ECHA
EUROPEAN CHEMICALS AGENCY

Exchange Network on Exposure Scenarios (ENES)

Meeting Report

11th Meeting of the Exchange Network on Exposure Scenarios (ENES11)
23–24 November 2017

Disclaimer

This publication is solely intended for information purposes and does not necessarily represent the official opinion of the European Chemicals Agency. The European Chemicals Agency is not responsible for the use that may be made of the information contained in this document.

If you have questions or comments in relation to this document please send them (quote the reference and issue date) using the information request form. The information request form can be accessed via the Contact ECHA page at:
http://echa.europa.eu/contact

European Chemicals Agency

Mailing address: P.O. Box 400, FI-00121 Helsinki, Finland
Visiting address: Annankatu 18, Helsinki, Finland

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The Exchange Network on Exposure Scenarios held its 11th meeting in November. The event was organised by the ECHA-stakeholder ENES Coordination Group. This Group comprises ECHA, Cefic, Concawe, DUCC, Eurométaux and Fecc, and six Member States (AT, DE, FI, IT, NO, PL).

Seventy-five delegates came from industry (manufacturing and downstream user companies and sector organisations), Member States (11 representatives from nine countries), consultants and IT solution providers. The plenary sessions were also web streamed.

ENES aims to identify and promote good practices to improve information on *safe use* in the supply chains for chemicals. The ENES11 event centred around three working sessions that were designed for the REACH supply chain roles of the registrant, the formulator and the downstream end user. These enabled delegates to discuss and/or try out via practical exercises key ENES products associated with their tasks, to generate or process safe-use information in the chemicals' supply chain.

The outcomes of these working sessions were then discussed in a world café setting to allow an exchange between all the delegates and to reinforce the findings or to identify gaps. As well as enabling REACH duty holders to gain a better understanding of how the ENES tools work together, the ECHA-stakeholder ENES Coordination Group wanted feedback to complete the drafting of a three year programme to 2020 to work towards good quality information on the safe use of chemicals in the REACH chemical safety report and extended safety data sheet.[1]

This meeting report summarises the three ENES11 working sessions. Relevant outcomes from the world café are integrated into those summaries, as necessary. The report also documents the main points arising from a panel discussion involving a number of organisations who provide IT solutions for supply chain communication. Finally, a series of ideas gathered from delegates are documented on how the ENES products might be better promoted and greater awareness on supply chain communication achieved toward 2020, as part of a future ENES Work programme.

2. Session summaries

2.1 The Supply Chain Machinery

ENES11 opened with a reminder on how the "machinery" for the REACH chemical safety assessment and communication on safe use up and down the supply chain can work, and how the various ENES tools interconnect and operate together (see ENES11 presentation). The presentation concentrated on certain key tools: sector use maps, Chesar, the ESCom package, tools for formulators (the Lead Component IDentification methodology and SUMI Selection Method). Delegates heard news on initiatives that commenced in the last twelve months since ENES10 on certain key tools. These included industry-led pilot projects on utilising sector use maps and the ESCom package in the supply chain, both designed to illustrate how these tools can work and what benefits they bring. In addition, delegates learned about the growth of the Use Maps Library and steps taken by the developers of downstream sector use maps and generic exposure scenario (GES)-based use maps to align these information sources for registrants.

To conclude the opening presentation, delegates received an overview of the actions proposed for the *ENES Work programme to 2020*. The programme, drawn up by the ECHA-stakeholder ENES Coordination Group, aims to make communication in the supply chains on uses and conditions of safe use work in practice. The programme builds on the outputs of the CSR/ES

[1] The draft *ENES Work programme to 2020*, is the successor to the stakeholder action plan known as the CSR/ES Roadmap. Publication is expected early in 2018.

Roadmap with a focus on the implementation of the ENES tools and sets out a series of actions designed to support registrants, formulators and end users process the incoming-outgoing REACH information, as necessary. Delegates then discussed the supply chain role-specific actions in more detail in the subsequent working session and world café sections of the ENES11 agenda.

2.2 Working session 1: How a registrant can process information from sector use maps for their chemical safety assessment.

