Draft ID: daa253ce-23fb-413c-8d80-d6383184ccd4

Date: 15/03/2022 14:33:02

Lithuanian

Portuguese

Romanian

Slovak

Maltese

Polish

Public consultation for the targeted revision of the Toy Safety Directive

Fields marked with * are mandatory. Introduction About you *Language of my contribution Bulgarian Croatian Czech Danish Dutch English Estonian Finnish French German Greek Hungarian Irish Italian Latvian

Slovenian
Spanish
Swedish
*I am giving my contribution as
Academic/research institution
Business association
Company/business organisation
Consumer organisation
© EU citizen
Environmental organisation
Non-EU citizen
Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
Public authority
Trade union
Other
*First name
Sophia
*Surname
Krügel
Krugei
*Email (this won't be published)
sophia.kruegel@independentretaileurope.eu
*Organisation name
255 character(s) maximum
Independent Retail Europe
*Organisation size
Micro (1 to 9 employees)
Small (10 to 49 employees)

Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the <u>transparency register</u>. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

034546859-02	
--------------	--

*Country of origin						
Please add your country of orig	jin,	or that of your organisation	n.			
Afghanistan	0	Djibouti	0	Libya	0	Saint Martin
Åland Islands	0	Dominica	0	Liechtenstein	0	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
Albania	©	Dominican Republic	©	Lithuania	©	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Algeria		Ecuador		Luxembourg		Samoa
American Samoa		Egypt		Macau		San Marino
Andorra		El Salvador	©	Madagascar	0	São Tomé and Príncipe
Angola		Equatorial Guinea	a 🔘	Malawi		Saudi Arabia
Anguilla		Eritrea		Malaysia		Senegal
Antarctica		Estonia		Maldives		Serbia
Antigua and Barbuda	0	Eswatini	0	Mali	0	Seychelles
Argentina	0	Ethiopia	0	Malta	0	Sierra Leone
Armenia	0	Falkland Islands	0	Marshall Islands	0	Singapore
Aruba		Faroe Islands	0	Martinique	0	Sint Maarten
Australia	0	Fiji	0	Mauritania	0	Slovakia
Austria		Finland		Mauritius	0	Slovenia
Azerbaijan		France		Mayotte		Solomon Islands
Bahamas		French Guiana	0	Mexico		Somalia
Bahrain		French Polynesia		Micronesia		South Africa
Bangladesh	©	French Southern and Antarctic Lands		Moldova	©	South Georgia and the South Sandwich

Islands

0	Barbados		Gabon	0	Monaco	0	South Korea
0	Belarus		Georgia	0	Mongolia	0	South Sudan
0	Belgium		Germany	0	Montenegro	0	Spain
0	Belize		Ghana	0	Montserrat	0	Sri Lanka
	Benin		Gibraltar	0	Morocco	0	Sudan
	Bermuda		Greece	0	Mozambique	0	Suriname
	Bhutan		Greenland	0	Myanmar/Burma	0	Svalbard and
							Jan Mayen
0	Bolivia		Grenada	0	Namibia	0	Sweden
0	Bonaire Saint		Guadeloupe	0	Nauru	0	Switzerland
	Eustatius and						
	Saba						
	Bosnia and		Guam	0	Nepal		Syria
	Herzegovina						
0	Botswana	0	Guatemala	0	Netherlands	0	Taiwan
	Bouvet Island	0	Guernsey	0	New Caledonia	0	Tajikistan
	Brazil		Guinea	0	New Zealand		Tanzania
	British Indian		Guinea-Bissau	0	Nicaragua	0	Thailand
	Ocean Territory						
0	British Virgin	0	Guyana	0	Niger	0	The Gambia
	Islands						
0	Brunei	0	Haiti	0	Nigeria	0	Timor-Leste
	Bulgaria	0	Heard Island and	0	Niue	0	Togo
			McDonald Islands	3			
	Burkina Faso	0	Honduras	0	Norfolk Island		Tokelau
	Burundi	0	Hong Kong	0	Northern	0	Tonga
				_	Mariana Islands		
	Cambodia	0	Hungary		North Korea	0	Trinidad and
							Tobago
(iii)	Cameroon	0	Iceland	0	North Macedonia	0	Tunisia
(iii)	Canada	0	India	0	Norway	0	Turkey
0	Cape Verde	0	Indonesia	0	Oman	0	Turkmenistan
	Cayman Islands		Iran	0	Pakistan	0	Turks and
							Caicos Islands

