



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE

Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (Seville)

<p><u>Summary:</u> Analysis of the stakeholder's feedback within the EU Ecolabel criteria revision for Footwear. Comments received after the EUEB Meeting, November 2014, Brussels.</p>	<p><u>Date:</u> 18th of May, 2015</p>
<p><u>Author:</u> <i>Malgorzata Kowalska</i></p>	

Section	Amendment/change	Rationale/Comment	Action taken
General	Legal text adjustments		Language changes across the documents reflect the improvement of its legal and linguistic comprehension and quality. The criteria text has been adapted to look, as much as feasible, for a synergy with on-going EU Ecolabel criteria revision for other product groups. Applicability of the threshold for the material content in the final product (uppers and/or soles) was revised and specified under each criterion, when applicable.
General	Change in the criteria numbering		Change in numbering that stems from the removal of Criterion 5 (Energy consumption) and Criterion 9 (Waste management). Total number of criteria changed from 12 to 10. General reorganisation of the criteria set to improve clarity.
General	Criteria are too focused on leather	There are many requirements for leather as a material in shoes. It is proposed to add relevant criteria also for other materials used in shoes.	<u>Clarification:</u> Only Criterion 2 (water consumption) refers exclusively to leather processing. EU Ecolabel criteria are designed to address the final product "footwear." The requirements towards materials used in footwear are designed horizontally. The chemical performance of variety of materials is mainly addressed within criterion 5 and 6. Proposed. Criteria set is intended to balance the possible environmental savings, verification capacity of the applicant, and economic- administrative burdens.
Framework: assessment and verification	Clarification	<i>The validity of the license is based on verification upon application, and where specified product testing which shall be periodically submitted to Competent Bodies for verification.</i> The CB verifies the application – it will not perform product testing.	<u>Rejected:</u> Accordingly, the obligation to demonstrate on-going compliance refers to the license-holder. Wording was adapted for clarification.
Framework: assessment and verification	To specify if other than general threshold applies	Identical material less than 3 % w/w of the whole upper part (or 3 % w/w of the whole outer sole) is not covered by the criteria. In criterion 1 (a), it is mentioned that this criteria only applies if the uppers or soles containing at least 10% of leather. It should be clarified in the general part "assessment and verification" that other limits can be listed in a specific criterion.	<u>Accepted:</u> % w/w threshold applicability was adapted accordingly
Framework: assessment and verification	3% w/w threshold	During the revision process, it was advocated that the threshold refers only to the origin of materials but not to the hazardous substances content, as – in the worst case – that could otherwise mean 30g /kg of a hazardous substance in footwear. As a compromise it is proposed to follow at least the approach formulated in the criteria of the Blue Angel regarding the criteria for chemicals: The requirements for chemicals, auxiliaries and dyes apply to all components of the final product (shoe) accounting for more than 3 weight percent, as well as for all materials intended for skin contact/inside materials.	<u>Accepted:</u> The cut-off limit that refers to % w/w of each product accommodates the dynamic nature of footwear. Setting the threshold aims at focusing on these materials that constitute the relevant part % w/w of the final product. 3% threshold refers to those materials/components weight (e.g. plastic, textile, leather, rubber elements) that will be screened for hazardous substances. The proposal has been aligned with Blue Angel criteria for footwear.

