LIFE / FIT FOR REACH

Final Event Report

2020

The Project "Baltic pilot cases on reduction of emissions
by substitution of hazardous chemicals and resource efficiency"
(LIFE Fit for REACH, Nr.LIFE14ENV/LV000174) is co-financed
with the contribution of the LIFE financial instrument of the European Community.

Final Project Conference

Substitution, use reduction and overall improved chemicals risk management:

Companies in the Baltic States are fitter for REACH!

24 November 2020 – virtual (zoom) Baltic States

Organised by LIFE Fit for REACH

Report by

Ingrida Bremere (BEF Latvia), Antonia Reihlen (Senior Consultant), Sandra Oisalu (BEF Estonia), Sigita Židoniene (BEF Lithuania)

Participants:

75 participants from various stakeholder groups, such as researchers / project implementers, company representatives, scientists, consultants, policy makers (EU COM, MS), LIFE programme officer/EASME, ECHA, and NGOs participated in the event.

Agenda

- see Annex n°1

Goal of the Final Project Conference:

To present the findings from the LIFE Fit for REACH project and link them to the overall policy context in the European Union.

A series of short briefing documents were provided to the participants prior to the meeting:
01_FitforREACH in Brief – Project Overview
02_FitforREACH in Brief – Substitution and resource efficiency cases
03_FitforREACH in Brief - Project impacts
04_FitforREACH in Brief – "Green markets"
05_FitforREACH in Brief – Publications and tools
06_FitforREACH in Brief – Findings and recommendations

Videos of 10 Baltic Substitution and Chemicals Risk Management Cases were shown, illustrating practical activities and outcomes of the project at the companies.

Welcoming address

Ms. **Alda Ozola,** Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia, welcomed the participants. She highlighted the aim of a toxic free environment (Chemicals Strategy, Green Deal), as well the approach that uses of harmful chemical substances are reduced, and safer alternatives promoted. It was pointed out that small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) need support. The LIFE FitforREACH project has shown how academia, policy makers, consultants and industry can better cooperate to improve chemicals risk management.

Introduction to the meeting

Ms. **Heidrun Fammler**, BEF Germany, welcomed the participants and gave an overview about the planned proceedings of the final conference. She informed that the aim was to present findings from the LIFE Fit for REACH project and reflect on them with the help of feedback panels and interaction with the participants. Additionally, the recommendations to national stakeholders and the European Commission should be discussed. A show-cast of manifold cases of chemicals risk management from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania would illustrate the company work within the project frame.

Session 1

Chemicals Risk Management Basics & Communication

Project experiences regarding the capacities of Baltic companies to obtain, understand and implement chemical information: general awareness on chemicals, classification and labelling, Safety Data Sheets (SDS), inventories, communication in the supply chain.

In their presentation **Ingrida Bremere**, BEF Latvia, **Juhan Ruut,** Hendrikson Ltd. Estonia, and **Heli Nommsalu**, BEF Estonia gave an overview on how they perceived the companies' work and performance as based on the experiences from the LIFE Fit for REACH project. They presented results from a survey and interviews pointing out that companies are aware of the need *to take care of* chemicals and that a majority was confident to have enough of in-house information and knowledge on chemicals. While companies stated to basically rely on SDSs they frequently recognized that these are of low quality. Interview responses suggested that 80% of the respondent companies have been involved in substitution either as main player, as supplier or as a customer. A very high share of the responding companies (90%) was certain that the pressure to avoid and substitute substances of concern will increase in future. The actual performance of the companies was evaluated during consultations on chemicals risk management and during the project's site visits, e.g., by screening which chemicals are used and developing or improving the chemicals inventories, assessing the availability and quality of SDSs, listing the known chemicals-related problems and priority setting, as well as identifying needs for substitution. The findings on chemicals management were summarised: (i) many companies, particularly, at the end of the supply chain, are not aware that they use (hazardous) chemicals; (ii) companies partly lack basic knowledge and skills in chemicals risk management; (iii) many companies use only parts of the SDS information; and (iv) direct contacts to companies are key to getting them involved in chemicals risk management activities. At the end of the presentation, the conference participants were introduced to the recent publications on chemicals risk management by the project.

