

# SPICE YEAR 2 COMMITTEE 2 MEETING MINUTES

15.01.2020



**Minutes written by:** Quantis

## **In-person participants (Paris meeting):**

- Aude Charbonneaux, Albéa
- Gilles Swyngedauw, Albéa
- Vincent Ng, Axilone
- Robin Hervé, Axilone
- Hélène Villecroze, Chanel
- Nicolas Mathieu, Chanel
- Nathalie Perroquin, Coty
- Andrea Spinosa, Coty
- David Petit, Hermès Parfums
- Pierre Dehé, Groupe Pochet
- Chloé Pignerol, Groupe Pochet
- David Bayard, L'Occitane en Provence
- Philippe De Brugière, L'Occitane en Provence
- Philippe Bonningue, L'Oréal
- Alexandre Capelli, LVMH
- Pauline de Rodellec, LVMH
- Tobias Koetter, Schwan Cosmetics
- Armel Yver, Shiseido
- Romain Reyx, Shiseido
- Valentin Fournel, CITEO
- Hélène Orliac, FEBEA
- Auriane Bodivit, Quantis
- Camille Rosay, Quantis
- Dimitri Caudrelier, Quantis

- François Witte, Quantis
- Thibault Compagnon, Quantis
- Anne-Sophie Verquère, Quantis
- Maria Zafeiridou, Quantis
- Anne-Florence Lecolier, Quantis
- Caroline Ruiz Palmer, MWE

**In-person participants (New York meeting):**

- Mike Hercek, Avon
- Raqy Delos Reyes, Avon
- Robert DiPalma, Estée Lauder
- Michael Christel, Estée Lauder
- Kimberly Mauser, Estée Lauder
- Ana Espinosa, Estée Lauder
- Kristin Dasaro, Mary Kay
- Meredith Reisfield, Quantis
- Bryan Sheehan, Quantis

**Remote participants:**

- Joseph Lemoine, Albéa
- Michele Del Grosso, Aptar
- Christophe Marie, Aptar
- Luiz Campos, Avon
- Pierre Delbarre, Mary Kay
- Kenji Ohashi, Shiseido
- Samantha Sauvestre, Sisley
- Emmanuelle Schloesing, Elipso
- Thomas Myers, PCPC
- Amanda Martin, Quantis

**SPICE Members apologized for absence:**

- Clarins
- Heinz-Glas
- Cosmetic Valley

**Description:** The Members of the SPICE initiative - the Sustainable Packaging Initiative for CosmEtics - gather for the 2<sup>nd</sup> committee of the second year of the initiative.

## Opening of the meeting

### Introduction

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) welcomes all participants and presents the Quantis SPICE team.

### Meeting agenda

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

0. Antitrust Statement
1. Introductions: SPICE Members and their representatives
2. SPICE Environmental Claims Guidance update
3. Communication: Summary Document & Webinar
4. SPICE Methodology: Recyclability
5. SPICE Tool: update on the next steps
6. SPICE Database: Data development proposal
7. Project budget update
8. 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 SPICE is not used as a cover for an anticompetitive agreement. 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. Introductions: SPICE Members and their representatives

Camille Rosay (Quantis) welcomes all participants. The Mary Kay company is joining SPICE as a new Corporate Member.

Attendants are invited to present themselves.

## 2. SPICE Environmental Claims Guidance update

Anne-Sophie Verquère (Quantis) explains the process followed to develop the SPICE Claims Guidance. Following Members' survey, a few points are still pending and should be discussed today. She explains the next steps for the document's finalization.

Participants split in 5 different groups - each of them led by a Quantis representative, to have a first discussion and submit the group's conclusions to the Committee to prepare the vote on the topic.

### **Group 1: LCA indicators communication**

(facilitated by François Witte & Auriane Bodivit (Quantis) in Paris)

Philippe De Brugière (L'Occitane en Provence) presents the group's conclusions:

If we communicate on 3 environmental indicators, we lose the "SPICE effect" and precision, however 16 indicators is confusing. There is no agreement between members on the number of indicators that should be used. The common agreement in the group's discussion is that we should use the aggregated number as defined by the SPICE Methodology, however we need to explain what is inside in an easy way: the figure itself cannot be understood, the objective is to communicate as a comparison. We need to have this common standard explanation, easy for the consumer to understand.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): I disagree that SPICE only recommends to use an aggregated score, because it is too complicated for the consumer to understand an aggregated score representing a "global footprint". If a company wants to make claims on specific criteria, it should be possible to do so, provided that the global footprint shows an improvement versus the previous footprint. The criteria communicated should be relevant for the given product (meaning that the chosen criteria (which shows a big improvement) cannot be a criteria that is not significant within the global footprint).

