Welcome to this report on the debates held at the tenth annual Helsinki Chemicals Forum. This year's event attracted 168 delegates from 37 countries. The 2018 Forum discussion on five key themes ranged from the difficulty of communicating the subject of endocrine disruptors to how effective chemicals management can help solve the problem of microplastics pollution. The Helsinki think-tank promoted the case for the safe administration of chemicals while taking stock of the dynamic global political landscape and growing obstacles to preserving human health and the environment.

The Forum kicked off by addressing the expanding chasm between OECD countries and developing countries. Panellists discussed how best to support developing nations in the context of Saicm and its “beyond 2020 process”. The debate then moved to the controversial issue of endocrine disruption, centering around effective ways to convey risk. The third panel session examined the potential for harmonisation and synergies when it comes to setting priorities for substances. The subject of plastics pollution – the focus of panel four – has gained much media attention in recent months. And while Echa prepares a proposal to restrict microplastics, panellists exchanged views on the particles and the problems in policy areas and regulations. The final debate of the Forum put arguments for solid regulatory rules against product stewardship measures for nanomaterials.

This report, prepared by independent news service Chemical Watch, aims to be a balanced and accessible reflection of two days of debate as a means to further understanding. We have not taken sides or judged comments on their accuracy, veracity or fairness. This is not a formal report because the annual Forum is not an official session and its conclusions do not represent a consensus. Instead, the report offers a reference point for policy makers, companies, academics and others – presenting the voice of the people in the room at this key international gathering. The final pages of the report comprise an unedited selection of questions and observations that were posted on the Forum message wall during the event to ensure that audience views are reflected.
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Keynote addresses:

REACH around the world – past achievements, future ambitions

Speakers
Marco Mensink, director general of the European Chemical Industry Council (Cefic); Bjorn Hansen, executive director, Echa.

Context
Last year marked a decade of the EU REACH Regulation. Now that the final registration deadline has passed and the second Review report has been published, stakeholders are considering what comes next for REACH and chemicals legislation in Europe. Regimes around the world, such as those in South Korea and Turkey, view the Regulation as an exemplary model for the control of hazardous chemicals, but authorities and industry say it is not perfect. Yet more needs to be done to promote it globally to enhance protection for human health and the environment, reduce burdens and costs for businesses and level the playing field.

In the opening address of this year’s Forum, Marco Mensink told delegates it is time to turn REACH into a competitive advantage.

With the Regulation’s final deadline now past, it is time to develop a “smart REACH foreign policy”, Mr Mensink added. In this REACH® compliant would become a global brand.

“We have to make sure the world understands the Regulation and that being compliant with REACH is well accepted and is perceived as risk and science-based across the globe,” he said, adding that the spread of the acceptance of REACH around the world would ensure duplication costs are avoided and make markets more accessible.

“We need to make sure no substance enters Europe without being registered”
Marco Mensink

But, Mr Mensink said, the Regulation “has to be allowed to work, and it needs to be kept centre stage”. Enforcement is central to this, he said. “We need to make sure no substance enters Europe without being registered.”

A ‘golden opportunity’
And Bjorn Hansen told the Forum that passing the REACH deadline had seen an “amazing effort” on the part of industry, member states and Echa staff.

However, he also pointed to the recent REACH Review, which had highlighted areas where more needs to be done. Collective work is needed on making some of the tools – such as safety data sheets – more usable and more directly applicable. There is also a need for improved efficiencies, he said, not so much in processes, but in training and education.

“We need to get more knowledge on chemicals out there earlier. And we need to work together earlier so that we can identify the problems earlier.”

Europe has a “golden opportunity to put chemicals on a higher level”
Bjorn Hansen

Speaking after his keynote speech, Mr Hansen said the EU has a “golden opportunity in the context of the Beyond 2020 and SDGs discussions to put chemicals on a higher level, and within that framework to establish more harmonised, more consistent protection for human health and environment across the globe”.

Full story: www.chemicalwatch.com/67692
Panel 1:
Capacity building beyond 2020

Moderator: Jacob Duer (UN Environment)

Panel: Li Cangmin (Solid Waste and Chemicals Management Center, Ministry of Environmental Protection, China); Thierry Decoud (Secretariat of Environmental Control and Monitoring, Ministry of Environmental and Sustainable Development, Argentina); David Williamson (Energy and Climate Change banking team, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)); Johanna Lissinger Peitz (Senior Advisor and Chief Negotiator on Climate Change, Sweden).

