Ver. van Verf- en Drukinktfabrikanten (VVVF)
en Vereniging Lijmen en Kitten (VLK)
Castellum, ingang C 'Synthesium'
Loire 150 (Forepark), 2491 AK Den Haag
www.vvvf.nl en www.vlk.nu

VVVF/VLK Input to the Call for Evidence – March 2026

VVVF and VLK, the Dutch Association of Paint and Printing Inks and the Dutch association of Adhesives and Sealants, welcome the opportunity to contribute to the evaluation of the Biocidal Products Regulation (BPR). In its current form, the BPR is overly complex and not fit for purpose for the paints, printing inks, adhesive and sealant industry.

While EU harmonization of biocide legislation was necessary, its original design and implementation were flawed. The BPD largely mirrored the Plant Protection Products Directive, despite major differences between plant protection products and biocides. Unlike the well-regulated PPP sector, biocides were only partially regulated in Member States before harmonization. The sudden introduction of strict EU-wide requirements created major financial and administrative burdens, particularly for SMEs, leading to significant market consolidation.

The biocides market is highly fragmented, with very different economic realities across product types. Nevertheless, requirements and fees were set at levels comparable to those for plant protection products, and regulatory uncertainty increased over time, discouraging investment.

A more proportionate system—similar to REACH Regulation—would have been more appropriate, with requirements linked to risk, tonnage, and socio-economic considerations. Under the BPR, all biocidal substances and even mixtures require authorization, going beyond the approach used under REACH, where authorization is limited to substances of very high concern.

The review program for existing active substances has taken nearly 30 years and has been hampered by evolving requirements, increasing complexity, lack of expertise in Member States, and shifting policy objectives.

A fundamental overhaul of the BPR is now necessary.

Our main Recommendations are:

1. **Adopt a holistic approach by Product Type (PT)**
   Assess all active substances within a PT together, rather than substance by substance, to avoid market disruption and ensure availability of effective combinations.

2. **Include risk, benefit and socio-economic assessments**
   Decisions should balance risks, benefits, alternatives and economic impacts. Impact assessments should be mandatory and DG GROW involved in decision-making.

3. **Do not change rules mid-process**
   Dossiers under review should not be subject to new requirements, models or guidance introduced after submission.

4. **Address the “market freeze”**
   Extremely long evaluations and classification changes under CLP Regulation block innovation and prevent product updates. Evaluations must be significantly faster.

5. **Base decisions on sound science and realistic protection goals**
   Risk assessments must remain science-based and proportionate, avoiding unrealistic worst-case assumptions.

6. **Avoid duplication with REACH and CLP**
   Non-biocidal co-formulants already assessed under REACH Regulation should not face additional BPR data requirements. CLP labelling should be considered sufficient for consumer protection.

7. **Introduce proportionality (like REACH)**
   Data requirements and fees should depend on tonnage placed on the market, applying the “no data, no market” principle.

8. **Make the BPR innovation-friendly**
   Improve predictability through clear roadmaps, shorter timelines and stable requirements to justify investment.

9. **Do not apply Article 5 as an automatic ban**
   Exclusion criteria should not result in default prohibition based solely on hazard classification where safe use can be demonstrated.

10. **Fix mutual recognition and renewals**
    Product approvals in one Member State should be automatically accepted by others within short deadlines, reducing duplication and delays.