Hélène Villecroze (Chanel): How do you define "relevant" criteria and how do you define that the global footprint is "favorable"?

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): Relevant criteria depends on the packaging characteristics (you can have CO<sub>2</sub> for instance, but we want to avoid communicating exclusively on CO<sub>2</sub> while other indicators don't demonstrate a good performance). The global footprint can be "favorable" either if the packaging is renovated and there is an improvement compared to its previous version, or compared to a baseline that is defined accurately by the company for a given type of packaging if there is no previous version to benchmark it against.

Hélène Villecroze (Chanel): Communicating on the aggregated score can be considered in the short or middle term: for us, it is the future of communication on the topic, and we need to educate consumers to this approach.

Philippe de Brugière (L'Occitane en Provence): Usually when you change 1 parameter of the packaging, there is an impact on all individual environmental indicators, so if you want to improve the overall impact it is more relevant to look at the whole score.

Nathalie Perroquin (Coty): What is important for us is to have a common and standardized explanation of the aggregated score, especially if companies want to communicate on the fact that they have a global positive impact on the environment; we should be able to communicate the 2 options.

Michele Del Grosso (Aptar): What is the logic behind the SPICE aggregated single score?

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): This was decided when we built the SPICE Methodology, this is described in the SPICE Methodological Guidelines, we can have further explanation if needed.

Gilles Swyngedauw (Albéa): When conducting a LCA, there are always assumptions made that lead to biases and can be irrelevant for the consumer.

Aude Charbonneaux (Albéa): LCA is a perfect internal tool for making decisions. Here we are talking about communication to consumers, and at Albéa it is not clear if we want to communicate LCA results, and whether LCA results should be communicated to non-experts, e.g. consumers.

Anne-Sophie Verquère (Quantis): summarizes the different options: 1/ to communicate the aggregated score; 2/ when a company wants to communicate on specific indicators, the

prerequisite is that the global footprint should be better than the previous one (options 1 and 2 are not mutually exclusive); or 3/ not to communicate LCA results externally.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): For option 2, you should be able to select the criteria that are relevant for your product.

Christophe Marie (Aptar): If you communicate that on-pack the consumer will see a number; it could be misleading compared to other products displaying an environmental score.

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): All options are possible in the end: these are guidelines and on a voluntary basis, then it is not mandatory to follow the recommendation.

Hélène Orliac (FEBEA): Writing such kind of document, it is difficult not to recommend one of the options and let companies do whatever they want. It is expected from consumers that Brands communicate on product sustainability and there are lots of regulations in perspective (e.g. Green Deal in Europe). It is complicated to communicate on LCA but, on the other hand, it is difficult not to communicate.

Hélène Villecroze (Chanel): We could keep all 3 options, explaining the limitations of each case for options 1 and 2.

Robin Hervé (Axilone): If as a consumer I buy a dishwasher, there is a A / A+ / A++ scale that exists and we would need to have the same for cosmetics packaging. We should agree on a rating for each product, based on a common baseline.

Bryan Sheehan (Quantis): Could we clarify if options 1 and 2 are compulsory to use or optional?

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): It will remain optional for Members to apply what is decided and recommended in SPICE. The options you select need to be understood when starting to communicate.

David Bayard (L'Occitane en Provence): We calculated the aggregated score for our top 50 products, what we can see is that the results highly depend on the type of packaging.

I fully agree it is ok for comparison between the new product and the old one.

Anne-Sophie Verquère (Quantis): Again, internally you can use whatever indicator. This document is for external communication.

Aude Charbonneaux (Albéa): The guidance should warn the risk of communication for companies deciding to communicate.

Anne-Sophie Verquère (Quantis): Proposes to vote on the 3 options - the Guidance will highlight the various limitations: 1/ to communicate the aggregated score; 2/ to communicate on specific and relevant indicators, the prerequisite is that the global footprint is better than the previous one; or 3/ not to communicate externally on the results.