Context:
There is a risk that the gap between OECD countries and developing countries keeps on increasing. What strategic and systematic approaches could be put in place to support developing countries in particular in the context of Saicm and its “beyond 2020 process”?

Key points
- Rapid population growth, coupled with a shift from rural to urban areas has seen growing demand for products and increased pressure on the chemical industry
- There has also been a significant shift in production to Asia
- In many developing countries the regulatory infrastructure is not in place; often there is little or no capacity for enforcement
- There is an increased need for focused capacity building in low and middle income countries
- Chemical management in OECD countries is growing rapidly and can contribute to increasing the gap in capacity
- Capacity building goes beyond traditional support to governments, for example promotion through higher education. There is a very important role for industry to play
- Green investment, combined with the enhanced role of financial institutions, is essential
- Chemicals management should be placed in the context of the broader sustainable development agenda
- No one player can move the agenda forward. It needs a group of players and positive governmental engagement

Suggested actions
- Help promote national legislation and support institutions running training programmes
- Political and public awareness of chemicals and their impact is critical to generating action
- Examine the linkages between the chemicals/waste agenda and the climate change, biodiversity, agriculture and food agenda, etc.
- Promote the use of hazard/risk information developed in national/regional programmes and use them to build on OECD standards
- Make chemicals management integral to the green economy and sustainability
- Use the sustainable development goals – Saicm and “Beyond 2020” – to create a framework and seize the opportunity they present
- Implement GHS and establish institutions and enforcement authorities, and a system of international assistance
- Examine the linkages between the chemicals/waste agenda and the climate change, biodiversity, agriculture and food agenda, etc.

Mood in the room
- It is not just capacity building, it is also about priorities and struggles with governments about resource allocation
- Two key barriers to capacity building are initiation of policy dialogue and its sustainability
- Learn from the experiences of both developed and developing countries
- The more national legislation there is the greater impact it will have on the successful management of chemicals
- How can we create knowledge on a global level as well as creating a level playing field for industry?
- Create an interest in chemical management among media and the public like that for climate change. 2020 is only 18 months away. Use it as an opportunity to create something new
- Support governments in setting up regulatory mechanisms, but also push for industry best practices
Panel 2:
Endocrine disruptors as a challenge for risk communication

Moderator: Peter Korytar (EU Commission)

Panelists: Barbara Demeneix, (National Museum of Natural History, France); Stéphane Horel, (Le Monde, France); Martin Kayser (BASF); Axel Singhofen (Greens/EFA in the European Parliament); Michael Warhurst, (CHEM Trust).

Context:
There have been concerns about the adverse effects of endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs) for more than two decades. A lot of scientific development has taken place and regulations have been put in place. But the controversy remains. In an era of social media and deteriorating confidence in science, how should authorities and stakeholders communicate such a complex topic?

State of play

- Endocrine disruption is an ‘invisible threat’ that some in industry are reluctant to admit. Delays in addressing the subject lead to more exposure. We are always estimating toxicity; we do not know it.
- More and more EDCs are used in everyday products and the tools are out there to address them.
- Gaps and uncertainties remain in the EU’s EDC criteria and guidance documents, which need to be addressed.
- NGOs say public confidence in chemicals safety is still too high. Consumers believe products are placed on the market only after they are tested. REACH provides a lot of information, but it has not succeeded in providing all the data.
- Industry says it is using hazardous chemicals in a way that ensures they do not cause harm.
- Industry believes some groups are using scaremongering tactics. But those groups say informing is not scaremongering – putting consumers and workers in danger from exposure to hazardous chemicals is scary.
- Others accuse industry of ‘doublespeak’ – when they say hazardous substances are banned or controlled in one region, but they sell them in another. The Commission has also been accused of ‘doublespeak’.
- There are questions about where EDCs are used and concerns they are not adequately controlled in certain areas – for instance food contact materials. NGOs call this a scandal.

