g. due to consumers and manufacturers choosing and producing more robust products, respectively).
- A negligible increase in service lifetime.
- No effect on the service lifetime.
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent does not answer “I have no opinion”)*

#### **6.4.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.5 ROBUSTNESS SCORING SYSTEM**

Do you agree with the scoring system described in lines 5252- 5283 and table 71?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **6.5.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **6.5.2 How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.6 ASSUMPTION ON SERVICE LIFETIME**

At lines 5294- 5310, the average service lifetime is assumed to increase by 5%.

Do you agree with the average increase by 5% of the service lifetime?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **6.6.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **6.6.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.7 ASSUMPTION ON ENERGY USE FOR THE KNITTED PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the energy use is assumed to increase by 2%.

Do you agree with the increase by 2% of the energy use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 6.7.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 6.7.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 6.7.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 6.7.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 6.8 ASSUMPTION ON ENERGY USE FOR THE DENIM PRODUCT CATEGORY

In Table 72, the energy use is assumed to increase by 2.5%.

Do you agree with the increase by 2.5% of the energy use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 6.8.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 6.8.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 6.8.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **6.8.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.9 ASSUMPTION ON ENERGY USE FOR THE OTHER WOVEN PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the energy use is assumed to increase by 2%.

Do you agree with the increase by 2% of the energy use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **6.9.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **6.9.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **6.9.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **6.9.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.10 ASSUMPTION ON WATER USE FOR THE KNITTED PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the energy use is assumed to increase by 1%.

Do you agree with the increase by 1% of the water use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 6.10.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 6.10.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 6.10.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 6.10.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 6.11 ASSUMPTION ON WATER USE FOR THE DENIM PRODUCT CATEGORY

In Table 72, the energy use is assumed to increase by 2.5%.

Do you agree with the increase by 2.5% of the water use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 6.11.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 6.11.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 6.11.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 6.11.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **6.12 ASSUMPTION ON WATER USE FOR THE OTHER WOVEN PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the energy use is assumed to increase by 1.4%.

Do you agree with the increase by 1.4% of the water use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **6.12.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **6.12.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.12.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### **6.12.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **6.13 ASSUMPTION ON FIBRES USE FOR THE KNITTED PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the fibres use is assumed to increase by 0.6%.

Do you agree with the increase by 0.6% of the fibres use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **6.13.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

**6.13.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**6.13.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- 
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

**6.13.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**6.14 ASSUMPTION ON FIBRES USE FOR THE DENIM PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the fibres use is assumed to increase by 0.5%.

Do you agree with the increase by 0.5% of the fibres use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

**6.14.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

**6.14.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**6.14.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

**6.14.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **6.15 ASSUMPTION ON FIBRES USE FOR THE OTHER WOVEN PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the fibres use is assumed to increase by 0.44%.

Do you agree with the increase by 0.44% of the fibres use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **6.15.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **6.15.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.15.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### **6.15.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **6.16 ASSUMPTION ON CHEMICALS USE FOR THE KNITTED PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the chemicals use is assumed to increase by 2%.

Do you agree with the increase by 2% of the chemicals use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **6.16.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

**6.16.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**6.16.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

**6.16.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**6.17 ASSUMPTION ON CHEMICALS USE FOR THE DENIM PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the chemicals use is assumed to increase by 1.7%.

Do you agree with the increase by 1.7% of the chemicals use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

**6.17.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

**6.17.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**6.17.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

**6.17.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**6.18 ASSUMPTION ON CHEMICALS USE FOR THE OTHER WOVEN PRODUCT CATEGORY**

In Table 72, the chemicals use is assumed to increase by 1.25%.

Do you agree with the increase by 1.25% of the chemicals use?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **6.18.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **6.18.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **6.18.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **6.18.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.19 ADDITIONAL PARAMETERS RELATED TO INCREASED ROBUSTNESS**

Would you propose additional parameters to model related to increased robustness?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I want to propose additional parameters
- No, I cannot propose additional parameters
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose additional parameters”)*

#### **6.19.1 Please, carefully describe the additional parameters and the reasoning to use them.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **6.19.2 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 6.19.3 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 6.20 ADDITIONAL MANUFACTURING COSTS DUE TO INCREASE OF ENERGY, WATER, FIBRES AND CHEMICALS USE

At lines 5336-5337, it is reported that the additional manufacturing costs for achieving a higher robustness are calculated based on the additional energy, water, mass and chemicals used.

Do you agree with what is reported at lines 5336-5337?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 6.20.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 6.20.2 Please specify the alternative approach you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 6.20.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 6.20.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 6.21 COSTS OF TESTING IN DO1

At lines 5338-5343, is reported that an additional cost of testing is considered and estimated to be of 0.05 €/unit.

Do you agree with the additional cost of testing equal to 0.05 €/unit?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 6.21.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers "No")*

### 6.21.2 Please specify the alternative approach you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 6.21.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers "Other")*

### 6.21.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 6.22 COSTS OF LABELLING IN DO1

At lines 5344- 5348, is reported that an additional cost of labelling is considered and estimated to be of 0.02 €/unit.

Do you agree with the additional cost of labelling equal to 0.02 €/unit?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

### 6.22.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers "No")*

### 6.22.2 Please specify the alternative approach you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers "No")*

### 6.22.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers "Other")*

#### **6.22.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.23 ADDITIONAL COSTS RELATED TO INCREASED ROBUSTNESS**

Would you propose additional costs related to increased robustness?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I want to propose additional costs
- No, I cannot propose additional costs
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose additional costs”)*

#### **6.23.1 Please, carefully describe the additional costs per product and the reasoning to use them.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose additional costs”)*

#### **6.23.2 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **6.23.3 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.24 PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ON ROBUSTNESS**

Would you be in favour of proposing a performance requirement on robustness?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would
- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **6.24.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **6.24.2 How would you justify the limit values? Based on what information would you establish such performance requirements?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 6.24.3 Can you provide tentative limit values by product category?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 6.24.4 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 6.24.5 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 6.25 CLASSES OF PERFORMANCE ON ROBUSTNESS

Classes of performance are a structured categorisation that translates a product’s performance on a single key parameter (e.g. visual inspection, spirality, and dimensional change), or an aggregated potential robustness score, into clear bands that are easy to compare. For example, considering 5 classes from A to E, with A being the best and E the worst.

Under the ESPR, they are used to benchmark and differentiate products, incentivise better-performing designs and communicate circularity and environmental performance on labels to guide customers' choices, while ensuring that the lowest class aligns with the minimum required performance.

Would you be in favour of proposing classes of performance on robustness?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would
- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 6.25.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 6.25.2 How would you justify the limit values? Based on what information would you establish performance levels?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 6.25.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurements
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **6.25.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **6.26 INFLUENCE OF THE EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY ON ROBUSTNESS**

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) schemes required under the Waste Framework Directive could incentivise designing products with higher robustness scores.

Do you think that EPR fee modulation based on a robustness score will increase the use of products with increased service lifetime?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, it will
- Yes, it mostly will
- No, it mostly will not
- No, it will not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **6.26.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **6.26.2 By how much?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **6.26.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **7 DO2 ON RECYCLABILITY**

---

### **7.1 CONTRIBUTION TO DESIGN OPTION ON RECYCLABILITY (DO2)**

Do you want to contribute to section 11.1.2 of the working document on design option about recyclability? This section of the questionnaire contains 12 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

### **7.2 REASONS OF PROPOSING DESIGN OPTION 2 (DO2) ON RECYCLABILITY**

DO2 was proposed because products which are recyclable after specific processing yield recycled fibres, the use of which can prevent the use of virgin fibres. This design option indirectly addresses 60-63% of the lifecycle environmental impacts of the product.

Lines 5375- 5391 report justifications and collect relevant information from previous sections.

Based on the information and rationale provided at lines 5375- 5391, do you agree with the proposal of this design option?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **7.2.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **7.3 EFFECT OF INFORMATION ON RECYCLABILITY**

Lines 5383-5388 report limiting factors for textile recyclability that go beyond design of products.

Despite these limiting factors, do you think that an information requirement on recyclability (under the assumption that stakeholder comments for its improvement are addressed appropriately) would:

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Significantly increase the share of textile going to recycling.
- Result in some increase of textile going to recycling.
- Have no effect on the share of textile going to recycling.
- I have no opinion.

*(If the respondent does not answer “I have no opinion”)*

#### **7.3.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **7.4 DEVELOPMENT OF RECYCLING TECHNIQUES AND CAPACITY**

At lines 5386- 5388, the available techniques are highlighted as the main limiting factor for recycling.

Can you provide any projections on how the textile recycling capacity will increase globally in 2030, 2035, 2040, in absence of any ecodesign requirement?

