


#6



INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Started: Thursday, April 07, 2016 1:24:32 PM

Last Modified: Thursday, April 07, 2016 1:29:03 PM

Time Spent: 00:04:31

IP Address:

PAGE 2: Partie I – Informations générales sur les participants

Q1: Adresse

Nom et prénom du contact

Organisation/entreprise

Pays

E-mail

Q2: Si vous avez un numéro d'identification au registre de transparence, veuillez l'indiquer ci-dessous Si votre organisation n'est pas inscrite dans le registre de transparence, vous avez la possibilité de l'inscrire via ce lien. Si votre organisation répond sans être enregistrée, la Commission considèrera votre réponse comme celle d'un particulier, et par la suite, publiera votre réponse séparément.

Q3: Les contributions reçues peuvent être publiées sur le site web de la Commission européenne, avec l'identité du contributeur. Veuillez préciser votre préférence à l'égard de la publication de votre contribution. Il convient de noter que, quelle que soit l'option choisie, votre contribution peut faire l'objet d'une demande d'accès aux documents en vertu du règlement 1049/2001 relatif à l'accès du public aux documents du Parlement européen, du Conseil et de la Commission. Dans de tels cas, la demande sera évaluée en fonction des conditions énoncées dans le règlement et en conformité avec les règles de protection des données applicables.

Ma contribution peut être publiée mais je veux garder l'anonymat ; je déclare que son contenu n'est pas soumis à des restrictions de droit d'auteur qui empêcheraient sa publication.

Q4: Il se peut que nous ayons besoin de vous contacter afin de clarifier certaines de vos réponses. Veuillez préciser votre préférence ci-dessous :

Je ne veux pas être contacté

Q5: Veuillez indiquer si vous répondez à ce questionnaire en tant que :

Citoyen/citoyenne

Q6: Si vous répondez en tant qu'entreprise ou association professionnelle/industrielle, veuillez préciser votre/vos domaine(s) d'intérêt/d'activité – les lettres entre parenthèses correspondent à un code NACE [choix multiple] :

Industrie du cuir et de la chaussure (C15)

Q7: Si vous répondez en tant qu'entreprise, veuillez préciser la taille de votre entreprise : La définition des petites et moyennes entreprises dépend du nombre d'employés, du chiffre d'affaires annuel, ou du bilan d'entreprise. Veuillez consulter le site web suivant : http://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-definition/index_en.htm

Microentreprise (moins de 10 salariés)

Q8: Veuillez préciser si votre entreprise est active sur le plan :

UE

PAGE 3: Partie II – Questions générales

Q9: Selon vous, dans quelle mesure est-il important qu'il existe, au niveau de l'UE, une législation sur les produits chimiques et apparentée aux produits chimiques* permettant d'atteindre les objectifs suivants ? (1 = pas important ; 5= très important)* Cela comprend toute la législation qui relève de ce bilan de qualité. Cela inclut la législation régissant l'identification et la classification des dangers, ainsi que les mesures de gestion des risques, y compris la législation sur la sécurité des travailleurs, le transport, l'environnement, les contrôles de produits chimiques et leurs textes d'application, hors règlement REACH. Voir une liste complète de la législation ici. Le marché intérieur de l'Union européenne (UE) est un marché unique où les biens, les services, le capital et les personnes peuvent se déplacer librement à travers les frontières. L'un des principaux objectifs de la législation sur les produits chimiques et apparentée aux produits chimiques est de créer un marché unique pour les substances et les mélanges chimiques, ainsi que pour les produits contenant des substances chimiques.**

Protection de la santé humaine	3
Protection de l'environnement	3
Bon fonctionnement du marché intérieur**	3
Amélioration de la compétitivité et de l'innovation	3

Q10: Selon vous, la législation sur les produits chimiques et apparentée aux produits chimiques a-t-elle été efficace dans la réalisation des objectifs suivants ? (1= pas efficace, 5= très efficace). Veuillez ne tenir compte que des dispositions de la législation qui sont relatives aux produits chimiques.