Albéa: option 3

Aptar: options 2 and 3

Avon: option 2

Axilone: option 1

Chanel: options 1 and 2 (explaining the risks and limitations of each)

Coty: options 1 and 2 (either relative SPICE indicators or absolute chosen indicators)

Estée Lauder: options 1 and 2

Groupe Pochet: option 2 (if the brand is free to define the baseline)

Hermès Parfums: options 1 and 2

L'Occitane en Provence: options 1 and 2 (for comparison with a previous product or baseline)

L'Oréal: options 1 and 2

LVMH: options 1 and 2

Mary Kay: options 1 and 2

Schwan Cosmetics: option 2 (with categories or a rating system as basis for comparison)

Shiseido: options 1 and 2

Sisley: options 1 and 2

**Option 1: 11 votes; option 2: 14 votes (approved); option 3: 2 votes.**

## **Group 2: communication & marketing examples**

(facilitated by Anne-Sophie Verquère (Quantis) in Paris)

Pauline de Rodellec (LVMH): presents the group's conclusions:

We think we should display several real and concrete examples from both cosmetics brands and packaging suppliers, on a voluntary basis. Precision should be made if this is on pack or off pack communication. Quantis could filter what can be considered as good examples and practices. This list of examples could be updated regularly.

Camille Rosay (Quantis): Regarding the update of the Guidance and of these examples, this can be made as long as SPICE is active and provided the SPICE Committee decides to update the document.



This proposal is submitted to the vote:

Albéa: ok

Aptar: ok

Avon: ok

Axilone: ok

Chanel: ok

Coty: ok

Estée Lauder: ok

Groupe Pochet: ok

Hermès Parfums: ok

L'Occitane en Provence: ok

L'Oréal: ok

LVMH: ok

Mary Kay: ok

Schwan Cosmetics: ok

Shiseido: ok

Sisley: ok

**The proposition is approved.**

### **Group 3: bio-based content threshold for making claims**

(facilitated by Camille Rosay & Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) in Paris)

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal) presents the group's conclusions:

To claim on bio-based content, we should first have a minimum of 20% of bio-based. Then, we should say what component is considered, and what is the exact percentage of bio-based content.

Christophe Marie (Aptar) and Kimberly Mauser (Estée Lauder): If there are different components, should we can claim differently for each individual component, or communicate the aggregated percentage for the whole packaging?

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): As you want, provided there is at least 20%.

Aude Charbonneaux (Albéa): What if the component represents 5% of the packaging?

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): We should not over-complexify the rules and use them in a smart way.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): Again, when claiming, we should take into account that the global footprint is "good". When claiming on bio-based materials, the overall impact should be better than the alternative, otherwise the claim is misleading.

David Petit (Hermès): Is it necessary to specify the type of feedstock or the bio-based content generation?

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): I think it can be worth it from a marketing point of view. However, if the environmental impact is indeed better, it is not mandatory.

The proposal is submitted to the vote:

Albéa: ok

Aptar: ok

Avon: ok

Axilone: ok (if better than fossil-based materials)

Chanel: ok

Coty: ok

Estée Lauder: ok

Groupe Pochet: ok

Hermès Parfums: ok

L'Occitane en Provence: ok

L'Oréal: ok

LVMH: ok

Mary Kay: ok

Schwan Cosmetics: ok

Shiseido: ok (if better than fossil-based materials)

Sisley: ok

**The proposition is approved.**

#### **Group 4: resource optimization threshold for claims**

(facilitated by Bryan Sheehan and Meredith Reisfield (Quantis) in New York)

Bryan Sheehan (Quantis) presents the group's conclusions: we recommend that:

- Optimization claims should include the percentage of packaging weight reduction,
- The stated value should be 10% minimum,
- Baseline needs to be clear when comparing
- Light-weighting should not have other adverse impacts

Aude Charbonneaux (Albéa): The scope should be primary packaging; we have to be careful not to have a higher impact transferred to other parts of the packaging and keep similar functionality (e.g. if you reduce your packaging weight, but then it becomes very fragile, it does not make sense).

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): We should be able to claim for the secondary packaging (like folding box) as well.

Bryan Sheehan (Quantis) specifies that the group's proposal covers both primary and secondary packaging.

Valentin Fournel (CITEO): We should also consider that there is no higher weight of tertiary packaging.

