EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Health & Consumers

2nd Annual nano
BRUSSELS, 2nd-3rd October 2008
SAFETY FOR SUCCESS DIALOGUE

Products Breakout Group

Chair: Dr. Andrew Maynard, Project on Emerging Nanotechnologies, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; Co-Chair : Mr Manfred Kohler, European Commission, DG Enterprise

Brussels, Friday, 3 October 2008

Means to improve communication/ dialogue (Please prioritize.)

- Create trust by multi-stakeholder approach visible to the general public (no focused nano organisation)
- Make information relevant to nano-materials available on internet (independently from the outcome of discussions on labelling)
- Learn how to communicate (as industry, authority etc)
- Draw available industry information into the light, as it is there

- Who knows what to be able to communicate?
  - View 1: We as authorities do not know what is out there. Thus we are unable to communicate appropriately.
  - View 2: We even do not know what are the exposure ways?
- What is to be dealt with as nano in the communication?
  - View 1: No meaningful definition, CMR as comparison
- How to deal with uncertainty on risk?
- How to accommodate the democratic right to know?
- Validation of the information necessary? Can we get trusted even if we do it right?
  - View 1: multi-stakeholder approach which correlates data and concerns;
  - View 2: positive NL experience by co-operation of all sides.
- What do consumers want to know, what do they need to know? What should they know, morally speaking?
- Is corporate reputation sufficient for assuring safety and responsible information?
  - View 1: yes
  - View 2: at least for SME this is not necessarily true.
- Is legislation needed to trigger responsible information practice?
  - (No strong call except from 2 participants)
- Are industries ready to identify nano-materials?
  - View 1: What is meaningful information for consumers? But nonetheless readiness is given.
- If list of ingredients on a product, shall nano-scale materials be identified?
  - View 1: no added value for consumer;
  - View 2: the same interest as for ingredients;
- Which communication means are suitable? Database / web-resource instead of labelling?
  - View 1: not good enough for general public. First explain generally the safety, if you can

Major challenges identified

- What happens when you cannot measure exposure?
- How to regulate when we even miss the methods to measure risk?
- What and how much is out there?
- How to handle the issues democratically?
- How to sort-out what is really new in nano-materials and what is not new?

Means to improve impl. of existing reg.?

Only marginal remarks, no sound discussion:

- Methodology and information is necessary for market surveillance programs.
- Implementation of safety criteria is needed sector specifically.

Introduction to the current legislation

Basically two principles applied:
Full safety principle: cosmetics, construction, machinery, toys, cars
Risk-benefit analysis: medical devices

Furthermore: obligation to reduce risks as much as possible

The current legislative systems differ with regard to:
The Criteria for the products be fulfilled,
The Procedures to be undergone
Implementing measures: law, standards, guidance
Market surveillance

This paper was produced for a meeting organized by Health & Consumer Protection DG and represents the views of its author on the subject. These views have not been adopted or in any way approved by the Commission and should not be relied upon as a statement of the Commission's or Health & Consumer Protection DG's views. The European Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this paper, nor does it accept responsibility for any use made thereof.