PANEL:
Andreas Ahrens, European Chemicals Agency (ECHA)
Lothar Lieck, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA)
Kerstin Heitmann, com4chem, Germany

The panel discussion started with a question to the panellists on their **experience about chemicals risk management**, and if any of the presented issues was **particularly notable** for them as well as what they found to be the **most critical deficits**:

- The panellists reflected that according to their experience and slightly differing from the findings in the project many companies are aware of legal requirements but are not able or partly not willing to implement them. To improve a (pro-active) implementation of chemicals risk management and to get more companies aiming to be a frontrunner, they anticipated a change of generation in company managers necessary.
- All panellists found education a key issue: if companies lack education on chemicals, workers' health and in environmental issues, they have difficulties to understand the necessity of chemicals risk management and the requirements of legislation.
- The panellists stated a lack of substitution projects and therefore appreciated the LIFE Fit for REACH.
- The panellists saw a need to develop "bigger solutions". The deficits in chemicals risk management identified in the LIFE Fit for REACH reminded them of evaluation results from earlier studies on chemicals legislation. It would be time to look for approaches that structurally addresses these deficits and not rely on projects.
- The analysis of drivers of change and the reasons of failure or success of chemicals risk management in general was appreciated as useful by the panellists and the results were found corresponding to their experience.
- One contradiction was pointed out: companies stated to be well-informed but found their information source, the SDSs, of low quality. This would indicate a lack of detailed checking of SDSs and related supplier communication on the (low quality of) SDSs. This was also seen in relation to the finding that inventories, which are legally required in the Baltic countries, are frequently missing or outdated.

Another discussion topic was **dealing with the gap between the companies' opinion of their chemicals risk management competences and those that were observed to exist in reality**:

- REACH shifted the responsibility for the assessment and risk management of chemicals from the authorities to the companies. This shift was not supported by competence and capacity building programmes on the side of the companies, particularly, at the downstream and end-user levels of the supply chain. This "structural competence gap" would be one reason for deficits in the implementation of risk management measures and communication along the supply chains.
- According to the panel discussions, awareness raising is necessary about the role of good quality information on chemical products. Currently, companies mainly compete on technical product performance and prices. The understanding of the product performance should concern the chemical quality, i.e., absence of hazards substances as well as the quality of chemical information (in the SDS).
- The associations have a major role in reducing the observed lack of chemicals risk management competences in companies. However, experience from the Baltic countries suggest that most (downstream user) associations show little interest in this and that there is no systematic professional training and support (from associations) on chemicals risk management.

In the discussions on **how to motivate companies to change and improve** the panellists stated, amongst others:

- If companies should change their processes, they need to see the related benefits. Any change is a risk and therefore initiatives are needed to really implement changes. For companies it is difficult to invest in change without an idea on the benefits.
- Obviously, legislation is a driver, but responsible chemicals management requires more than just legal compliance.
- Training is one option to provide companies with ideas for structural changes. As it is difficult to develop such ideas in the company, an outside perspective can be beneficial.
- Companies will invest their resources with highest priority into actions improving compliance with legal requirements. For example, companies will establish and maintain a chemicals inventory as prescribed by legislation. Any additional information content that is provided on a voluntary basis would only be implemented if companies see a clear (monetary) benefit from doing so.
- If several legal requirements are supported by a certain chemicals risk management measure, this enhances the need and motivation for its implementation. For example, a chemicals inventory supports the implementation of installation permitting requirements, workers protection, environmental reporting, and chemicals legislation.

Specific discussion among the panellists on **Chemicals Inventories** lead to the following conclusions:

- The chemicals inventory is seen as an essential basis for decision on managing chemicals risks. Therefore, it would be rather a question how it can be implemented efficiently than if it should be done at all.
- The purpose of an inventory needs to be clear: risk assessment, prioritisation of action needs on substances, reporting etc. It was suggested to consider upgrading the (legal) requirements (in the Baltic States) on the content of inventories to make them (more) useful for supporting decisions or assessments.
- The quality of the information sources that feed into the inventory is of paramount importance. SDSs should be available along the supply chain electronically to prevent the mere retyping of data when it is included into inventories.
- Companies need good and cost-efficient inventory tools to make chemicals information accessible. Excel® files may be sufficient if only few chemicals are used. More sophisticated IT tools are needed allowing data mining to support decision making for companies with a more complex use of chemicals. Due to a lack of such easy to use and economical tools, many companies do use Excel®.