2.2.1 The working session and its objectives

During the ENES 11 meeting a working session was held with the objective to demonstrate how use maps can be used by registrants as a key input for the use description and exposure assessment part of their registration dossier (CSA/CSR generation), and for the exposure scenario for communication (ES to be attached to the SDS).

The session consisted of hands-on exercises where participants were asked to perform the human health and environmental chemical safety assessment for a test substance based on information from a test use map, using Chesar. Participants were then shown how to generate the CSR and ES for communication.

The working session also sought for collecting feedback from participants on how the use maps approach could be implemented in their company and on how the tools (use maps and Chesar) could be further improved.

Twenty-six participants attended the session, representing manufacturing/formulating companies, industry sector associations, consultants and authorities.

ECHA would like to thank its partners for their involvement in the organisation of the session and in the revision of the hands on exercise: Torsten Funk (Sika); Alejandro Garabatos (Cefic); Divina Gomez (FEICA); Erika Kunz (Clariant); Pierre Serfass (ERM); Jan Urbanus (Shell).

2.2.2 Working session results

The following main aspects were highlighted by the participants:

The **Downstream Sector Use maps** are a good development work and a useful tool to support registrants (gain of time, consistency and transparency in the assessment) and downstream users (homogeneity in information received from different suppliers) alike. For a number of registrants they fill an important information gap.

For registrants who have already performed their assessments, the business case to convert to use maps is however not clear enough yet. More incentive is needed.

The following observations were made:

- Due to the specific description of uses in a use map the level of differentiation of uses is sometimes quite high, which leads to a larger number of assessments and increases the length of the annex in an eSDS.
- In a SWED-based assessment the concentration of the substance in a mixture is the only condition of use which can be modified by the assessor to finally come to an RCR below 1. All other relevant exposure parameters are fixed by the SWED. From registrants' perspective, the feeling is that allowing only to lower concentration may lead to some unwanted market limitations. Registrants are seeking advice from downstream user sectors on how to overcome that challenge (further guidance needed). In this regard, the consideration of higher tier tools (other than ECETOC TRA) was noted, as the SWED template has a field to consider parameters from other tools and measured data.

The difference in the approach between the Downstream Sector Use Maps and the Generic Exposure Scenarios (GES), as developed by the solvent sector (ESIG), was discussed. The GESs

aim to consolidate the different solvent applications according to their similar uses, and hence consist of generic use descriptors and initial sets of conditions of use for the solvent(s). They had been developed by *registrants* sectors in the perspective of the first registration deadline, and allow the registrants to modify all parameters based on an iteration process taking into account the substance properties. Being generic, they tend to cover several uses across sectors in one scenario, resulting in more concise annexes to the eSDS.

One participant commented on the fact that a feedback mechanism to sectors on their use maps should be organised e.g. to allow DUs to comment on ESs which do not fit their practice and/or to allow registrants to comment on the outcome of some assessments done based on use maps.

Participants also commented on the **use maps library,** in particular on the need to develop it in a way that registrants can more easily find the information relevant to their case and can be better informed about changes/updates. Via the use maps library sector associations should also communicate their intentions to publish use maps (with indicative deadline), to allow registrants to plan their activities accordingly.

Setting a network of use maps users and use maps developers was mentioned as a possibility to explore to enhance communication and exchange.

With regards to **Chesar** the general feeling of the participants was that the tool well supports the use maps approach and should continue to develop in that direction.

It was pointed out that using use maps as a basis, an exposure assessment can become relatively straightforward. There is a concern that simplifying too much the assessment may create the (mistaken) impression that knowledgeable assessors are no longer needed. At the same time one participant shared a vision for the future where everyone could check the safeness of his mixtures based on a very simple application.