In your answer, please, specify if you include or not the effects of other policy tools, such as the Extended Producer Responsibility under the Waste Framework Directive, and the planned revision of the Textile Labelling Regulation.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I can
- No, I cannot
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I can” and “No, I cannot”)*

#### **7.4.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I can”)*

#### **7.4.2 If possible, please, provide figures, taking into account different available recycling technologies**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers "Yes, I can")*

#### **7.4.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers "Other")*

#### **7.4.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **7.5 RECYCLABILITY SCORING SYSTEM**

Do you agree with the scoring system described in lines 5403- 5443 and Table 76?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

#### **7.5.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers "No")*

#### **7.5.2 How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **7.6 ASSUMPTION ON SHARE GOING TO RECYCLING**

At lines 5447- 5461, the share going to recycling is assumed to increase by 5%.

Do you agree with the increase by 5% of the share going to recycling?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

### 7.6.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 7.6.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 7.6.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 7.6.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 7.7 COSTS OF LABELLING IN DO2

At lines 5462- 5465, is reported that an additional cost of labelling is considered and estimated to be of 0.02 €/unit.

Do you agree with the additional cost of labelling equal to 0.02 €/unit?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 7.7.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 7.7.2 Please specify the alternative approach you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 7.7.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers "Other")*

#### **7.7.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **7.8 ADDITIONAL COSTS RELATED TO RECYCLABILITY INFORMATION DISCLOSURE**

Would you propose additional costs related to recyclability information disclosure (DO2)?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I want to propose additional costs
- No, I cannot propose additional costs
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers "Yes, I want to propose additional costs")*

#### **7.8.1 Please, carefully describe the additional costs per product and the reasoning to use them.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers "Yes, I want to propose additional costs")*

#### **7.8.2 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers "Other")*

#### **7.8.3 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **7.9 INFLUENCE OF THE EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY**

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) schemes required under the Waste Framework Directive could incentivise designing products with higher recyclability scores.

Do you think that EPR fee modulation based on a recyclability score will increase the share of products going to recycling?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, it will
- Yes, it mostly will
- No, it mostly will not
- No, it will not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

#### **7.9.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers "Yes")*

### **7.9.2 By how much?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **7.9.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **7.10 INFLUENCE OF THE PLANNED REVISION OF THE TEXTILE LABELLING REGULATION**

The planned revision of the Textile Labelling Regulation (TLR) aims to improve fibre identification on the label, notably by modernising the fibre names according to international standards, streamlining the process to add new fibre names, requiring more detailed information on location of fibre and non-fibre content across textile products components/parts and by incorporating new standards on test methods. Extending the current recycling tolerance for the carding process to all mechanically recycled content is also planned.

Do you think that a revised TLR will increase the share of products going to recycling?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, it will
- Yes, it mostly will
- No, it mostly will not
- No, it will not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **7.10.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **7.10.2 By how much?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **7.10.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **7.11 USE OF RFID TO CARRY LABELLING INFORMATION**

Do you agree that the use of RFID to carry labelling information in a machine-readable format could facilitate automatic sorting and recycling and therefore increase the share of products going to recycling?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly do not agree
- No, I do not agree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **7.11.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 7.11.2 By how much?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 7.11.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 7.12 PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ON RECYCLABILITY

Would you be in favour of proposing a performance requirement on recyclability?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would
- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 7.12.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 7.12.2 Please, carefully describe the reasoning and the characteristics of the requirement

Information on corresponding costs would be highly appreciated. If the respondent considers such information confidential, could directly send it to the functional mailbox [JRC-B5-TEXTILES@ec.europa.eu](mailto:JRC-B5-TEXTILES@ec.europa.eu).

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 7.12.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 7.12.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 7.13 CLASSES OF PERFORMANCE ON RECYCLABILITY

Classes of performance are a structured categorisation that translates a product’s performance on a recyclability score, into clear bands that are easy to compare. For example, considering 5 classes from A to E, with A being the best and E the worst.

Under the ESPR, they are used to benchmark and differentiate products, incentivise better-performing designs and communicate circularity and environmental performance on labels to guide customers' choices, while ensuring that the lowest class aligns with the minimum required performance.

Would you be in favour of proposing classes of performance on recyclability?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would
- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **7.13.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **7.13.2 How would you justify the limit values? Based on what information would you establish performance levels?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **7.13.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### **7.13.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **8 DO3 ON RECYCLED CONTENT**

---

### **8.1 CONTRIBUTION TO DESIGN OPTION ON RECYCLED CONTENT (DO3)**

Do you want to contribute to section 11.1.3 of the working document on design option about recycled content? This section of the questionnaire contains 30 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

### **8.2 REASONS OF PROPOSING DESIGN OPTION 3 (DO3) ON RECYCLED CONTENT**

DO3 was proposed because the use of recycled fibres prevents the manufacturing and use of virgin fibres. This design option directly tackles the 60-63% of the lifecycle environmental impacts of the product.

Lines 5497- 5500 report justifications and collect relevant information from previous sections.

Based on the information and rationale provided at lines 5497- 5500, do you agree with the proposal of this design option?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.2.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.3 SOURCE OF RECYCLED FIBRES**

Regarding the types of waste from which the recycled fibers originate, they should include:

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Post-consumer textile waste only
- Post-industrial, pre-consumer and post-consumer textile waste
- Post-industrial, pre-consumer, post-consumer textile waste, and waste from other sectors (e.g. PET bottles)
- Others
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent does not answer “I have no opinion”)*

#### **8.3.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.4 AVAILABILITY OF RECYCLED COTTON**

Section 13.12 reports the assessment on the availability of the recycled cotton.

Do you agree with the assessment reported in Section 13.12 regarding the availability of recycled cotton?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.4.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.4.2 How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.5 AVAILABILITY OF THE RECYCLED NYLON**

Section 13.12 reports the assessment on the availability of the recycled nylon.

Do you agree with the assessment reported in Section 13.12 regarding the availability of recycled nylon?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.5.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.5.2 How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.6 AVAILABILITY OF THE RECYCLED POLYESTER**

Section 13.12 reports the assessment on the availability of the recycled polyester.

Do you agree with the assessment reported in Section 13.12 regarding the availability of recycled polyester?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.6.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.6.2 How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.7 AVAILABILITY OF THE RECYCLED WOOL**

Section 13.12 reports the assessment on the availability of the recycled wool.

Do you agree with the assessment reported in Section 13.12 for recycled wool?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.7.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.7.2 How can it be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.8 ASSUMPTIONS FOR KNITTED PRODUCT CATEGORY WHEN ONLY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ARE ASSESSED**

Lines 5577-5582 report the assumption made when only information requirements are considered.

Do you agree with the assumption that by only setting information requirements this would lead to an increase of secondary materials content equal to 2% of polyester, and 0.5% of nylon, wool and cotton?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.8.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.8.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **8.8.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **8.8.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.9 ASSUMPTIONS FOR DENIM PRODUCT CATEGORY WHEN ONLY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ARE ASSESSED**

Lines 5577-5582 report the assumption made when only information requirements are considered.

Do you agree with the assumption that by only setting information requirements this would lead to an increase of secondary materials content equal to 5% of cotton and 2% of polyester?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.9.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.9.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **8.9.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **8.9.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.10 ASSUMPTIONS FOR OTHER WOVEN PRODUCT CATEGORY WHEN ONLY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ARE ASSESSED**

Lines 5577-5582 report the assumption made when only information requirements are considered.

Do you agree that the adoption of only information requirements would result in an increase of secondary materials content equal to 2% of the polyester, and 0.5% of the nylon, wool and cotton?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.10.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.10.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 8.10.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 8.10.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 8.11 PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ON RECYCLED CONTENT FOR KNITTED PRODUCT CATEGORY

Section 11.1.3 considers the following performance requirements for knitted product category: 5% of the nylon, 10% of the wool, and 15% of the polyester.

Do you agree with the adoption of these minimum limit values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### 8.11.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### 8.11.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### 8.11.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### 8.11.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 8.12 PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ON RECYCLED CONTENT FOR THE DENIM PRODUCT CATEGORY

Section 11.1.3 considers the following performance requirements for the denim product category: at least 20% of the cotton used in the product should be recycled material.

Do you agree with the adoption of this minimum limit value?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.12.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.12.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **8.12.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **8.12.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.13 PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ON RECYCLED CONTENT FOR OTHER WOVEN PRODUCT CATEGORY**

Section 11.1.3 considers the following performance requirements for other woven product category:

- at least 5% of the nylon used in the product should be recycled material,
- at least 10% of the wool used in the product should be recycled material,
- at least 15% of the polyester used in the product should be recycled material.

Do you agree with the adoption of these minimum limit values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.13.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **8.13.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.13.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### **8.13.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **8.14 ASSUMPTIONS FOR KNITTED PRODUCT CATEGORY WHEN INFORMATION AND PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ARE ASSESSED**

Section 11.1.3 considers the following performance requirements for knitted product category:

- at least 5% of the nylon used in the product should be recycled material
- at least 10% of the wool used in the product should be recycled material
- at least 15% of the polyester used in the product should be recycled material

Do you agree with the assumption that an information requirement on recycled content in combination with a performance requirement would lead to an increase of secondary materials content by 5% as compared to the mentioned thresholds (i.e. resulting in 5.25% of the nylon, 10.5% of the wool, and 15.75% of the polyester?)

