

Stakeholder consultation on exemption request evaluation under Directive 2011/65/EU

1 Introduction

The RoHS Directive (2002/95/EC) (RoHS 1) has been recasted and has now become Directive 2011/65/EU that entered into force on 21 July 2011, repealing Directive 2002/95/EC on 3 January 2013. Directive 2011/65/EU is available here: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32011L0065:EN:NOT>.

The European Commission has appointed the Oeko-Institut and Fraunhofer IZM¹ to technically assist in reviewing the requests for exemptions from the substance restrictions of Directive 2011/65/EU (RoHS 2). The exemption requests have to be evaluated against the criteria for exemptions in Art. 5(1)(a).

This consultation is run by Oeko-Institut together with Fraunhofer IZM on behalf of the European Commission, with the purpose to collect stakeholder contributions, under <http://rohs.exemptions.oeko.info/index.php?id=275> . Please note that the role of Oeko-Institut and Fraunhofer IZM is only to collect and evaluate the information provided by stakeholders with a goal to provide the Commission with a recommendation on an exemption's justification. Any decision making, however, is the sole responsibility of EU institutions.

Neither the fact that a stakeholder consultation is being launched, nor the results of this stakeholder consultation should be interpreted as a political or legal signal that the Commission intends to take a given action.

2 Consultation scope

The scope of the current consultation concerns a request for exemption renewal and two requests for new exemptions as shown in the table below.

¹ Contract is implemented through Framework Contract No. ENV.A.2/FRA/2015/0008 led by Oeko-Institut

Oeko-Institut and Fraunhofer IZM – on behalf of the European Commission – has published the requests as worded by the applicant, therefore the applicant is solely responsible for the wording and supporting evidence it has provided.

Table 1: RoHS exemption requests covered by this stakeholder consultation

No.	Initially Proposed Wording	Applicant
Requested renewal/ amendment of existing exemption		
2017-1	Lead in solder used to make electrical connections to vacuum boards used in Mass Spectrometers. Boards designed to be used periodically under low pressure. 5 years	SCIEX
2017-2	Use of lead in welds for soldering of certain printed circuit board assemblies in gas detectors	Oldham S.A.S.
Annex III, 1(g)	Mercury in single – capped (compact) fluorescent lamps for general lighting purposes < 30 W with a lifetime equal or above 20 000 h: 3,5 mg 5 years (Max)	LightingEurope

3 How to submit a stakeholder contribution

The following general guidelines should be taken into account:

- Refer to the exemption request listed in Table 1 and have a clear reference as to the exemption number.
- Take the **questionnaires** on the exemption requests into account (see the request specific sections at <http://rohs.exemptions.oeko.info/index.php?id=276> respectively <http://rohs.exemptions.oeko.info/index.php?id=277> and <http://rohs.exemptions.oeko.info/index.php?id=278>).
- Clearly state whether the exemption requests are supported or whether no justification is seen. To support your comment, it is needed to **provide relevant technical and scientific evidence** in accordance with the criteria listed in Article 5(1)(a). Explain the reasons why potential alternative materials, designs or processes are unsuitable with quantitative data wherever possible. If possible, **provide photographs or diagrams** to illustrate claims. Provision of third party data and information may be beneficial to further support your view. **Sources of information** should be referenced where possible.
- Provide your input to the consultation as early as possible in order to allow other stakeholders to comment.
- Exemptions to the RoHS Directive can not be justified on the basis of confidential information. Should you wish such information to be used as a justification for an

exemption, you need to give explicit agreement to the Commission and the project team to disclose the relevant information on their website.

- Nevertheless, comments shall be clearly marked “**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**” if they are not to be posted as comments on the consultation website. Please also refrain from submitting confidential and non-confidential information mixed in one document!
- Please refrain from submitting several identical comments in order to support a position / comment. It is more useful and efficient to include a cover letter stating that a submission is supported by several parties.
- Submit **compact and comprehensive information** instead of very large and extensive documentation. It will facilitate formulating the need for further information.
- It shall be noted that generic comments, statements, position papers and any additional request for exemptions will not be taken into account.
- **Do not submit new exemption requests.** New exemption requests as well as questions or remarks concerning results of former evaluations have to be addressed to the European Commission directly.
- Please be aware that it might be necessary to give a negative recommendation if important information is missing.
- Always include **your contact details** (or of the person responsible for further contact with name, organisation, email and phone number). The evaluation procedure will normally lead to further questions which we need to address to you directly.
- If you submit documents in **PDF-formats**, please make sure that text can be marked and copied selectively from these documents in order to avoid retyping (which is a possible source of mistakes) when summarising your arguments for the review report.

Interested parties are invited to send their comments by e-mail, at the latest on **7 November 2017**, to rohs.exemptions@oeko.de or by post to:

Oeko-Institut e.V.
Yifaat Baron
P.O. Box 17 71
D - 79017 Freiburg
Germany

Responses submitted electronically will be posted on this web site as they are received, unless respondents specifically request that their contribution should not be published. In the

latter case, responses should be clearly and visibly marked with the words **"Not for publication"**.