Improvements could still be made to Chesar to further support registrants in their duties. Suggestions included:

- Develop functionalities to keep track of the decision made by the assessors on the uses coming from a use map (e.g. reason for deleting a use or a contributing activity, reason from deviating from a SWED-based assessment).
- Better support updates: currently Chesar generates a list of differences between the existing use map and the updated use map. Improvement could be done e.g. by enabling the assessors to select which assessment to re-do.
- Look at a possible adaptation of the format of the ES for communication based on an analysis of the information strictly needed by end-users, and looking at a more concise format, …
- Offer translations for the ESCom standard phrases
- Implement the calculation of Msafe (environment) and maximum safe concentration in products (worker / consumer)

2.2.3 Reflections on ENES Work programme

The group also reflected on possible actions that would lead to an improvement of the ENES tools for registrants and pave the way for an increased uptake by companies. The following main aspects were highlighted:

- Further piloting of the use of use maps by registrants is key to further develop guidance and demonstrate that the concept works. The next phase of the piloting should encompass a full DU sector use map and the use of higher tier tools. Downstream users, as well as registrants, should be involved. Additional use maps should also be considered.
- A pilot project on the use of ESIG-GESs is also needed.

- Having an IT format (ESCom XML) to exchange use and exposure information along the supply chain is key. Actors should work further on the business case and explore creative solutions (e.g. funding) to make this happen.

Other actions discussed included the need for consolidating workers / consumers exposure assessment tools and to further develop the ESCom standard phrase catalogue.

2.2.4 World café discussion

During the world café discussion that followed the working session the above results were presented to the rest of the ENES participants. The direction of the actions was confirmed, and a number of more concrete proposals made (e.g. on the use maps library features). In addition, it was stressed that many supply chains are not simple. It was suggested to expand the pilot to cover more complex, multi-step situations (which may better reflect reality). It was also proposed to work towards linking more higher tier tools to Chesar than is currently the case.

Commenting on the implementation of the use maps approach in companies, the following was (re-)emphasised: registrants need a good business case to update their dossiers to use maps. Higher involvement of SIEFs, lead registrants and Consortia is required. A number of technical difficulties which can refrain/block updates (e.g. access to the lead dossier by members) require further discussion within industry (this issue goes beyond the simple use maps implementation).

The feedback from the participants will be considered when finalising the ENES work programme to 2020 (publication expected spring 2018) and when scoping each individual action.

2.3 Working session 2: How a formulator can transform the incoming substance exposure scenarios into meaningful safe-use-information for their customers.

2.3.1 The working session set up and its objectives

The second working sessions was focusing on the formulators activities within the supply chain, and more particularly 'How a formulator can verify that the uses of his mixtures are covered in the incoming substances' eSDS, and how he can generate safe-use-information for the mixture?'

This working session has set aside a considerable amount of time for hands-on exercises where participants could practice the use of ENES tools that have been developed for formulators' work.

One exercise, aka the SUMI hands-on exercise, was demonstrating how suitable exposure controls for mixture can be determined when downstream sector use-maps/SWEDs and pre-defined Safe Use Information for Mixtures (SUMI) exist (SUMI selection method): The participants were asked to put themselves in the shoes of a formulator who produces a wall/floor coating for outdoor construction works (applied by professional workers). The participants carried out the following tasks: check and compare the ES for communication received from the suppliers and transform the incoming substance exposure scenarios into a meaningful safe-use-information for the customers of the mixture. The exercise was based on a number of training documents (e.g. EFCC use map and SWEDs, technical data sheet of the product, safety data sheet for the substance composing the mixture, etc.).

The SUMI hands-on exercise was followed by an exercise on the Lead Component Identification (LCID) method. This method aims at helping to determine which of the exposure scenarios received for components of the mixture will drive the risk management for the whole mixture. At the end of the hands-on exercise, three options to generate safe use information for the mixture were also discussed: (i) attach the ES for the lead substances to the eSDS for the mixture, (ii) consolidate the information across the lead substances in an appendix to the SDS, and (iii) consolidate in a consistent manner the information across the lead substances in the core body of the SDS (e.g. section 8, but also sections 6 and 7).

In the last part of the working session, the twenty-six participants had also the opportunity to reflect and discuss the main actions of the draft ENES work programme to 2020 related to the

formulators' activities.

The working session was jointly prepared and designed by Cefic/VCI (Christian Boegi), EFCC (Martin Glöckner, Torsten Funk), VERISK 3E (Nursulu Davrenova, Paul Lloyd), and ECHA (Andreas Ahrens, Sandrine Lefèvre).

