



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

www.gov.uk/defra

Proposals to ban the use of plastic microbeads in cosmetics and personal care products in the UK and call for evidence on other sources of microplastics entering the marine environment

Summary of responses

July 2017



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government



Department of
**Agriculture, Environment
and Rural Affairs**
www.daera-ni.gov.uk



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

© Crown copyright 2014

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

This document/publication is also available on our website at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/banning-the-use-of-microbeads-in-cosmetics-and-personal-care-products>

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent to us at:

marinelitter@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Contents

Introduction	4
Overview of responses	4
Proposals for a ban on microbeads in cosmetics and personal care products	5
Gathering evidence to inform future UK action on marine microplastic pollution	14
Annex A: List of consultation questions	19
Annex B: List of respondents	21

Introduction

1. This document contains the UK government response to the consultation on “Proposals to ban the use of plastic microbeads in cosmetics and personal care products in the UK and call for evidence on other sources of microplastics entering the marine environment” which was held between 20th December 2016 and 28th February 2017 (<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/marine/microbead-ban-proposals>).
2. The consultation asked for comments on proposals for the UK’s implementation of a ban on the manufacture and sale of cosmetics and personal care products containing microbeads which may harm the marine environment. The consultation also sought to gather evidence on the extent of the environmental impacts of further sources of potential marine plastic pollution, to inform future UK actions to protect the marine environment. See Annex A for a list of consultation questions.
3. The UK government and Devolved Administrations would like to thank everyone who contributed to our consultation. The proposals have been refined following the consultation exercise and the responses will continue to help us develop future UK actions to protect the marine environment.

Overview of responses

4. We received a total of 431 responses. The majority were from individuals, but we also received responses from a wide range of organisations including cosmetics companies and associations, environmental charities and campaign groups, academic institutions, local authorities and fishing organisations. See Annex B for the list of respondents.
5. A number of respondents simply acknowledged being consulted; the majority provided comments on the proposed microbead ban and/or more general marine litter issues.
6. The majority of the respondents welcomed the proposed ban. Many suggested modifications to the scope of the ban and/or when the ban should come into force. Of these, some proposed the scope should be increased to cover additional products; others that it should be restricted to cover fewer products. Some called for more time for the ban to be introduced whereas others asked that the ban be implemented as soon as possible. Suggestions were also provided on alternative wording of the ban, exemptions, methods for compliance monitoring and enforcement, and potential impacts on industries, imports and the

environment. These suggestions have been used to refine our proposals and prepare draft legislation.

7. Many respondents recognised the need to take further action to address additional sources of marine litter. Responses included suggestions on additional sources of marine pollution from a variety of industries and applications, as well as relevant research. Responses also included possible interventions to address other sources of marine pollution, including improvements to infrastructure, developing technologies and voluntary commitments.
8. A number of respondents commented on other more general environmental issues. These have been noted but will not be considered as part of this consultation exercise.
9. Where appropriate, we will share information from responses we received with colleagues across OSPAR (the Oslo and Paris Convention for the protection of the marine environment of the North-East Atlantic), particularly those task leads responsible for implementing key actions from the OSPAR Regional Action Plan on Marine Litter¹.

Proposals for a ban on microbeads in cosmetics and personal care products

Issue raised: scope of the ban

10. Many respondents expressed support for aspects of the proposed ban, including the exclusion of an exemption for biodegradable products, the absence of a lower size limit for microbeads and the absence of a restriction on the basis of function (i.e. the ban should not be limited to microbeads used for particular purposes, e.g. exfoliation).
11. Several respondents asked that the ban be restricted to products designed for exfoliation and/or cleaning, in line with the US ban.
12. Many respondents asked for the scope of the ban to be evidence based and that it should be adjusted to ensure it targets plastics causing harm in the marine

¹ <http://www.ospar.org/documents?v=34422>

environment. However, the comments received varied on how to address the cases where robust evidence is lacking. While some advocated a more precautionary approach, e.g. that we ban plastic microbeads in all products unless there is clear evidence that they do not cause harm to the marine environment, others said that products should only be banned if there is clear evidence that they do cause harm.