Framework: assessment and verification		Change accordingly text in the ANNEX proposal to ensure that at least for all physic/chemical analyses and (eco) toxicological tests EN ISO 17025 laboratories perform the tests or clearly specify in the user manual.	<u>Accepted</u>
Article 1	To exclude from the scope footwear intended for animals	Footwear intended for animals is proposed to be clearly excluded from the scope in order to improve clarity of the product group definition and avoid misinterpretation.	<u>Rejected:</u> The definition of the product group 'footwear' is harmonized with Directive 94/11/EC. This Directive shall apply to labelling of the materials used in the main components of footwear for sale to the consumer. It is considered as straightforward that the product group is intended for human consumption.
Criterion 1	Materials covered by the criterion	There should be a high minimum threshold that ensures that all materials used are covered by the materials origin criterion.	<u>Partially accepted:</u> Criterion 1 aims at establishing the solid base for supply chain control and management for the origin of "natural" materials such as wood, cork, or leather. Environmental and chemical performance of synthetic materials is addressed by different criterion (in particular Criterion 3,4,5, and 6).
Criterion 1	To restrict the use of materials that come from non-renewable resources	There should be a criterion for oil-based materials. In the case of plastics or similar. Applicant should need to demonstrate that the raw material does not originate from "cracking" operation	<u>Partially accepted:</u> Environmental and chemical performance of synthetic materials is addressed by the revised proposal (in particular Criterion 3,4,5, and 6).
Criterion 1	To include as many textile fibres as possible under the criterion e.g. wool.	Wool is frequently used in footwear like home slippers. The criterion could be mandatory only if wool would be more than 20% of the upper or sole not to make the criterion too complicated for footwear which are mainly composed of another materials.	<u>Rejected:</u> Variety of fabrics of possible use in footwear constitutes one group of materials. The criteria set is designed to address product group footwear and is intended to balance the possible environmental savings, verification capacity of the applicant, and economic- administrative burdens. The exact market share of wool used in footwear is not known. Following the findings of the EU Ecolabel criteria for Textile, the estimates for the production of organic wool is most likely to still be very small and it may be too early to have a criterion that requires a minimum content of organic wool.
Criterion 1 (a)		Splitting of the criterion 1 into 1(a)i and 1(a)ii to specify the origin of hides and skins used (first sub-criterion) and to clearly state that IUCN classified species shall not be used (second sub-criterion).	
Criterion 1 (a)i	To clarify application of the specific threshold	It should also be clarified that the limit listed in Criterion 1 (a) only applies in this criterion and a leather content less than 10 % (if higher than 3%) is still covered by other criteria if applicable, e.g. criterion 2.	<u>Accepted:</u>
Criterion 1 (a)ii	To clarify the use of animals in the category "near threatened" and "least concern" according	Threatened, vulnerable or endangered species, according to the categories established by International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species, shall not be used. What with animal is classified as "Near Threatened" or "Least Concern"	<u>Accepted:</u> Near Threatened category refers to animal that does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable now, but is close to qualifying for or is likely to qualify for a threatened category in the near future. Least Concern category refers to

	to IUCN) Red List classification.		<p>animal that does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable or Near Threatened. Widespread and abundant taxa are included in this category. 71% of total world skin production originates from bovine hides, followed by sheepskins (14%), goat skins (8%) and calfskins (6%). These animals represent most common type of domesticated hoofed animals used by meat and milk industry.</p> <p>Near threatened category was accordingly added into criterion in order to harmonize wording with the IUCN Red List of threatened Species.</p>
Criterion 1(a)ii		Category not-evaluated according to the categories established by International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species shall not be used	<p><u>Clarification:</u> According to the evidence found the precautionary principle could be applied only if there is any existent scientific evidence on the existence of a possible risk. In case of lack of any scientific assessment the precautionary principle should not apply.</p>
Criterion 1 (a)	<p>To partly ban chromium tanned leather</p> <p><u>For the document clarity requirement was moved to the Criterion 2 (b)</u></p>	<p>To partly ban chromium (III) tanning: at least for linings in general, and maybe for children footwear generally too.</p> <p>According to product-safety database RAPEX this year up to now 57 serious cases with chromium (VI) in footwear have been detected.</p>	<p><u>Partially accepted:</u> According to the Leather Technology Centre (BLC)¹, vegetable leather production is not necessarily more sustainable than chrome-tanning. This is consistent with the BREF² findings which point out that vegetable tannins have the potential to degrade surface waters.</p> <p>A high proportion (80 – 90 %) of all the leather produced today is tanned using chromium (III) salts. The remaining leather is usually treated in vegetable, aldehyde or mineral tanning process. Vegetable leather is usually destined for the sole and hard leather production. Vegetable tanned leather does not have flexibility characteristics when comparing to chrome tanned leathers³. The current market situation clearly indicates the need to accommodate all available tanning methods under the revised EU Ecolabel criteria for Footwear.</p> <p>It is estimated, on the basis of the available data, that 0.2-0.7% of the population in the EU are allergic to chromium VI. The</p>