	Central African	0	Iraq	0	Palau		Tuvalu
	Republic						
0	Chad	0	Ireland	0	Palestine	0	Uganda
0	Chile	0	Isle of Man	0	Panama	0	Ukraine
	China		Israel		Papua New		United Arab
					Guinea		Emirates
0	Christmas Island		Italy		Paraguay	0	United Kingdom
	Clipperton		Jamaica		Peru	0	United States
	Cocos (Keeling)		Japan		Philippines	0	United States
	Islands						Minor Outlying
							Islands
0	Colombia		Jersey		Pitcairn Islands	0	Uruguay
	Comoros		Jordan		Poland	0	US Virgin Islands
0	Congo		Kazakhstan		Portugal	0	Uzbekistan
0	Cook Islands		Kenya		Puerto Rico	0	Vanuatu
0	Costa Rica		Kiribati		Qatar	0	Vatican City
0	Côte d'Ivoire		Kosovo		Réunion	0	Venezuela
	Croatia		Kuwait		Romania	0	Vietnam
0	Cuba		Kyrgyzstan		Russia	0	Wallis and
							Futuna
0	Curaçao		Laos		Rwanda	0	Western Sahara
0	Cyprus		Latvia		Saint Barthélemy		Yemen
0	Czechia		Lebanon		Saint Helena	0	Zambia
					Ascension and		
					Tristan da Cunha		
	Democratic		Lesotho		Saint Kitts and		Zimbabwe
	Republic of the				Nevis		
	Congo						
0	Denmark	0	Liberia	0	Saint Lucia		

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published. Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

*Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

Part I - Strengthening the protection of children against possible risks in toys

1. Strengthen the protection of children against chemical risks

The <u>evaluation</u> of the Toy Safety Directive identified several shortcomings – in particular concerning chemical risks – that could compromise the health and safety of children. In the EU, Regulation No 1272 /2008 on Classification, Labelling and Packaging (CLP) determines whether a substance or mixture displays properties that lead to it being classified as hazardous. The Toy Safety Directive generally bans in toys substances that are classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic for reproduction (CMRs) under the CLP Regulation, with only a few derogations. Substances under other hazardous classifications in the CLP Regulation are not currently covered by the general bans in the Directive. The chemicals strategy for sustainability commits to better protecting from the most harmful chemicals in toys and to extend the general bans to other most harmful chemicals, i.e. chemicals that affect the endocrine system, chemicals affecting the immune, neurological or respiratory systems, and chemicals toxic to a specific organ. The Directive already preventively bans carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic-for-reproduction substances based on their hazardous properties and generic exposure and risk considerations. Limited exemptions to the general bans are allowed.

Chemicals with adverse effects on the environment, including endocrine disruptors and chemicals that are persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic, are regulated under REACH.

Question 1.

Do you agree or disagree that the EU rules on toy safety should set stricter requirements for chemicals in toys?

Strongly	agree
Cucigiy	agroc

- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- No opinion

Question 2.

In your opinion, should the Toy Safety Directive address the following substances, and in what manner?

	They should be preventively banned from toys (generic risk assessment)	They should be banned only after they have been scientifically assessed and found unsafe for use in toys (specific risk assessment)	They should not be regulated in the Toy Safety Directive	I don't know /No opinion
Substances that are known or presumed to be disruptive to the endocrine system (endocrine disruptors for human health)	©	•	©	•
Substances that are suspected to be disruptive to the endocrine system (endocrine disruptors for human health)	•	•	©	•
Substances that affect the immune system	0	0	0	•
Substances that affect the neurological system	0	0	0	•
Substances that affect the respiratory system	0	0	0	0
Substances toxic to a specific organ	0	0	0	0

Substances that can				
cause an allergic response following skin contact (skin sensitizers)	©	•	0	•

Othe	r substance	es – please	clarify:			

Question 3.

Currently, the Directive allows for a number of derogations to the general bans on substances. In line with the chemicals strategy for sustainability, other most harmful chemicals – i.e. those that affect the endocrine system, those that affect the immune, neurological or respiratory systems and those toxic to a specific organ – could also be subject to general bans.