13. Several respondents asked for the ban to be extended to cover all products that result in microbeads being washed down the drain and therefore that might enter the marine environment, including “leave-on” makeup, and sunscreen. Some raised specific brands or products of make-up suspected of containing microplastic particles. Details were provided of a survey of consumer behaviour suggesting that some of these products are also washed down the drain and may therefore contribute to the microplastic load entering the marine environment.
14. Other respondents stated that the ban should not be extended to leave-on cosmetics because they said there was a lack of evidence of environmental impact and that reformulating these products would be difficult. Responses from the cosmetics industry indicated that the reformulation of thousands of products would be required. They stated that some companies may require up to 90% of their product portfolios to be reformulated. They noted that reformulation is lengthy and expensive and as such would have significant cost implications for the whole industry, particularly small companies, could damage global competitiveness, restrict consumer choice and could mean that large quantities of products would have to go to landfill if insufficient time were given for reformulation.
15. A few respondents suggested that rinse-off cosmetics are a sensible starting point, because there is firm evidence of the harm they can cause and suitable alternatives have already been developed, but that future work should address other applications including makeup which may also be rinsed off at some stage.
16. Some respondents identified specific categories of polymer that they felt should be included in the ban, including semi-solid plastics and liquid/wax polymers. This is because in the marine environment these polymers behave in the same way as solid microplastics.
17. Some respondents suggested that cleaning products should be included in the ban. However the UK Cleaning Products Industry Association (UKCPI) confirmed that no microbeads are used in UK-produced household and industrial cleaning products.

Government Response: scope of the ban

18. The proposed ban is designed to prevent the use of plastic microbeads in products designed to be washed down the drain, in order to protect the marine environment. The purpose for which the plastic particles are added to a product does not influence the harm they cause. We therefore consider it inappropriate to restrict the scope of the ban to plastic microbeads used as exfoliants and/or cleansers rather than all rinse-off cosmetics and personal care products containing microbeads.
19. UK government is seeking to balance its commitment to protect the marine environment with a proportionate application of legislation. There is clear, robust evidence that microbeads are used in rinse-off cosmetics and personal care products, that they reach the marine environment and that they cause harm there. This was the basis for our proposals. Based on the evidence presented in response to the consultation there is insufficient evidence as to which products contain microplastics and how they are disposed of. The process of reformulating and determining suitable alternatives is also less well advanced. We therefore do not consider that it is appropriate to extend the ban to other products at this stage. This approach is consistent with action being taken in other countries who have committed to take action to prohibit microbeads in rinse-off cosmetics and personal care products.
20. Nonetheless we recognise the potential for microbeads in other products to reach the marine environment under certain circumstances. We will therefore be working with the Hazardous Substances Advisory Committee (HSAC) to review the available evidence on the existence of solid plastic particles in products other than rinse-off cosmetic and personal care products, and their likelihood of entering the marine environment. We will review the position in the light of their advice.
21. The UK government recognises the hard work of the cosmetics industry to reformulate and remove microbeads from its rinse-off products up to this point. We encourage the industry to continue its good work by considering the replacement of microbeads in any other products with the potential to reach the marine environment.
22. The OSPAR Regional Action Plan on Marine Litter includes an action to engage with the wider European cosmetics industry to remove plastics from cosmetic and personal care products. We will share relevant responses from this consultation and the results of the HSAC review with the task leads for this action and will continue to support OSPAR's work in this area.

Issue raised: timings

23. Many respondents agreed with the proposed timescale for implementation of the ban. Some asked that it be brought in sooner to minimise the release of microplastics to the environment; others said that the timescale was not long enough to allow companies to reformulate their products.
24. Several respondents noted that if the scope of the ban were extended, additional time would be required for the reformulation of products that were previously out of scope. Some suggested that companies supplying hard-to-reformulate products be allowed to apply for an extension to the timeframe.
25. It was also noted that Devolved Administrations should follow a similar timescale to England.