¹ <http://www.blcleathertech.com/>

² (BREF-Tanning, 2013)

³ BREF for Tanning of Hides and Skins, 2013

			<p>awareness of the possible risk of allergenic reaction might be lower between young children. The criterion is also intended to stimulate the development of the non-chromium tanning technologies in general, without indication of the specific method</p> <p>Specific testing requirements for Cr (VI) content in chromium-tanned leather to ensure product safety and demonstrate on-going compliance with the criterion was introduced under Criterion 6 (Restricted Substances List).</p>
Criterion 1 (a)	To withdraw restriction on the use of chromium tanned leather in children linings and socks	There is no scientific reason to ban chromium-tanned leather in children footwear for being placed on the EU market when the material meets REACH requirements. The only special requirement for children footwear interiors that could be acceptable is a restriction applying to all kind of materials used in children shoe interiors and which would ban a number of potential risks for children.	<u>Rejected:</u> see above
Criterion 1 (b)	Traceability of GMO's - Reference to Regulation 1830/2003	<p><i>"For the production standard organic, all conventional cotton and IPM cotton used shall come from non-genetically modified varieties."</i> Verification in conformity with Regulation (EC) No 1830/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2003 concerning the traceability and labelling of genetically modified organisms." is only for living GMO's (cotton plants or seeds), not for GMO cotton used in footwear like yarn and fabrics, so it has no place in the criteria. For this reason the traceability is not installed, this makes it in practice impossible to investigate if conventional cotton or IPM cotton is GMO free. The only scheme that bans GMO cotton is the organic standard.</p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> Products which consist of GMOs or which contain GMOs and food products from GMOs which have been authorised under Directive 2001/18/EC are subject to traceability requirements in application of Regulation No 1830/2003.</p> <p>According to Art. 3 of this Regulation traceability is defined as "the ability to trace GMOs and products produced from GMOs at all stages of their placing on the market". This Regulation covers: all products which consist of GMOs or which contain them (this includes products destined for industrial processing for uses other than consumption).</p> <p>According to Art. 4. operators must hold the information for a period of five years from each transaction.</p> <p>Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products contains the basic objectives and general principles for organic farming. The objectives focus on sustainable agriculture and production quality including vegetative propagating material and seed used for crops.</p> <p>In fact for the purpose of the EU Ecolabel criteria Regulation No 1830/2003 and No 834/2007 should be used in parallel providing a general framework to be communicated to suppliers.</p> <p>The requirement is harmonised with the EU Ecolabel criteria for textile as laid down in the Commission Decision 2014/350/EU.</p>

