Questionnaire Exemption Request No. 18

"Lead used in compliant pin connector systems for use in monitoring and control instruments (Category 9)."

Background

The Öko-Institut together with Fraunhofer IZM has been appointed for the technical assistance in reviewing the requests for exemptions from the requirements of the RoHS Directive 2011/85/EU (RoHS II) by the European Commission. You have submitted the above mentioned request for exemption which has been subject to a first completeness and understandability check.

As a result we have identified that there is some information missing and a few questions to clarify before we can proceed with the online consultation on your request. Therefore we kindly ask you to reformulate your request taking the following points into consideration.

Questions

1. Please provide substantiated data on the amounts of lead used in this exemption:
   a) Which types of equipment would use this exemption?
   b) How much solder/lead per device?
   c) How many of such devices are sold annually worldwide and in the EU?
   d) How much lead would be used in this exemption in equipment put on the market in Europe and worldwide?

   Detailed technical information is not available at this stage. The reason is that this exemption was presumed to be available for cat. 9 and therefore no detail assessment and investigation has been performed so far. Our supply chains are very complex as our products are made of thousands of parts and we deal with a substantial number of suppliers. For further details see General comments Sections 1 and 2.2. 8.

2. You state that the requested exemption would be used in professional equipment of category 9. This equipment, however, will come under the scope of the RoHS Directive from 2017 on. This leaves around six years to find lead-free alternatives. Please note

that lead-free solutions are available for C-press connectors already so that exemption 11 (a) in Annex III expired in 2010. For other connector types, the exemption expires in 2013 as lead-free solutions are foreseeable. Please take into account in your answers that you are simply expected to take all necessary efforts to be RoHS compliant in time, which is a step all other sectors had to and still have to go since some years ago.

a) Please justify and prove that six years are still too short for you to redesign your equipment. Given the rapid technological progress, please also explain how you modernize your products if more than six years are needed in this case for a redesign.

We wish to clarify that this request relates to all monitoring and control products and not just those for industrial or professional, instruments.

It must be pointed out that it was NOT clear for our category of products that exemption 11 would expire since category 9 was not yet in the scope of RoHS and the existing RoHS exemptions were not assessed for this cat. The European Commission and ERA confirmed the need of continuation of the exemptions for cat. 9. For more details see General comments, Sections 1.1 and 1.2.

It is important to stress that many products have been already transitioned to RoHS compliant products, with the assumption that existing RoHS exemptions continue to apply. Redesigning those products could not be done in six years time and this will result in substantial cost and forced obsolescence of products which can be otherwise in use of up to thirty years. This is not economically viable and conflicts with the objective of sustainable use of products and waste prevention. Six year is insufficient for the redesign of products given the specificity of our sector. There are a large number of contributing factors; see General comments Section 2.2.

b) Please provide evidence that the C-type connectors with lead are still available on the market for purchase now and for the next years after 2017.

Market research and supply chain investigations have not been performed as this exemption was presumed to remain available for category 9 products.

Test and Measurement producers do not rely on continued availability of material on the market that utilize the exemptions requested. Our supply chain management is extremely complex. For more details see General comments Section 2.2.10 .

c) Why is this exemption only requested by manufacturers of category 9 equipment, while medical devices in principle have similar life time and redesign conditions?

The T&M Coalition can only represent the business requirements of its members and will not be brought into discussions regarding why producers of other categories of products have not submitted any Exemption requests.