Recommendations

- Risk communication should derive from a science-based, coherent, relevant, respect and lawful basis.
- There is a need to channel the right message to the right person at the right moment. Consumers are not idiots and they do understand. Advice is one thing but we have to couple it with better regulation.
- Openness and transparency is needed. Everyone can get information using sources like the internet, but communicating risk should be done in an advanced way.
- Companies need to be moving to safer alternatives and not fighting yesterday’s battles.
- Industry and NGOs should not undermine authorities as they play a very important role and consumers are not experts. There needs to be a high level of trust and industry and authorities should work together to present facts and opinions in a trustworthy way.
- The Commission has been accused of not acting in the interests of society as a whole. Instead, some claim it has been acting according to industry’s wishes.

Key take-home messages

- Stakeholders need to cooperate and think about who they are communicating to.
- Politicians and regulators need a sense of urgency to improve the way EDCs are handled.
- There is still some way to go and there are still some important regulatory deficiencies to be addressed starting with developing proper test methods so we can identify the substances in the first instance.
Panel 3:

Priority setting of chemicals – potential for harmonisation and synergies

Moderator: Eeva Leinala, OECD

Panelists: Tala R Henry, (Risk Assessment Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, US EPA); Jerker Lighthart, (ChemSec, Sweden); Mike Rasenberg, (Echa); Michael Walls (American Chemistry Council, US).

Context:
Countries that regulate industrial chemicals apply screening and priority-setting mechanisms to select chemicals for further testing, assessment or risk management. The approaches and methods already have several commonalities, but there could be great opportunities for further synergies and savings via stronger sharing and harmonisation of the data and tools used. How can we further the use of exposure data to support priority setting? How can we get maximum benefit from high throughput screening and other new approach methods to generate hazard data? How can we improve transparency and predictability for stakeholders? Can common data formats and IT tools create significant potential for tangible efficiency improvements for all involved authorities?

Key points

- All countries with developed chemicals management systems apply priority-setting schemes
- The main task is to identify high priority substances for further work. Finding a substance a low priority is also a usable result
- Prioritisation context matters
- Exposure plays a part in priority setting frameworks, but there are challenges as good data is less developed and more difficult to get
- Collaboration on prioritisation can be done at a technical level, including: data collection and capture standards; and information sharing
- Cooperation on priority setting is a stepping stone for cooperation elsewhere. Collaborations should start at the onset of a project
- Seek efficiency in prioritisation and move those flagged to further consideration (no paralysis by analysis for prioritisation)
- Prioritisations should be revisited as information changes and evolves
- Transparency of approaches, information used and results is important, and is key to the circular economy
- With some jurisdictions it is possible to share outcomes. Once such work gets into the regulatory system they become subject to lots of boundaries. The less political you keep things the more opportunities you have
- There is more and more data in the world and the challenge is to corral it
- Industry must provide information, the lack of which leads to a need for exposure models
- Common data formats facilitate data sharing and cooperation. They also allow for common use of the technical tools

Mood in the room

- The lack of data should not hold up priority setting
- There is a need to recognise that prioritisation means some substances are never dealt with
- REACH has brought a new transparency on hazard, plus a set of tools, but further development is needed
- If prioritisation just leads to further investigation do you ever get to real risk management?
- There are differences in national policies, but the earlier there is cooperation on hazardous substances the better
- CBI in the US is an issue and a stark contrast to the EU
- The aim must be that eventually all chemicals in commerce have at least been screened
- Inaction is a kind of action
Panel 4:

Plastics – role of chemicals management to solve the problem with microplastics in the environment

Moderator: Mamta Patel (Chemical Watch, UK)

Panel: Valentina Bertato (EU Commission); Jane Bremmer (National Toxics Network, Australia); Steven Russell, (American Chemistry Council, US); Graham Houlder (SLOOP Consulting and the CEFLEX Initiative).

Context:
Pollution of oceans and surface waters with microplastics is a widespread issue. Microplastics in the environment originate on the one hand from the fragmentation of plastic products and waste, and on the other from their intentional production. Many countries and international organisations are looking into this. The problem is in the interface of many policy areas and regulations – what solutions can chemicals management provide? What lessons are there for sustainable product design?