Criterion 1 (b)	Clarification for blending of cotton	All conventional cotton and IPM cotton used shall comply with the pesticide restrictions in criterion 1(b) (iii), and For the production standard organic, all conventional cotton and IPM cotton used shall come from non-genetically modified varieties. Stating that organic cotton can only be mixed with non-GMO cotton is in practice stating that you should mix organic cotton with more organic cotton because for all the other non-organic cotton productions schemes this remains unclear because it does not have to be traced.	<u>Accepted:</u> All cotton used shall comply with the pesticide restriction, organic cotton is considered to fulfil the pesticides restriction. The formulation of the criterion is aligned with EU Ecolabel criteria for textile according to the Commission Decision 2014/350/EU. The intention behind the specification is to ensure that organic cotton is not mixed with GMO-cotton.
Criterion 1 (b)	95% organic cotton content	It is recommended to implement this target for all shoes.	<u>Rejected:</u> The criterion is aligned with EU Ecolabel for textile and considers market availability.
Criterion 1(b)		Specific verification for non-use of specific pesticides for IPM cotton has been integrated into sub-criterion 1(b)ii.	The proposed Criterion 1(b)ii addresses suppliers of the basic raw material. It is proposed to simplify the requirement on pesticides content and requires verification supported by the application of IPM schemes that explicitly prohibit the use of listed substances.
Criterion 1 (b) and 1(d)	Use of recycled fibres	Cotton and man-made fibres that contains at least 70% by weight of recycled content is exempted from the requirement of the Criterion 1(b) and Criterion 1 (d).	<u>Clarification:</u> In order to stimulate the recycling market it has been proposed to introduce specific exemption for recycled cotton, in line with the EU Ecolabel criteria for textile that grants exemption for recycled feedstock.
Criterion 1 (c)	To require 100% of certified wood	It is highly recommend setting requirements for the EU Ecolabel through which 100% of wood originate from certified sustainable managed forest.	<u>Rejected:</u> The criterion accommodates general approach of EU Ecolabel in regard to sustainable wood sourcing.
Criterion 2	To allow 35 m ³ /tonne of leather for vegetable tanning	The vegetable tanning in pits is mainly done for heavy leather. One can produce vegetable tanned leather for shoe sole in drums. This process will require higher water consumption than chrome tanning as more washing is needed. Vegetable tanned leather should not have more difficult requirements than chrome-tanned leather. It is therefore suggested to remove the word "in pits". No distinction between vegetable tanning in drums or pits are made in the BAT conclusions	<u>Accepted:</u> According to the information contained in BREF for Tanning of Hides and Skins (2013) tannage requires more time and more water than the drum processes. Proposal of the value of 35 m ³ /t applicable to "vegetal" leather tanned in pits originates from CEN/TC 289/WG4/ <i>Leather – Criteria defining the performance characteristics of leather with a low environmental impact</i> ⁴ . The washing step after tanning requires more water for vegetable tanning compared to chrome tanning. The BAT-associated consumption levels refer to the higher water consumption for vegetable tanning. No further specification was introduced.
Criterion 2	Calfskin processing	Water consumption during calfskin processing is proposed to be integrated into general category: skins	<u>Clarification:</u> The BAT Reference Document specifies that for the processing of calfskins, about 40 m ³ /tonne and sometimes more water is needed. It is proposed to integrate this type of material

⁴ CEN/TC 289/WG4/ Draft WI 00289154 Leather – Criteria defining the performance characteristics of leather with a low environmental impact

			into general category skins (water consumption limit 45 m ³ /tonne).
Criterion 3		Tanneries are requested to comply with some specific BAT-technologies (e.g. BAT 11). The techniques listed and described in the BAT-conclusions of the TAN BREF document are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. Other techniques may be used to ensure at least an equivalent level of environmental protection according to the Directive. The important information in the BREF documents are the BAT-AELs and the BAT-associated consumption levels. BAT 11 is to reduce the chromium content of waste water discharges by on-site or off-site chromium precipitation. This is normally a very good idea to do. However, it may give some problems for the tanneries that is not allowed to use chromium precipitation since the environmental authorities were afraid that it would increase the salt content in the waste water. The chromium is removed during treatment in joint effluent plants.	<u>Accepted:</u> Required Cr content reflects BAT-average emission levels (AELs) values that represents different technologies applied in tannery wastewater processing where both on-site and of-site treatment is used. The criterion intents addressing different technological/infrastructure solutions identified throughout Europe and is harmonized with BAT-AELs for tanning of Hides and Skins
Criterion 3 (a)	For leather: additional waste water criteria to be defined	Additional waste water criteria to be defined for leather: Ecotoxicological parameter / Sulfide. Sulfide is very important to be measured in tanneries. It is also recommended to include an ecotoxicological parameter. In the Blue Angel results of the fish egg test are required	<u>Rejected:</u> Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) is one of the most widely used metrics in the field of water-quality analysis in water bodies and in the effluents from sewage and industrial plants. The verification of COD value looks for equality approach and harmonization between requirements towards different materials Fish eggs toxicity test has been assumed as being of low reliability and limited applicability in the tannery process. It is not listed as BAT-AELs in the Commission Implementing Decision 2013/84/EU being considered rather the quality parameter which is taken into account at the stage of operational permit of the treatment plant.
Criterion 3(b)	Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) in wastewater from textile		To simplify the compliance verification, the scope of the requirement is proposed to focus on finishing process that shall include: thermosetting, thermosoling, coating and impregnating of textiles. During the finishing process the final washing take place.
Criterion 3 (d)		Tanneries are requested to comply with some specific BAT-technologies (e.g. BAT 11). The important information in the BREF documents is: BAT-AELs and the BAT-associated consumption levels. BAT 11 is to reduce the chromium content of waste water discharges by on-site or off-site chromium precipitation. This is normally a very good idea to do.	<u>Accepted:</u> The criterion intents addressing different technological/infrastructure solutions identified throughout Europe and is harmonized with BAT-AELs for tanning of Hides and Skins ⁵ . BAT-AELs values address different technologies applied in tannery wastewater processing where both on-site and of-site treatment is

