

SPICE COMMITTEE 4 MEETING MINUTES

17.04.2019



Minutes written by: Quantis

In-person participants:

- Sabine Bouillet-Lubot, Aptar
- H el ene Villecroze, Chanel
- Nicolas Mathieu, Chanel
- Jordan Rey, Clarins
- Nathalie Perroquin, Coty
- Aurore Fandard, Coty
- Elisa Trebes, Heinz-Glas
- Thomas Eidloth, Heinz-Glas
- David Petit, Herm es Parfums
- David Bayard, L'Occitane en Provence
- Philippe De Brugi ere, L'Occitane en Provence
- Philippe Bonningue, L'Or al
- R egine Fr etard, LVMH
- Tobias Koetter, Schwan Cosmetics
- Armel Yver, Shiseido
- Kenji Ohashi, Shiseido
- C edric Laplace, Sisley
- Samantha Sauvestre, Sisley
- Sophie Bonnier, CITEO
- Julien Romestant, Cosmetic Valley
- Auriane Bodivit, Quantis
- Camille Rosay, Quantis
- Dimitri Caudrelier, Quantis
- Fran ois Witte, Quantis
- Thibault Compagnon, Quantis
- Amanda Martin, Quantis
- Caroline Ruiz Palmer, MWE

Remote participants:

- Michele Del Grosso, Aptar
- Mike Hercek, Avon
- Cesar Tadashi, Avon
- Raqy Delos Reyes, Avon
- Robert DiPalma, Estée Lauder
- Michael Christel, Estée Lauder
- Thomas Myers, PCPC

Description: The Members of the SPICE initiative - the Sustainable Packaging Initiative for CosmEtics - gather for a working session in view of the presentation of Year 1 deliverables, and of the validation of key orientations and scope to explore in Year 2, as well as the planned overall budget.

Opening of the meeting

Introduction

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) welcomes all participants.

He informs the participants that since the last committee there are no new organizations joining the initiative, but three new participants will attend today's meeting. He adds that Amanda Martin, a Quantis consultant, will join for the second part of the meeting.

Meeting agenda

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) presents the meeting's agenda:

0. Antitrust Statement
1. Roundtable: SPICE Members and their representatives
2. Recyclability
3. Case Studies
4. SPICE Database
5. SPICE Year 2 proposition
6. Communication
7. Timeline and next steps

0. Antitrust statement

Caroline Ruiz Palmer (MWE) introduces the antitrust statement that was signed by all participants:

While some initiatives among companies may be both legal and beneficial to their industry, group initiatives between competitors are often suspected to be anticompetitive and therefore illegal by National Competition Authorities.

In this respect, being a member of such an initiative, as being part of any formal or informal meetings, where other competitors are present, may involve risks, especially regarding the type of information likely to be shared around the table.

As a general rule, participants shall not exchange any sensitive information in relation to their business or company nor reach any understanding, expressed or implied, with the object or effect of restricting competition. Participants may only discuss the issues at hand in the agenda of the meeting. Therefore, it is the responsibility of each participant to avoid raising improper topics for discussion.

Participants to the meeting must not discuss topics such as:

- Prices, including any subject relating to prices or its components such as discounts, rebates, surcharges, price changes, price differentiation, profit margins, price increases, credit, or any other sales condition;
- Costs, including any component relating to costs such as production or distribution expenses, formulas for cost accounting, methods for cost calculation;
- Information relating to sales and company's production, especially production volumes, sales profits, operating capabilities, level of stocks or supplies;
- On-going non-public litigations;
- Any of a company's upcoming and confidential projects, including those relating to sales and to marketing strategy, along with production and technology, wage policy, R&D programs;
- Information relating to the relationship with customers/suppliers (including terms and conditions).

This applies not only to discussions in formal meetings but also to informal discussions before, during and after meetings.

Participants shall observe the below procedure for each meeting:

- The agenda of the meeting, including the name and position of each participant, must be submitted to legal review prior to the meeting.
- The meeting shall be conducted on the basis of the agreed agenda only.
- The antitrust statement may be read by each participant at the beginning of each meeting.
- If the discussions turn to improper subjects during a meeting, the concerned participants will be required to put an end to the discussion and to leave the meeting immediately.