Government response: timings

26. The timetable we have developed reflects our ambition to take action as quickly as possible. We recognise it is a challenging timescale. This is to minimise the loss of plastic to the marine environment, balancing the need of industries to reformulate with the fact that suitable alternatives have already been identified and are widely used. The industry has been working to remove microbeads for some time already.
27. The Devolved Administrations will introduce legislation according to their own legislative processes and timetables. Legislation will be published prior to being made and therefore those with an interest will be able to make representations on it.

Issue raised: alternative wording for a ban

28. Many respondents suggested that clear definitions were required for a number of terms, including plastic, microplastic, microbead, solid, rinse-off and cosmetic and personal care products. Some provided definitions for one or more of these terms.

Government response: alternative wording for a ban

29. We are grateful for all the suggestions received which have been considered and used in the drafting of the legislation where appropriate.

Issue raised: exemptions

30. Some respondents suggested that exemptions should be provided for medical products, although no specific examples of such products were given.

31. Others suggested that biodegradable products should be exempt, or that the wording should leave room for biodegradable innovations.

Government response: exemptions

32. There are currently no agreed standards for biodegradability in the marine environment. Although certain items are marketed as compostable or biodegradable, these frequently require specific conditions such as the application of heat or UV light. The conditions deep in the ocean are considerably different. Many plastic items break into smaller pieces in the marine environment but do not break down completely into harmless constituents. No materials have been proven to adequately biodegrade in the open marine environment. We therefore do not consider it appropriate to include an exemption on this basis. No medical application for rinse-off plastic microbeads has yet been identified. Future exemption on the grounds of medical applications could be considered in light of new medical advancements.

Issue raised: interventions and warnings for products that are not designed to go down the drain but may be disposed of that way

33. Many respondents said that any products with the potential to be disposed of down the drain should be within scope of the ban (see “Issue raised: scope of the ban” above). Others said that product labelling and/or a campaign should be used to raise awareness of the potential for harm to the marine environment and to encourage consumers to dispose of these products in the bin (e.g. wipe off make up and put the wipe or cotton pad in the bin, rather than washing it off in the shower). The European Disposables and Nonwovens Association’s (EDANA) “Don’t flush” symbol was identified as a potential symbol to make use of on packaging.

34. Some respondents suggested that an environmental quality assurance labelling scheme could be developed, with the initial aim of labelling products in the cosmetics sector but which could, in due course, be rolled out to other relevant products which may potentially enter the marine environment.

Government response: interventions and warnings for products that are not designed to go down the drain but may be disposed of that way

35. The OSPAR Regional Action Plan on Marine Litter includes an action to evaluate all products and processes that include primary microplastics and act, if appropriate, to reduce their impact on the marine environment. We will share relevant responses from this consultation with the task leads for this action and will continue to support OSPAR’s work in this area.

Issue raised: compliance and enforcement

36. Several respondents suggested methods for testing compliance. Some pointed out that analytical techniques will not be a viable method to determine the origins of any microbeads found in marine litter. Others noted the considerable reduction in microbead use already achieved by the cosmetics industry on a voluntary basis, suggesting that non-compliance with a ban may be limited. Some suggested that the industry could in effect self-regulate, given the recommendations of industry leaders to comply and the likelihood of manufacturers testing competitors' products and/or that a formal industry body could be set up to ensure compliance.
37. Some respondents suggested that compliance could be monitored by the appropriate Competent Authority reviewing the Cosmetic Product Information File (PIF) and aligning the ingredient with the function. However, others noted that reviewing a cosmetic product's ingredient list of INCI names (International Nomenclature for Cosmetic Ingredients) is not sufficient because many substances listed may exist in different forms, e.g. the INCI name used for ingredient labelling does not identify the physical form of an ingredient.
38. Some respondents suggested that enforcement was unlikely to be required on account of the anticipated levels of non-compliance being low. Some suggested that enforcement should be undertaken by agents such as Local Authority Trading Standards teams or the Health and Safety Executive.
39. Some suggested that enforcement should focus on specific areas they perceived to be of higher risk, such as non-members of trade associations and imports.