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): It should be understood for the whole product, if the tertiary packaging has a very low contribution, then even if tertiary is worse and the rest of the packaging has a way better impact, then overall it is ok.

Valentin Fournel (CITEO): Yes overall, there is no higher weight or impact.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) reminds that this discussion focus is resource optimization and the reduction in weight.

David Bayard (L'Occitane en Provence) and David Petit (Hermès): It is not clear if the 10% threshold applies to components or to the whole packaging?

Bryan Sheehan (Quantis): We took into account the global packaging, and the weight of the packaging.

Nathalie Perroquin (Coty): This communication is meant for consumers, what they care about is the sold product (primary and secondary packaging).

Hélène Orliac (FEBEA): It can be relevant to specify the material we are reducing (e.g. reduction in plastics use when switching to glass).

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): You are referring to plastic bashing: if we shift from plastic to glass and increase the global environmental footprint, I don't agree. It is easier to make a claim when considering a given type of material (iso-material, no change of material). If we move to multiple materials, then the prerequisite of having a better environmental footprint before claiming reduction in weight should apply.

Gilles Swyngedauw (Albéa): It should be for the same material, otherwise it is misleading.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): We have 2 options to consider:

- Option 1: for iso-material weight comparative claims: the minimum threshold for making a claim about weight-lightning is 10%, for both primary and secondary packaging, provided the global environmental footprint is reduced versus the former packaging
- Option 2: for iso-material weight comparative claims: the minimum threshold for making a claim about weight-lightning is 10%, for primary packaging only, provided the global environmental footprint is improved versus the former packaging

Nicolas Mathieu (Chanel): If you consider switching zamak and aluminum, I am not sure this could apply.

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): What could be misleading is if I replace one material per another, for example plastic by glass.

Bryan Sheehan (Quantis): In option 2, the 10% threshold applies to the combination of primary and secondary packaging.

David Bayard (L'Occitane en Provence): For the wording of option 2, the footprint should be "not higher" rather than "improved".

Aude Charbonneaux (Albéa): Isn't the global footprint improvement a prerequisite for all claims we make?

Anne-Sophie (Quantis): Yes, it is specified by the Guidance.

Kristin Dasaro (Mary Kay): The perimeter for option 2 is still not clear.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): The reduction (threshold) we claim should not be for the whole packaging, but for a given component.

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): I agree, however this is very challenging.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) proposes to cancel the vote. The wording will be clarified, and submitted to Members by email.

### **Group 5: recycled content threshold for making claims**

(facilitated by Amanda Martin (Quantis), over the phone)

Amanda Martin (Quantis) presents the group's conclusion:

1/ Any claim should specify the recycled content material (in percentage)

2/ Recycled content percentage should take into account the total packaging weight

3/ Follow the SPICE Methodological Guidance on how to calculate the PCR content

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): We should avoid falling in the same trap, and clarify if we are talking about components or total packaging, as well as primary and/or primary and secondary packaging.

Anne-Sophie Verquère (Quantis): We should align across all topics; we will resubmit the vote based on a harmonized wording, after the meeting.

## 3. Communication: Summary Document & Webinar

Maria Zafeiridou (Quantis) reminds the aim of the SPICE summary document. It will provide a concise overview of SPICE's ambition and objectives. It is meant to raise awareness and understanding of what the SPICE initiative is and aims to achieve. The second objective is to strengthen the positioning of SPICE as a reference for the industry. The audience will be C-suite stakeholders and sustainability professionals.

It will be a 4-page document available in print and digital format. Work is on-going on the content and the design.

She presents the document's mock-up and the next step for Members before the release.

Camille Rosay (Quantis) reminds the initial objective of the SPICE webinar. Today, Members' priority may have changed, this is why different options are submitted.

Maria Zafeiridou (Quantis) presents the 3 potential options:

- 1) Keep focusing on explaining the content of the SPICE Methodology (therefore intended to a quite technical audience)
- 2) Highlight SPICE Members' feedback: how SPICE outputs help companies deploying their packaging strategy, and how the topics discussed through SPICE help them to move forward regarding sustainable packaging
- 3) Present the SPICE Tool to external stakeholders, once released

The webinar will be co-presented by speakers from L'Oréal, Quantis (as Co-Founders) and a SPICE Member. Whatever the option, we will ask for Members' participation on a voluntary basis.