⁵ OJ L 45, 16.2.2013, p. 13–29

		However, it may give some problems for the tanneries that is not allowed to use chromium precipitation since the environmental authorities were afraid that it would increase the salt content in the waste water. The chromium is removed during treatment in joint effluent plants.	used.
Criterion 3(d)	Cr content in the tannery waste water	Chromium content in tannery waste water after treatment to be lowered to 0,5 mg/l.	<u>Rejected:</u> see above
Criterion 4	Not to lower the limit to 18 mg/pair.	Manufacturer of footwear reported a problem with the VOC-limit of 20 mg per pair of shoe (one manufacturer need even 30 mg another about 23 mg). It is proposed not to lower the limit to 18 mg.	<u>Partially accepted:</u> In line with the IED Directive 2010/75/EU total emission limit value (expressed in grams of solvent emitted per pair of complete footwear produced) should be lower than 25 g per pair ⁶ . The use of solvent-based adhesives is the most important source of solvent-related VOCs emissions during footwear manufacture. Substitution of solvent-based adhesives is more difficult for the manufacture of heavy duty footwear such as heavy work/safety boots or walking/alpine boots ⁷ . Considering the specific technical requirements, and the current stage of the art of footwear cementing techniques, more flexible approach of 20 g VOC/pair ⁸ is proposed for footwear classified as Personal Protective Equipment.
Criterion 5 (Former 6)	Changes in the criterion formulation	In order to improve the clarity of the requirement the criterion and assessment and verification text has been changed. Splitting into Criterion 5(a) and 5(b).	<u>Clarifications:</u> The proposed criterion text reflects findings of EU Ecolabel Chemicals Horizontal Task Force. ⁹
Criterion 5(a)	Restriction of Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC's)	No threshold applies	The criterion refers to Substances of Very High Concern
Criterion 5(b)	Restriction based on CLP hazard classifications	Decision, the criterion shall apply when the content of any homogenous material or article in shoe uppers and/or shoe soles is greater than 3.0% weight by weight of either component. For lining and socks, any homogenous material or article that composes lining and socks shall be subject to the restriction specified below.	To ensure that the footwear parts that remain in the direct skin contact are verified against listed CLP hazard statements.

⁶ For the solvent consumption threshold higher than 5 tonnes/year

⁷ <http://www.enviroportal.sk/uploads/files/ovzdušie/organicke%20rozpustadla/315pdfsamVOC-doc-210509.pdf>

⁸ In line with the currently valid EU Ecolabel criteria for footwear, according to the Commission Decision 2009/563/EC

⁹ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/documents/Chemicals%20HTF_Approach%20paper.pdf