Current status

- Plastics are integral to the global economy. The forecast for a doubling of production volume over the next 20 years is linked to population and economic growth
- If population growth is not addressed it will not be possible to tackle the problem
- Sources of plastic pollution closely track economies where investment in waste management has not kept pace with economic development
- There is a growing awareness of product impact. Industry is increasingly being challenged to understand the lifecycle of products
- The microplastics issue is largely, but not only, a waste management issue
- The characteristics that make plastics so useful create the problems at the end of life. It is the end of life that needs to be addressed
- Chemicals management is not the only solution. There is a need for multi-stakeholder involvement
- Unintentionally added microplastics are probably the biggest problem with tyres, pellets and synthetic cloth being examples
- Governments and industries are taking action – circular economy, plastic strategy, microplastics restrictions, etc.
- Plastics and microplastics are a policy priority for the European Commission, which does not want a plastic-free economy, but argues that plastics need to be used more sustainably and in a circular way
- The Commission needs industry help to work through the complexity of the proposed REACH restriction on intentionally added microplastics

Mood in the room

- Can regulation adequately deal with microplastic pollution?
- Stakeholders need to be more careful with language. Single use plastics – what does this really mean? Straws? Diapers? Contact lenses?
- Plastics offer tremendous products for the sustainability that society needs
- Microplastics in the environment are a ticking time bomb
- No one looking at the problem of waste would say it has been adequately tackled
- Plastics themselves are not the problem, but the way we use them is
Open questions

- Safety data generated by product stewardship and regulators has not been ideal, with some noting an historical lack of recognition on specific data requirements for hazard identification
- The concept of uncertainty – the lack of understanding of hazards and risk of nanomaterials – is prevalent. What is unacceptable uncertainty and how can this be quantified and where is the line drawn?
- Industry could wait to see what the impact of a nanomaterial is before marketing it, but nano innovation is moving quickly and promises to provide many benefits in a wide range of market sectors
- There is the question of who makes the decisions on nanomaterials – producers or authorities. NGOs suggest they should be put in the hands of authorities not companies and/or NGOs – they should be political
- There is however an argument that decisions should be left to trained organisations, such as the US EPA and Echa
- What would precautionary-based regulation look like in practice and how would it be implemented? In practice it would mean acknowledging the limitation of our understanding. NGOs say some data generated from tests a decade ago cannot be used now because they were not done according to modern requirements
- Existing chemical legislation is by and large precautionary, industry says, and perhaps acknowledging knowledge limitations and uncertainties are communication issues rather than regulatory matters
- There is a notion that precautionary-based regulation has a negative impact on innovation. However, some studies have shown it can spur innovation

The bottom line

- Regulation and product stewardship of nanomaterials both play a part, but is the latter sufficient to guarantee the safety of material? Not necessarily
- The role of product stewardship is not always clear and must be better defined and communicated
- One weakness of product stewardship is that what companies do with it is not sufficiently communicated
- Instead of saying or implying everything on the market is safe, industry and regulators should be forthcoming about the complexity of the issue and say there are still some unknowns
- There is no such thing as a safe nanomaterial – only safe ways of using nanomaterials. Some knowledge of nanomaterial hazards as directed by regulations is needed. However responsible and safe manufacture and use of nanomaterials is possible in the presence of uncertainty and without complete hazard knowledge

Debate:

Can product stewardship replace regulation?

Case study: nanomaterials

Moderator: Roger Drew (ToxConsult, Australia)

Debaters: David Azoulay (the Centre for International Environmental Law (Ciel)); David Warheit (The Chemours Company, US).

Context

There is a general perception that chemicals legislation is not yet sufficiently robust to manage nanomaterials. What should the role of industry product stewardship be? How can companies demonstrate what due diligence concretely means in this situation? Can workers and consumers have confidence that the use of nanomaterials is safe without specific testing and assessment requirements?
The Writing on the Wall
An unedited selection of comments and questions raised on the message wall

Panel 1: Capacity building beyond 2020

» To the capacity panel: What is your opinion of the role of new technologies on chemical safety? Could a mobile app scanning GHS pictograms, giving safe use advice to consumers be useful?

» Thierry Decoud from Argentina confirms their wish to comply with OECD standards has put chemical safety on the political agenda

» Jacob Duer stresses the need to ensure that those nations with the biggest need get the right help to stop them falling behind

» How can developing countries work to reduce the gap in chemical management and have the same options as developed countries to find investors?

Panel 2: Endocrine disruptors as a challenge for risk communication

» Risk communication on endocrine disruptors is challenging. How to communicate about such a complex topic?