2.3.2 Working session results and next steps

The participants provided very positive feedback highlighting that the practical exercises have helped to better understand how Use Maps/SUMIs and LCID are meant to work. It was also a good opportunity to identify some topics where further explanations or development are needed.

The group also reflected on the identified ENES actions that would lead to an improvement of the ENES tools for formulators and pave the way for an increased uptake of the existing tools by companies.

The following main aspects were highlighted both during the working session and later during the world-café:

- Further piloting/exemplification of the use of the SUMI selection method to generate safe use information for mixtures is key to further develop guidance and demonstrate that the concept works. The next phase of piloting/exemplification should encompass multiple sector use maps and the use of higher tier tools, other than ECETOC TRA, that have been used so far to generate the ES. Participants highlighted also the need to explore if and how the method can still work if not all suppliers source their ES from sector use maps. In addition, the participants indicated that the method should be expanded to the environment in order to offer a full package solutions to formulators eager to use the SUMI selection method. In addition, it was highlighted that, an update tracking mechanism is needed to make single formulator's system aware if use-maps are updated. Last but not least, the SUMI selection mechanism needs to be transparent, robust, and replicable across sectors, so it is well understood by the single formulator; especially when the formulator is dealing with multiple sectors.
- The functioning of the SUMI selection method at a broader scale is dependent on Registrants' dossier updates. This is associated with a number of questions: What would be incentives to update? How would the lead and the members organise the update among each other? What would be a realistic timeframe?
- The question was raised also about the formulators who do not belong to a sector association. Participants expressed that it would be in general desirable that SUMIs are publicly available. However it must be clear that they should be only used in (i) connection with a CSA and (ii) as part of an extended safety data sheet. Also, it needs to be clear that SUMIs cannot replace OSH workplace risk assessments, but they may contribute to them.
- Exemplification of step 2 of the LCID method is needed i.e. demonstrating how the safe use information for the mixture is generated, once the lead components and the related exposure scenarios have been identified. Such exemplification would include (i) the three different options mentioned above, (ii) the need of differentiating among tasks due to differences in the conditions of safe use , and (iii) the question on how to handle lead substance without ES (e.g. <10T registration). Participants highlighted the importance of having formulators from various sectors also involved in the exercise.
- Explore, try out and discuss available methods to generate safe use information in the case of mixtures to be used in mixtures. The participants supported the proposal to initiate a particular action under the ENES programme to explore suitable solutions for mixtures in mixtures.
- Common issues in the SUMI and LCID methods, affecting the work of the formulators, were also identified and discussed. For example, the identification of the relevant incoming ES could be facilitated with more readable, consistent, and useful ESs table of content (formatting aspects). The structure of short title could be revised to make it more

useful and readable. Enriched ESCom catalogue with sector specific wording and SWED titles (and code?) was also identified as an action.

- Additional pictograms, specifically covering ventilation would be very beneficial for the effective communication of OC's in SUMIs.

In general, participants highlighted the importance of ensuring a strong link and coordination between the various ENES pilots in order to try to reach a common understanding and harmonization of formats for the information inputs and outputs.

The integration of tools into existing IT architecture at company level is also seen as important, but might not happen "over-night" especially for the companies who have already systems in place for the supply chain communication. In term of promotion, and development efforts, some proposals were made therefore to try to differentiate between beginners (companies with no systems in place), and actors with advanced systems. Focus could be made on beginners who most probably would benefit the most in term of health safety improvement. Simple, well explained clear benefits should be communicated to this type of ENES tools users.

The proposals made by the participants will be considered when finalising the ENES work programme to 2020 (publication expected spring 2018) and scoping each individual action.

2.4 Working session 3: Safe-use information at the bottom of the supply chain: Which information is needed?

2.4.1 The working session and its objectives

During the ENES11 meeting a working session was held with the objectives to find out how companies at the end of the supply chain identify **safe-use information** from the extended safety data sheets they receive from their suppliers and how it is used by them, including the checking compliance with their site-specific use and conditions of safe use information.