Government response: compliance and enforcement

40. We agree that the rate of non-compliance is expected to be low given the action that has been taken to date by the cosmetics industry. The enforcement regime is needed to make the legislation effective and to create the necessary deterrent effect. Accordingly, in England Trading Standards will be appointed as the regulator to assess compliance with the ban and to carry out enforcement action when necessary. They have considerable experience in the analysis of consumer products and the enforcement of legislation relating to consumer products including cosmetics.
41. In England, although non-compliance with the ban will be an offence, it is the Government's preference to enforce non-compliance by using the civil sanctions regime. On consideration of the comments received through the consultation process it has been decided that the sanctions which are most appropriate and will be available to the regulator will be variable monetary penalties, compliance

notices, stop notices and enforcement undertakings as set out in Part 3 of the Regulatory Enforcement and Sanctions Act 1990.

42. Anyone who is interested in and/or potentially affected by the ban will be able to make representations on the detail of this enforcement regime (or indeed any other matter) when the draft legislation for England is published in the London Gazette later in the year.
43. The Devolved Administrations are considering appropriate mechanisms for enforcement.

Issue raised: costs and/or constraints for industry

44. Many respondents gave details of the steps required by industry to implement the proposed ban, including development of suitable alternatives, reformulation and testing. However, little detail of financial cost was provided.
45. Many respondents noted that the cost to industry would be significantly greater if the scope of the ban were extended to leave-on products because this would require the reformulation of thousands of products. Some added that the benefit to the environment would be negligible.
46. Some respondents noted that the phased implementation of the ban and its timescale permitted cosmetics companies time to use up stock, which limited their financial burden.
47. Some suggested that non-plastic alternatives may be more expensive and that there could be an additional cost of developing new labels even for products outside the scope of the ban, e.g. by adding Do Not Flush symbols.
48. Some suggested that the costs should be passed onto consumers and some pointed out that the use of more expensive non-plastic alternatives could have a negative impact on exports because UK companies would be at a disadvantage.
49. Some respondents suggested that Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) should be eligible for grants to support Research and Development and investment in new equipment and infrastructure.

Government response: costs and/or constraints for industry

50. We believe that the timetable for implementation of the ban is reasonable and that no further support is needed to comply with the ban. In reaching this decision we have taken into account the fact that a significant part of the industry has been working on the voluntary phase out of microbeads from cosmetics and personal care products for a number of years.

Issue raised: consistency with other countries' bans

51. Several respondents suggested that any ban should be consistent with legislation in other countries (both within and beyond the EU) to facilitate free movement of goods and to avoid disadvantaging the UK market. In particular, several respondents noted the value in aligning the scope and definitions in our proposals with those used in other global markets.

Government response: consistency with other countries' bans

52. We agree with this suggestion to be consistent with others' approaches where possible and appropriate. Our approach is to target those products where we know there is clear, robust evidence that microbeads reach the marine environment. We have shared our approach with other countries and encourage them to follow our lead. We are working with OSPAR, other EU Member States, the G7 and other relevant international fora to support the development of wider international bans, which align with the UK ban.

53. It is accepted that this ban potentially affects trade. We will, therefore, notify our proposals to the EU (under the Technical Standards Directive) and World Trade Organization (under the Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement), in order to allow other countries the opportunity to consider the ban, its impact on trade and the justification for that (environmental protection), and to make representations on it.

Issue raised: impact on imports

54. Few respondents provided suggestions of potential impacts on imports. Some suggested that key importers should be encouraged or supported to make the necessary changes to their own approach.

Government response: impact on imports

55. As highlighted above many countries, including countries that import cosmetics and personal care products to the UK are either implementing bans of their own or are considering doing so. Therefore we do not consider that there will be a significant impact on imports.

Issue raised: costs/risks of alternatives

56. We received several suggestions for alternatives to plastic microbeads. These included shells, seeds and kernels; leaves, fruit and seaweed; microcrystalline cellulose particles; starches derived from corn, tapioca and caruba; salt and sugar; waxes such as beeswax, castor wax and rice bran wax; and minerals such as silica, quartz and clay. In addition to this several respondents commented on

the importance of ensuring that the environmental impacts of these potential alternatives were carefully considered before being used.