- A comprehensive summary of all meetings shall be taken and shall be submitted to legal review prior to circulation.
- The summary shall be circulated to all members as soon as possible after the meeting.
- Any comment or request for amendment shall be notified as soon as possible following receipt of the summary.

She specifies that her role is to ensure that participants will not exchange commercially sensitive information as regards competition rules, and that it is the responsibility of each participant to avoid raising any improper subjects during the meeting. She develops the list of topics that are considered commercially sensitive from a competition law perspective.

1. Roundtable: SPICE Members and their representatives

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) welcomes participants who attend a SPICE meeting for the first time. Attendants are invited to present themselves.

Camille Rosay (Quantis) recalls that there are currently 14 Corporate SPICE members and explains that a new member will join for Year 2, Groupe Pochet. She explains that the SPICE team will come back to each partner to confirm whether members will join for Year 2, and to detail what will be the procedures.

She recalls Year 1 steps of enlargement of the initiative for both Corporate and Associated Members.

2. Recyclability

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis) presents the objectives of the work undertaken on recyclability and the definition set by the Ellen MacArthur Foundation the SPICE Committee decided to rely on (see Committee 3).

This definition remains quite broad and challenging,

- as it allows interpretation of “recyclable (...) in practice and at scale”
- considering the wide variety of markets and products the cosmetic sector covers.

The definition of “disruptor” which was suggested in Committee 2 is recalled.

Various guidelines can help defining what can be considered as “recyclable” or not in the different markets of interest: Plastics Recyclers Europe, EPBP, APR, Greenblue, Cotrep, CITEO, FEVE...

A decision tree representation, based on a packaging’s characteristics (components separability, recyclability or disruption) is proposed to determine the determinants to a pack recyclability and what fraction of the whole packaging can be considered as recyclable.

Sophie Bonnier (CITEO): what happens if a non-separable component of the packaging is not recyclable, however not a disruptor?

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis): According to the EMF definition, components that are not separable, not recyclable and yet, not disruptive, will not hinder the recyclability of the pack if their weight is inferior to 5% of the weight of the total packaging. In that case, **the packaging is considered as recyclable (if weight < 5% of total weight)**. In the reverse scenario, then **a fraction of this packaging will be recyclable (if weight > 5% of total weight)**. The recyclable fraction will correspond to the weight percentage of the whole packaging minus the weight percentage of the non-recyclable elements.

As a consequence, 3 cases can be envisioned for a given packaging component:

1. it is recyclable,
2. it hinders recycling,
3. it is not recyclable.

Based on this categorization of components, and for a comprehensive description of recyclability applied to the cosmetics industry, the following approach is proposed to define the whole packaging’s recyclability:

- **Adopt a binary approach**, i.e. a packaging is considered:
 - recyclable in case 1
 - not recyclable in case 2 or 3
- Develop this approach per **family of cosmetic packaging**:
 - PET, PE and PP Shampoo bottles
 - Glass jar
 - HDPE Sunscreen cream
 - Aluminum aerosol can
 - Blush powder

- Mascara
- Lipstick
- and **per region**: study in priority markets where information is accessible:
 - France (specific information)
 - US (specific information)
 - Europe (generic information)

Raay Delos Reyes (Avon): In the proposed matrix we are defining the conditions under which a packaging can be considered recyclable or moderately recyclable?

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis): Indeed, when packaging is considered medium or highly disrupting recycling process, in the approach that we suggest which is consistent with the EMF definition, it is considered as not recyclable.

Jordan Rey (Clarins): If we consider a PET bottle with metallized label, it will be considered as not recyclable?

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis): According to the EPBP and Plastic Recyclers guidelines, yes, if components cannot be separated.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): I agree with the binary approach as in the end we need to know if something is recyclable or not (and this is linked to the claim to the consumer, as well). We would need to define a list of disruptors (which would be global). And to define more precisely what "recyclability" means, we should first define what both "in practice" and "at scale" mean for Cosmetics. In the first part of the presentation you focused on "at scale" but it appears that "in practice" is also difficult to define precisely. Even though the information available is not exhaustive, it would be up to SPICE to set a position; we gather, as the SPICE committee, in order to influence and give a sound voice on behalf of the Cosmetics market we represent. We should use this voice/power to do so in particular in this case, having in mind the 'vision' of the recycling, not the existing limits.