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **8.14.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **8.14.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.14.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **8.14.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.15 ASSUMPTIONS FOR DENIM PRODUCT CATEGORY WHEN INFORMATION AND PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ARE ASSESSED**

Section 11.1.3 considers the following performance requirements for the denim product category: at least 20% of the cotton used in the product should be recycled material

Do you agree with the assumption that an information requirement on recycled content in combination with a performance requirement would lead to an increase of secondary materials content by 5% as compared to the mentioned threshold (i.e. resulting in 21% of the cotton)?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.15.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.15.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **8.15.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **8.15.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.16 ASSUMPTIONS FOR OTHER WOVEN PRODUCT CATEGORY WHEN INFORMATION AND PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ARE ASSESSED**

Section 11.1.3 considers the following performance requirements for recycled content for the other woven product category:

- at least 5% of the nylon used in the product should be recycled material
- at least 10% of the wool used in the product should be recycled material
- at least 15% of the polyester used in the product should be recycled material

Do you agree with the assumption that an information requirement on recycled content in combination with a performance requirement would lead to an increase of secondary materials content by 5% as compared to the mentioned thresholds (i.e. resulting in 5.25% of nylon, 10.5% of wool, and 15.75% of polyester?)

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.16.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **8.16.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **8.16.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **8.16.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.17 ADDITIONAL PARAMETERS RELATED TO INCREASED SHARE OF RECYCLED FIBRES**

Would you propose additional parameters to model that relate to having an increased share of recycled fibres?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I want to propose additional parameters
- No, I cannot propose additional parameters
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose additional parameters”)*

#### **8.17.1 Please, carefully describe the additional parameters and the reasoning to use them.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **8.17.2 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience

- Other

*(If the respondent answers "Other")*

**8.17.3 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**8.18 PRICE OF RECYCLED PET – AN AVERAGE VALUE FROM THE GLOBAL MARKET**

Table 81 reports that the price of recycled PET at global level is equal to 1 840 EUR/kg. The information was taken from [this source](#).

Do you agree with the adopted value and the use of its source?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

**8.18.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent does not answer "Yes")*

**8.18.2 Please, provide an alternative value and its source**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**8.19 PRICE OF RECYCLED PET – AN AVERAGE VALUE FROM CHINESE PRODUCERS**

Table 81 reports that the price of recycled PET from the Chinese market is equal to 1 068 EUR/kg. The information was elaborated from [this source](#) and [this source](#).

Do you agree with the adopted value and the use of its sources?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers "Yes" and "No")*

**8.19.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent does not answer "Yes")*

**8.19.2 Please, provide an alternative value and its source**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **8.20 PRICE OF RECYCLED PET – AN AVERAGE VALUE FROM EU PRODUCERS**

Table 81 reports that the price of recycled PET from the EU market is equal to 2 430 EUR/kg. The information was taken from [this source](#).

Do you agree with the adopted value and the use of its sources?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **8.20.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent does not answer “Yes”)*

### **8.20.2 Please, provide an alternative value and its source**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **8.21 PRICE OF RECYCLED POLYAMIDE – AN AVERAGE VALUE FROM NON-EU PRODUCERS**

Table 81 reports that the price of recycled polyamide from non-EU producers is equal to 3 375 EUR/kg. The information was taken from [this source](#).

Do you agree with the adopted value and the use of its sources?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **8.21.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent does not answer “Yes”)*

### **8.21.2 Please, provide an alternative value and its source**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **8.22 PRICE OF RECYCLED POLYAMIDE – AN AVERAGE VALUE FROM EU PRODUCERS**

Table 81 reports that the price of recycled polyamide from EU producers is equal to 3 375 EUR/kg. The information was elaborated from [this source](#) and [this source](#).

Do you agree with the adopted value and the use of its sources?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.22.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent does not answer “Yes”)*

#### **8.22.2 Please, provide an alternative value and its source**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.23 PRICE OF RECYCLED COTTON – AN AVERAGE VALUE FROM NON-EU PRODUCERS**

Table 81 reports that the price of recycled cotton from non-EU producers is equal to 2 648 EUR/kg. The information was elaborated from [this source](#) and Khan et al. (2025).

Do you agree with the adopted value and the use of its sources?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **8.23.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent does not answer “Yes”)*

#### **8.23.2 Please, provide an alternative value and its source**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.24 PRICE OF RECYCLED COTTON – AN AVERAGE VALUE FROM EU PRODUCERS**

Table 81 reports that the price of recycled cotton from EU producers is equal to 2 693 EUR/kg. The information was elaborated from [this source](#).

Do you agree with the adopted value and the use of its sources?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 8.24.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent does not answer “Yes”)*

### 8.24.2 Please, provide an alternative value and its source

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 8.25 PRICE OF RECYCLED WOOL – AN AVERAGE VALUE FROM NON-EU PRODUCERS

Table 81 reports that the price of recycled wool from non-EU producers is equal to 3 560 EUR/kg. The information was elaborated from [this source](#).

Do you agree with the adopted value and the use of its sources?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 8.25.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent does not answer “Yes”)*

### 8.25.2 Please, provide an alternative value and its source

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 8.26 PRICE OF RECYCLED WOOL – AN AVERAGE VALUE FROM EU PRODUCERS

Table 81 reports that the price of recycled wool from EU producers is equal to 3 560 EUR/kg. The information was elaborated from [this source](#).

Do you agree with the adopted value and the use of its sources?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 8.26.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent does not answer “Yes”)*

### 8.26.2 Please, provide an alternative value and its source

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 8.27 COSTS OF LABELLING IN DO3

At lines 5592- 5595, it is reported that an additional cost of labelling is considered and estimated to be of 0.02 €/unit.

Do you agree that the additional cost of labelling is equal to 0.02 €/unit?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 8.27.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 8.27.2 Please specify the alternative approach you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 8.27.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 8.27.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 8.28 COSTS OF CERTIFICATION IN DO3

At lines 5596- 5602, it is reported that an additional cost of certification is considered and estimated to be of 0.13 €/unit. This cost refers to a certification based on a chain of custody system that is capable to demonstrate that a specific quantity of fibre in the final product is a recycled material coming from a specific type of textile waste, i.e. post-industrial, pre-consumer, and post-consumer.

Do you agree that the calculated cost of certification is equal to 0.13 €/unit?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **8.28.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **8.28.2 Please specify the alternative approach you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **8.28.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### **8.28.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **8.29 ADDITIONAL COSTS RELATED TO DO3**

Would you propose additional costs to be considered related to the design option 2 (DO2) on recycled content?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I want to propose additional costs
- No, I cannot propose additional costs
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose additional costs”)*

### **8.29.1 Please, carefully describe the additional costs per product and the reasoning to use them.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose additional costs”)*

### **8.29.2 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### **8.29.3 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **8.30 INFLUENCE OF THE EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY ON RECYCLED CONTENT**

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) schemes required under the Waste Framework Directive could incentivise designing products with higher recycled content.

Do you think that EPR fee modulation based on the quantity of recycled material will increase the use of products with increased recycled content?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, it will
- Yes, it mostly will
- No, it mostly will not
- No, it will not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **8.30.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **8.30.2 By how much?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **8.30.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **8.31 EPR SCHEME AND THE CALCULATION OF RECYCLED CONTENT**

Should the EPR fee modulation be based on:

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- The overall amount of recycled content present in the product
- The recycled content in the product sourced from European post-consumer textile waste
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### **8.31.1 Please specify how you would account for the recycled content**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **9 DO4 ON ENVIRONMENTAL OR CARBON FOOTPRINT**

---

### **9.1 CONTRIBUTION TO DESIGN OPTION ON ENVIRONMENTAL OR CARBON FOOTPRINT (DO4)**

Do you want to contribute to section 11.1.4 of the working document on design option about environmental or carbon footprint? This section of the questionnaire contains 29 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

## 9.2 CONSEQUENCES OF THE INFORMATION REQUIREMENT ON PRODUCT FOOTPRINT

Do you think an information requirement on product footprint would:

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Significantly decrease the footprint of the textile apparel, e.g. because consumers and manufacturers would choose and produce less impactful products, respectively.
- Somewhat decrease the footprint of the textile apparel.
- Have no effect on the environmental impact of textile apparel.
- I have no opinion.

*(If the respondent does not answer “I have no opinion”)*

### 9.2.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.3 ENVIRONMENTAL FOOTPRINT ADDRESSING LC2

DO4 was proposed as an environmental indicator to (1) help consumers make informed purchases of less impactful products, and (2) encourage manufacturers to produce products with lower environmental impacts.

DO4 focuses only on Life-Cycle Stage 2 (LCS2 - manufacturing) and addresses 20% of the total lifecycle impacts when the environmental footprint is chosen as environmental indicator – see lines 5659- 5662.

Do you agree with the use of the proposed environmental indicator that addresses 20% of the total lifecycle impacts?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 9.3.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.4 CARBON FOOTPRINT ADDRESSING LC2

DO4 was proposed as an environmental indicator to (1) help consumers make informed purchases of less impactful products, and (2) encourage manufacturers to produce products with lower environmental impacts.