The session consisted of a series of exercises/discussions where participants were asked to identify, based on their own experiences, the challenges, needs and solutions associated with the information they receive as end users of chemicals.[2] As a point of reference, a limited number of examples had been distributed beforehand.

It was also explored how the ENES Work programme to 2020 can help to further understand needs and to work out solutions.

Fifteen participants attended the session representing manufacturing/formulating companies, industry sector associations, consultants, authorities and media.

ECHA would like to thank Pascal Frou (SAFRAN), Anja Van De Velde (CRC Industries) and Donna Seid (Ashland Services B.V.) for preparing short presentations to facilitate the discussion at the working session.

2.4.2 Working session results

The following main aspects were highlighted by the participants in terms of **challenges and needs**.

Safe-use information received up to now remains either very generic (unhelpful) or very detailed data (unclear language) with limited applicability and as a consequence, difficult to fit with on-site situations. Either case can result in the need for some end users to complete their own assessment and find their own solutions, unaware of their rights and obligations under REACH for a two-way supply chain communication between customer and supplier to resolve issues.

[2] This information can be provided either in the form of an annex of exposure scenarios attached to a safety data sheet, or for mixtures, a consolidated annex (in some downstream sectors, called a SUMI), or integrated into the main body of a safety data sheet.

A supplier's chemical safety assessment is often viewed as a theoretical assessment. Safety data sheets for mixtures are often not complete, information gaps occur, for instance for vapour pressure, explosion limits, etc.

Wording like "adequate" or "sufficient" in connection with risk management measures are difficult to interpret / convert as practical, on-site measures. Again, end users may need to complete their own assessment to show adequacy of control. End users need concrete requirements or technical specifications for risk management e.g. do not store above 25°C, provide ventilation of a specific extraction rate etc. Safe-use information should be clear in terms of what to do and what not to do.

In the workplace, the REACH information format does not always transpose easily. Workers often do not work with only one chemical substance; they typically work with multiple chemicals and mixtures, in various ways, which may differ from day-to-day. Occupational health and safety (and its national legislation) looks at combined (hazardous) components, multiple activities or tasks, etc., whereas the REACH registration is per substance and use, so how to reconcile/improve alignment?

Authors of safety data sheets need to consider more the reader who is using the information. The safety data sheet contains information written for an EHS professional, chemist, toxicologist etc. For many (SME) end users, they seldom have such in-house expertise; chemical hazards (and associated terminology) are not their core competencies.

Different suppliers provide different, or even conflicting information for the same substance and the same use, often in different layouts. This creates a challenge for end users in how to handle, both in terms of content and efficiency in processing the information.

The generation of safe-use information within the supply chain remains a moving target and needs to reach a mature state. This is a feature of the phased registrations for substances, coupled with their associated guidelines in terms of the format for exposure scenarios and the application of use descriptors, such as process categories (PROCs) in the registrant's chemical safety assessment and exposure scenarios for communication.

Next, considering these challenges and needs, the participants proposed a number of **solutions for further development**:

- Registrants come together and provide a shared safety data sheet for a substance, which could be posted centrally by for example Cefic or ECHA, or alternative smart IT solutions. But supplier still retains responsibility.
- End user industries come together to identify the common application of operational conditions (OCs) and risk management measures (RMMs).
- Regulatory (competent) and enforcement authorities come together, for environment and occupational safety and health, to agree what common data sets they need for their spheres of responsibility and on the sources of information that they accept.
- In terms of the presentation of safe-use information in the extended safety data sheet, differentiate clearly between (i) information relevant for all uses/tasks and the use-/task-specific information and (ii) find ways that the relevant information can be easily traced.
- Provide separate documents for separate audiences. Suppliers could provide short, simple guidance to supplement their safety data sheet.
- Industry sector groups might develop specific safe handling guides and/or short videos which instruct downstream/end users on operational conditions and risk management measures for specific use descriptors.
- Develop pictograms for risk management measures, e.g. for local exhaust ventilation, different glove types, etc. that then require no translation.
- Develop examples or Hints&Tips of simple presentational ways to improve readability of extended safety data sheet, e.g., highlight revised content, table that details the use descriptors for the given substance, a Table of Contents in the introduction of the annex,

including page numbering, easy-to-find REACH-related information (REACH registration/exemption status, use under strictly controlled conditions, applicable authorisations/restrictions, presence/absence of SVHCs, concrete Dos & Don'ts.

