

Your Voice In Europe: ROADMAP feedback for Rules concerning use of Bisphenol A (BPA) in food contact materials

User's data:

- Domain : Non governmental organisation
- Name : Lisette van Vliet
- Email : lisette@env-health.org
- Country : Belgium
- Organisation : Health and Environment Alliance
- Headquarter : select
- Register : 00723343929-96
- Size : select
- Publication : can be published with your personal information

Related document: Rules concerning use of Bisphenol A (BPA) in food contact materials

Feedback:

HEAL is a leading European public interest organisation addressing how the environment affects public health in the EU. With 65+ member organisations, we represent health and medical professionals, non-profit insurers, patient/disease groups, and other public interest constituencies. We have been working on hazardous chemicals policy, including BPA, since our inception.

HEAL welcomes the fact that DG Sante is examining Bisphenol A in food contact materials (FCM) with its roadmap on Bisphenol A. Action on Bisphenol A in FCM is urgently needed and long overdue. We also have extensive concerns about the impacts on public health from other hazardous and unknown chemicals in FCM which have individual and combination effects. Moreover, some of these chemicals may act in an additive manner with Bisphenol A, so their presence in FCM should also be swiftly addressed. We do not think that proceeding with 'Mutual Recognition' between national rules, instead of EU legislative action, will effectively reduce the public's exposures to harmful FCM chemicals.

Regarding the Bisphenol A roadmap, we have the following points:

Consultation process – for this roadmap and for FCM more generally

The consultation process for this roadmap is not clearly laid out and to date has not been fully transparent. Despite having significant implications for citizen's health, the consultation on the BPA roadmap is not even listed on the DG Sante FCM consultation webpage.

http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/chemical_safety/food_contact_materials/consultation/index_en.htm

The roadmap content shows that DG Sante has been in dialogue with FCM industry and food industry, but does not show that prior inputs from environmental, health, consumers' organisations were sought or received. Another neglected stakeholder group are the trade unions whose workers are exposed to the chemicals during the manufacturing of FCM, with corresponding health impacts. The resulting imbalance in the roadmap between the

protection of health and convenience for industry contradicts DG Sante's mission.

This lack of contact with non-commercial stakeholders seems to be a more general issue: the DG Sante FCM Consultations page, aside from Member States, only lists a 'Technical expert group for food contact materials', which is limited to European associations representing food contact material manufacturers and/or their supply chain.

http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/chemical_safety/food_contact_materials/consultation/index_en.htm

In contrast, DG GRO and DG ENV have been hosting a Competent Authorities group on the REACH chemicals legislation (CARACAL) for many years, where environmental, health and other public interest / union groups have been actively participating alongside associations of commercial industry. Many of these NGOs also participate in the more technical committees of the European chemicals agency.

We believe that consultation with stakeholders representing public and workers interests in environmental health are crucial in all phases of FCM policy development, and the current imbalance should be immediately remedied.

Roadmap Content – general comments

Overall, discussion of the impact on/ perspective of consumers' health is paltry. A simple analysis shows consumers are mentioned 11 times, whereas industry is mentioned over 40 times. Further perusal shows close re-iteration of industry-furnished information but no close attention to chemicals exposures issues, or to health concerns which remain despite EFSA's opinion.

HEAL believes a ban at EU level on all bisphenols with suspected endocrine disrupting properties for food contact materials is necessary. Given the ongoing criticism of the EFSA opinion from national bodies (France's ANSES, Denmark's National Food Institute), and scientists, we believe that laying all the EU BPA FCM risk management eggs in the EFSA no/low concern basket is a poor policy choice. At the very least, a Specific Migration Limit that reflects the temporary TDI should have already been installed for all types of FCM. We make further detailed comments in our uploaded written submission to Parts A, B, and C, where again we find any solid discussion of public health interests or concerns missing; innovation and efficacy issues too narrowly presented; and other problems. Given the prominence of the discussion about the concerns and interests of industry, and concomitant lack of mention or discussion about public health concerns from BPA throughout the whole document, it is clear that the option (5) which requires the closest attention for its enormous potential health benefits has not been properly investigated, which prejudices its fair and balanced consideration.

Feedback file:

[201601_HEALinput_BPAroadmapFCM_Full.pdf](#)