Criterion 5(b) (Former 6)	Flame retardants	The withdrawal of derogation.	<u>Clarification:</u> Following the information gathered from stakeholders flame retardants are not used in Footwear. The exception might take place in particular case of professional footwear for use in specific fire-risk activities. But even here, to the best of our knowledge, flame retardants are hardly used to make these materials fire safe. The possible use of flame retardants is covered horizontally by the Criterion 6: Annex 1. 3 (b). in line with the requirement of Criterion 5.
Criterion 5(b) (Former 6)	Derogation for dyes and dye house: H411, H412, H413	To meet only one derogation condition is not sufficient. It is important to meet at least the first two. Use of colour removal is an end-of-pipe possibility which should be avoided as far as possible. Products classified with H411, H412, H413 should be readily or inherently biodegradable.	<u>Rejected:</u> The derogation requires meeting at least one of the listed conditions. The environmental impact between given derogation options is difficult to be quantified and compare. Extensive analysis of dyes on the market was performed within the EU Eco label revision for textile. Following the stakeholders agreement the proposed derogation looks for harmonization with EU Ecolabel criteria for textile according to the Commission Decision 2014/350/EU.
Criterion 6 (Former 7)		<i>"The restrictions set out in the RSLs take precedence over the derogations listed in Criterion 5(a) Table 3"</i> We say there are restrictions according to R-phrases, then say some are derogated and then we say they may be restricted again in the RSL.	<u>Accepted:</u> Criteria should be read in parallel, being a part of a complex set of measures. The final product should comply with criterion 5. Criterion 6 introduces specific verification requirements for the final product, article thereof or production stages. For the document clarity the text was withdrawn.
Criterion 8	Corporate Social Responsibility		Harmonised with the on-going revision of the EU Ecolabel criteria for notebooks and personal computers
Criterion 9 (Former 11)	To include plastic boxes as the packaging option	Shoe can also be packed in the plastic boxes that should comply with the recycled content requirement.	<u>Partially accepted:</u> The vast majority of footwear packaging used on the market is assumed to be corrugated cardboard. The criterion aims to encourage the use of recyclates in general. Accordingly, changes have been introduced into criterion text. The revised criterion refers to materials used, independently of its form (box, bag, etc)
Criterion 9 (Former 11)	To specify if criterion refer to post-consumer - recycling	Need for specification	<u>Rejected:</u> Criterion aims at encouraging material recycling. Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC ¹⁰ sets the basic concepts and definitions related to waste management. Accordingly Art 3 (17) defines recycling as: <i>any recovery operation by which waste materials are reprocessed into products, materials or substances</i>

¹⁰ OJ L 312, 22.11.2008, p. 3–30

			<i>whether for the original or other purposes. It includes the reprocessing of organic material but does not include energy recovery and the reprocessing into materials that are to be used as fuels or for backfilling operations. It is therefore proposed to stick to the official nomenclature and refer to "recycling" without further distinction of the material origin, however in the manual the information will be added that the criterion refers to pre- and post-consumer waste.</i>
Criterion 9 (former 11)	To simplify the criterion	It is suggested to simplify the criterion to "80 percent recycled material" and not differentiate between different types of material.	<u>Rejected:</u> In 2012, the average recycled content for corrugated boxes in Europe was 94.2% in 2012. The requirement on 80 % w/w for recycled plastic content in packaging recycling is aligned the Blue Angel (RAL-UZ 30a). The simplification of the criterion would not reflect the best practices on the market. For the criterion clarity the reference was done to the material used and not to the form of packaging.
Criterion 9 (former 11)		Separation of textile and plastics packaging criteria 9(b) Plastic 9(c)Textile: Textile used for the final packaging of footwear shall be made of at least 70% of recycled material. Change of the requirement for recycles content for textile from 80 to 70%	
Criterion 10 (Former 12)		The user information specification for water resistant footwear has been removed	<u>Clarification:</u> The specific requirement related to the product care and cleaning instruction should be shall be supplied with the product. The introduction of additional information for the consumer has been perceived as redundant.
Criterion 10 (b)		The statement that reflects the intention to introduce criterion 1 has been changed to: Natural origin raw materials sustainably managed (in case Criterion 1 (b), (c), or (d) applies)	
Appendix	RSL	It is recommended to reintroduce the requirement on restriction of SVHC as formulated in the September's proposal.	<u>Rejected:</u> The requirement was removed for the document's clarity. Restriction on the use of SVHC is introduced under Criterion 5 (a) and 5 (b). Product that is awarded is Ecolabel should fulfil the entire set of criteria in parallel.
Appendix 1(b)	To allow the use of EDTA NTA in vegetable tanning	The phosphate products can be used for one type (wet-white) but for another type of leather (veg tanned) the stronger and more efficient sequestering agent, EDTA, is the best to avoid black iron stains on the leather. Without a good sequestering agent like EDTA it is very difficult to avoid iron	<u>Rejected:</u> According to the information contained in BREF for Tanning of Hides and Skins (2013) complexing agents such as EDTA or NTA cannot yet be completely eliminated from the wet finishing process, particularly for the avoidance of iron stains in vegetable tanning. Nevertheless, there is a general tendency to