The panellists also discussed the specific **role and needs of formulators** (producers of chemicals mixtures) in the chemicals risk management along the supply chain. They stated that:

- Formulators are responsible for and therefore must assess the safety of their mixtures, including for their customers.
- Formulators need different training than end-users of chemicals as it would be most beneficial if they substituted hazardous substances from their mixtures thereby making them inherently safe. This would prevent that end-user would have to assess risks or implement specific risk management measures.
- Consequently, formulators need training on substitution, including how to assess alternatives to hazardous chemicals in their mixtures.

- Formulators have to provide information on the safe use of their mixtures, i.e., the operating conditions and risk management measures needed to control potential risks. As the formulators derive this information mainly from their suppliers' SDSs it is crucial that the initial information is correct and concise.
- Conditional advice in the SDSs of mixtures is not helpful because companies need clear information on what to do, and what not to do, instead of having to decide what is needed under which condition of use.

The quality of SDSs was said to be interlinked with the primary **information on substances** as such:

- The registration data of substances should be translated to the SDS including the classification, derived no effect levels (DNELs) and predicted no-effect concentration (PNECs) as well as the relevant property information, such as on water solubility. However, already at this first step, mistakes occur, including by retyping. A direct electronic information transfer would be avoiding many mistakes.
- Frequently several substance manufacturers place a substance on the market (on average 7 companies register one substance on the EU market). Often these companies fail to develop consistent SDSs and to coordinate updates of registration dossiers and SDSs. The resulting differences in substance information frequently creates confusion in the market.
- It is too large a challenge for companies to ensure the quality of SDS by feedbacks in the supply chain as originally foreseen under REACH. A centralized approached operated e.g., by sector organisations at EU level would possibly be a solution: A small group of people could investigate SDSs of substances and mixtures and communicate with the suppliers to improve (and harmonise) them. This would ensure quality checking is done by experts, who also know the specific conditions of the sector, and that in particular SMEs at the end of the supply chain would receive good quality information.
- Such system would be efficient and could be operated in cooperation between EU Member States and respective associations. Cooperation between authorities and industry is needed to address emerging solutions on the market.

Session 2

Substitution, use reduction and Green Markets

Project experiences on approaches support factors and barriers for Baltic companies regarding substitution and use reduction of hazardous substances as well as forming markets for safer products, e.g. via green procurement or green claims.

The presentation by **Juste Kukucione**, BEF Lithuania, **Jana Simanovska,** Ecodesign Competence Centre, Latvia, and **Grazvydas Jegelevicius,** BEF Lithuania, started with defining substitution as the replacement of hazardous substances with safer alternatives, including technologies. It gave an overview and several examples of the extensive company work that was implemented in the project both related to substitution and resource efficiency. The role of the market and of green or environmental claims to promote hazardous substance free alternatives was pointed out. The question was raised why green markets are not yet important enough to pull companies towards less hazardous products and what can be done to increase the market incentives in that direction. Related to green claims it was concluded that there is a need for clearer rules and market surveillance. At the end of the presentation, the challenges companies faced in the project during substitution processes were presented. The presentation concluded with a summary of the project team's learnings from the LIFE

Fit for REACH project: (i) legislation is the most important incentive for substitution; (ii) barriers to substitution are investment costs, uncertainty of product performance, lack of alternatives, and low priority of environmental performance; (iii) the companies expect few economic benefits from entering greener markets with safer products and are therefore not very interested, except in markets of products with close consumer contact; and (iv) success factors for substitution are a motivated and engaged (top) management in companies, the availability of direct and specific support, and small grants.

PANEL:
Denis Mottet, European Chemicals Agency (ECHA)
Tonie Wickman, Chemicals Substitution Centre, Sweden
Joel Tickner, University of Massachusetts Lowell, USA
Yifaat Baron, Oeko Institute, Germany

The panel discussion started with a reflection of the panellists on **what was presented about the substitution cases in the project.** The panellists were asked if there was anything outstanding and what they thought to be critical deficits identified in working with the industries and why. The panellist reflections included the following points:

- Awareness raising is key in chemicals management, especially on substitution. Still a lot of work was seen necessary. It would take time to increase the awareness within companies. It was stated important to make companies understanding that getting to start is the hardest step and helping them to see the benefits of their investments.
- A support structure across Europe would be needed to raise awareness and to push for better management of chemicals and substitution. Having substitution competences in dedicated national 'centres' was regarded important as this cannot be done from Helsinki or Brussels remotely. According to the discussions, such 'support centres' should be close to the businesses where companies can visit and speak their own language.
- The project demonstrated that substitution is possible, and it is important to act, even though resources are required. To save the resources, knowledge and experiences should be shared about successful substitution cases and related experience through networking.
- Capacity and knowledge building are a key for companies and these support structures can help in many SMEs (especially when resources are limited, e.g., one person dealing with environment, health, and safety issues among other issues). The panellists stated that companies want to work together, learn from each other, and share their achievements as the competitive advantage would be accommodated in the skills and not the technology they are using. Therefore, the LIFE FitforREACH case examples were considered important.
- Legal pressure was confirmed to be the main driver for substitution – and the role of the REACH was seen important. Without regulation, a clear driver for companies was said to be missing. Substitution needs a clear driver and clear support.
- Financial support can help companies to invest in alternative technologies and it can be the critical driver for the top management to get involved.
- The panellists summarised that the Baltic countries do not differ from other Member States in that small businesses are not very aware of chemicals risk management and substitution. The same experience was reported also from Massachusetts in the US.

The panellists were asked why after app. 15 years of **REACH and more than 50 years of chemicals regulation** at EU level, still the same issues are being discussed and what experiences and information they could share about promoting substitution:

- While REACH registration only concerns manufacturers and importers of chemicals, other parts of the legislation also address the downstream users. End-users of chemicals, in particular (very) small companies (still) lack awareness that they use (hazardous) chemicals and therefore must comply with REACH.
- Substitution is challenging for companies due to the required competences, resources, and the dependency on the supply chain. In addition, drop-in solutions may not be available, and it is necessary to more fundamentally understand the function of the chemical to find replacements based on a clear vision of their aims.
- Country experience and examples on chemicals regulations:
    - The Massachusetts Toxic Use Reduction Institute (TURI) was formed in 1989 under a Massachusetts law. The law requires manufacturing firms using over a certain amount of toxic chemicals to assess their chemicals use once per year and biannually plan how to reduce the use of toxic chemicals. Companies must report and pay fees that depend on the volume and number of reportable chemicals. A small company might pay 2000 – 3000 euro a year, a large company might pay 20 000 euro a year. The fees are earmarked for financing the TURI programme that advises and consults companies on substitution in return. Industry acknowledges the benefits of the programme, make use of the consultation opportunities, and accept the fees.
    - Sweden had a tax on flame retardants but could not observe that this tax influenced the market by driving substitution of hazardous chemicals – the prices of products just increased for customers and the money was not invested in the support of substitution. Therefore, the tax was abolished.
- ECHA carries out supply chain substitution workshops to promote best practices per sector, where actors from the supply chains dealing with certain chemicals are gathered. This is a very useful and quite effective model, although the individual solutions might differ for companies. Such events may initiate discussions of a specific issue in the supply chain on how to interact and find solutions for a particular problem.
- Substitution centres or affordable consultancy offices would be very helpful for companies, who need the specific competences only for a particular substitution project and not continuously. Hence in particular small companies could get targeted support. The question is how such advisory services or substitution centres could be organised and financed.
- Any such substitution centres should cooperate to increase efficiency. For example, BEF offices worked like substitution centres in the project LIFE Fit for REACH.

Session 3

Project impacts, conclusions, and recommendations

LIFE FitforREACH in a helicopter perspective: measuring impacts of the project, learnings for a wider context, policy recommendations and conclusions from the meeting.

Jolita Kruopiene, Kaunas Technical University, Lithuania, and **Daiva Semeniene,** Environmental Policy Centre, Lithuania, presented the methodology and results of the environmental and socio-economic impact assessment of the substitution cases in the partner companies and some "light case companies" of the LIFE Fit for REACH. Overall risks to the environment, workers and consumers were reduced. However, with chosen methodology was not suitable to evaluate all cases and additional information as well as qualitative assessments were necessary. Challenges consisted of a lack of critical data, such as comparable DNELs and PNECs to derive Risk Characterization Ratios (RCR). Here more scientific approaches would have been necessary to derive the missing values, and the use of a higher

tier exposure model. Substance-specific Life Cycle Data were also often missing in the used database, making LCAs impossible or causing high levels of uncertainties about the results. Similarly, the socio-economic assessment suffered from a lack of data availability. An example calculation on the socio-economic impact of substitution in a company resulted in monetized benefits to health and the environment. If that substitution happened in all respective companies and were extrapolated to the Baltic countries, the substitution of that substance could create benefits worth 2 613 000 EUR/year.

Antonia Reihlen, Senior Consultant, Germany, gave an overview about the overall project findings and recommendations related to information quality, downstream user capabilities, support to substitution, on market incentives, and to strengthening of the policy framework.