DO4 focuses only on LCS2 (manufacturing) and addresses 6% of the total lifecycle impacts when the carbon footprint is chosen as environmental indicator. It addresses the most impactful category in that lifecycle stage (LCS2) – see lines 5659-5662.

Do you agree with the use of an environmental indicator that addresses the most impactful category of the manufacturing stage (LCS2), representing 6% of the total lifecycle impacts?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree

- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.4.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted*

### **9.5 CHOICE OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR**

Many indicators (single or aggregated) can be chosen as environmental indicator of a product’s footprint.

The Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) reported in section 10.1 provides a useful and holistic analysis of most of the impacts generated due to the consumption of the three representative products in scope. In particular, the contribution analysis reported in section 10.1.2 details the contribution to the total lifecycle impacts of impact categories, Life-Cycle Stages (LCSs) and other contributing factors, such as energy and chemicals use.

In your opinion, what is the percentage of the total lifecycle impacts that the chosen environmental indicator should address?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- At least 5%
- At least 10%
- At least 20%
- At least 30%
- At least 40%
- At least 50%
- At least 60%
- At least 70%
- At least 80%
- At least 90%
- It should address the whole lifecycle impacts
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent does not answer “I have no opinion”)*

#### **9.5.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted*

### **9.6 DATASET BIAS IN LCS1**

Lines 5668-5673 describe the reason of excluding Life-Cycle Stage 1 (LCS1) from DO4.

Do you agree that the datasets available for the environmental assessment of the several fibre types do not allow their fair comparison?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 9.6.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.7 INCLUSION OF ANY OTHER LIFE-CYCLE STAGE (LCS)

Would you propose the inclusion of any other LCS?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- No, only LCS2 (manufacturing)
- Yes, the indicator should include LCS1 (raw materials) and LCS2 (manufacturing)
- Yes, the indicator should include LCS1 (raw materials), LCS2 (manufacturing) and LCS3 (distribution)
- Yes, the indicator should include LCS1 (raw materials), LCS2 (manufacturing), LCS3 (distribution) and LCS4 (use)
- Yes, the indicator should include LCS1 (raw materials), LCS2 (manufacturing), LCS3 (distribution) and LCS4 (use) and LCS4 (end of life)
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(For each of the answers above)*

### 9.7.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.8 METHODOLOGY FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR

What do you consider is the most suitable methodology to build the environmental indicator for the products in scope?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Environmental footprint based on the PEFCR
- Carbon footprint based on the PEFCR
- Other
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Environmental footprint based on the PEFCR” and “Carbon footprint based on the PEFCR”)*

### 9.8.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 9.8.2 Please, describe the environmental indicator you would suggest and elaborate on the reasons for your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.9 ENVIRONMENTAL BENCHMARK BASED ON THE PEFCR

At lines 5687-5706, the use of a benchmark based on PEFCR is described. An excellence label could be attributed to products where the manufacturer demonstrates that their environmental / carbon footprint associated to manufacturing is better than the benchmark set by the PEFCR for the representative product in that product category, indicating also the improvement (in %) with respect to the benchmark value. The JRC’s proposal does not require economic operators to disclose the environmental / carbon footprint of the product. It is proposed as voluntary information to be disclosed by those willing to indicate excellence in their performance.

Do you agree with this proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.9.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.10 COMMUNICATING THE ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR**

At lines 5687-5706, the use of a label indicating improved performance with respect to a benchmark based on PEFCR is described. In this option the chosen environmental indicator would be expressed via an excellence label that additionally informs about the numerical value of the indicator, expressed in the relevant units:

- The carbon footprint would be expressed as CO2 equivalent,
- The environmental footprint would be expressed as environmental points.

If an environmental indicator would be used, do you agree with disclosing on a label only the numerical value of the environmental indicator expressed in the referred units?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.10.1 Why? What would be the advantages as well as the limitations and drawbacks?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.11 FOOTPRINT INFORMATION AND INCREASED COSTS**

Section 6.2 reports that consumers prioritise purchases based on price, perceived quality and fit. Consumers express their concern on environmental impacts, but it is unknown how much more they are willing to pay for products less impactful on the environment.

Do you agree with introducing an information requirement on environmental or carbon footprint, despite an increase in costs to operators and users?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **9.11.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **9.11.2 What increase in cost would you consider acceptable?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Up to 2%
- Up to 4%
- Up to 6%
- Up to 8%
- Up to 10%
- Up to 20%
- Up to 30%
- Up to 40%
- Up to 50%
- Up to 60%
- Up to 70%
- Up to 80%
- Up to 90%
- Up to 100%
- More than 100%
- I have no opinion

## **9.12 ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF INTRODUCING A VOLUNTARY INFORMATION REQUIREMENT ON ENVIRONMENTAL FOOTPRINT FOR PRODUCTS PERFORMING ABOVE A CERTAIN BENCHMARK (D04.1)**

Lines 5710- 5730 report the assumption made on the effect of using a voluntary information requirement on environmental footprint addressing the manufacturing stage (LCS2). We here refer to D04.1.

Do you agree that the adoption of a voluntary information requirement disclosing the environmental footprint would result in a decrease of the environmental footprint of the representative products equal to 3%?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **9.12.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **9.12.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 9.12.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 9.12.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.13 ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF INTRODUCING A VOLUNTARY INFORMATION REQUIREMENT ON CARBON FOOTPRINT FOR PRODUCTS PERFORMING ABOVE A CERTAIN BENCHMARK (DO4.2)

Lines 5710- 5730 report the assumption made on the effect of using a voluntary information requirement on carbon footprint addressing the manufacturing stage (LCS2). We here refer to DO4.2.

Do you agree that the adoption of a voluntary information requirement disclosing the carbon footprint would allow a decrease of the carbon footprint of the representative products equal to 3%?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 9.13.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 9.13.2 Please specify the alternative value you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 9.13.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 9.13.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.14 COSTS OF LABELLING IN D04

At lines 5731- 5734, it is reported that an additional cost of labelling is considered and estimated to be of 0.02 €/unit.

Do you agree that the additional cost of labelling is equal to 0.02 €/unit?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 9.14.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 9.14.2 Please specify the alternative approach you propose along with its justification.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 9.14.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 9.14.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.15 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS OF D04

Lines 5735- 5780 describe the administrative costs for the implementation of D04.

The authors highlight that estimation of the administrative costs should include the verification of two types of information:

(a) The input data (primary or secondary data) from specific industrial sites, which are representative of the supply chain of the specific product model described. The representativeness of input data should be documented and verified.

(b) The correct application of the PEFCR framework.

Do you agree that these are the only costs to be included?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree

- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.15.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **9.15.2 Please specify additional cost(s) that should be considered per product and motivate your reply.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **9.15.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.15.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.16 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS IN DO4.1**

Lines 5735- 5780 describe the administrative costs to implement DO4. Due to lack of more specific information, the current version of the preparatory study refers to estimates reported in the impact assessment carried out in support of Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 concerning carbon footprint thresholds for industrial and EV batteries.

Lines 5744- 5746 report the estimates for initial costs equal to EUR 2 550 per model and a verification cost equal to EUR 4 500 per model.

These estimates were used to account for the documentation and verification of the requirement on the environmental footprint (DO4.1), regardless of whether primary or secondary data are used.

Do you agree with these estimates?

Please in your answer, consider all the costs you think should be included for documenting and verifying DO4.1.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.16.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

**9.16.2 Please specify any alternative values you may propose, together with their rationale.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**9.16.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

**9.16.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **9.17 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS IN DO4.2**

Lines 5735- 5780 describe the administrative costs for the implementation of DO4. Due to lack of more specific information, the current version of the preparatory study refers to estimates reported in the impact assessment carried out in support of Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 concerning carbon footprint thresholds for industrial and EV batteries.

Lines 5744- 5746 report the estimates for initial costs equal to EUR 2 550 per model and a verification cost equal to EUR 4 500 per model.

These estimates were used to account for the documentation and verification of the requirement on the carbon footprint (DO4.2), regardless of whether primary or secondary data were used.

Do you agree with these estimates?

Please in your answer, consider all the costs you think should be included for documenting and verifying DO4.2.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

**9.17.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

**9.17.2 Please specify any alternative values you may propose along with their rationale.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**9.17.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC

- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.17.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.18 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PER UNIT OF KNITTED PRODUCTS IN D04.1**

Lines 5735- 5780 describe the administrative costs for the implementation of D04. Due to lack of more specific information, the current version of the preparatory study refers to estimates reported in the impact assessment carried out in support of Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 concerning carbon footprint thresholds for industrial and EV batteries.

Lines 5749- 5757 report that the estimated cost per unit of knitted product is equal to EUR 0.07.

Do you agree that this cost estimate covers all upstream costs incurred to comply with the disclosure required by D04.1?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.18.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **9.18.2 Please specify any alternative values you may propose along with their rationale.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **9.18.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.18.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.19 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PER UNIT OF KNITTED PRODUCTS IN D04.2**

Lines 5735- 5780 describe the administrative costs for the implementation of D04. Due to lack of more specific information, the current version of the preparatory study refers to estimates reported in the impact assessment

carried out in support of Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 concerning carbon footprint thresholds for industrial and EV batteries.