- Identify and include in ENES a wider range of stakeholders affected by these regulations to find solutions on what is more user-friendly to them, and the methods to communicate with/reach them. In particular, downstream user associations or trade associations, e.g., hairdressers, carpenters (including professional schools). Others include workers, site managers/EHS professionals/industrial hygienists, actual end users, trade unions, occupational healthcare and insurance services. Such initiatives would help to raise awareness of DU rights and obligations that need to be addressed and include their feedback in driving user-friendly solutions to drive behaviour changes.
- Education: teaching/training e.g., at professional schools, universities. Also involving occupational healthcare professionals who could explain things to workers, etc.

2.4.3 Next steps

The group also reflected on possible actions that would lead to an improvement of the ENES tools for downstream end users. A number of their information needs could be addressed by actions taken further up the supply chain. In addition, there are specific actions that could be taken at the end user level, for which the following main aspects were highlighted:

- Being clearer on who are "end users" i.e., the target audience(s).
- Developing a better means of monitoring progress/effectiveness that goes beyond simple compliance with the receipt of incoming safe-use information. Whilst the amount of exposure scenarios and safe-use information in European market may increase over time and in so doing raise awareness, monitoring for evidence of change in behaviour (safer practices) would be a stronger measure of progress as that, for the resources invested by companies, may manifest itself in more safety for workers, minimised releases to the environment, and enhanced reputation. For end users, the focus should be on driving behaviour, changing what they (end users) do in ensuring they are using chemicals safely, as a result of information they receive from the supply chain.
- Carrying out market research to identify exposure scenario information (content) useful for different groups of end users is worthwhile in the domains of workplace safety, environmental release controls and product (article) safety. The emphasis however, should be placed on establishing why end users like/dislike certain information and through applying the thought process and end users' efforts to find better solutions.
- Consider market research into how artificial intelligence or future (smart) technologies can support handling substance information (i.e. exposure scenario information) and bring about safer use on-site. As an extension to that, how "smart" technologies, such as use of smart phone apps with built-in search capabilities, real-time feedback via "wearable" PPE/use of sensors, augmented reality, artificial intelligence or future (smart) technologies can support ensuring the safe handling of substances on-site.

Many of the working sessions' findings were reinforced later during the world café session at ENES11. The proposals made by the participants will be considered when finalising the ENES Work programme to 2020 (publication expected spring 2018) and scoping each individual action.

2.5 How IT solutions supporting communication on conditions of safe use in the supply chain can be implemented in practice: IT Panel

2.5.1 The panel set up

The one-hour panel discussed IT solutions currently available to support supply chain communication and the status of integration of the ENES tools in these systems. The panellists[3] represented ECHA and four companies attending ENES11 who had volunteered to take part. The session consisted of panel questions, audience participation through live polls and a Q&A session.

2.5.2 The discussion

The panellists noted that the integration of safe use information from registration dossiers into (extended) safety data sheets (eSDSs) as well as an efficient use of information from eSDSs for workplace risk assessment and environmental assessment require well-functioning import and export functionalities between systems as well as a capability to translate the information into different languages. The use of ESCom XML was considered as the best solution for harmonising the content. Automatic uploading of XML files, ideally generated by Chesar, into SDS authoring systems could save time, effort and minimise errors during the data transfer. It was commonly felt that the benefit of ENES tools and formats depends on companies' willingness to integrate them with their IT systems. Benefits could be gained for example by linking the REACH information better to the requirements under the OHS legislation. It was underlined that only relevant and easy-to-understand information should flow in the supply chain. This would facilitate downstream users' assessments under REACH and other pieces of legislation and reduce confusion at all steps of the chain. A business case for this to happen is however still pending in most companies. The speakers did note that the awareness of ENES tools is increasing and there is interest in the field for the use maps and XML format.