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis): We suggested to focus on "at scale" because "in practice" remains more concrete and technology-based. If it appears that the position of partners is not homogenous based on the EMF definition on both terminologies, then it would be relevant to create a definition in which SPICE members agree.

Defining a unique list of disruptors would require many simplifications, as disruptors are country-dependent and material-dependent.

François Witte (Quantis): The reason why we propose an approach per family of packaging and country is to have an as comprehensive as possible understanding of recyclability in different markets. In addition to this, for missing gaps, such an approach could be adopted.

Cesar Tadashi (Avon): Could you clarify what we want to validate today?

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): Today we propose to validate:

- the binary approach,
- and the format, meaning the approach per packaging family and country.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): No tube is included in the products list? List is to be revisited.

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis): The HDPE sunscreen cream should be understood as a tube.

Robert DiPalma (Estée Lauder): In order to better understand the categories of packaging you suggest, could you clarify in which category would enter other types of jars (plastic jars), and could we define a limit in terms of size for "small" packaging?

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis): For instance, a PET jar would be considered the same as a PET bottle. The separation between types of packaging is based primarily upon the material. If the suggested categories are not explicit enough, we can suggest new category names. The size limit under which a packaging will not be collected depends on the market: for instance, the COTREP excludes small packaging < 20 mL.

Sophie Bonnier (CITEO): It is true that small packs are often excluded, however work is on-going to ensure they can be properly sorted: please consider they are not always lost, rather "sometimes" recyclable. I could change the COTREP guide wording to avoid confusion.

Philippe De Brugière (L'Occitane): This is a good example of what implies defining "at scale".

Cesar Tadashi (Avon): The proposed analysis applies to the French market, what about other markets? For instance, we have markets in Latin America, and more specifically in Colombia the legislation is changing and it requires strong efforts from our teams to define precise rules for this market.

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis): All markets are specific, this is why we propose an approach to specify information by format and country. Analyzing new markets, such as Colombia, would require significant time but we are open to collect information from members if specific studies have already been made.

Sophie Bonnier (CITEO): About components separability, it should be noted that it is difficult to ask consumers to separate the different packaging components. In practice, CITEO has conducted studies showing that consumers don't properly do it (e.g. yoghurt pot). If we want the approach to be realistic, I suggest we don't take into account components separability, as a recycler would tell you that these components are actually disrupting recyclability (unless the consumer needs to separate components to use the product, e.g. ketchup bottle lid).

Philippe De Brugière (L'Occitane): I do agree that this is what happens in reality, however we also need to educate consumers if we want recycling to improve, otherwise no action is possible.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): This is the difference between "recyclable" and "recycled": we must design the pack so that it is recyclable (including *separability*...), this is our responsibility as producer when we design it, and this will help it is being actually recycled where the part of

collecting/recycling organizations... is higher. But we need to know what the “disruptors” are, in order to do so (and this is a key information for any footprint-tool to develop as well).

Jordan Rey (Clarins): A question about the binary approach: what happens if we take the example of a glass jar with a plastic cap? and how do we manage multi-material packaging?

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis): Through the suggested approach, it will be possible to answer this question and to have a refined approach of multi-material packaging situations.

Robert DiPalma (Estée Lauder): Why is direct printing on colored PET considered as disrupting recyclability?

Sophie Bonnier (CITEO): This rule applies for clear PET, since what we want to collect is only clear PET without glue, ink, etc. We need to be cautious about what is mentioned in the guidelines used as sources.

Philippe Bonningue (L’Oréal): With the suggested approach (i.e. considering both moderately disruptive and highly disruptive elements as hindering the recyclability of the total pack), the risk is that we develop a very (too) tough approach according to which ‘only 1%’ of cosmetic packaging could be considered as recyclable; this would be far from the truth/reality and bad for the image of the cosmetics.

François Witte (Quantis): The idea of the approach we propose is also to be as operational as possible, and in the end to provide clear information to a future tool user. The binary approach is therefore useful for matter of simplicity.

Aurore Fandard (Coty): Internally, it could be very difficult to manage different definitions of recyclability (for instance, if we want to consider that dark PET is not recyclable). For this reason, it could be easier to have a disruptor approach.