		<p>stains. By restricting EDTA one would have to use alternative sequestering agents, either less effective or more expensive. Otherwise use chrome-tanned leather, where a sequestering agent is not used.</p> <p>If present in the tannery effluent, EDTA would be removed in the tannery waste water treatment plant so it is unlikely to be in the natural surface waters.</p>	<p>restrict the use of these substances during wet processing. The scope of requirement is proposed to be narrowed to any preparations or formulations for dyeing and finishing leather, coated leather, and textiles</p>
Appendix 1 (b)	Change from 25 to 100 ppm for leather	availability of the detection method	<u>Accepted</u>
Appendix 1 (f)	Biocides	It seems confusing that there is restriction on the use of biocides in the final product and any part thereof is included under criterion that refer to the use of biocides during storage, transport, or final product packaging. The non-use of biocide should be extended to the packaging as well.	<u>Rejected.</u> The requirement on biocides was brought together following the previous stakeholders consultation mainly to improve document clarity (to group up functional substances). Packaging of the final product forms in general part of transportation and storage activity, where mainly anti-moulding substances are used. The added specification aims at enforcing the requirement.
Appendix 3(a)	To permit the use of PFC-free breathable, waterproof membrane without derogation.	Arnitel VT is a safer alternative to PFTE. It is free of fluorine, does not involve upstream emissions of hydrofluorocarbons, is recyclable, and has a lower carbon footprint than PFTE.	<u>Clarification:</u> EU Ecolabel is technology independent. The requirement refers to fluopolymer based membranes and laminates.
Appendix 3(a)	use of PFCs	PFCs should also be fully restricted under sub-criterion (ii). Non PFCs substances should be used in the EU Ecolabel, since companies are working on the development of alternatives that phase out PFCs.	<u>Rejected:</u> Following the consultation with stakeholders for specific technical requirements there is still no available PFCs-free alternative on the market. The use of PFCs in membranes is permitted only if product needs to meet high water repellence related to its function (intended destination). Furthermore, it looks for synergy between requirements set for membranes under EU Eco label criteria for textile considering specificity of the product group footwear, and being in line with the OECD PFCs classification and recommendation.
Appendix 3(b)	Flame retardants	To consider using the GreenScreen method to compare flame retardant systems.	<u>Clarification:</u> Flame retardants are not present in ordinary footwear. Their use is restricted to fire-proof footwear within the category protective shoe that globally represent approx. 3% of the market share. Criterion refers exclusively to footwear classified as PPE with incorporated flame-retardancy function which addresses product intended destination. Limited feedback was provided on this proposal. The compliance with Criterion 5 is required. In order to build up a data base for the next revision and ensure environmental performance of the product the specification of the substances used to achieve flame retardancy is required. .