» The WHO/IIPCS definition of an EDC requires that a chemical interfere with endocrine function and as a consequence of that interference it causes an adverse health effect. In essence, it makes an important distinction between mere endocrine activity and true endocrine disruption. Too often, chemicals are listed as EDCs when they are merely endocrine active. How do we ensure this definition is employed in effective risk communication with the public?

» Experts writing about effective risk communication emphasize that messages should be delivered humbly, and openly acknowledge uncertainties and credible alternative viewpoints. Could each of you please take a minute to 1) tell the audience where you believe there is uncertainty within your own opinion on EDCs; and 2) restate some aspect of a differing or competing opinion to your own that you would, in the spirit of humility, acknowledge may actually have some merit?

» What specific challenges do you see social media is creating for communicating about EDCs?

» I would like to know how to increase public knowledge (risk communication) from other countries experiences since there are increasing products and processes using chemical in the market. Some products already have labels, however the public does not know how to read it and handle it properly. Increasing chemicals used in product and process will increase waste containing hazardous substance. And, in terms of EPR, it is not well carried out by industry. Is there any regulation or guideline on public risk communication, and is there guidelines on method and technique available to eliminate/ dispose of hazardous waste from industrial waste and medical waste that is feasible in a developing country such Indonesia? Right now we incinerate waste. And in addition, I would like to know under what codes in hazardous waste list is soil contaminated by oil classified and what is the major criteria for soil that is considered safe to be disposed into the environment

» REACH for sure provides many data as Martin says but what’s the panel’s view on the data requirements to identify EDs? Should these be revisited?

» What is Martin Kaysers view on the Dietrich et al paper? Do you see it as good risk communication? Or do you recognize it as flawed?
Panel 3: Priority setting of chemicals – potential for harmonisation and synergies

» If prioritisation just leads to further investigation, do you ever get to actually do real risk management? These are chemicals in use, where people are exposed. I can see that REACH processes can lead to controls on use, what about the US ones?

» Exposure tools are certainly important but it starts with understanding how the chemical is used. Despite all requirements in REACH we still see that manufacturers in essence often don’t know where their substances end up. What international collaboration can help here? Is the situation in the US / Canada truly better?

» Should OECD start working as a forum for priority setting?

» Priority setting for individual chemicals is fairly well developed. How about using the same methods if you want to identify groups of substances, or chemicals in products?

» Priority setting of chemicals - is there potential for harmonisation and synergies between all countries that regulate industrial chemicals?

Panel 4: Plastics – role of chemicals management to solve the problem with microplastics in the environment

» Are all types of microplastic materials equally bad? Are some relatively benign while others toxic for food chain?

» The lack of clean and accessible drinking water (SDG 6), especially in poor countries with inadequate waste management systems, is a driver of plastic drinking water bottles demand. This root cause should be acknowledged

» A consumer is forced to buy plastics together with a product, because it is (not necessarily) packed. This significantly contribute to problems with plastics

» #ChemicalsForum It’s also a myth that high incineration rates go with high recycling rates. High recycling needs a mix of waste policy measures, and incineration can & does compete with this; e.g. see this Danish data. More details in this 2007 briefing: https://t.co/Rs36DGCIU8 https://t.co/NpNjwsxPZL

» #ChemicalsForum Observation: that gasification & pyrolysis can be unreliable technologies is demonstrably true (esp. for plasma gasification), there is much innovation going on with waste to gas grid, waste to chemical feedstocks, etc. What is needed to drive such innovation?

» It seems real solutions are not so easy to achieve. Shouldn’t the industry producing (end user consuming) plastic products pay for the expense of the environment. Extra taxes on plastic products? Extra waste fees if not recyclable

» Could single use plastic be degradable?

» Plastics are not a ‘renewable’ energy source - they are solidified oil

» Biodegradable/compostable plastic is not the answer to the global littering problem. 1) Littered plastic = lost material; new material has to be created; 2) Compostable materials require, e.g. certain temperature, humidity, pH to fully biodegrade

» ‘Recovery’ of plastics - incineration - is not a climate-friendly approach. Burning plastic is like burning oil in a power station, but incinerators are less efficient than power stations. e.g. see this analysis from 2006: https://t.co/z4ZH6IlaSb

» While the 10 Asian rivers may be the source of 88-94% of large plastic articles (bottles etc) are they really the source of over 88% of microplastics globally? There is a lack of baseline data on this globally. Does the panel consider there is a need for analysis of ‘hidden’ microplastics, such as fibers from domestic washing before calling for bans/different management of certain plastics or products?