Sophie Bonnier (CITEO): We should keep in mind that eco-design and sorting rules are 2 different topics. In the context of SPICE, we should focus on eco-design.

Jordan Rey (Clarins): To improve the packaging footprint, we need to improve recyclability. I would agree with the different product types that are proposed, but we would need a worldwide approach and a non-binary vision of recyclability (for instance, what % of the packaging is recyclable).

Robert DiPalma (Estée Lauder): We agree on a global approach.

Philippe De Brugière (L’Occitane): I agree that country-specific information is too complicated.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): We need to find a compromise between an approach as close as possible to reality, and a simple approach – this could lead us to go back to the initial matrix that was presented and not validated during Committee 2.

Philippe Bonningue (L’Oréal): We are aligned with the disruptors matrix presented 6 months ago, as it was developed and created for the SPOT methodology, and as it represented the most

advanced one. However, it could be challenged, to develop a more robust list of disruptors, applicable worldwide. Still, we need to define the meaning of “at scale” and “in practice”; this is the purpose of SPICE group, having the ‘vision of recycling’ in mind.

Aurore Fandard (Coty): A generic global approach could be completed by specific information at region level.

Michele Del Grosso (Aptar): Different recycling technologies depending on the recycler in each country should be taken into account.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): We will formalize an updated proposition, since:

- on the framework: the binary approach is challenged
- geography: we understand information should be provided on a worldwide basis. at least, for each country generic information can be developed, the question is the level of granularity of specific information (country, or maybe continent-specific)
- packaging families: if an approach per type of pack is maintained, the naming could be improved

To get your feedback and specify the revised approach, we will send a questionnaire.

David Bayard (L'Occitane): In the end we need to take into account the final consumer, we must keep that in mind and address both eco-design and communication, to make sure methodology is aligned with what we communicate to the end user. We cannot have a different recyclability definition depending on guidelines and recyclers.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): Indeed, we will work on what can be claimed to consumers through the “Claims” topic in year 2.

David Petit (Hermès Parfums): What is important is that we make packaging better and better, and that the consumer and marketing people can be aware of these improvements: it is good to show recyclability, and to be able to understand why the new pack is better than the previous one.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): We will suggest an updated proposition. If we choose to maintain a global approach, please note that the approach will remain at the macro-level, and that there may be a gap between country-specific guidelines and worldwide information.

3. Case Studies

François Witte (Quantis) reminds participants of the objective of the case studies, that have been carried out for a range of 8 products. The goal is to have an assessment of the differences

implied by the Planetary Boundaries and Panel-based weighting factors, when calculating an aggregated single score.

Cédric Laplace (Sisley): Where is water scarcity represented on the Panel-Based graph?

François Witte (Quantis): Water is represented in light blue and is more visible on the Panel-Based graph than the Planetary Boundaries equivalent.

Michele Del Grosso (Aptar): To evaluate different technologies of metallization for instance, how does calculating a single score help comparison?

François Witte (Quantis): Environmental indicators enable to calculate potential impacts through the quantification of physical flows; whereas a single score introduces subjectivity by ranking environmental issues that are completely different one from another. However, it facilitates decision-making when comparing a wide range of indicators. It answers to a need of simplification of the representation. Indeed, the set of indicators that is selected has a high impact. It is a matter of positioning. We do not need single score, but if we decide to propose a single score, then these considerations should be taken into account.

Case studies results are displayed for one example (shampoo bottle), full results for all packaging products will be sent after the meeting.

Given the low differences between results obtained according to the 2 weighting approaches, it is recommended to keep both options open in the SPICE Guidance. The reasons for this are:

- the European Commission for now recommends the Panel-based approach, however the Planetary Boundaries approach is currently under review and could be recognized by the Commission in the coming months. According to Quantis expertise, the Planetary Boundaries is more robust than the Panel-based one.
- final decision could be taken when deciding how footprint results should be displayed in the SPICE tool.

Kenji Ohashi (Shiseido): Could you explain the panel-based approach again please? Were the Panel-based weighting factors obtained based on a consumer's survey?