Government response: costs/risks of alternatives

57. We agree that it is important for manufacturers to ensure that any alternatives to plastic microbeads should be sustainable and that their impact on the environment should be carefully assessed.

Our proposals

58. We are grateful for the evidence received in response to this consultation. Based on this evidence the overall objective of our proposals remains to ban the use of rinse-off plastic microbeads in cosmetics and personal care products where there is clear and robust evidence of harm to the marine environment. Where appropriate we have used the responses to refine our proposals. The main features of our revised proposals are:

- i. the timescale for the ban in England becoming effective is unchanged: the ban on manufacture to start 1st Jan 2018 and the ban on sale 30th June 2018;
- ii. we have developed precise definitions of “microbead”, “plastic” and “rinse-off personal care product” to clearly define the scope of the ban;
- iii. we have retained the scope of rinse-off products, but are additionally working with the Hazardous Substances Advisory Committee (HSAC) to assess the case for addressing further categories of products.
- iv. we have identified Trading Standards as a suitable regulator to manage compliance and enforcement in England.
- v. enforcement in England will be carried out through a range of sanctions including variable monetary penalties, compliance notices, stop notices and enforcement undertakings; and
- vi. the Devolved Administrations are considering appropriate enforcement mechanisms, regulators and timescales according to devolution settlements.

Gathering evidence to inform future UK action on marine microplastic pollution

59. Key sources of microplastics were set out in Part 3: Background of the consultation document. Respondents suggested additional sources to those identified in our consultation document and raised potential interventions to address them. Some recognised that the available evidence on the relative importance of the sources of marine microplastic pollution was limited.

Issue raised: other sources of microplastic pollution

60. Many respondents suggested other sources of marine microplastic pollution. Suggestions included pre-production plastic pellets (nurdles), microfibres released from washing machines, tyre particles, plastic beads used as aerators at wastewater treatment plants, the spreading of wastewater sludge as agricultural fertiliser, and polystyrene boxes used in the fishing industry to transport fish and keep them cold.

61. Some respondents identified research being undertaken into some of these sources, including research on the tendency of tyre particles to be retained in river sediment rather than entering the marine environment and whether it is toxic.

Issue raised: interventions to address other sources of marine microplastic pollution

62. Some suggested methods to address some of these sources. The suggestions included:

- i. introducing a Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) for plastic bottles and/or other items;
- ii. adding filters to washing machines to catch textile fibres released during washing;
- iii. encouraging organisations and industries to sign up to Operation Clean Sweep, a plastics industry initiative to reduce the loss of pre-production pellets (nurdles);
- iv. encouraging the use of biodegradable materials to replace the use of plastics, for example in agriculture;
- v. improving waste collections including biowaste such as compostable bags;

- vi. increasing screening at sewage treatment works;
- vii. encouraging the use of glass and metal/wood products over plastic; and
- viii. improving education and improving enforcement to prevent fishing gear “loss”.

Government response: interventions to address other sources of marine microplastic pollution

63. The UK aims for this to be the first generation since the industrial revolution to leave the environment in a better state than it inherited it. As such it has put in place a wide range of actions and policies to reduce and prevent marine litter.
64. The UK Marine Strategy Part Three, published in 2015, set out actions being taken to address litter in the marine environment. It covered actions to prevent land-based and sea-based sources of litter, actions to improve education and actions to remove litter that has already reached the marine environment.
65. As marine litter is a transboundary problem we work with other countries through OSPAR and other international fora, including the G7 group and the United Nations Environment Programme. Through OSPAR the UK and neighbouring countries have developed and are implementing a Regional Action Plan on marine litter.
66. We also conduct monitoring of marine litter on beaches, in the water column and on the seafloor, and play an active role in advising and influencing marine litter and microplastics research.
67. We are discussing with environmental groups and research institutes how best to address pre-production pellet (nurdle) loss, such as by supporting the plastics industry to sign up to Operation Clean Sweep, an initiative to implement good practice aimed at reducing the loss of preproduction pellets during transport and use.
68. Much of the debris in the marine environment was originally lost or discarded on land and therefore actions to reduce waste and increase the efficiency of waste management systems contribute to a reduction in the amount of litter reaching the marine environment.
69. Supporting greater resource efficiency and increasing the effective use of resources is a key priority for the UK Government. We are working with producers across the whole material value chain to explore how products can be better designed and more efficiently produced to maximise the value we get from them and minimise the environmental impacts associated with their extraction, use and disposal.