Protection de la santé humaine	3
Protection de l'environnement	3
Bon fonctionnement du marché intérieur	3
Stimulation de la compétitivité et de l'innovation	3

Q11: Si vous pensez que la législation sur les produits chimiques et apparentée aux produits chimiques n'est pas efficace (1) ou seulement assez efficace (2,3), veuillez en préciser les raisons en choisissant une des options suivantes :

Protection de la santé humaine	La législation n'est pas adaptée aux enjeux
Protection de l'environnement	La législation n'est pas adaptée aux enjeux
Bon fonctionnement du marché intérieur	La législation n'est pas adaptée aux enjeux
Amélioration de la compétitivité et de l'innovation	La législation n'est pas adaptée aux enjeux

Q12: Dans quelle mesure la législation sur les produits chimiques et apparentée aux produits chimiques a-t-elle eu une valeur ajoutée supérieure à celle qui aurait pu être atteinte par l'action au niveau national ? [Un seul choix] (1= pas de valeur, 5= très forte valeur)

Degré de valeur ajoutée par rapport à l'action au niveau national

3

PAGE 4: Partie III – Questions spécifiques

Q13: Pour les entreprises : Veuillez choisir la législation qui réglemente ou qui a un effet sur votre secteur ou les activités de votre entreprise. Pour toutes les autres parties prenantes : Veuillez choisir la législation dont vous avez connaissance

Accidents majeurs impliquant des substances dangereuses (Seveso) (Directive 2012/18/UE)

,

Autre (veuillez préciser)

The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:

- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis.
- Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers.
- Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to

the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:

- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis.
- Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers.
- Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:
- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the

limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis. • Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers. • Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular: • Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers. • Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis. • Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers. • Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to

vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:

- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis.
- Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers.
- Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:

- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the

limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis. • Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers. • Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular: • Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers. • Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis. • Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers. • Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid

vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:

- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis.
- Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers.
- Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:
- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the

report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis. • Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers. • Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular: • Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers. • Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis. • Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers. • Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. aaa The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid

vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:

- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis.
- Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers.
- Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:

- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013

report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis. • Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers. • Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular: • Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers. • Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis. • Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers. • Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe. The June 2013 Technical Update found that Volt and LEAF were cost competitive for many customers relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid

relative to similarly-equipped conventional and hybrid vehicles. This study finds that the cost reductions to the Volt have reinforced this positive conclusion, and that the Plug-in Prius and C-Max Energi have a lower total cost of ownership than the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid vehicles, although they are still more expensive than the hybrid vehicles which they share platforms with. In particular:

- Chevrolet Volt: The 2014 Volt has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, and occurs over about 7 years relative to the Generic Conventional for most customers.
- Nissan LEAF: The 2013 LEAF has a much lower cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, and payback is rapid compared to both the Generic Conventional and Generic Hybrid. There are some customers with driving patterns that would not be favorable for the LEAF due to its range limitations, but most customers would experience much lower expenditures over the vehicle life. The June 2013 report has a more extended discussion of the limitations for these customers; this is unchanged from the previous analysis.
- Ford C-Max Energi: The 2013 C-Max Energi has a significantly lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, but it does have higher ownership costs than the C-Max Hybrid. Payback for the C-Max Energi occurs rapidly relative to the Generic Hybrid, but occurs over an extended timeframe relative to the Generic Conventional, and doesn't occur at all for some customers.
- Toyota Prius Plug-in: The 2014 Prius Plug-in has a much lower total cost of ownership than comparable conventional and hybrid vehicles, including significantly lower costs than the non-plug-in Prius. Payback is rapid relative to the Generic Hybrid, but due to relatively high up-front costs payback relative to the Generic Conventional vehicle happens over an extended timeframe.

PAGE 5: Efficacité

Q14: Dans le cadre législatif de l'UE pour les produits chimiques, les mesures de gestion des risques se fondent, dans certains cas, directement sur le danger identifié en tenant compte des considérations générales des risques (par exemple, l'exposition généralisée ou l'exposition de groupes vulnérables), qui justifient l'adoption automatique de telles mesures. Dans d'autres cas, les mesures de gestion des risques sont déterminées sur la base d'une évaluation spécifique des risques qui évalue la probabilité d'effets néfastes sur la santé et sur l'environnement résultant des scénarios d'exposition spécifiques liés aux utilisations proposés du produit chimique. Pensez-vous que la législation sur les produits chimiques et celle apparentée aux produits chimiques doivent, généralement :

Respondent skipped this question

Q15: En dehors de l'élément de danger et/ou de risque que peut représenter une substance chimique ou un mélange, pensez-vous que tous les éléments pertinents sont pris en compte lors de la prise de décision en matière de gestion des risques (par exemple, les effets combinés des produits chimiques, l'existence de groupes vulnérables, les répercussions sur l'emploi ou sur la compétitivité de l'industrie européenne, etc.) ? Veuillez expliquer votre réponse.

Respondent skipped this question

Q16: Selon vous, dans quelle mesure les éléments suivants du cadre législatif global de l'UE sur les produits chimiques sont-ils satisfaisants ? (1= pas satisfaisants, 5= très satisfaisants)

Respondent skipped this question

Q17: Selon vous, dans quelle mesure les éléments de gestion des risques suivants sont-ils satisfaisants ? (1= pas satisfaisants, 5= très satisfaisants)

Respondent skipped this question

Q18: Les données de sécurité pour les produits chimiques sont soumises à des critères de qualité, notamment aux bonnes pratiques de laboratoire (BPL), visant à assurer la fiabilité et la reproductibilité des données. Pensez-vous que ces critères sont appropriés ?