Do you agree or disagree that the Toy Safety Directive should, by way of exception, allow the presence of chemicals which are subject to current and new general bans?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
When these chemicals are contained in equal or smaller concentrations than required to be classified as hazardous under the relevant EU legislation (CLP Regulation)	©	0	0	•	•	•
When these chemicals are inaccessible to children in any form, including inhalation	•	0	0	0	•	•
When these chemicals are found to be safe for human health (as evaluated by a scientific committee) for that particular use in toys	©	0	0	•	•	•
When these chemicals are found to be safe for human health (as evaluated by a scientific committee) for that particular use in toys and there are no alternatives	•	•	•	•	•	•

When the use of these chemicals in toys is proven to be essential for society	•	0	0	•	•	•
There should be no derogations to the general bans	0	0	0	0	0	•

Ot	her – please specify:			

Question 4.

How do you assess the likely overall impact of introducing general bans for the most harmful chemicals as described in the previous question, with some limited derogations if necessary?

Impact on:

	5	4	3	2	1	No opinion
Costs for companies to adapt to new chemical requirements	0	0	0	0	0	•
Administrative burden for businesses	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative burden for public authorities	0	0	0	0	0	•
Protection of children	0	0	0	0	0	•
Consumer demand	0	0	0	0	0	•
Price of toys	0	0	0	0	0	•
Choice of toys	0	0	0	0	0	•
Incentives for companies to place innovative products on the market	0	0	0	0	0	•
Free movement of toys within the EU single market	0	0	0	0	0	•
Competitiveness of small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Competitiveness of larger firms	0	0	0	0	0	•

Ot	ner – please specify:		

Comments: (if appropriate)

Qu	estion 6.						
The	e Directive currently only en	npowers th	ne Com	mission t	to set limit	values fo	r
ado	ditional chemicals in toys for	children i	under 3	6 months	s and in to	ys intende	ed to be
put	in the mouth.						
То	what extent do you agree	or disag	ree with	the foll	lowing sta	atements	?
		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
	The toy safety rules should						

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
The toy safety rules should continue to allow different requirements to be set for chemicals in toys for younger children (under 3 years) compared to older children	•	•	0	•	•	•
The toy safety rules should continue to allow different requirements to be set for chemicals in toys intended to be put in the mouth	•	•	•	•	•	•
The toy safety rules should allow new requirements to be set for chemicals in any toy should new scientific knowledge emerge	0	0	©	0	0	•

er – please	specify:		
<u> </u>			

Question 7.

The evaluation concluded that the current limits for (the carcinogenic) nitrosamines and their precursors, the nitrosatable substances, appear to be too high.

Do you agree or disagree that limit values in the Directive for nitrosamines and nitrosatable substances should be lowered?

nd nitrosatable substances should be lowered?	
Strongly agree	
Agree	

Neutral

Disagree

,,	estion 9.						
	v do you assess the likely overall impacts of re-	quirin	g the	labe	lling (ot che	emical
	stances in toys? act on:						
•	le from 5 (very positive), through 3 (neutral) to 1 (very negative)						
		5	4	3	2	1	No opinion
	Costs for companies to adapt to new chemical requirements	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Administrative burden for companies	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Administrative burden for public authorities	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Protection of children	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Consumer demand	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Price of toys	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Choice of toys	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Incentives for companies to place innovative products on the market	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Free movement of toys within the EU single market	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Competitiveness for small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Competitiveness of larger firms	0	0	0	0	0	•
Oth	er – please specify:						

Strongly disagree

No opinion

2. Adapting the Directive to other risks

Digital technologies in toys may pose new risks for children, for example in terms of protection of data, privacy or risks linked to cybersecurity. The Directive is currently focused on the physical health and safety of children. Other pieces of horizontal EU legislation addressing aspects like cybersecurity and the protection of data or privacy in a more general manner (such as the Radio Equipment Directive, the General Data Protection Regulation or the proposed regulatory framework for artificial intelligence) also apply to toys.

Question 11.

Do you agree or disagree that the Toy Safety rules should address the following, in addition to the EU legislation on these aspects referred to above? (multiple replies possible)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Privacy breaches (for example, in relation to information or data on the child being shared)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Cybersecurity risks	0	0	0	•	0	0
Psychological harm	0	0	0	•	0	0

Other – please specify:

These aspects are already sufficiently covered by the existing product safety regulation. Introducing specific provisions on data protection or cybersecurity for toys might have negative consequences for the overall legal coherence of the product safety legislation and might create confusion among economic operators.

Question 12.

What would be your preferred option to ensure that children are protected from new risks posed by the use of digital technologies?