Lines 5749- 5757 report that the estimated cost per unit of knitted product is equal to EUR 0.07.

Do you agree that this cost estimate covers all upstream costs incurred to comply with the disclosure required by DO4.2?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.19.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **9.19.2 Please specify any alternative values you may propose along with their rationale.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **9.19.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.19.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.20 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PER UNIT OF DENIM PRODUCTS IN DO4.1**

Lines 5735- 5780 describe the administrative costs for the implementation of DO4. Due to lack of more specific information, the current version of the preparatory study refers to estimates reported in the impact assessment carried out in support of Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 concerning carbon footprint thresholds for industrial and EV batteries.

Lines 5749- 5757 report that the estimated cost per unit of denim product is equal to EUR 0.14.

Do you agree that this cost estimate covers all upstream costs incurred to comply with the disclosure required by DO4.1?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree

- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.20.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **9.20.2 Please specify any alternative values you may propose along with their rationale.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **9.20.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.20.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.21 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PER UNIT OF DENIM PRODUCTS IN D04.2**

Lines 5735- 5780 describe the administrative costs for the implementation of D04. Due to lack of more specific information, the current version of the preparatory study refers to estimates reported in the impact assessment carried out in support of Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 concerning carbon footprint thresholds for industrial and EV batteries.

Lines 5749- 5757 report that the estimated cost per unit of denim product is equal to EUR 0.14.

Do you agree that this cost estimate covers all upstream costs incurred to comply with the disclosure required by D04.2?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.21.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **9.21.2 Please specify any alternative values you may propose along with their rationale.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **9.21.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.21.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.22 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PER UNIT OF OTHER WOVEN PRODUCTS IN DO4.1**

Lines 5735- 5780 describe the administrative costs for the implementation of DO4. Due to lack of more specific information, the current version of the preparatory study refers to estimates reported in the impact assessment carried out in support of Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 concerning carbon footprint thresholds for industrial and EV batteries.

Lines 5749- 5757 report that the estimated cost per unit of other woven product is equal to EUR 0.09.

Do you agree that this cost estimate covers all upstream costs incurred to comply with the disclosure required by DO4.1?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.22.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **9.22.2 Please specify any alternative values you may propose along with their rationale.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **9.22.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.22.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.23 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PER UNIT OF OTHER WOVEN PRODUCTS IN D04.2

Lines 5735- 5780 describe the administrative costs for the implementation of D04. Due to lack of more specific information, the current version of the preparatory study refers to estimates reported in the impact assessment carried out in support of Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 concerning carbon footprint thresholds for industrial and EV batteries.

Lines 5749- 5757 report that the estimated cost per unit of other woven product is equal to EUR 0.09.

Do you agree that this cost estimate covers all upstream costs incurred to comply with the disclosure required by D04.2?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 9.23.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 9.23.2 Please specify any alternative values you may propose along with their rationale.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 9.23.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 9.23.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.24 UPTAKE OF THE VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION IN D04

Lines 5758- 5763 report the estimated level of uptake by the market of the voluntary reporting of the product footprint proposed in D04.

Do you agree that 50% of the product models placed on the EU market would disclose this voluntary information?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.24.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **9.24.2 Please specify any alternative values you may propose along with their rationale.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **9.24.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.24.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.25 ADDITIONAL COSTS RELATED TO DO4**

Would you propose any additional costs to be considered related to design option 4 (DO4) on product footprint?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I want to propose additional costs
- No, I cannot propose additional costs
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose additional costs”)*

#### **9.25.1 Please describe the additional costs per product proposed and the rationale behind them.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I want to propose additional costs”)*

#### **9.25.2 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.25.3 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.26 VOLUNTARY INFORMATION REQUIREMENT FOR DO4**

Lines 5699-5701 propose that the disclosure of information regarding the environmental indicator – environmental or carbon footprint – should be voluntary. This means that the manufacturers would not need to calculate their

footprints if they did not want to be attributed the excellence label that would indicate that they perform better than the average. Do you agree that this calculation should be voluntary?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.26.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.27 USE OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DATA FOR THE INFORMATION REQUIREMENT IN DO4**

Lines 5702 -5703 indicate that the proposed environmental indicator – environmental or carbon footprint – can be calculated based on primary or secondary data and that a label would be used to inform about the type of data used. This means that the manufacturer would need to adjust their inventory and then use the default average (secondary) or real (primary) data to quantify the impacts.

Would you support the use of:

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Only primary data
- Only secondary data
- Both primary and secondary data following the directions reported in the PEFCR framework
- Other
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent does not answer “I do not know”)*

#### **9.27.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **9.27.2 Incentivising the use of primary data**

Would you agree with the current proposal of using a label to inform about whether the environmental indicator has been calculated using secondary data or primary data?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **9.27.3 What would you propose as an alternative?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.28 CLASSES OF PERFORMANCE ON DO4

Lines 5699-5701 propose the voluntary information disclosure of the environmental indicator – environmental or carbon footprint.

Classes of performance are a structured categorisation that translates a product’s performance on a single key parameter (e.g. carbon footprint), or an aggregated single score (e.g. environmental footprint), into clear bands that are easy to compare. For example, considering 5 classes from A to E, with A being the best and E the worst.

Under the ESPR, they are used to benchmark and differentiate products, incentivise better-performing designs and communicate circularity and environmental performance on labels to guide customers' choices, while ensuring that the lowest class aligns with the minimum required performance.

Would you be in favour of proposing classes of performance on an environmental indicator disclosed in DO4?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would
- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### 9.28.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 9.28.2 What would be the rationale to define these classes of performance? Based on what information could these be established?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 9.28.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 9.28.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 9.29 MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENT FOR DO4

Lines 5699-5701 propose the voluntary information disclosure of the environmental indicator – environmental or carbon footprint.

Would you be in favour of setting a mandatory information requirement for DO4?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would

- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.29.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **9.30 MANDATORY PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENT FOR DO4**

Lines 5699-5701 propose the voluntary information disclosure of the environmental indicator – environmental of carbon footprint.

Alternatively, in case an information requirement would be set, would you be in favour of also setting a performance requirement for DO4?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would
- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **9.30.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I would”)*

#### **9.30.2 Which limit value would you tentatively set as a threshold for each product category? Based on what information would you establish performance levels?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **9.30.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct experience
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct experience
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **9.30.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **10 COMBINATION OF DESIGN OPTIONS: PATHS**

---

### **10.1 CONTRIBUTION TO THE COMBINATION OF DESIGN OPTIONS: PATHS**

Do you want to contribute to section 11.2 of the working document on combinations of design options? This section of the questionnaire contains 14 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

## **10.2 INVESTIGATION OF THREE COMBINATIONS OF DESIGN OPTIONS: PATHS**

Lines 5824- 5848 report the reasoning for the combination of the design options.

Do you agree with the proposed paths?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **10.2.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **10.3 ADDITIONAL COMBINATION OF DESIGN OPTIONS: PATHS**

Lines 5824- 5848 report the reasoning for the combination of the design options presented.

Would you be in favour of assessing additional grouping of design options?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would
- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

### **10.3.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **10.4 ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE FULL SYNERGY SCENARIO**

Section 11.2.1 reports the estimates for the assessment of the paths.

In the Full Synergy Scenario, it is assumed that 50% of the time the information provided acts synergistically in terms of the effect it has on consumers and consequently also on manufacturers, achieving the full improvement effect of 5% for each product aspect.

Do you agree with the values chosen for the Full Synergy Scenario?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **10.4.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **10.4.2 Why? Can you report and justify alternatives?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **10.5 ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE PARTIAL ADJACENCY SCENARIO**

Section 11.2.1 reports the estimates for the assessment of the paths.

In the Partial Adjacency Scenario, it is assumed that 35% of the time the information is not completely synergistic, assuming that the consumer will choose some product aspects to prioritise. This would lead to a reduced improvement as compared to the full 5% improvement estimate for each product aspect.

Do you agree with the values chosen for the Partial Adjacency Scenario?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **10.5.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **10.5.2 Why? Can you report and justify alternatives?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **10.6 ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE INDEPENDENT CHOICE SCENARIO**

Section 11.2.1 reports the estimates for the assessment of the paths.

In the Independent Choice Scenario, it is assumed that 15% of the time, the consumer is predominantly influenced by one indicator that conflicts with the rest, achieving a 5% improvement only in one of the product aspects.

Do you agree with the values chosen for the Independent Choice Scenario?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree

- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **10.6.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **10.6.2 Why? Can you report and justify alternatives?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **10.7 IMPROVEMENT VALUE CORRESPONDING TO THE SYNERGY OF TWO DOS**

Lines 5875- 5882 report the estimates for the effect of two design options analysed together.

Do you agree with the improvement value adopted when two design options are analysed together?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **10.7.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **10.7.2 Why? Can you report and justify alternatives?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **10.8 IMPROVEMENT VALUE CORRESPONDING TO THE SYNERGY OF THREE DOS**

Lines 5883-5889 report the estimates for the effect of three design options analysed together.