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 6: Efficience

Q19: Selon vous, quels sont les bénéfices les plus importants pour la société européenne générés par la législation de l'UE sur les produits chimiques et la législation apparentée aux produits chimiques ? (Une ou plusieurs réponses sont possibles)

Respondent skipped this question

Q20: Selon vous, quels sont les coûts les plus importants supportés par la société européenne à cause de la législation de l'UE sur les produits chimiques et de la législation apparentée aux produits chimiques ? (Une ou plusieurs réponses sont possibles)

Respondent skipped this question

Q21: Selon vous, laquelle des exigences légales suivantes du cadre législatif engendrent des coûts importants pour les entreprises (le cas échéant) ?

Respondent skipped this question

Q22: Y a-t-il des exigences spécifiques dans le cadre législatif européen qui engendrent des coûts particulièrement importants pour les autorités ?

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 7: Pertinence

Q23: Dans quelle mesure le cadre législatif de l'UE a-t-il contribué à une réduction du nombre et/ou de l'utilisation de produits chimiques dangereux et/ou leur remplacement par des alternatives plus sûres ? (1= pas de contribution, 5= une grande contribution)

Respondent skipped this question

Q24: Dans quelle mesure le cadre législatif actuel de l'UE prend-il suffisamment en compte les nouveaux domaines de préoccupation, par exemple ceux qui résultent des progrès de la science et de la technologie ? (1= les nouveaux domaines de préoccupation ne sont pas suffisamment pris en compte, 5 = les nouveaux domaines de préoccupation sont suffisamment pris en compte)

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 8: Cohérence

Q25: Veuillez indiquer dans quelle mesure vous êtes d'accord avec les énoncés suivants qui concernent les dispositions relatives aux produits chimiques des textes de loi européens qui relèvent de la portée de ce bilan de qualité.

Respondent skipped this question

Q26: Veuillez indiquer toute incohérence (lacune ou chaînon manquant, chevauchement, contradiction, etc.) entre les divers textes législatifs qui relèvent de la portée de ce bilan de qualité. Veuillez ne prendre en considération que les aspects relatifs à l'identification des dangers, à l'évaluation des risques, et à la gestion des risques de produits chimiques. La liste des textes législatifs qui relèvent du champ d'application de ce bilan peut être consultée ici.

Respondent skipped this question

Q27: Veuillez indiquer toute incohérence (lacune ou chaînon manquant, chevauchement, contradiction, etc.) entre les textes législatifs qui relèvent de la portée de ce bilan de qualité et tout autre texte législatif que vous considérez comme pertinent en ce qui concerne la réglementation et la gestion des risques relatifs aux produits chimiques.

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 9: Partie IV : Questions spécifiques sur le règlement CLP

Q28: Le règlement CLP permet la communication des risques aux travailleurs et aux consommateurs via les divers éléments d'étiquetage, y compris les mentions d'avertissement, les pictogrammes, les mentions de danger et les conseils de prudence. (1= pas efficace ; 5= très efficace)

Respondent skipped this question

Q29: Est-ce que les classes de danger dans le règlement CLP couvrent tous les dangers pertinents ?

Respondent skipped this question

Q30: Dans quelle mesure le soutien offert aux entreprises via des documents d'orientation formels et les services nationaux d'assistance est-il efficace ? (1= pas efficace ; 5= très efficace)

Respondent skipped this question

Q31: Dans quelle mesure le règlement CLP est-il appliqué de manière harmonisée dans tous les États membres ?

Respondent skipped this question

Q32: Dans quelle mesure les éléments actuels relatifs aux critères de classification du règlement CLP sont-ils satisfaisants ? (1= pas satisfaisants ; 5= très satisfaisants)

Respondent skipped this question

Q33: Le règlement CLP est révisé sur une base régulière en fonction des progrès techniques. Est-ce que les périodes transitoires sont adéquates pour mettre en œuvre les critères nouveaux ou révisés de classification ?

Respondent skipped this question

Q34: Dans quelle mesure les éléments actuels relatifs aux procédures de classification et d'étiquetage harmonisés (CLH) sont-ils satisfaisants ? (1= pas satisfaisants ; 5= très satisfaisants)

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 10: Partie V : Autres commentaires

Q35: Si vous avez d'autres commentaires qui sont pertinents pour cette consultation publique, insérez-les ici.

Respondent skipped this question