70. Local Authorities are best placed to deliver local recycling services, and with householders have played a key role in increasing the UK's recycling rate to 44% in 2015/16. The amount of plastics sent for recycling has increased. The total amount of plastic material collected from waste from households for recycling has increased from 279k tonnes in 2010, to over 420k tonnes in 2014.
71. Recycling rates have remained relatively stable since 2012, after increasing strongly from 2000. To meet the 50% target the Government recognises the need to work with local authorities to expand the range of materials collected, including plastics, and to make it easier for householders to recycle. In addition, working through the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) the Government is developing and delivering activities in support of both the use of recycled materials in new products, and to identify opportunities to rationalise packaging formats (in particular plastic packaging) to those that are recyclable and for which there is a steady market.
72. Recent additional actions include the 5p charge on single use carrier bags which was introduced in Wales in 2010; Northern Ireland in 2013; Scotland in 2014; and England in 2015. So far this charge has been highly effective at reducing consumption of single-use carrier bags (by around 70% or more) whilst raising millions of pounds for good causes including charities and community groups.
73. The recent Litter Strategy for England (2017), developed by Defra in collaboration with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and the Department for Transport (DfT), aims to apply best practice in education, enforcement and infrastructure to deliver a substantial reduction in litter and littering behaviour on land, which in turn will lead to a reduction in the amount of litter reaching the marine environment.
74. As part of our work to deliver the Litter Strategy for England, we have established a number of working groups to consider specific issues. It is intended that one such working group will look at different voluntary and economic incentives to improve recycling and reuse of packaging, and to reduce the incidence of commonly littered items. As well as voluntary models, the scope of the intended Working Group includes consideration of regulatory options and measures to target particular types of item or product, including the full costs impacts and benefits of different types of deposit and reward and return schemes for drinks containers. The independent Advisory Committee on Packaging has also established a task force to look at the role packaging design could play in reducing littering and littering behaviour. This will include looking at design aspects (e.g. detachable caps) across a range of commonly-littered items including plastic drinks bottles. The Strategy also announces a new 'litter

innovation fund' to trial small scale projects that could be replicated more widely, including those aimed at reducing litter entering the marine environment.

75. Both Scotland and Northern Ireland have published dedicated marine litter strategies. Scotland published its Marine Litter Strategy² in 2014, setting out the approach to ensure the amount of litter entering the marine environment is minimised to bring ecological, economic and social benefits. The Northern Ireland Marine Litter Strategy³ was introduced in 2013. It aims to reduce the amount of litter entering the sea through measures targeted at changing behaviour, data collection, enforcement and having an appropriate coastal infrastructure in place; and also to remove some of litter already present. In Wales, stakeholders are currently developing a Marine Litter Action Plan to deliver best practice to tackle marine and coastal litter.

76. We are also working with the water industry to reduce the amount of litter entering the environment from sewage and waste water systems, in line with European directives on water quality and waste water treatment. Sewage treatment is not normally designed to specifically remove microplastics. However the normal level of treatment in the UK will remove a proportion of microplastics from final effluent. Furthermore larger plastic items are removed during treatment and this reduces a potential source of secondary microplastic. In recent years there has been significant investment in providing measures to improve coastal sewage treatment works and collecting systems, including adding screening to and/or reducing volumes from overflows to limit polluting events. This investment includes over £8 billion in England and Wales between 1990 and 2010 and further investment is planned between now and 2020.