- No action is needed
- Toys should comply with specific requirements for cybersecurity and privacy, additional to those for other connected consumer products
- Toys should comply with general requirements for cybersecurity and privacy for connected consumer products
- Toy safety rules should protect children from risks in toys not only for their physical health, but also for their mental health or cognitive development

ner – please clarify:						
estion 13.						
w do you assess the likely overall impacts o	f vour pr	eferre	ed op	tion f	or ada	apting
e Directive to risks posed by the use of digital	•		-		o	чр .9
pact on:		J				
	5	4	3	2	1	No opinior
Costs for companies	0	0	0	0	0	©
Administrative burden for companies	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative burden for public authorities	0	0	0	0	•	0
Protection of children	•	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer demand	•	0	0	0	0	0
Price of toys	0	0	0	0	0	0
Choice of toys	0	0	0	0	0	•
Incentives for companies to place innovative products on the market	0	0	0	0	0	•
Free movement of toys within the EU single market	•	0	0	0	0	0
Competitiveness of small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)	•	0	0	0	0	0
, ,	0	0	0	0	0	©

Part II - Single market

The evaluation of the Directive found that many non-compliant toys are sold in the EU and that it is difficult to enforce the Directive, in particular for online sales. Enforcing the Toy Safety Directive in online sales is challenging: for instance because it is more difficult to reach online providers who place non-compliant products on the market, or to obtain the necessary documentation to assess the compliance of the toy with the Directive's requirements.

Question 14.

To what extent do the following issues hamper the application of the Directive?

	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a small extent	Not at all
The chemical requirements for toys are set out in different pieces of legislation	0	0	•	0	0
The Directive and its regular adaptations to new scientific knowledge need to be transposed into national law	•	0	0	0	0
Testing and safety/conformity assessment is done by the manufacturer itself without the intervention of a qualified conformity assessment body	0	0	•	0	0
Documentation on the conformity of the product is provided only at the request of the authorities	•	0	0	0	0
There are no specific requirements for online sales	0	0	0	0	•

Ot	her – please specify:			

1. Conformity assessment of toys

Question 15.

The Toy Safety Directive requires the manufacturer to demonstrate that the toy they produce conforms to the safety requirements applicable. Currently, third-party verification by a notified body is required only in very limited cases (i.e. when harmonised standards do not exist or are not applied, or when the manufacturer considers that the nature, design, construction or purpose of the toy necessitates third-party verification). A notified body is a test laboratory of recognised quality which has been designated by a Member State (where the test laboratory is located) for this purpose. The notified body then examines a prototype of the toy and delivers a certificate (EU-type certificate) on the conformity of the prototype with the requirements of the Directive.

Do you think the toy safety rules should extend the obligation of third-party verification to more toys (EU-type examination)?

-	
	Yes

O No

No opinion

Question 16.

How do you assess the likely overall impacts of extending the requirements to apply third-party verification to other toys as in the previous question? Impact on:

Scale from 5 (very positive), through 3 (neutral) to 1 (very negative)

	5	4	3	2	1	No opinion
Costs for companies	0	0	0	0	0	•
Administrative burden for companies	0	0	0	0	0	•
Administrative burden for public authorities	0	0	0	0	0	•
Protection of children	0	0	0	0	0	•
Compliance of toys with the Directive	0	0	0	0	0	•
Consumer demand	0	0	0	0	0	0
Price of toys	0	0	0	0	0	•
Choice of toys	0	0	0	0	0	•
Incentives for companies to place innovative products on the market	0	0	0	0	0	•
Free movement of toys within the EU single market	0	0	0	0	0	•
Competitiveness of small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Competitiveness of larger firms	0	0	0	0	0	•

2. Obtaining compliance information and performing checks

In market surveillance, experience has shown that checks on toys can be difficult – mainly because key documents such as the EU declaration of conformity are difficult to obtain, are incorrect or of questionable quality, and/or are drafted only after a request from authorities. An option would be to require that products be accompanied by a digital product passport – including information on compliance of the product – which would ensure that information is immediately available to market surveillance and customs authorities.

Question 17.

Should the following information be available through digital tools?

	Should be available in paper /on the product	Basic information should be available on the product /paper and more details can be available digitally	Should be available only digitally	No opinion
Name and address of the manufacturer	0	•	0	0
EU declaration of conformity	0	•	0	0
EU-type examination certificates, where they exist	•	0	0	0
Instructions for use	•	0	0	0
Safety information	•	0	0	0
Information on allergenic fragrances or any other chemical substance which may be subject to labelling obligations	•	•	0	0

Question 18.

If any of this information is provided through digital tools, what digital solution would you prefer to use to access the information online?