Hélène Villecroze (Chanel): If we vote for Option 3, will it be also technical and explain the content of the SPICE Methodology?

Camille Rosay (Quantis): Within the Tool development process, we have a specific training that is scheduled for SPICE Members. Here, the idea would be to present the Tool to external stakeholders, so that the industry be aware of what has been developed. We can explain basic principles (for instance, the aggregated score as an output of the Tool). We would not go in the details of the methodology.

Philippe De Brugière (L'Occitane en Provence): Is the webinar also targeting a C-suite audience?

Camille Rosay (Quantis): The summary document is intended to C-suite stakeholders; however, the webinar's audience covers both internal and external stakeholders (your peers in the cosmetics industry and packaging sectors).

The 3 options are submitted to the vote:

Albéa: option 1

Aptar: option 2

Avon: option 1

Axilone: option 1

Chanel: option 1

Coty: option 1

Estée Lauder: option 1 (and option 3 in a second time)

Groupe Pochet: option 1 (and option 2 in a second time)

Hermès Parfums: option 2

L'Occitane en Provence: option 1

L'Oréal: option 1 (but if the audience is only technical, then it might be very limited, therefore question is whether a webinar is necessary)

LVMH: option 1

Mary Kay: option 1

Schwan Cosmetics: option 1

Shiseido: option 3

Sisley: option 1

**Option 1 is approved.**

Camille Rosay (Quantis): We note that there could be interests for other webinars as well. Today we cannot guarantee that the Committee will decide to allocate budget in the future, but we keep this option in mind.

## 4. SPICE Methodology: Recyclability

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis) presents the results of the survey sent to SPICE Members: following the feedback received, the definition of recycled content will not be modified in the SPICE Methodology. It is proposed to complement the definition by providing concrete cases and examples to clarify the scope of the definition (in Year 3).

She explains the operational next steps to define the SPICE common approach on recyclability.

Valentin Fournel (CITEO) presents the CITEO's work in progress around recyclability in France. This work has multiple objectives:

1. Recyclability definition (according to different criteria: main material, collection system, sorting, recycling system, etc.)
2. Recyclability assessment and definition of a recyclability rate
3. Delivering a certificate to guarantee if a packaging is recyclable
4. Then, creating an on-pack recyclability score, working with consumer to understand what is the most obvious information for them
5. and finally, developing a specific ecomodulation linked to this score

CITEO also collaborates with the FEBEA to work more on specific types of cosmetics packaging.

Nathalie Perroquin (Coty): What is the scope of sorting, and how do we know what sorting applies?

Valentin Fournel (CITEO): For CITEO the scope is France, but we could apply the same rules in other countries, based on the relevant sources (which can be challenging depending on the country and sources availability).

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): What is developed by CITEO applies to any waste. What is more precisely developed by the FEBEA?

Hélène Orliac (FEBEA): A specific document for cosmetics is being developed, will be submitted to the industry's stakeholders and will be issued once consensus is found.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): So, this document will apply to France. For example, will small size packaging like mascara be considered as recyclable?

Hélène Orliac (FEBEA): For mascara it will depend on the type of material. This document will present a few types of packaging, and is to be updated in the future to extend the scope. We are also working with CITEO to list the different types of packaging and materials to cover. For the moment this is for the French market, but we can expect that this vision of the different types of packaging and material can help identify the main cases to consider, and where efforts should be made.

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis): Do we have any timeline for this release?

Hélène Orliac (FEBEA): The document should be ready in a couple of months, and the mapping of materials by July 2020. We will ask our Members to validate the approach, and we can see how we can share that with SPICE.

Aude Charbonneaux (Albéa): No tests have been conducted to define these guidelines?

Valentin Fournel (CITEO): The COTREP makes pilot tests, based on recyclers' processes.

Aude Charbonneaux (Albéa): We are still learning a lot, for instance through what we are developing with Circpack. Making tests is crucial.

Gilles Swyngedauw (Albéa): We have standards from recyclers according to which we need to pass the test, and what we see today is that these different standards and tests can provide different results.

Valentin Fournel (CITEO): This is why the protocol of the COTREP is interesting in the approach that is developed.