PANEL:
Ministries of Environment/ Agencies REACH Help desks in the Baltic States
Jonath Blokker-Rowe, European Commission, DG ENV, Chemicals Unit
Andreas Ahrens, European Chemicals Agency, ECHA
Manuel Montero-Ramirez, EASME, LIFE Unit, European Commission

The panel discussion started with the **question addressed to the representatives from national REACH help desks in the Baltic States**: what do you think was the best in the LIFE Fit for REACH project and what was useful for your organizations?

- **From Lithuania** it was stressed that this the project linked national authorities and industries, by providing knowledge and competence how to implement substitution. Also, Environmental Protection Agency welcomes and supports recommendations of this project and will implement them in the future as much as possible. A challenge was seen in addressing companies so that they would understand their need to substitute hazardous substances.
- **Latvia** pointed out that the project raised awareness in industry and provided knowledge to them to help overcoming problems with chemicals management and regulations. They saw a potential for many more companies that could benefit from substitution.
- **From Estonia** it was noticed that the project was a very useful experience for the REACH/CLP Help Desk and for SMEs. It was an important channel to raise awareness in SME about chemicals risk management, chemicals legislation and other issues. The project materials will help to communicate with companies in the future.

Question to ECHA representative: Do you agree with main project recommendations and which of them you can prioritize as high?

- The ECHA representative agreed with most of the recommendations. An important and specific point about substitution is the ability to compare chemicals to avoid regrettable substitution. This was stressed as very important and a benefit of REACH would be that such data is largely but not always available, e.g., for substances in low volumes.
- Another issue to focus on is that companies understand SDSs mainly as information source about occupational safety in the workplace. However, it is important to consider that under REACH, SDS are also a source of information supporting environmental protection, product design and substitution. The information provision and use of the information is still not sufficiently implemented on the market.
- Digitalization of SDS information could enhance availability, correctness, and completeness of the necessary information within the supply chain.

The European Commission, DG ENV, Chemicals Unit representative noticed that the LIFE Fit for REACH project is one of the most relevant projects in the area and that substitution is a slow process, mainly driven by legislation. The project's recommendations and findings should be shared on EU level. Communication is very important, and SMEs have needs to access relevant information about chemicals management and substitution. Should highlighted the idea to set up support centers for SMEs as feasible and confirmed the lack of data on chemicals in the environment an important deficit. More data on health would be available than on the environment. It was found interesting and helpful to illustrate that substitution of hazardous substances can lead to overall savings.
The Commission representative stated that chemicals risk management has always been a slightly isolated issue. The Green Deal could change this by the zero emissions and especially the non-toxic environment ambitions. This could give a new impetus on the topic and increase prevention and innovation in the field of chemicals.

The EASME, LIFE Unit, European Commission representative was asked for his opinion about the recommendations to the national level and to the EU level and whether they align with his experiences:

- The project was found very impressive and evaluated as successful, particularly due to having well reached the core actors. The results and recommendations of the project were found highly relevant for (the implementation of) the chemicals strategy and would provide a good, real example, how the strategy can be implemented.
- The recommendations were assessed to be precise, concentrated, directed to specific addressees, and emphasizing the main outcomes and key messages. They should be provided to the relevant stakeholders. The recommendations could be a source for new project ideas.

Summary of the overall project findings were presented by **Antonia Reihlen,** Senior Consultant, Germany

Feedback on findings of the project

State of the Chemicals Risk Management (CRM) and Substitution is similar in the Baltic States as in other EU countries (and the US). It is common, that there is a gap between the companies' perception of the own abilities on CRM and the actual performance. Awareness and competence building are key for improving CRM.

It would be good to investigate the inconsistencies in the company answers regarding their feeling well informed (90%), their use of SDSs as main information source and the statement that SDS are of insufficient quality. SDS are the most important information source, they should be compliant, understandable and include all relevant information.

There is a structural problem that companies are tasked with the CRM but lack competences, resources, and incentives to implement them. Knowledge on CMR is needed also in company support entities, including associations.

Substitution is not easy; it needs drivers, advice, and finances. Legislation is the core driver of substitution also in other countries, green claims only work in consumer-close market. Companies need good examples, such as from LIFE Fit for REACH, to identify benefits from substitution and initiate cooperation (share successes). It is frequently experienced that the substitution challenges are met in the actual implementation, therefore the project is a good success.