The majority of the audience indicated in a poll that the current IT tools somewhat meet their needs for supply chain communication but further development is needed. The proposed development areas are Chesar, ESCom XML, harmonisation of templates and tools for exposure scenarios (ESs) to facilitate automatisation and making information downloadable from the ECHA (dissemination) website that could be used as input for SDSs authoring. The Chesar related suggestions include further development of the export files (e.g. by changing the format of the ESs and/or adding additional formats) and making the tool suitable for mixture assessment. Some participants also felt that the main focus should be on authorities pushing for harmonisation, for instance by introducing a fixed format for the ES similarly to what already exists for the core body of the SDS, by enforcement or even by making Chesar a compulsory tool.

The commonly asked question on the integration of LCID/SUMI approaches in the existing IT tools SDS authoring was also discussed. It was noted that SUMIs are prepared by industry and therefore in some cases their use is restricted to the members of the related sectors. This may be a limiting factor for incorporation them into SDS authoring systems. Testing of how the output of the LCID method maybe communicated via the SDS of a mixture is part of the current ENES work programme.

The IT providers' solutions for making eSDSs easier to understand and use include the implementation of a table of contents, the use of structured short titles and the use of linguistic experts to make the phrases easier to understand as well as the earlier discussed automatisation, links between tools and ESCom XML.

---

[3] ***Henri Heusen***, Chief Technology Officer, Cosanta; ***Sigþrúður Kristinsdottir***, Product Specialist, EcoOnline; ***Nursulu Davrenova***, Manager of Authoring Software & Service Solutions, Verisk 3E; ***Ilaria Finazzi***, EHS Regulatory Data Specialist, Selerant and ***Mike Rasenberg***, Head of Unit, Computational Assessment & Dissemination, ECHA

2.6 Strategy and promotion

As part of the world café, delegates were invited to suggest:

(i) Particular areas where the strategy toward improving supply chain communication deserved more attention as part of a future ENES work programme,

(ii) How the ENES products (see ENES11 presentation) might be better promoted, and

(iii) How ENES meetings might better serve as a means of dissemination and exchange.

World Café outcomes:

2.6.1 Strategy

- Focus on benefits of the ENES tools and link business cases with e.g. sustainability initiatives in companies.
- Improve and clarify interaction between chemicals and other legislation.
- ECHA to prepare layman information on safe use from the SDS to create more confidence in safer products.
- Stress importance of dossier updates.
- Increase consumer and end-user demand.
- Education, communication, enforcement.

2.6.2 Promotion

Using multipliers

- Involve national industry associations, local worker associations, chambers of commerce and consultancies.
- Define a list of multipliers together with Member States and industry.
- More active role for ECHA to promote tools.
- Use international channels like trade fairs.

Communication

- Use trade and sector publications to spread news.
- Create simple and easily digestible videos explaining ENES products and processes.
- Prepare information packages and/or guidance on the ENES tools by REACH role/group/sector.

Increase learning / understanding

- Develop and make training material available on the ENES tools including a series of webinars. More training by ECHA, national associations and consultancies. More ECHA presence at local events.
- Training and events for specialist audiences such as health inspectors, professional industrial hygienists and trade schools.
- More interactivity and/or hands-on exercises in events.
- Organise 'supply chain communication for beginners' events.
- Invite SMEs and end users to attend events on-line and at local level.

3. Conclusions.

ENES11 provided a unique opportunity for participants with differing REACH roles to discuss and/or try out via practical exercises on key ENES products linked with their tasks in generating or processing safe-use information in the chemicals' supply chain. The working sessions were prepared by ECHA and industry representatives in a true collaborative effort, and were greatly appreciated by the ENES delegates.

The actions in the draft *ENES Work programme to 2020* were largely confirmed with few actions added. Proposals for refining the draft actions gathered at ENES11 will now be considered by the ECHA-stakeholder ENES Coordination Group to finalise this Work programme.

EUROPEAN CHEMICALS AGENCY
ANNANKATU 18, P.O. BOX 400,
FI-00121 HELSINKI, FINLAND
ECHA.EUROPA.EU