» The more plastic than fish in the ocean comment is false and made up. Yes plastic waste needs tackling. Stick to the facts

» The goal of the circular economy initiative is to overcome global plastic problem but it seems that the rate of its implementation does not catch up with global production of plastic packaging. Maybe there is a way to minimise it from the beginning/source. Is there any technology to
Debate: Can product stewardship replace regulation? Case study: nanomaterials

» EU member states have increased their efforts significantly in ensuring test guidelines and methods are adequately adapted to nanomaterials. Based on a prioritisation made at ECHA Nanomaterial Working Group, 7 new projects were accepted at OECD level. Each of these are assessing an important test guideline for the implementation of REACH/CLP to ensure it is adapted as needed for nanomaterials. A pioneering project

» EU nanomaterials observatory updated with two searchable databases. The European Union Observatory for Nanomaterials (EUON) features two searchable databases: NanoData, a knowledge base on nano science and technology and the eNanoMapper that helps you find safety information about nanomaterials. www.echa.europa.eu/-/eu-nanomaterials-observatory-updated-with-two-searchable-databases

» A working group of the Nordic Council of Ministers, the official body for inter-governmental co-operation in the Nordic region, is launching an information campaign on REACH-relevant regulation for nanomaterials. The aim of the campaign is to develop a simple and easily usable web-tool to explain EU chemical legislation requirements for nanomaterials. Companies will be able to navigate the tool and find information to support them in the preparation of a REACH registration for nanomaterials. (see www.euon.echa.europa.eu/view-article/-/journal_content/title/nordic-information-campaign-on-reach-relevant-regulation-for-nanomaterials)

» Perhaps some of the issues and challenges will be dealt with under the EU “Future-Proof NanoMaterials” initiative (17-18 April 2018, see: www.rivm.nl/en/About_RIVM/Mission_and_strategy/International_Affairs/International_Projects/Completed/ProSafe/Policy_Conference_17_18_April_2018/media/Policy_Conference_Future_proof_Nanomaterials_final_report.pdf)

» A draft Commission regulation with revised REACH annexes will soon undergo a three month scrutiny process by EU Parliament and Council before being adopted by the EU Commission. The draft annexes include nano-“specific” information requirements on physical chemical, toxicological (e.g. emphasis on inhalation route) and ecotoxicological endpoints. The revised REACH annexes are expected to be fully applied by 1 January 2020. (see “Nanomaterial” www.ec.europa.eu/environment/chemicals/news_en.htm) (Draft REACH regulation: www.ec.europa.eu/transparency/regcomitology/index.cfm?do=search.documentdetail&Ds_ID=15915&DS_ID=56122&Version=2)

» Industry seems very forthcoming and collaborative by suggesting a discussion on data they have on their substance to establish if safe use can be ensured. Why is this not mirroring the reality in the over 10 year long debate on regulatory application of e.g. REACH to nanomaterials? There are already channels to use to submit the lacking data but these remain unused

» How do you consider that the “Safe by Design” (SbB) approach may be applied during the discovery/invention/development stages in the product development chain of nanomaterials (NM)? And how might this approach, if achievable, be coupled with or replace product stewardship of NM? Background: One of the recommendations of ProSafe White Paper (2017) advocates the use of the SdB approach (www.rivm.nl/dsresource?objectid=008c3189-984e-4204-b129-048cecad1743&type=PDF). The SbB approach should address ways to identify, and thus avoid,
possible adverse effects of NM from the earliest stages of the design/innovation process onwards based on chemical and other properties. However, it has been claimed that SdB may be a misleading concept that cannot replace regulation of NM (www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17435390.2017.1299891)

» Textile fibres are 1-500 microns in diameter and more than 100 times in length. PET is denser than water; it slowly sinks, however could float quite long. PET is used more than 40 million tons globally and often in blends with cotton, wool and viscose. The production of cotton can’t be increased above 30 million tons. The cellulose-based man-made fibre (viscose) production is increasing and it is forest-bio-based, biodegradable in nature. Laundry and waste-water treatments should be developed. Does the panel have information concerning the amount of textile fibre microparticles in oceans
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