

SE CA response to the second stakeholder consultation on the Substance Review Methodology

General comments

Is an Echa guidance and a Reach guidance for socio-economic analysis the best to refer to? Alternatively, is there a general guidance for socio-economic analysis? In cases where there is a reference to a Reach guidance, it might simplify work if only one of them is used. The Reach guidance for restrictions might in that case be the best option.

Specific comments

Questions and answers

5. Evidence of elevated levels measured in the environment shall be considered significant when end-point related limit values are exceeded (i.e. DMELs, PNEC, etc.). Do you support this specification - please explain your views and provide supporting data to explain them if relevant. (Section 2.2., pg. 35)

Basically yes, but not for PBT / vPvB substances. For such substances, the starting point should be that they should not enter the environment at all i.e. the levels of such substances do not need to be above PNECs to be considered significant. For vPvB, it may not even be possible to set a PNEC (and if such a substance has a measured toxicity, it may be relatively low and consequently give a high PNEC). Therefore, quite high levels could be considered non-significant if this approach is applied to vPvB-substances.

Comments

p 12 Please note that the Waste framework directive was amended by an update on 30 May 2018 by Directive (EU) 2018/851. There are some amendments of the definitions in Article 3 that should be taken into account, such as the following; para 9 waste management; para 15 a material recovery.

p 44

In the following phrases:

- "the hazard risk of the substance for health (Figure 3-1, step 1c);

Swedish Chemicals Agency

Mailing address

Box 2
SE-172 13 Sundbyberg
Sweden

Visit & delivery

Esplanaden 3A
SE-172 67 Sundbyberg
Sweden

Invoicing address

FE 124
SE-838 80 Frösön
Sweden

Phone & fax

Phone +46 8 519 41 100
Fax +46 8 735 76 98

Internet

www.kemi.se
kemi@kemi.se

VAT No

SE202100388001

- the hazard risk of the substance for the environment (Figure 3-1, step 1); ”do you mean ”the hazard and the risk of...” or just ”the hazard of...”? Please rephrase.

p 47 under ”Information required” and point 2: ”

Compile information on the functions for which the substance is used: In order to evaluate substitutes, the information on the function of the substance (e.g. use as a plasticizer, flame retardant, etc.) or the properties that it enables in EEE is also to be compiled.”

Could you please provide more examples of functions than just ”use as a plasticizer, flame retardant”, for example ”solders” and/or other examples.

p 52 Step P III-2) Determination of the relevant waste streams and treatment processes and release estimation

We would like to suggest that ”Eurostat” should be included as relevant source of information here.

p 65 under ”Estimated risk”

The information ”The number of waste treatment processes from which the risks arise” and where they are placed, could be included earlier in the methodology to be able at an early stage in the process to judge whether more detailed data are needed and if a RoHS restriction is relevant. As a suggestion the information can in that case be included under the sections ”3.5. Step P III-2) Determination of the relevant waste streams and treatment processes and release estimation” and/or ”3.6. Step P III-3) Exposure estimation during use and/or WEEE treatment”