77. In addition, campaigns by water companies educate the public and businesses on items and material that should not be disposed of in sewers, avoiding blockage and reducing items that might otherwise pass through sewers and treatment processes. As part of this, water companies are working with manufacturers to change the way products are marketed and reduce the amount of material flushed away. Measures to address pollution from surface water runoff and drainage are also likely to reduce litter entering rivers and other water

² <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2014/09/4891>

³ <https://www.daera-ni.gov.uk/publications/northern-ireland-marine-litter-strategy>

bodies. Work is ongoing to ensure that what is disposed of in sewers can break down in the sewage treatment system to reduce impact on the environment.

78. While there is currently no plastic proven to fully biodegrade in the marine environment, the Government supports the development of sustainable biodegradable plastics and other materials. We have committed to work with the Research Councils to help develop a standard for biodegradable plastic bags as part of the emerging work on a national Bioeconomy Strategy (while also recognising the need to avoid microplastics pollution).
79. In June 2017 the UK joined the UN Clean Seas campaign, a platform which aims to connect individuals, civil society groups, industry and governments to transform habits, practices, standards and policies around the globe to dramatically reduce marine litter and the harm it causes.
80. The OSPAR Regional Action Plan on Marine Litter includes a number of relevant actions including one to evaluate all products and processes that include primary microplastics and act, if appropriate, to reduce their impact on the marine environment. We will share relevant responses from this consultation with OSPAR to support their implementation of their Regional Action Plan.
81. We will continue to assess the potential for further actions to reduce marine plastic pollution.

Annex A: List of consultation questions

Consultation questions on the proposals for a ban

- a. Are our proposals for a ban fit for purpose? If not, please explain why. What alternative wording in a ban would most effectively reduce the risk of microplastic particles from personal care and cosmetic products reaching the marine environment?
- b. This proposed ban applies to rinse-off cosmetics and personal care products including but not limited to exfoliating scrubs, shower gels and toothpastes. Is this category appropriate? If not, what range of products should the ban apply to, bearing in mind that the purpose of the ban is to protect the marine environment? Please supply evidence to support your suggestions.
- c. Should any products be exempt from the ban? If so, please supply evidence to support your suggestions.
- d. If products are not designed to go down the drain, but may still be disposed of in this way, what interventions or warnings are appropriate to protect the marine environment?
- e. How should compliance with the ban be monitored?
- f. Our proposals for enforcement are set out at point (f) on page 9. We would welcome comments on our proposed approach, suggestions for alternative approaches and views on how enforcement of the ban can most effectively and proportionately be carried out? Details of the types of civil sanctions available are set out in the Regulatory Enforcement and Sanctions Act 2008 Part 3 Civil Sanctions sections in particular sections 39, 42 and 4612.
- g. What costs and/or constraints would industry, including in particular small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), incur in meeting a ban on microplastics in cosmetics and personal care products?
- h. To what extent will imports be affected by the ban? Please supply evidence to support your suggestions.
- i. What are the risks that alternatives to microbeads will themselves have significant environmental impacts? If so, how could these risks be avoided, minimised or mitigated? Please supply evidence to support your suggestions.

¹³ <http://www.eunomia.co.uk/report-tag/microplastics>

Consultation questions on further sources of potential marine microplastic pollution including larger marine plastic debris that breaks down into microplastics, such as plastic bottles and other packaging

a. Key sources of microplastics are set out in Part 3: Background. Are any missing or inappropriate? Please provide evidence to support your response.

b. Which sources of microplastic pose the greatest risks to the marine environment? Please provide evidence to support your response.

c. How should sources be prioritised for action? Please explain your response.

d. What possible interventions could be developed to reduce these risks and how might the cost of these interventions be minimised? What is the likely impact on industry of these interventions? Please explain your response.