François Witte (Quantis): They are based on a survey sent to a panel including a few hundreds of academics and experts.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): Case studies results are at the same time very good (i.e., Planetary Boundaries is recognized as a very robust approach), and disappointing, precisely because the difference is very tiny.

Jordan Rey (Clarins): I am really in favor of the single score as it helps decision-making and it is consumer-centric.

David Bayard (L'Occitane): What is the absolute value of the single score?

François Witte (Quantis): Absolute value is a digit that is not directly readable, this is why we prefer to present it on a 100% basis. Furthermore, an absolute single score value should not be used in direct communication to the consumer.

Kenji Ohashi (Shiseido): According to the LCA ISO standard, aggregation of impacts and comparative assessment with single score is prohibited. How does it articulate with the approach you are suggesting?

François Witte (Quantis): This is true, single score should be used for eco-design decision-making. The score itself should not be communicated, and weighting different impacts categories when making a public comparative assertion is prohibited by ISO. However comparison using the single score can help explain an improvement. Indeed, we will add a note in the Guidance to mention this point.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): It is important to note that even though we use LCA practices for the approach we suggest, it is not an LCA. This approach is not meant to allow to compare specific products to similar products in the marketplace. It is not the purpose of SPICE a comparative communication.

Kenji Ohashi (Shiseido): Does it make sense to compare every single indicator, even small ones?

François Witte (Quantis): We keep LCA principles and use within SPICE a comprehensive approach regarding multicriteria assessment.

Cédric Laplace (Sisley): We are also a bit disappointed and thought that the difference between both the Planetary Boundaries and the Panel-based approach would be more significant. When it comes to the Single Score, we strongly believe that SPICE needs to keep this approach, as well as the breakdown per indicator for the 15 indicators.

4. SPICE Database

François Witte (Quantis) presents the SPICE database (xls file) and explains how it is structured. He specifies that the database includes the production of virgin materials and the recycling of materials.

Camille Rosay (Quantis) recalls that this is the first version of the database. A questionnaire has been sent to members to assess Members' needs, and identify which data should be added to this first version in year 2 (see Data development proposition for year 2).

As detailed during Committee 3, several data have been granted to the SPICE initiative by Members (i.e., L'Oréal with a range of datasets originally developed for SPOT Methodology and then granted to SPICE, as well as datasets granted to SPICE by Heinz-Glas).

Coffee Break

Amanda Martin (Quantis) joins the meeting.

5. SPICE Year 2 Proposition

Camille Rosay (Quantis) recalls that there is an extra budget from Year 1 (€50,000) that will be reported on Year 2. She mentions that the review of the propositions for Year 2 will start by the topic of the claims, presented by Amanda Martin who has to leave afterwards.

5.1. Base operations

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) presents the part about keeping the methodology alive and adds that the option on Recyclability and the approach that is suggested is considered as outdated based on the discussions above mentioned. An updated proposal will be sent to partners taking into account the modifications and the clarifications that have been asked.

Camille Rosay (Quantis) adds that this option was not included in the previous version of the budget that was presented for Year 2.

5.2. Thought Leadership

5.2.1. Webinar: SPICE Methodology explained to external stakeholders

Camille Rosay (Quantis) specifies that one of the key questions is to identify who are the targets of this webinar.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): Do not forget the **web**-platform, we need to take into account the comments on our website and to account for people visiting the website.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): It is planned in the Base Operations budget. We decided not to debate this budget envelope because this is an amount we cannot compress.

5.2.2. Environmental claims guidance

Amanda Martin (Quantis) presents the proposal for Year 2 concerning the Claims Guidance document. She underlines that the point is to develop a guidance specific to cosmetics packaging.

She presents the suggested claims and target audience to the participants.

Armel Yver (Shiseido): I believe legal and regulation teams should also be included in the targeted audience.

Amanda Martin (Quantis): Indeed, it would be useful to include them into the guidance's targeted audience.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): In the slide about Purpose and Audience, you mention the need for ensuring transparent and credible communication on the environmental performance of cosmetics packaging. What about honesty?

Amanda Martin (Quantis): The mention to transparency and credibility resulted from an example among a list of criteria that we consider important for a claims guidance to be robust. Honesty is included in this list, but it is just not the example we took in this sentence.