Appendix 3 (b)	Flame retardants	Halogenated flame retardants should not be allowed. Scientific concern towards brominated and chlorinated flame retardants are summarised in a consensus San Antonio Statement, signed by 210 scientists.	<u>Rejected: see above</u>
Appendix 3(b)	To remove criterion	Flame retardants are not used in footwear, except in the particular case of professional footwear for use in specific fire-risk activities. Therefore, flame retardants should not be mentioned in the EU Ecolabel criteria for footwear. For the specific case of relevant professional fire-risk footwear with a potential use of flame retardants, some substances will be excluded in any case by the application of the EU Ecolabel Regulation Art. 6.6 and Art. 6.7 on chemicals, so that another explicit exclusions of these flame retardant substances is not necessary or justified but redundant.	<u>Clarification: see above</u>
Appendix 4 (a)	PAHs		Update of the test method, Introduction of the specific requirement for REACH restricted PAHs,
Appendix 4 (c)	Tinorganic substances	To add TBTO to the list of tinorganic substances in line with the Blue Angel criteria.	<u>Clarification:</u> TBTO- (CAS: 56-35-9). The proposed requirement refers to Tributyltin (TBT) which is a class of organotin compounds that contain a cation whose formula is $(C_4H_9)_3Sn^+$. Therefore, Tributyltin oxide is one of the TBT compounds. . For the document clarity the word compounds was added in line with Blue Angel for Shoes RAL-UZ 155.
Appendix 4 (d)	DINP, DNOP, DIDP	There should be no differentiation between the product for children and for adults.	<u>Rejected:</u> The phthalates DINP, DIDP and DNOP are restricted in toys and childcare articles which can be placed in the mouth by children in accordance with entry 52 of Annex XVII to the REACH Regulation. Based on conclusion of the ECHA Risk Assessment Committee (RAC) no additional risk management measures are needed to reduce the exposure of adults ¹¹ .
Appendix 4 (e)	Extractable metals	There should be no differentiation between the product for children and for adults.	<u>Rejected:</u> Special measures in case of article for children under 3 years old are in line with the EU Toy Safety Directive 2009/48/EC.
Appendix 4 (h)	To lower the limit to 20 mg/kg	There should be a single limit of 20 mg/kg without differentiation between children or adults. In the EU Ecolabel for textile 75 mg/kg is requested for materials other than skin contact. The current proposal of 150 mg/kg is too high. Since June 2014 formaldehyde is classified as carcinogenic Cat. 1b.	<u>Clarification:</u> The amount of free and hydrolysed formaldehyde of the textile components of the footwear shall not be detectable: (<20 mg/kg), The further differentiation refers to leather and stems from the current state-of-the-art.

¹¹ <http://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/31b4067e-de40-4044-93e8-9c9ff1960715>

Withdrawn proposals	Former Criterion 1 (d) proposal: Certification of natural rubber		<u>Clarification:</u> Asia accounted for over 90% of the 11.4 million tonnes of natural rubber produced globally in 2012. Two-thirds of global demand is absorbed by tire manufacturers . At present there is a limited market share for CoC certified natural rubber. Industry-level of interest in environmental standards for natural rubber is a relatively recent development. Considering the current market situation it is not feasible require % w/w of certified rubber. The criterion proposal was withdrawn considering the balance of possible environmental savings against the verification capacity of the applicant, and economic- administrative burdens.
Withdrawn proposals	Former Criterion 5	Energy consumption	<u>Clarification:</u> Considering the lack of available data on energy consumption that hinders the feasibility to introduce a specific threshold, and thus quantitative verification of the criterion it is proposed to withdraw the criterion proposal.
Withdrawn proposals	Former Criterion 8	Waste management	<u>Clarification:</u> The difficulties to establish precise and quantitative threshold for waste management efficiency and consequently a specific limit value hinders the feasibility to verify the requirement
Appendix	Biodegradability requirements		The requirement referred two the verification at the level of materials wet-processing. It was assessed as a considerable burden for the applicant to gather required information and to require supporting test results.
Others	To phase out the use of PVC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no possible closed-loop recycling for footwear. 2. The restriction of PVC is consistent with the EU Ecolabel Regulation (EC 66/2010): criteria shall be determined on a scientific basis considering the whole life cycle of products. There are strong arguments that justify this restriction 3. Alternatives are available. 4. In Europe: shoes end up in normal household waste, not in special industrial waste streams for PVC: Shoes that end up in the normal household waste bag come together with a lot of other waste streams so the chlorine content of the components is "diluted" are and the whole remains below 1% chlorine. 4. 2nd hand shoes are exported to countries where specialized plants are not available. 5. Even with the best filters in the furnace, there remains a small environmental pollution 6. Allowing use of PVC undermines the credibility of the EU Ecolabel 	<u>Rejected:</u> In general terms, from the LCA perspective, it could not be clearly stated that PVC environmental performance is more impactful than that of alternative thermoplastics. The EU Ecolabel should be material and technology independent. PVC as material is not classified; its environmental performance is addressed, mainly through the Restricted Substance List.