Do you agree with the improvement value adopted when three design options are analysed together?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **10.8.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **10.8.2 Why? Can you report and justify alternatives?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **10.9 IMPROVEMENT VALUE CORRESPONDING TO THE SYNERGY OF FOUR DOS**

Lines 5890-5893 report the estimates for the effect of four design options analysed together.

Do you agree with the improvement value adopted when four design options are analysed together?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **10.9.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **10.9.2 Why? Can you report and justify alternatives?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **10.10 IMPROVEMENT VALUE ADOPTED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND CARBON FOOTPRINT IN PATHS**

Lines 5894-5897 report the estimates for the effect of voluntary information requirements on environmental or carbon footprint when they are analysed together with other DOs. Their effect was estimated to improve by 2.5% the footprint of the representative products.

Do you agree with this estimate?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **10.10.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **10.10.2 Why? Can you report and justify alternatives?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **10.11 INCREASED PRICE OF TEXTILE APPAREL DUE TO ECODESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

The implementation of the ecodesign requirements could increase the price of the textile apparel placed on the EU market.

What is the purchase price increase that you would consider acceptable – not disproportionate?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- None
- Up to 1%
- Up to 5%
- Up to 10%
- Up to 20%
- Up to 30%
- Up to 40%
- Up to 50%
- Up to 60%
- Up to 70%
- Up to 80%
- Up to 90%
- Up to 100%
- More than 100%
- I do not know / I have no opinion

## **10.12 INCREASE OF COSTS OF TEXTILE APPAREL DUE TO ECODESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

By normalising the costs over the whole lifecycle to a yearly basis, the figures could reflect how the price increase is diluted and offset over longer lifetimes. Thus, in terms of annualised costs over the whole lifecycle, what is the increase that you would consider acceptable – not disproportionate?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- None
- Up to 1%
- Up to 5%
- Up to 10%
- Up to 20%
- Up to 30%
- Up to 40%
- Up to 50%
- Up to 60%
- Up to 70%
- Up to 80%
- Up to 90%
- Up to 100%
- More than 100%
- I do not know / I have no opinion

### **10.12.1 Assessment of increase in cost**

In which terms would you analyse whether an increase in cost is proportionate?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Purchase price
- Annualised costs over the whole lifetime
- Societal costs
- I do not know / I have no opinion

### **10.13      PREFERRED DESIGN OPTION COMBINATION: PATH**

Which is your preferred analysed path?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Path 1, which includes the information requirements on robustness, recyclability, recycled content and environmental footprint, as well as a performance requirement on recycled content.
- Path 2, which includes the information requirements on robustness, recyclability, recycled content and carbon footprint, as well as a performance requirement on recycled content.
- Path 3, which includes the information requirements on recyclability and recycled content, as well as a performance requirement on recycled content.
- None of the above
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent does not answer “I have no opinion”)*

#### **10.13.1      Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **10.14      PRODUCTS IN THE SCOPE AND THE PROPOSED DOS**

The scope of the preparatory study is described in section 3.2.

Do you think that there are products in scope of the preparatory study that could have problems complying with the proposed DOS?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, there are
- No, there are not
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, there are”)*

#### **10.14.1      Which products would be affected? Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **10.15      INCLUSION OF FURTHER DOS**

Would you propose further design options?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- No, I would not
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I would”)*

#### **10.15.1      Which ones? Please motivate your response.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I would”)*

### **10.15.2 Information supporting additional design options**

Which information presented in the sections 1-10 of the working document support the proposal of such additional design option? Alternatively, what other evidence and information would support your proposal?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No, I would not”)*

### **10.15.3 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **11 CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES IN TEXTILE PRODUCTS**

---

### **11.1 CONTRIBUTION TO SUBSTANCES OF CONCERN**

Do you want to contribute to section 12 of the working document on chemical substances in textile products? This section of the questionnaire contains 14 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

### **11.2 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS – SoCs TYPE (D) (1 OF 2)**

Considering:

- The legislative and technical context of the preparatory study,
- The knowledge and evidence presented in the working document of the 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone,
- The definition of Substances of Concern (SoCs) under the ESPR - Article 2(27),

Do you agree that substances which are known to have a negative effect on reuse and recycling due to existing regulatory limitations associated to their chemical safety (e.g. under REACH or POPs Regulation), should be identified as SoCs type (d)? (Refer to lines 6815 – 6822).

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes” and “No”)*

#### **11.2.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 11.3 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS – SoCs TYPE (D) (2 OF 2)

Considering:

- The legislative and technical context of the preparatory study,
- The knowledge and evidence presented in the working document of the 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone,
- The definition of Substances of Concern (SoCs) under the ESPR - Article 2(27),

Are you aware of any substances “negatively affecting the reuse or recycling of materials in the product in which it is present”, other than those referred to in the previous question?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I am aware
- No, I am not aware

*(If the respondent answers “Yes, I am aware”)*

**11.3.1 Please provide the substance identifiers (name, CAS, etc.) and explain why such substances would affect the recycling or reuse of materials in the product in which it is present (and therefore should be identified as SoC (d)).**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 11.4 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS – THRESHOLDS FOR SoCs (A) AND (C)

Consider the proposed thresholds triggering the tracking of SoCs (lines 6823 - 6939).

Do you agree with the JRC proposal to track SoCs (a) and (c) present in textile apparel starting from a general threshold concentration set at 0.1% w/w?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

**11.4.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

**11.4.2 What threshold would you propose and why? (lines 6835- 6837).**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 11.5 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS – THRESHOLDS FOR SoCs (B)

Consider the proposed thresholds triggering the tracking of SoCs (lines 6823 - 6939).

Do you agree to track SoCs (b) when they exceed the cut-off values as shown in Table 1.5.1 provided under section 1.5.3. on ‘General guidance for compiling safety data sheets’ of the Globally Harmonised System on Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **11.5.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **11.5.2 Which threshold would you propose and why? (lines 6873 – 6878).**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **11.6 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS – THRESHOLDS FOR SoCs (B) IN HAZARD CLASSES NOT RECOGNISED UNDER GHS**

Consider the proposed thresholds triggering the tracking of SoCs (lines 6823 - 6939).

For SoCs (b) to which a relevant hazard class or category not listed in the referred GHS table can be attributed, do you agree to use, as a concentration threshold to trigger tracking obligations, the generic concentration limit (GCL) for that hazard class / category defined in Annex I to CLP? (lines 6883 – 6905).

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **11.6.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **11.7 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS – THRESHOLDS FOR SoCs (D) IDENTIFIED DUE TO TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS**

Consider the proposed thresholds triggering the tracking of SoCs (lines 6823 - 6939).

The 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone of the working document of the preparatory study does not propose information requirements on SoCs (d) identified due to technical constraints (i.e. for reasons primarily other than chemical safety), given no such substances have been identified.

Do you agree with this proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **11.7.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **11.7.2 Which substances should be identified as SoC(d) and tracked for reasons primarily other than their chemical safety? What threshold/s should trigger their tracking? Please motivate your reply.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **11.8 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS – THRESHOLDS FOR SOCS (D) SUBJECT TO REGULATORY LIMITATIONS (E.G. UNDER REACH)**

Consider the proposed thresholds triggering the tracking of SoCs (lines 6823 - 6939).

Lines 6923 - 6931 report that for SoCs (d) identified as such due to regulatory limitations, the threshold for tracking these substances could be (1) equal, or (2) lower than the legal applicable regulatory limit, or (3) a generic limit (eg 0.1%). The proposal in the 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone is (1) equal to the regulatory limit value.

Do you agree to the threshold proposed for SoCs (d) due to regulatory limitations?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **11.8.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **11.8.2 Which should be the threshold for tracking of these SoCs (d)? Why?**

Please detail your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **11.9 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS – THRESHOLDS FOR SOCS (D) LIMITED BY CUSTOMERS**

Consider the proposed thresholds triggering the tracking of SoCs (lines 6823 - 6939).

Lines 6932 - 6935 report that for SoCs (d) identified due to customer-driven limitations (other than those covered by regulatory limitations already applicable in the EU), tracking should be defined case-by-case and if possible, in agreement with stakeholders. Currently, the thresholds to track these SoCs (d) are proposed to align with those, as applicable, in AFIRM, Bluesign or ZDHC substance lists.

Do you agree to this?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree

- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **11.9.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **11.9.2 Which should be the threshold for tracking of these SoCs (d)? Why?**

Please detail your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **11.10 BASIS FOR THE CALCULATION OF SUBSTANCE CONCENTRATIONS AGAINST WHICH TO ASSESS THRESHOLDS**

With reference to lines 6847 – 6871, out of the two options proposed as the basis for calculating the substance concentrations against which to compare the thresholds to trigger information requirements on SoC, which is your preferred option?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Option 1. - Calculation (w/w) made based on the weight of the final garment (lines 6850 – 6854).
- Option 2. - Calculation based on two separate groups of materials (i) the textile fibres component of the apparel textile product (aggregated weight of textile materials) and including soft non-fibre components such as leather, and (ii) separate calculation for individual hard components, in particular buttons, sequins, zippers, etc. which would be assessed based on their individual respective weights (lines 6855 – 6863).
- Another calculation approach.
- I have no opinion

#### **11.10.1 Please motivate your reply?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **11.11 EXEMPTIONS**

Lines 7001 – 7005 propose that only chemical substances remaining in the final product and intentionally added are subject to mandatory tracking, i.e. to information requirements. This entails exempting from information requirements e.g. those chemical substances that are not intentionally added to the final products and that are not present in the final product but that are otherwise related to the life cycle of the products (e.g. process chemicals). Do you agree with the proposed approach?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

#### **11.11.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **11.12 ENTRY INTO APPLICATION FOR INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SoCs (A), (C) AND (D)**

Lines 7064 – 7066 propose that SoCs (a), (c) and (d) in the product are subject to information requirements 18 months after the future Delegated Act on textile apparel is published in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU), as per the ordinary statutory minimum transition period set out in Article 4(4) ESPR.

