

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SADAUSKAS Kestutis \(ENV\)](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability : 3 more discussion papers
Date: jeudi 18 juin 2020 23:42:15
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[CSS chemicals value chains and recovery June 2020.docx](#)
[CSS QSOA June 2020 \(2\).docx](#)

Dear all,

As promised, here are the two last documents:

- Contribution of the chemical industry to the strategic industrial ecosystems for the Recovery. Please note that at this stage, we are not in a position to propose criteria/mechanisms for choosing which chemicals are strategic. This is a complex choice that requires further reflection and likely involvement of the value chains. We will give it some thought. Similarly, we will further consider your request for what policies or tools would allow to “turn the tide” on competitiveness.
- Our thoughts on One Substance, One (hazard) Assessment

Apologies for another ‘late evening sending’... (hope at least the first one contributes to sweet dreams)

With regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 June 2020 23:30
To: 'Kestutis.SADAUSKAS@ec.europa.eu' <Kestutis.SADAUSKAS@ec.europa.eu>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability : 3 more discussion papers

Dear all,

Further to recent discussions between Cefic and DG ENV, I am sharing three more Discussion Papers on the following themes:

- **Level-playing field for the EU Chemical Industry:** this paper explains what we mean with “level-playing field” and outline reasons for the erosion of the chemical industry competitiveness in Europe.
- **Supporting global chemicals management:** specific suggestions are made with regard to SAICM, further GHS implementation, Mutual Acceptance of Data, Free Trade Agreements and regulatory cooperation in particular
- **Tracking and Tracing of substances that may pose a problem to future recycling:** concrete proposals are suggested.

I hope we can send two last documents tomorrow: ‘Strategic value Chains’ and ‘One Substance, One Assessment’.

I am also following-up on some points raised during our meetings:

1. You asked whether Safe-and-Sustainable by Design criteria could be organised around the 6 environmental objectives listed in the Taxonomy (Sustainable Finances) which are (a) climate change mitigation; (b) climate change adaptation; (c) the sustainable use and protection of water and marine resources; (d) the transition to a circular economy; (e) pollution prevention and control; (f) the protection and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems. Most of these objectives, if not all, are indeed considered in the existing Product Portfolio Sustainability Assessment (PSA) methodology of the World Business Council on Sustainable Development. In addition, the PSA methodology considers other, non-environmental criteria as well (market, HSE profile, economic, social). That's very important to integrate in a holistic approach. We have compiled a list of environmental categories typically considered in a Portfolio Sustainability Assessment. Let me know if you would like to receive the list.
2. On potential environmental impact of Chemical Recycling, I understand BASF has been in contact with you (they have run a study).
3. You asked about blockchain technology for enforcement purposes. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. I understand from colleagues that blockchain has been used in the [cotton market](#) for a couple of years, and [palm oil](#).

I trust you will find this input useful.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Tel. +3 [REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



European Chemical Industry Council - Cefic aisbl
Rue Belliard 40 (Box 15), B-1040 Brussels Belgium
www.cefic.org



@Cefic

EU Transparency Register n° 64879142323-90