Annex B: List of respondents

Named organisations

A Rocha International
Aberdeenshire Council
Acheson & Acheson Ltd
Akzo Nobel Surface Chemistry
An MEP
Anglian Water Services Limited
Angling Trust
Angling-School CIC
Ards and North Down Borough Council
Ashland Specialties UK Limited
Association of Scottish Shellfish Growers
BASF
Beiersdorf UK Ltd
Belfast City Council
Bio-based and Biodegradable Industries Association
Bio-based and Biodegradable Industries Association
Bristol Avon Catchment Partnership
British Coatings Federation Ltd
British Plastics Federation
British Retail Consortium
British Tyre Manufacturers' Association Ltd
Catholic Action for Animals
Cedre (French national Documentation, Research and Experimentation on accidental water pollutions)
Chanel
Charlotte Tilbury Beauty Ltd
Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management
Chichester Harbour Conservancy
City to Sea CIC
Colne Valley Fisheries Consultative
Community of Arran Seabed Trust
Cornish Plastic Pollution Coalition
Cornwall Council
Cosmetics Europe
COSMOS-standard AISBL
COTY

Croda International Plc
Cyngor Tref Conwy Town Council
Devon County Council
Dorset Catchment Partnerships
Dorset Wildlife Trust
DR COSREG LTD
Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water
Environmental Investigation Agency
Eunomia
Fauna and Flora International
FDD International
Fidra
GlaxoSmithKline
Greenpeace
H. Bronnley & Co. UK Ltd
Hallstar
Have You Got The Bottle? campaign team
Henkel AG & Co. KGaA
Johnson&Johnson
KANEKA
Kao UK
Keep Britain Tidy
Keep NI Beautiful
Keep Scotland Beautiful
King's College London
Lamberti S.p.A.
Langstone Harbour Board
Litter Free Coast and Sea Dorset and East Devon
Llanarthne Community Council
Local Government Association Coastal Special Interest Group
Love your Lough Voluntary Marine Conservation Group
Lubrizol Advanced Materials Europe BVBA
Marine Conservation Society
McBride plc
MediChem Manufacturing Ltd
Meller Design Solutions
Mercona (GB) Limited
Microbeads coalition (Greenpeace, Marine Conservation Society, Fauna and Flora International, Environmental Investigation Agency)
National Parks Wales (officer reponse for Brecon Beacons, Pembrokeshire Coast and Snowdonia National Park Authorities)
Natural Word environmental writing, editing and communications

NE Scotland Fisheries Development Partnership
Neal's Yard Remedies
Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
Northern Ireland Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside
Northumberland IFCA
Northumbrian Water
Pangaea Laboratories Ltd
Pembrokeshire County Council
Personal Care Products Council
Pierre Fabre Limited
Pisces Environmental & Fisheries Services
Plymouth City Council
Port of London Authority- Cleaner Thames Campaign
Procter & Gamble UK
ProTec Ingredia Limited
Pupils2Parliament
PZ Cussons (UK) Ltd
Road Safety Markings Association
Save Newcastle Wildlife
SCFF
Scottish Marine Animal Stranding Scheme/ SRUC
Scottish Water
Seafood Shetland
Seagull Fishing Tackle
Severn Trent Water Ltd
Shetland Shellfish Management Organisation
Society of Chief Officers of Trading Standards in Scotland
Soil Association
Solent International Ltd
Solvay Solutions UK Ltd
Solway Firth Partnership
South Western Fish Producer Organisation LTD
Southern Water
Strangford Lough & Lecale Partnership
Surfachem Ltd
The Cosmetic Toiletry & Perfumery Association
The Danish Ecological Council
The Dow Chemical Company
The Estee Lauder Companies
The European Federation for Cosmetic Ingredients
Torfaen Friends of the Earth

Transition Falmouth
Tywyn Town Council
UK Cleaning Products Industry Association
UK Water Industry Research Ltd
University of Plymouth
Variati SPA
Wales Environment Link
Walgreens Boots Alliance
Welsh St Donats Community Council
Wessex Water
Women's Institute
Wildlife and Countryside Link
World Animal Protection
Wrigley Angling Club
Zoological Society of London

Unnamed organisations

Business involved in the manufacture and sale of cosmetics and personal care products
Cleaning / Organising
Cosmetic Industry
Personal Care Manufacturer
Sewerage undertaker

Organisations that asked to remain confidential (6)

Individuals (289)