\cap	R	\sim	d	
				_

	١.	\cap	tŀ	h	e	r	h	a	r	C	\cap	d	6	9

Contactless technologies such as NFC or RFID tags

Website address

Doesn't matter as long as it with works with my preferred device

Other (please specify below)

☑ I don't know/cannot answer

Question 19.

How do you assess the likely overall impacts of requiring the provision of certain information through digital means?

Impact on:

Scale from 5 (very positive), through 3 (neutral) to 1 (very negative)

	5	4	3	2	1	No opinion
Costs for companies	•	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative burden for companies	•	0	0	0	0	0

Administrative burden for public authorities	•	0	0	0	0	0
Protection of children	•	0	0	0	0	0
Compliance of toys with the Directive	0	0	0	0	0	•
Efficiency of market surveillance	•	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer demand	0	0	0	0	0	•
Price of toys	0	0	0	0	0	•
Choice of toys	0	0	0	0	0	•
Incentives for companies to place innovative products on the market	0	0	0	0	0	•
Free movement of toys within the EU single market	0	0	0	0	0	•
Competitiveness of small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Competitiveness of larger firms	0	0	0	0	0	•

Question 20.

While a Regulation is directly applicable in every Member State, a Directive has to be transposed by Member States into national legislation. The evaluation concluded that unequal transposition – as regards both substance and time – of the numerous amendments to the Directive into national law are a further obstacle to the single market.

Do you agree or disagree that the Toy Safety Directive should be converted into a Regulation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- No opinion

Other – please specify:

We favour fully harmonised rules across the EU to guarantee the same level of safety to EU consumers across the EU and to enable companies to operate more easily across the EU.

Question 21.

mprove compliance and enforcement? (multiple replies possible)
No action needed
The toy should have digital information on compliance that should also be available at customs (digital product passport)
More toys should be tested by a third party before they can be marketed in the EU
The Directive should be converted into a Regulation
Other – please specify:

What would be your preferred measures to be in---cluded in the Directive to

Part III - Additional feedback

Question 22.

What other aspects, if any, do you think could be improved if the Toy Safety Directive were revised?

European retailers consider that a general provision enabling the dematerialisation of certain key product information in the TSD is premature.

Retailers have discussed at length with other industry partners and manufacturers the feasibility of digital product safety infromation. Unfortunately, there is currently no solution available to make key information accessible to consumes who do not have access to internet / smartphones in a non-digital way at their request at the moment of pruchase, that would not reveal to be extremely cumbersome for distributors in practice and risk changing the responsibilities of the economic operators in the supply chain.

Dematerialising key product information and making it available at the point of sale in a non-digital way raises the following major issues:

- Economic aspects: it represents a massive shift of the financial cost from (mostly large) manufacturers onto brick and mortar retailers, as manufacturers would massively save printing costs that would be passed on to physical shops. This would also strengthen further ecommerce to the detriment of physical shops, since online retailers would not incur these printing costs.
- Storage and distribution of non-digital product information is unworkable: Storing and making available product information provided by the manufacturer beforehand and separately from the product will be unworkable in practice. The sheer amount of leaflets will exceed warehouse capacities, as even small retailers often have hundreds or thousands of product references available at the same time. Distributing them will be prone to errors and thus implies a major risk for consumers. Moreover, this would in fact constitute a transfer of the responsibility to correctly inform consumers about a product from the manufacturers to the retailers. Retailers should in no case be held liable for consumer information.

- Providing access to data is highly problematic: In case the distributor would have to make the data "accessible" it is not clear where the distributor is supposed to obtain the file for printout "at the time of purchase". There is currently no solution for accessing the product information without considerable effort nor for ensuring that consumers are always provided with the correct and up-to-date version. It is not realistic that a printout can be made at the time of purchase at the point of sale, as this enormously delays the purchasing process and leads to dissatisfied customers, again disadvantaging in-store retail!
- Legal obstacle: The making available of paper formats by the retailer would in practice transfer the burden of the obligation to provide information to the customer from the manufacturer to the retailer, plainly contradicting the distribution of obligations among economic operators foreseen by the GPSR and all other EU product safety legislation acquis.
- Environmental considerations: The objective to reduce the consumption of paper will be diluted by an obligation to print out the product information at the point of sale. Paper consumption of unforeseeable proportions would be the result.

European retailers therefore consider that a general provision enabling the dematerialisation of certain key product information in the TSD is premature. Even more so, where vulnerable consumers are concerned.

Question 23.

If you would like to share a document in connection with the possible revision of the Toy Safety Directive, please upload it below:

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Contact

GROW-TOYS@ec.europa.eu