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NEED OF PT6

Why do detergents, paints, printing inks and artist colours need protection?

- Water-based products are food for microorganisms
- Because most products are no more based on solvents (Legislation on VOC)
- Variety of modes of action to prevent bacterial tolerance develop (like resistance to antibiotics)
BENEFITS OF PRESERVATIVES

• Preserve products from degradation ->
  ✓ Answer to circular economy (sustainable society)
    Less waste, more durability, less use of natural resources
  ✓ Helps limiting global warming
    Less production, less transport = less CO2 emission

• Allow existence of water-based products, reduce VOC emission in air, reduce atmospheric pollution
BENEFITS OF PRESERVATIVES

- Our industries heavily depend on preservatives:
Users of biocidal products follow the review programme with concern.
Why is it a problem as 50 PT6 substances potentially available?

On paper:
- 47 existing PT6 active substances
- 3 ‘new’

In reality:
- Many technically incompatible
- Not always supported for our products
- CLP classifications through RAC trigger BPR Art 5 and Art 10 – Hazard based approach

100% → 0%?
Is it a new problem?

• For PT6 (and PT7) we have warned 5 years ago that a crisis could come, now we are almost there

• COM tabled document: CA-May18-Doc7.6_subs

(45) For many years, downstream users of in-can preservatives have expressed concerns about the possible reduction of the availability of safe preservatives that might have a negative impact on their ability to adequately preserve their products and impact their businesses. Industry has been encouraged in past CA meetings to invest into R&D in order to use safer in-can preservatives currently approved or in the review programme, and to develop chemical or non-chemical alternatives to the problematic active substances.
OUR CONCERNS ARE TWO FOLD

Two main issues:

1. Review of preservative actives independent of each other, not same timing -> Does not allow consideration of the general need of preservation

2. BPR bans consumer treated articles classified as skin sensitizers despite available hazard warning under CLP
INNOVATION

- BPD and BPR push for innovation
- Not really possible to bring new substances
- Innovation at product level (treated articles) exists

But, still heavy challenges ahead, need solution under the BPR in the short-term
Why are we here today?

• Past experience with some Biocide PTs showed that at some point there is a need to solve a crisis

• Today:
  ✓ Exchange information
  ✓ Get a good understanding of the preservation problem
  ✓ Question Industry experts, clarify innovation
  ✓ Discuss if CLP is sufficient to communicate hazard to consumers
  ✓ Identify potential solutions within the BPR framework
Exchange information with expert

The future availability of preservatives
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