## Coffee Break

Auriane Bodivit (Quantis) details the next steps to define the SPICE common approach on recyclability:

- Step 1: Conduct a gap analysis of existing methodologies to identify each one's characteristics
- Step 2: Define a pragmatic approach to recyclability assessment to integrate to the SPICE Tool V1
- Step 3: Identify the next steps for the integration of a recyclability score to the SPICE Tool for Year 3

She presents the anticipated planning for these 3 steps.



## 5. SPICE Tool: update on the next steps

François Witte (Quantis) recalls that 2 versions of the SPICE Tool are being developed, and the development planning. he also presents the first mock-ups of the Tool. Members will have the opportunity to provide comments on the Tool functioning and design when testing the beta version.

Members' contribution will be needed as well to collect sectorial data to describe transport scenarios, tertiary packaging average data and complex component (such as pump) average composition. Companies data will not be shared to other Members, it will enable Quantis to define a sectorial average.

Philippe Bonningue (L'Oréal): Should we all contribute on all streams? It would be more relevant if companies provide data on topics where they have expertise.

François Witte (Quantis): Indeed, all companies don't need to contribute to all, and priority is to be made where companies have specific knowledge. Quantis could also provide data, for instance on transport, but we believe it is good to have an average based on the industry's data.

David Bayard (L'Occitane): For tertiary packaging, is the expected information per kg of packaging or per kg of purchased product?

François Witte (Quantis): Yes, this should be per weight of pack, without the packaging content (the survey that will be sent will explicit on that).

Nathalie Perroquin (Coty): Are transport scenarios for upstream or downstream distribution?

François Witte (Quantis): This is from the manufacturer to end consumer.

He explains how members' comments on the Tool specification enabled to add or specify some features to be developed for the 1<sup>st</sup> version of the Tool. In addition, Members asked for a range of additional features which could be developed in the future, depending on companies' needs and priorities.

Among Members' comments, the "Super Admin" role (operated by Quantis) was questioned. Two options can be envisioned:

- Full access: Super admin has the interface for accessing and modifying any content of the tool. This makes potential support tasks easier.
- User management: Super admin has the interface for user management only. This makes potential support tasks on project more timely.

Nathalie Perroquin (Coty): What is the limitation without full access?

François Witte (Quantis): In case there is a need for support, Quantis will not have access to users' project, so it would be more complicated to solve.

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): We should clarify the consequence of what we vote, if Quantis can have access, then there is a confidentiality issue, but if we don't give access, then it will not be possible for Quantis to provide anonymous statistics for example.

Michael Christel (Estée Lauder): could the Super Admin have access to projects' data and no possibility to change it?

François Witte (Quantis): Yes, it is a possibility.

Bryan Sheehan (Quantis): What do you mean saying that the user management option would make potential support tasks "more timely"?

François Witte (Quantis): It would require more time.

Aude Charbonneaux (Albéa): If we have an issue, there is still the possibility to share our password and user account.

François Witte (Quantis): Yes.

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) proposes to vote between options 1 (full access) and 2 (user management):

Albéa: option 2

Aptar: option 2

Avon: option 2

Axilone: option 2

Chanel: option 2

Coty: option 1, as we have a NDA with Quantis.

Estée Lauder: option 2

Groupe Pochet: option 2

Hermès Parfums: option 2

L'Occitane en Provence: option 2

L'Oréal: option 2

LVMH: option 2

Mary Kay: option 2

Schwan Cosmetics: option 2

Shiseido: option 2

Sisley: could not vote

**It is agreed to limit the Super Admin role to user management only.**

François Witte (Quantis) explains that the decision should be taken to host the SPICE Tool on a private cloud (cost is 28 k€ per year), or a virtual private server (8 k€ per year).

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): Is the decision reversible?

François Witte (Quantis): Yes, the operation is not immediate, but it is possible to change hosting.

Hélène Villecroze (Chanel): We will not be able to vote today as we need to confirm with our IT Department.

**Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) proposes to reschedule the vote, as many companies first need to confirm internally with their IT and security departments. A dedicated vote will be set-up by email in the coming weeks.**

François Witte (Quantis) presents the list of identified potential “must-have” features, that would represent a blocking point for the use of the Tool (i.e. a company will not use or deploy the Tool as long as the feature is not implemented). The objective is to identify “must-have” features for Tool version 1, that could have an impact on the planning and budget.

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): Is it possible to give our position when testing the tool?