The suggested format for the claims guidance is a PDF presenting the debates around suggested topics, the position of the SPICE initiative, and examples. Amanda Martin (Quantis) explains that the objective is to find an alignment to move forward.

She especially insists on the fact that a SPICE label is not on the agenda.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): This is not a final list of topics to include in the claims guidance. It is the sum of your comments. Some topics may be beyond the scope of SPICE, such as the questions of targets-setting (environmental strategy should remain defined within companies) or a SPICE label.

Sabine Bouillet-Lubot (Aptar): Are you including the subject of tools and format in recommendations? How should this guidance be accessible: on a website, on an app? What is the scope of the recommendations?

Amanda Martin (Quantis): This is part of the topics we could discuss.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): We believe the content should be the priority, but we could also discuss the format under which information should be communicated to consumers.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): Could we imagine adding to the claims guidance a comparison between the reduction of emissions and something that has nothing to do with it? For example, giving a comparison for carbon emissions with distance traveled by car. I am not pushing for it but it is a practice we see that requires some guidance as well.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): Yes, this would be possible to allow audiences to grasp more easily the claims that are made.

Amanda Martin (Quantis): To sum up, would you rather be in favor of a website format or a PDF format?

Sandrine Boulliet-Lubot (Aptar): On our side, we would prefer an Internet-based format.

Amanda Martin (Quantis): Who among the partners would need to involve other people from their respective teams to work and validate the guidance?

Philippe de Brugière (L'Occitane en Provence): I believe that it is the case for every member, the interest being to involve the teams internally.

Aurore Fandard (Coty): How will the workshops be organized? Will they be integrated to the committees?

Camille Rosay (Quantis): There will be 2 working sessions and another one to present the deliverables, as part of the SPICE committees.

5.3. Tool

François Witte (Quantis) recalls the objectives, the format and the conditions of the tool. He shows the structure that the tool could have and what would be the conditions of access. He insists on the fact that the tool, or at least part of its functions, should be publicly available.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): We speak about single score, but you mean single footprint, right?

François Witte (Quantis): Yes, here we are talking about single footprint.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): I understand that you are suggesting that we commit to pre-pay for the tool maintenance, after it is developed. If members don't commit, there is no need to develop a tool, however, are we sure that people will commit and stay?

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): We are confident in the fact that members will support the development of the tool considering that this is a lengthy development and that investing in the development of the tool for a year and then shutting it down would not be in the interest of the partners.

Philippe de Brugière (L'Occitane en Provence): In the end, who will own the tool?

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): The tool will be owned by the SPICE initiative, by SPICE members.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): If we want the tool to remain alive, we need to anticipate the fact that it will need maintenance and that a budget will need to be voted in the last year of SPICE to provision for the continuity of the tool.

Michele Del Grosso (Aptar): Would it be possible to have a demo for the tool?

François Witte (Quantis): I will present the features in the next slides. We need to check internally whether it is possible to be shared, but we could provide an example of what the tool could look like and the format it could have.

Aurore Fandard (Coty): What would be the cost for maintenance?

François Witte (Quantis): The cost for maintenance will be 28k€ per year.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): Please note that this is the price per year and not per member.

Philippe de Brugière (L'Occitane en Provence): If after 2 years, the tool is not maintained, would it go public?

Camille Rosay (Quantis): According to SPICE status, the initiative's outputs property belongs to SPICE and should be made public. Once SPICE will be ended, if there is enough interest and users, Quantis would commit to maintain and update the tool. Beyond the duration of SPICE and the pre-financed years of maintenance, we would build a business-model based on license fees for instance, as for any tool of this type.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): Did we finally agree that the tool's code would be public or not?

François Witte (Quantis): This was a possibility that was considered but it has some risks for example, the capacity from some people to impact the methodology. That is why we propose two versions of the tool.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): The code itself will thus not be public.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): The tool is the warranty of the SPICE methodology robustness. It will allow the methodology to be implemented, and to validate its operationality.

Armel Yver (Shiseido): Does a public tool necessarily mean that it is free?

Caroline Ruiz Palmer (MWE): It is a requirement for the tool to be free so that it can be accessed and used by anybody. That is why it is suggested to develop a core tool which is free and publicly available, and, in addition, to develop more detailed features to answer needs of current partners, which would be accessible to members who finance the SPICE initiative only.