Annex no 1

Final Project Conference

Substitution, use reduction and overall improved chemicals risk management:

Companies in Baltic States are fitter for REACH!

Date: 24 November 2020 - virtual Baltic States
ZOOM: link to be provided upon registration
Start/End: 10:00 – 15:30 CET / 11:00 – 16:30 EET
Organizer: Baltic Environmental Forum

9:30	Entry of participants to the zoom room
10:00	Welcoming address *Alda Ozola, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development* Introduction to the event by *Heidrun Fammler, Project Manager, Baltic Environmental Forum*
10:15	Introduction to the event & Introduction to the LIFE Fit for REACH project: • What was it about, what were the goals and how was it implemented – Achievements in substitution and use reduction of hazardous substances as well as in basic chemicals risk management competences; paving the ground for even more substitution after the project. *Heidrun Fammler, Project Manager, Baltic Environmental Forum &* *Antonia Reihlen, Senior Consultant, Germany*
10:45	**Session 1: Chemicals Risk Management Basics & Communication**
• Project experiences with regard to the capacities of Baltic companies to obtain, understand and implement chemical information: general awareness on chemicals, classification and labelling, safety datasheets, inventories, communication in the supply chain	
Presentation	Ingrida Bremere, Baltic Environmental Forum Latvia Juhan Ruut, Hendrikson Ltd. Estonia Heli Nommsalu, Baltic Environmental Forum Estonia
Panel	Andreas Ahrens, European Chemicals Agency Lothar Lieck, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work Kerstin Heitmann, com4chem, Germany N.N. Inspector, Enforcement authority or REACH help desk.
12:00	***Coffee break (with your own coffee)***
12:30	**Session 2: Substitution, use reduction and Green Markets**
• Project experiences on approaches of, support factors and barriers for Baltic companies regarding substitution and use reduction of hazardous substances as well as forming markets for safer products, e.g. via green procurement or green claims	

Presentation	Juste Kukucione & Grazvydas Jegelevicius, Baltic Environmental Forum Lithuania Jana Simanovska, Ecodesign Competence Centre, Latvia
Panel	Denis Mottet, European Chemicals Agency Tonie Wickman, Chemicals Substitution Centre, Sweden Joel Tickner, University of Massachusetts Lowell, USA Yifaat Baron, Oeko Institute, Germany
14:00	***Coffee break***
14:15	**Session 3: Project impacts, conclusions and recommendations**

- LIFE Fit for REACH in a helicopter perspective: measuring impacts of the project, learnings for a wider context, policy recommendations and conclusions from the meeting

Presentation	Jolita Kruopiene, Kaunas Technical University, Lithuania Daiva Semeniene, Environmental Policy Centre, Lithuania Antonia Reihlen, Senior Consultant, Germany
Panel	Ministries of Environment/Agencies REACH help desks Baltic States Jonath Blokker-Rowe, European Commission, DG ENV, Chemicals Unit Andreas Ahrens, European Chemicals Agency Manuel Montero-Ramirez, EASME, LIFE Unit, European Commission
15:15 – 15:30	***End of the event & Farewell*** *Heidrun Fammler, Project Manager, Baltic Environmental Forum*

Baltic Pilot Cases – video show - during breaks:

- ***Tenachem***, Latvia - one of the leading Latvian producers for professional construction chemicals substituted phthalates in sealants for insulating glass units
- ***Epokate***, Estonia – producer of two-component epoxy resin materials for floor coverings successfully substituted the reprotoxic nonylphenol in its products
- ***Mayeri Industries***, Estonia - producer of detergents and car chemicals removed or reduced the quantity of four hazardous components from their products
- ***Henkel Balti***, Estonia- manufacturer of polyurethane construction foams minimized workers' exposure, reduced the amounts of hazardous waste, and lowered air emissions
- ***Vakaru metalgama***, Lithuania - ship building and repair company reduced emissions of volatile organic compounds and lowered reproductive toxicity risk categories by substituting the product used
- ***Ameralabs***, Lithuania– 3D printing material producers substituted hazardous substance in the printing liqui
- ***Kvist***, Latvia - furniture producer substituted polyurethane paints with water based in production of particular products
- ***Projecroom***, Latvia - printing house substituted solvent based inks with latex inks
- ***WESS Motors***, Latvia – official Toyota dealer and service provider made full inventory of the chemicals used in daily work
- ***Varva***, Lithuania – jewellery studio substituted hazardous substances in the jewellery making material