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): Yes.

David Bayard (L’Occitane): For all these features, there is no problem to implement them later?

François Witte (Quantis): Yes, they can be added later (provided we dedicate additional development budget, and modify the timeline).

Nathalie Perroquin (Coty): In the Tool V1 as it is today, are we able to share results between users? How many users per company?

François Witte (Quantis): There is no export feature, but you can copy and paste the results. In addition, when deleting a user, you can transfer all his projects in bulk to another one.

The maximum number is 70 users per company.

Michael Christel (Estée Lauder): What are the consequences in terms of security regarding data storage?

François Witte (Quantis): In any case, there will be no possible access to any data of other companies, this is only a double security.

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): Is it clear that if we don't take a feature for V1, we will need to wait for V2, which will be released 1 year later?

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis): The timeframe will depend on the features that Members will decide to develop for V2.

Raqy Delos Reyes (Avon): What kind of projects sharing is possible between brands?

François Witte (Quantis): You can see the brand when scrolling through the list of users, but it is not possible to see the associated projects. The brand has no effect on the users' rights.

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): Is a user defined by a given IP address?

François Witte (Quantis): A user is associated to an email address.

**Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) proposes to reschedule the vote, as many companies first need to confirm internally with their IT and security departments. A dedicated vote will be set-up by email in the coming weeks.**

Dimitri Caudrelier (Quantis) presents the different types of access envisioned for the SPICE Tool: more detail will be provided during an upcoming committee, to agree on the level of the license fee external users will pay to access the Tool's full version. The different scenarios that can be envisioned at this stage for the Tool's long-term governance and funding are presented.

## 6. SPICE Database: data development proposal

Camille Rosay (Quantis) explains how Members' needs in terms of datasets development were collected and analyzed by Quantis, in order to prioritize these identified needs. Regarding the development of renewably-sourced materials datasets manufactured by private companies, detailed inventory data would be needed, as well as their consent to share such data with Quantis (will remain confidential) and to include environmental results in the SPICE Database (will be publicly accessible through the SPICE Tool). Since such collaborations cannot be guaranteed, some publications have been identified and could be used as a back-up for development. The way to contact these companies on behalf with the SPICE community will be validated with Members.

Nathalie Perroquin (Coty): Would these datasets be available in the Tool V1?

François Witte (Quantis): For most of them yes, when we need to contact suppliers, it will depend upon their reactivity to answer.

Camille Rosay (Quantis) proposes Members to validate:

- The development of the 22 datasets, listed in 2 batches
- The allocation of an additional budget to this work stream: 64 k€ in total, instead of 48 k€ (i.e. +16 k€)

Albéa: agrees

Aptar: could not vote

Avon: agrees

Axilone: agrees

Chanel: agrees

Coty: agrees

Estée Lauder: agrees

Groupe Pochet: agrees

Hermès Parfums: could not vote

L'Occitane en Provence: agrees

L'Oréal: agrees

LVMH: agrees

Mary Kay: agrees

Schwan Cosmetics: agrees

Shiseido: agrees

Sisley: could not vote

**Note:** As a majority of 14 Corporate Members is needed, Quantis asked Members missing or who had to left the meeting for their agreement by email, so that the development is not postponed. Additional positive answers were received (from Sisley and Heinz-Glas) in the days following the meeting.

This proposition is approved.

## 7. Project budget update

Camille Rosay (Quantis) presents the overall initiative's budget allocation, following the entry of an 18<sup>th</sup> Corporate Member and the proposed allocation of additional budget to data development.

Andrea Spinosa (Coty): If we need to have private cloud hosting, does it mean we don't have enough budget?

Camille Rosay (Quantis): The budget for SPICE Year 2 already covers the Tool hosting on private cloud.

## 8. Timeline and next steps

Camille Rosay (Quantis) informs Members that Cosmetics Europe invites SPICE Members and Co-Founders representatives to present the initiative during the CEAC (Cosmetics Europe Annual Conference) in Brussels on June 11<sup>th</sup> 2020. As for all external presentations, it will be co-presented by speakers from L'Oréal, Quantis (as Co-Founders) and a SPICE Member. Voluntary speakers are invited to contact Quantis.

She presents the indicative overall planning and key milestones to anticipate before the next SPICE Committee.

**Closing of the meeting**