

From: [REDACTED] <japca@powder-coating.or.jp>
Sent: mardi 5 février 2019 07:43
To: GROW EU-TBT
Subject: JICA & JAPCA support opinions from JPMA & JTDIA.

Dear Sir and Madam

JICA(Japan Industrial Coatings Association) & JAPCA(Japan Powder-Coating Association)are both organizations in a position to paint(coat) using powdered paint.

Both associations support the opinions submitted by JPMA(Japan Paint Manufacturers Association)and JTDIA(Japan Titanium Dioxide Industry Association) as a position to use powdered paint.

(JPMA's opinion)

Japan Paint Manufacturers Association (JPMA) is affiliated with the International Paint and Printing Ink Council, Inc. (IPPIC), a global non-governmental organization whose membership is comprised of national and regional trade associations representing the paint and printing ink industry around the world. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to this open consultation under the EU's "Better Regulation" initiative.

JPMA supports the comments advanced by its EU-based IPPIC member associations, under the leadership of CEPE.

The effect observed in the underlying toxicology studies used (in rats) for the proposed classification does not point to any intrinsic (hazard) property of titanium dioxide and this should, therefore, fall outside of scope of CLP.

JPMA would also like to comment that only surface treated (rutile) Titanium Dioxide, which is not is not easily exposed, is formulated in paint and coatings including powder coatings.

JPMA notes there are no benefits attendant to the proposed classification and stresses that there are significant international trade consequences. Please also refer to comments by IPPIC and EU-based coatings associations.

(JTDIA's opinion)

I am glad to have this opportunity to submit out opinion to you.

We are Titanium Dioxide Manufactures Association in Japan. (JTDMA)

The proposal for the powder containing 1 % and over of 10 µm or less TiO₂ to be classified as carcinogenicity 2 (inhalation) holds varied

problems in predicted practical operations. Specific explanations will be pointed out as under;

1. Measuring method of 10 µm TiO₂

It is easily known by analogy that without precisely regulating integrated reliable international examination method, confusion could be raised not only among manufacturers but also throughout supply chain distribution network. The reason is that particle diameter values obtained from the pre-treatment are enormously different depending on the measuring methods for the samples. Therefore, measuring method of TiO₂ should cover also pre-treatment in the clear specification.

In addition, for TiO₂ the limitation of 10 µm or less is set up, but the ground of setting 10 µm as cut off value is ambiguous. An explicit explanation is required.

2. About NOTE V and 10

NOTE V requires that the hazard of surface-treated TiO₂ is to be equal or more than untreated TiO₂. The surface treating materials widely varied like as silica, aluminum and metallic soap, however NOTE V specifies that whatever surface treatment material doesn't reduce hazard of untreated TiO₂.

Scientific ground of the statement is to be clarified.

In addition, NOTE 10 says that carcinogenicity classification of TiO₂ is applied only to the mixture linked to inhalation. The limitation to mixture is rather unclear, as it doesn't mention what other forms than mixture are excluded. An explicit explanation is required to avoid confusion throughout supply chain network.

3. About ground of carcinogenicity classification

In May 2016, ECHA acknowledged the submission from France of a dossier that claims classification of TiO₂ carcinogenicity. The ground to classify carcinogenicity on TiO₂ is IARC examination results. It has become a big topic that the method of examination has to be re-scrutinised including whether it is consistent with OECD TG.

It is to be carefully noted that IARC Monographs VOLUME 93 recognized that the lung epithelial cancer developed due to secondary factor by overloaded

powder, not because of an assumption that TiO₂ has its own hazard.

4. Respect for RAC OPINION

In June 2017, ECHA issued RAC OPINION on TiO₂ carcinogenicity classification. The opinion also noted that the lung epithelial cancer developed due to secondary factor by overloaded powder, not because of an assumption that TiO₂ has its own hazard. It means that the opinion confirmed the conclusion of IARC

Monographs VOLUME 93.

From the fact it is explicit that TiO₂ has no hazard of its own.

5. Inconsistent restricting with CLP regulation and future response

CLP regulation is the law system to put restrictions on chemical substances with their own hazard. The legal spirit doesn't allow to regulate TiO₂ with no hazard

of its own. In other words regulating TiO₂ with no hazard of its own is against the legal spirit of CLP.

So it is the most suitable solution to address the substance matter as PSLT (Poor Soluble Low Toxicity). For the purpose, it is necessary to deepen findings about PSLT,

research definition of PSLT and, threshold values of PS and LT, and then address the applicable chemical substances appropriately.

We express strong objection against the European Commission's proposal but supporting the currently recognised alternative proposal.

The European Commission should seriously consider this public comment but should not move TiO₂ toward hazard classification more in discussion until these indicated

points are properly solved.

3rd Feb,2019 [REDACTED] Nano TiO₂ committee of Japan
Titanium Dioxide Industry Association

From:

5rd Feb,2019

JICA(Japan Industrial Coatings Association) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] a

JAPCA(Japan Powder-coating Association) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

* Both organizations are approved by the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry's Material Industry Division.