Do you agree?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **11.12.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **11.12.2 Which period would you advocate for? Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **11.13 ENTRY INTO APPLICATION FOR SoCs (B)**

Lines 7067 – 7095 propose a tiered entry into application of the tracking of SoCs (b). Do you agree?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **11.13.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **11.13.2 Why? How could the proposal be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **11.14 DELAYED ENTRY INTO APPLICATION FOR SoCs (B) DUE TO HAZARDS NOT COVERED UNDER GHS**

Lines 7081 – 7095 propose a long (8 year) delay in the entry into application for the information requirement on substances identified as SoC(b) exclusively due to being classified under hazard classes recognised under the CLP Regulation but not currently under GHS.

Do you agree with this proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **11.14.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **11.14.2 Why? How could the proposal be improved?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **11.15 PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS**

In lines 7351 – 7354 of the working document, the JRC concluded that there is not sufficient scientific evidence to enable proposing the setting of performance requirements for specific chemical substances identified in the inventory associated to apparel textile products.

Do you agree with this?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **11.15.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **11.15.2 Why?**

Please indicate for which substances it would be appropriate to propose a specific performance requirement and provide the rationale for such proposal – other than primarily for chemical safety reasons. Note that substances for which chemical safety concerns would be the primary reason for potentially proposing a performance requirement, these should in principle not be addressed under ESPR, but rather under dedicated legislation (e.g. REACH, POPs Regulation, RoHS, etc).

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

# 12 ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC MODEL

---

## 12.1 CONTRIBUTION TO ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC MODEL

Do you want to contribute to section 13.11 of the working document on environmental and economic model? This section of the questionnaire contains 12 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.)*

*(If the respondent selects “No, I want to skip this section of the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to address the following section of the questionnaire)*

## 12.2 FIBRE COMPOSITION OF KNITTED PRODUCTS (RP1)

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 10-31 report (column G) the fibre composition for knitted products. Information on the percentages of the more granular product groups (e.g. T-Shirt) considered for this representative product can be found in the tab “Consumer choice sc – supporting” at rows 1-5.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 12.2.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.2.2 Why?

Please provide an alternative composition (e.g. Acrylic 7%, Elastane 1%, Polyamide 10%, etc) and make sure that the suggested shares add up to 100%.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.2.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurement
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **12.2.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **12.3 FIBRE COMPOSITION OF OTHER WOVEN PRODUCTS (RP2)**

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 10-31 report (column H) the fibre composition for other woven products. Information on the percentages of the more granular product groups (e.g. Shirts and blouses) considered for this representative product can be found in the tab “Consumer choice sc – supporting” at rows 1-5.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **12.3.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **12.3.2 Why?**

Please provide an alternative composition (e.g. Acrylic 7%, Elastane 1%, Polyamide 10%, etc) and make sure that the suggested shares add up to 100%.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **12.3.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurement
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **12.3.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **12.4 FIBRE COMPOSITION OF DENIM PRODUCTS (RP3)**

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 10-31 (column I) report the fibre composition for denim products. Information on the percentages of the more granular product groups (e.g. Denim jackets) considered for this representative product can be found in the tab “Consumer choice sc – supporting” at rows 1-5.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

#### **12.4.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **12.4.2 Why?**

Please provide an alternative composition (e.g. Acrylic 7%, Elastane 1%, Polyamide 10%, etc) and make sure that the suggested shares add up to 100%.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

#### **12.4.3 What is the source of your proposal?**

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurement
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

#### **12.4.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **12.5 LOSSES IN MANUFACTURING**

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 32-36, 39-44, 48, 54-56 reports the losses and further information can be found in lines 12451-12471 of the working document.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 12.5.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.5.2 Why?

Please provide an alternative value expressed as percentage.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.5.3 What is the source of your proposal?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Technical evidence that could be made available to JRC
- Expert judgement based on direct measurement
- Expert opinion that is neither based on technical evidence nor direct measurement
- Other

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### 12.5.4 Please specify the source of your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 12.6 GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF PRODUCTION OF TEXTILE FIBRES

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study\\_3rd-Milestone\\_Model\\_20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 61-93 reports the geographic location of production of textile fibres and further information can be found in lines 12366-12387 of the working document.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 12.6.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.6.2 Why?

Please provide an alternative value expressed as percentage and make sure that the suggested shares add up to 100% for each type of fibre. Add references to your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 12.7 GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF MANUFACTURING PROCESSES

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 94-153 reports the geographic location of manufacturing processes and further information can be found in lines 12528-12535 of the working document.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 12.7.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.7.2 Why?

Please provide an alternative value expressed as percentage and make sure that the suggested shares add up to 100% for each type of manufacturing process. Add references to your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 12.8 ECONOMIC VALUES

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 154-160 reports the values for the ‘Full time equivalent’, ‘Interest rate’, ‘Working hours per year’, ‘Discount rate’, ‘VAT’, ‘Tariff for textile intermediate product’, and ‘Tariff for textile final product’ and further information can be found in lines 12472-12514 and 13074-13077 of the working document.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 12.8.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.8.2 Why?

Please provide an alternative value and add references to your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 12.9 PARAMETERS RELATED TO THE USE STAGE

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 8 and 232-242 reports the values for the parameters related to the use stage and further information can be found in lines 12182-12243 and 12746-12793 of the working document.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 12.9.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.9.2 Why?

Please provide an alternative value and add references to your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 12.10 SHARES OF THE END-OF-LIFE ROUTES

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 243-250 reports the values for the parameters related to the end-of-life and further information can be found in lines 12901-12928 of the working document.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 12.10.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.10.2 Why?

Please provide an alternative value and add references to your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 12.11 FIBRE PRICES

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 275-308 reports the values for the prices of fibres purchased from the various countries and further information can be found in lines 12336-12362 of the working document (acronyms: RoW = rest of the world; AU = Australia; CN = China; EU = Europe; ID = Indonesia; IN = India; HU = Hungary; NZ = New Zealand; Others = other countries; PO = Poland; RSA = South Africa; TR= Türkiye; TW = Taiwan; US = United State).

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 12.11.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.11.2 Why?

Please provide an alternative value and add references to your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## 12.12 ENERGY PRICES

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study 3rd-Milestone Model 20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 309-341 reports the values for the prices of energy purchased in various countries and further information can be found in lines 12932-12959 of the working document (acronyms: RoW = rest of the world; BD = Bangladesh; CN = China; EU = Europe; ID = Indonesia; IN = India; GLO = Global; NZ = New Zealand; Others = other countries; PK = Pakistan ; PO = Poland; TR= Türkiye; TW = Taiwan; US = United State; VN = Vietnam).

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### 12.12.1 Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### 12.12.2 Why?

Please provide an alternative value and add references to your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **12.13 COST FOR HR**

The Life Cycle Inventory ([Textile-Prep-Study\\_3rd-Milestone\\_Model\\_20251215.xlsx](#)) in tab “Base Case – Input data” at rows 342-350 reports the values for the cost of HR in various countries (acronyms: RoW = rest of the world; BD = Bangladesh; CN = China; EU = Europe; IN = India; GLO = Global; Others = other countries; PK = Pakistan ; TR= Türkiye; US = United State; VN = Vietnam). Further information can be found in lines 12494-12507 of the working document.

Do you agree with the proposed values?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree
- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

### **12.13.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “No”)*

### **12.13.2 Why?**

Please provide an alternative value and add references to your proposal.

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **13 QUESTIONS RELATED TO FUTURE STAGES OF THE PROJECT**

---

### **13.1 CONTRIBUTION TO QUESTIONS RELATED TO FUTURE STAGES OF THE PROJECT**

Do you want to contribute to questions related to future stages of the project? This section of the questionnaire contains 9 main questions.

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to finalise the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects “Yes”, the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.*

*If the respondent selects “No, I want to finalise the questionnaire”, the respondent will have the opportunity to finalise the questionnaire)*

### **13.2 EXTRINSIC DURABILITY**

This subject is out of scope of the JRC’s Preparatory Study.

Would you support consideration of extrinsic durability in the delegated act on textile apparel?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I agree

- Yes, I mostly agree
- No, I mostly disagree
- No, I disagree
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent does not answer “I have no opinion”)*

### **13.2.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **13.2.2 In your view, how should the extrinsic durability of a product be determined?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **13.3 SCORE OF A PRODUCT**

This subject is out of scope of the JRC’s Preparatory Study.