François Witte (Quantis) presents the various features of each tool, the Member SPICE tool and the Open SPICE tool.

Armel Yver (Shiseido): Do we already know the time necessary to run one assessment?

François Witte (Quantis): It is a matter of seconds. I can bring more precisions looking at our experience with tools.

Aurore Fandard (Coty): How do you consider to launch the tool phase? Will it be through a kick-off meeting or specific workshops?

François Witte (Coty): We will need to define one key contact per company; some validations could be made remotely, for what can be validated remotely.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): In the context of the Committees, we will focus on key and strategic decisions. It is not possible to have 4 people per company attending the committees. The validation of the maximum of specifications and decisions will be done remotely.

5.4. Data

Camille Rosay (Quantis) presents additional datasets that could be included to the database based on members' feedback in the months before the committee. She insists on the fact that two categories of datasets should be distinguished:

- datasets for which development will be possible based on existing sources and that require formatting to be included into the database,
- datasets for which either literature or external stakeholders' primary data is needed.

A dedicated process is proposed to identify which datasets could be developed, and validate them with SPICE Members.

Aurore Fandard (Coty): Here we do not see the datasets that have already been integrated into the database, would that be possible to have the list?

Camille Rosay (Quantis): This list was included in the presentation of the previous committee; we will add this list to this presentation.

5.5. Overall Budget

Camille Rosay (Quantis) presents the overall budget for Year 2, including the remaining part of Year 1 that will be added to the budget for Year 2.

Based on current members' feedback and the commitment of one new member to join in year 2 (Groupe Pochet), it is assumed that the 2nd year of SPICE should be launched with 14 corporate members.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): Based on the discussion we had on the topic of recyclability, this option is to be defined more thoroughly and the budget allocated to it may vary depending on the final approach that is adopted.

However, the range of membership fees should remain the same. In addition, it seems that we could be 15 members which would have an effect on the membership fees.

Cesar Tadashi (Avon): The total amount matches the amount that was paid during Year 1, so this is theoretically fine for us, but we need to validate the budget internally and we will give a definitive answer after that. We believe it is important for the tool to include data as global as possible with information that can be used not only for Europe but also for global markets.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): As François mentioned, the tool will provide results whatever the country where the product is manufactured or sold. This doesn't mean that we have specific data for each market (for instance, models are the same across countries but the energy mix will differ), but there is at least generic data for each country.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) calls members to vote on the following topics:

- **Members' expected commitment for Year 2**
- **Members' validation of the overall budget presented (and if they need to validate the budget internally)**
- **Members' support for the Option Recyclability**

- **L'Oréal**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor

- **Coty**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor, but we need to define more precisely what we want to explore.

- **Heinz-Glas**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: We are in favor of developing the recyclability option.

- **Sisley**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor.

- **Chanel**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor, we believe that SPICE has a strong added value to define this topic.

Concerning the tool, we will need to check internally whether we support this development and whether it is coherent for us. It would be necessary to have more precisions on the outputs, and to see whether this is relevant concerning the specificities of our packaging.

- **L'Occitane en Provence**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor.

- **Shiseido**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor.

- **LVMH**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor.

- **Hermès**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor.

- **Clarins**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: We need to check internally whether this would be coherent, but we will most likely be in favor.

- **Schwan Cosmetics**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor.

- **Aptar**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor.

We will need to have internal discussions for the tool

- **Avon**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK even though they will need to check internally if this coherent.

Option Recyclability: In favor.

- **Estée Lauder**

Commitment Year 2: We are in.

Budget: OK

Option Recyclability: In favor.

Results of the vote:

14 votes in favor, 0 vote against

CITEO and Cosmetics Valley also expressed themselves in favor of the budget, the option and Year 2 commitment

6. Communication

Camille Rosay (Quantis) recalls that SPICE was presented externally on the occasion of recent events in the US, France, Japan and Germany.

She presents the planning before the upcoming press release publication.

7. Next Steps

Camille Rosay (Quantis) presents the indicative overall planning for the second year of SPICE. If it is possible to gather all members before summer vacations, the first meeting will be scheduled early July, otherwise in September.

She presents the next steps and key deadlines to anticipate before the launch of SPICE Year 2.

Closing of the meeting