

# DETERGENTS LEGISLATION – ON-LINE CONSULTATION

## CESIO RESPONSE TO THE ENTERPRISE DIRECTORATE- GENERAL'S PRELIMINARY BUSINESS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Comite Europeen des Agents de Surface et leurs Intermediaires Organiques (CESIO) welcomes the opportunity to comment to the Enterprise Directorate-General on documents relating to the recasting of the detergents legislation published on the Internet on 31 July 2001.

With specific regard to the Preliminary Business Impact Assessment, CESIO wishes to make a number of comments, as follows:

Page 2 contains tables of data relating to the production and consumption of surfactants in Europe developed for use within CESIO and provided to the Directorate-General some time ago. More recent information is now available and a summary is offered in Annex I. The volumes are provided in the format used in the Preliminary Business Impact Assessment and have been corrected to avoid double-counting of some nonionics which are subsequently converted into anionics before being placed on the market. CESIO is not able to provide figures relating to soap.

Pages 3 and 4 contain a list of 16 families or groups of surfactants which are stated to be potential candidates for derogation. From information it provided in early discussions with the Commission, CESIO recognises that only **some** of surfactants in these families were potentially candidates for derogation. CESIO members are concerned that those industry sources which submitted the other families of surfactants appear to be unaware of all the relevant information regarding the properties of these materials.

CESIO members are now in possession of information confirming that **many of the surfactants in those families identified by CESIO would comply with the proposed test scheme and would not be candidates for derogation.** Indeed, substances from several of these surfactant families were included in the European ring test of the EN ISO Standard 14593 methodology and found to comply with the requirements. CESIO considers it to be of the highest importance that these facts should be widely recognised in order to prevent unnecessary concern and confusion; both in the market place and in the regulatory community.

Pages 3 and 4 suggests that 5% of existing surfactants might fail the test scheme and that replacement of these surfactants by the Detergent Industry should not be a major problem. Although 5% does not seem a high figure it should be recognised that this represents a very large number of different surfactants with differentiated performance properties designed for specialist operations; mainly in industrial and institutional cleaning applications. Successful reformulation in these highly specialised technical processes will not be a trivial task and the **impact on the business will not be negligible**. The suggestion in paragraph 3 of page 4 that replacing problematic surfactants should not involve any substantial cost is without foundation and appears unduly optimistic and misleading.

CESIO will respond separately to technical aspects of the draft Regulation in conjunction with AISE.

## ANNEX I. CESIO SURFACTANT STATISTICS FOR 1999/2000

In 1000 tonnes- as 100% active	<b><u>PRODUCTION</u></b> In W.Europe		<b><u>TOTAL MARKET</u></b> InW.Europe(incl.captive consumption)	
	1999	2000	1999	2000
A. Anionics				
Alkylbenzene sulphonates (LAS)	409	434	310	338
Alkane sulphonates	77	75	62	72
Alcohol sulphates	114	99	102	86
Alcohol ether sulphates	296	305	252	261
Soap (fatty acids)				
Other Anionics	91	85	72	75
Total Anionics	987	998	798	832
Soaps				
B. Nonionics				
All ethoxylates	825	798	665	675
Other nonionics	200	208	163	133
Total Nonionics	1025	1006	828	808
C. Cationics	203	207	159	166
D. Amphoterics	57	47	50	44
Grand Total	2272	2258	1835	1850