In the delegated act on textile apparel, there could be many ways of disclosing a score/s to define the performance of a product. Which of the following options do you consider most appropriate for textile apparel?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Disaggregated values specifying the information on robustness, recyclability, recycled content, and environmental impacts.
- Disaggregated values specifying the information on robustness, recyclability, recycled content, environmental impacts, and extrinsic durability.
- Only an “expanded ESPR score”, which would combine information on robustness, recyclability, recycled content, environmental impacts, and extrinsic durability in one aggregated value.
- The referred “expanded ESPR score” alongside with the specific information on robustness, recyclability, recycled content, environmental impacts, and extrinsic durability.
- Only an “ESPR score”, which would combine information on robustness, recyclability, recycled content, and environmental impacts into one aggregated value.
- The referred “ESPR score” alongside with the specific information on robustness, recyclability, recycled content, and environmental impacts.
- Only a “circularity score”, which would combine information on robustness, recyclability, and recycled content into one aggregated value.
- The referred “circularity score” alongside with the specific information on robustness, recyclability and recycled content.
- Other
- I have no opinion

*(If the respondent does not answer “I have no opinion” or “Other”)*

### **13.3.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent suggests the use of a single score)*

### **13.3.2 Weighting of product aspects into the ESPR or Circularity score**

You propose the use of an aggregated value, i.e. expanded ESPR score, ESPR score or circularity score. How would you weight all product aspects considered into the aggregated value?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

*(If the respondent answers “Other”)*

### **13.3.3 Please detail your proposal**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **13.4 WILLINGNESS TO INTRODUCE CHANGES**

*[only addressed to the industry]*

Would your company change the industrial process and the characteristics of the products you place on the market if this would result in a better score that could be communicated to the consumers?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes, I would
- Yes, I mostly would
- No, I mostly would not
- No, I would not
- I do not know / I have no opinion

*(If the respondent answers “Yes”)*

*(If the respondent does not answer “I have no opinion”)*

### **13.4.1 Why?**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **13.5 DATE OF APPLICATION OF DO1 ON ROBUSTNESS**

What should be the date of entry into application in a possible future delegated act of provisions associated to DO1 on robustness? Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **13.6 DATE OF APPLICATION OF DO2 ON RECYCLABILITY**

What should be the date of entry into application in a possible future delegated act of provisions associated to DO2 on recyclability? Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **13.7 DATE OF APPLICATION OF DO3 ON RECYCLED CONTENT**

What should be the date of entry into application in a possible future delegated act of provision associated to DO3 on recycled content? Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **13.8 DATE OF APPLICATION OF DO4.1 ON ENVIRONMENTAL FOOTPRINT**

What should be the date of entry into application in a possible future delegated act for provisions associated to DO4.1 on environmental footprint? Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **13.9 DATE OF APPLICATION OF DO4.1 ON ENVIRONMENTAL FOOTPRINT**

What should be the date of entry into application in a possible future delegated act for provisions associated to DO4.2 on carbon footprint? Why?

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **13.10 EPR FEE MODULATION**

Should the EPR fee modulation be based on information requirements for:

*(multiple answers are possible)*

- Recyclability
- Robustness
- Recycled content
- Other

*(If the respondent answers "Other")*

#### **13.10.1 Please specify the information requirement you refer to**

*Open answer with text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

## **14 PARTS OF THE WORKING DOCUMENT NOT ADDRESSED ABOVE**

---

### **14.1 CONTRIBUTIONS RELATED TO OTHER PARTS OF THE WORKING DOCUMENT**

Do you want to comment other elements / parts of the working document?

*Multiple choice – only one possible answer.*

- Yes
- No, I want to finalise the questionnaire

*(If the respondent selects "Yes", the questionnaire will show the questions in this section of the questionnaire.)*

*(If the respondent selects "No, I want to finalise the questionnaire", the respondent will have the opportunity to finalise the questionnaire)*

***Comments reported in this section answering questions addressed in the previous sections of the questionnaire will not be processed.***

***This section is ONLY dedicated to topics not addressed by previous questions.***

### **14.2 COMMENT 1**

#### **14.2.1 Which section you would like to comment?**

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions

- 3. Scope
- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
- 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
- 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance
- 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
- 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
- 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
- 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
- 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options
- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths
- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

#### **14.2.2 Which line does your comment refer to?**

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **14.2.3 Do you want to add another comment?**

- Yes
- No

### **14.3 COMMENT 2**

#### **14.3.1 Which section you would like to comment?**

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions
- 3. Scope
- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
- 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
- 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance

- 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
- 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
- 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
- 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
- 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options
- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths
- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

### **14.3.2 Which line does your comment refer to?**

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### **14.3.3 Do you want to add another comment?**

- Yes
- No

## **14.4 COMMENT 3**

### **14.4.1 Which section you would like to comment?**

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions
- 3. Scope
- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
- 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
- 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance
- 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
- 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
- 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
- 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
- 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options

- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths
- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

**14.4.2 Which line does your comment refer to?**

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**14.4.3 Do you want to add another comment?**

- Yes
- No

**14.5 COMMENT 4**

**14.5.1 Which section you would like to comment?**

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions
- 3. Scope
- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
  - 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
  - 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance
  - 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
  - 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
  - 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
  - 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
  - 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options
- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths
- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

**14.5.2 Which line does your comment refer to?**

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **14.5.3 Do you want to add another comment?**

- Yes
- No

## **14.6 COMMENT 5**

#### **14.6.1 Which section you would like to comment?**

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions
- 3. Scope
- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
  - 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
  - 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance
  - 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
  - 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
  - 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
  - 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
  - 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options
- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths
- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

#### **14.6.2 Which line does your comment refer to?**

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **14.6.3 Do you want to add another comment?**

- Yes
- No

## 14.7 COMMENT 6

### 14.7.1 Which section you would like to comment?

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions
- 3. Scope
- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
  - 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
  - 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance
  - 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
  - 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
  - 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
  - 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
  - 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options
- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths
- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

### 14.7.2 Which line does your comment refer to?

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

### 14.7.3 Do you want to add another comment?

- Yes
- No

## 14.8 COMMENT 7

### 14.8.1 Which section you would like to comment?

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions
- 3. Scope

- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
- 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
- 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance
- 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
- 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
- 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
- 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
- 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options
- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths
- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

#### **14.8.2 Which line does your comment refer to?**

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **14.8.3 Do you want to add another comment?**

- Yes
- No

### **14.9 COMMENT 8**

#### **14.9.1 Which section you would like to comment?**

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions
- 3. Scope
- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
- 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
- 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance
- 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability

- 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
- 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
- 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
- 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options
- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths
- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

#### **14.9.2 Which line does your comment refer to?**

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

#### **14.9.3 Do you want to add another comment?**

- Yes
- No

## **14.10 COMMENT 9**

### **14.10.1 Which section you would like to comment?**

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions
- 3. Scope
- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
- 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
- 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance
- 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
- 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
- 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
- 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
- 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options
- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths

- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

**14.10.2 Which line does your comment refer to?**

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**14.10.3 Do you want to add another comment?**

- Yes
- No

**14.11 COMMENT 10**

**14.11.1 Which section you would like to comment?**

If you want to comment the annexes, please report the main section the annex refers to, e.g. report section 10.1 if you want to comment the supporting information of section 13.11.

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definitions
- 3. Scope
- 4. Legislation
- 5. Market analysis
- 6. User Behaviour
- 7. Current EU Ecolabel criteria for textile products
- 8. Public procurement and current EU voluntary Green Public Procurement criteria
- 9.1 Relevant product aspects
- 9.2.1 Analysis of technologies in the context of physical durability
- 9.2.2 Analysis of technologies in the context of maintenance
- 9.2.3 Analysis of technologies in the context of repairability
- 9.2.4 Analysis of technologies in the context of waste management
- 9.2.5 Analysis of technologies in the context of recyclability and recycled content
- 9.2.6 Analysis of technologies in the context of environmental impacts
- 9.2.7 Analysis of technologies in the context of presence of substances of concern
- 9.3 Mutual influence of product aspects and product categorization
- 10.1 Environmental and economic analysis – impacts via Life Cycle Thinking approach
- 10.2 Fragmented fibres release into the environment
- 11.1 Definition of design options
- 11.2 Combination of design options: paths
- 11.3 Main conclusions of the assessment of the design options
- 12.1 ESPR and chemical substances
- 12.2 Methodology: substances and substances of concern
- 12.3 Substances on textile apparel

**14.11.2 Which line does your comment refer to?**

(open answer)

Report your comment.

*Text of 1 to 5000 characters will be accepted.*

**14.11.3 Do you want to add another comment?**

- Yes
- No

If you want to submit more comments, please finalise this questionnaire and open a new one. Be mindful of contributing only to the section of the questionnaire that allows the inclusion of comments.

## **15 FINALIZATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

---

Your opinion matters to us.

Thank you very much for taking the time to contribute to this consultation.