

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

Session document

A6-0341/2008

12.9.2008

*****I**
REPORT

on the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Directive 76/769/EEC as regards restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (Dichloromethane)
(COM(2008)0080 – C6-0068/2008 – 2008/0033(COD))

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

Rapporteur: Carl Schlyter

Symbols for procedures

- * Consultation procedure
majority of the votes cast
- **I Cooperation procedure (first reading)
majority of the votes cast
- **II Cooperation procedure (second reading)
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend
the common position*
- *** Assent procedure
*majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases
covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and
Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
- ***I Codecision procedure (first reading)
majority of the votes cast
- ***II Codecision procedure (second reading)
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend
the common position*
- ***III Codecision procedure (third reading)
majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission.)

Amendments to a legislative text

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. In the case of amending acts, passages in an existing provision that the Commission has left unchanged, but that Parliament wishes to amend, are highlighted in **bold**. Any deletions that Parliament wishes to make in passages of this kind are indicated thus: [...]. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). Suggested corrections of this kind are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

CONTENTS

	Page
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	16
PROCEDURE.....	20

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Directive 76/769/EEC as regards restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (Dichloromethane)

(COM(2008)0080 – C6-0068/2008 – 2008/0033(COD))

(Codecision procedure: first reading)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the European Parliament and the Council (COM(2008)0080),
 - having regard to Article 251(2) and Article 95 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Commission submitted the proposal to Parliament (C6-0068/2008),
 - having regard to Rule 51 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (A6-0341/2008),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
 2. Calls on the Commission to refer the matter to Parliament again if it intends to amend the proposal substantially or replace it with another text;
 3. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

Amendment 1

Proposal for a decision – amending act
Recital -1 (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(-1) Dichloromethane (DCM) is being used in very high concentration in paint stripping products. It is very volatile and has a narcotic effect leading to depression of the central nervous system and to cardio-toxicological effects at high exposure, with a direct risk of death as a result of misuse. DCM is classified as a carcinogen category 3 pursuant to Council Directive 67/548/EEC of 27 June 1967 on the approximation of laws,

*regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances*¹. *DCM is a priority substance pursuant to Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy*².

¹ *OJ Series I Chapter 1967 P. 0234.*

² *OJ L 327, 23.10.2000, p. 1.*

Justification

The hazardous properties and the use of, and the exposure levels to, DCM should be mentioned in the legislation, as well as its listing as one of 33 priority substances pursuant to Community legislation on water to complete the justification for restrictions.

Amendment 2

Proposal for a decision – amending act Recital 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1a) Alternatives to DCM with a much better human health and environmental hazard and risk profile are available.

Justification

This important finding from the independent impact assessment by "Risk Policy Analysts Limited" (RPA), commissioned by DG Enterprise and Industry of the European Commission, on "Potential Restrictions on the Marketing and Use of Dichloromethane in Paint Strippers", should be mentioned as a significant argument for the restriction of the use of DCM.

Amendment 3

Proposal for a decision – amending act Recital 1 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1b) To ensure that the current level of protection is not reduced and to prevent

increased exposure to risks to human health and safety that are presently unknown or not quantified, all alternative paint stripper ingredients should be assessed with the same rigour as DCM.

Justification

The above examples show that only a full risk assessment on all the alternatives as provided in REACH can ensure that the safest methods of paint removal are chosen and that any necessary control measures users will need to adopt are proportionate to the health and safety risks.

Amendment 4

**Proposal for a decision – amending act
Recital 3**

Text proposed by the Commission

(3) DCM-based paint strippers are used by consumers at home to remove paints, varnishes and lacquers both indoors and outdoors. The safe use of DCM by consumers cannot be ensured by training or monitoring. Therefore, the only effective and proportionate measure to eliminate the risks for consumers is a ban on the marketing and use of DCM-based paint strippers.

Amendment

(3) DCM-based paint strippers are used by consumers at home to remove paints, varnishes and lacquers both indoors and outdoors. The safe use of DCM by consumers cannot be ensured by training or monitoring. Therefore, the only effective and proportionate measure to eliminate the risks for consumers is a ban on the marketing, ***supplying*** and use of DCM-based paint strippers.

Justification

In order to achieve better prevention of the consumers, the possibility for distribution of DCM-based paint strippers by professional and industrial users has also to be avoided.

Amendment 5

**Proposal for a decision – amending act
Recital 5**

Text proposed by the Commission

(5) As consumers, may have access to DCM-based paint stripper despite the ban through the distribution chain intended

Amendment

deleted

for professional and industrial users, a warning phrase should be included on the product.

Justification

Linked to Amendment 8 shifting this recital in modified form to recital 8a (new), and to the amendments prohibiting DCM for professional use.

Amendment 6

**Proposal for a decision – amending act
Recital 6**

Text proposed by the Commission

(6) The fatalities registered in Europe over the last 18 years for industrial and professional uses are mainly attributed to inadequate ventilation, the inappropriate personal protective equipment, the use of inadequate tanks and the long-term exposure to DCM. Therefore restrictions should be imposed to control and reduce the risks involved in professional and industrial uses.

Amendment

(6) The fatalities registered in Europe over the last 18 years for industrial and professional uses are mainly attributed to inadequate ventilation, the inappropriate personal protective equipment, the use of inadequate tanks, ***inadequate product formulations lacking sufficient vapour retardants*** and the long-term exposure to DCM. Therefore restrictions should be imposed to control and reduce the risks involved in professional and industrial uses.

Justification

Some old DCM formulations did not contain the adequate amount of vapour retardants used to minimise vaporisation.

Amendment 7

**Proposal for a decision – amending act
Recital 7 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(7a) Professional use of DCM-based paint strippers regularly exceeds occupational exposure limits (OELs), despite good ventilation, and even when used outdoors. Compliance with the OELs is practically non-existent, as users lack adequate

measuring equipment and do not make use of adequate personal protection measures. Enforcement of the OELs is inherently inadequate due to the large number, small size and mobile nature of the enterprises involved.

Justification

This summarizes some of the key findings of the impact assessment commissioned by the European Commission, which recommends a total prohibition (ban) on all professional uses of DCM-based paint strippers.

Amendment 8

**Proposal for a decision – amending act
Recital 7 b (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(7b) Pursuant to Article 6 of Council Directive 98/24/EC on the protection of the health and safety of workers from the risks related to chemical agents at work¹, employers are required by preference to avoid the use of a hazardous chemical agent by replacing it with a chemical agent or process which, under its condition of use, is not hazardous or less hazardous to workers' safety and health, and only to apply protection and prevention measures where such substitution is not possible.

¹ OJ L 131, 5.5.1998, p. 11.

Justification

The discussion about adequate measures for professional use of DCM shall be put into the context of existing worker's health and safety legislation. The priority of substitution over protection and prevention measures needs be effectively applied.

Amendment 9

Proposal for a decision – amending act Recital 8

Text proposed by the Commission

(8) The placing on the market and use of DCM-paint strippers by professionals should therefore be banned in order to protect their health and to reduce the number of fatalities and non-fatal accidents. ***Nevertheless, when the replacement of DCM is deemed to be particularly difficult or inappropriate, Member States should be able to allow further use of DCM by specially licensed professionals. Member States would be responsible for granting and monitoring such licences, which should be based on compulsory training with specific requirements.***

Amendment

(8) The placing on the market and use of DCM-paint strippers by professionals should therefore be banned in order to protect their health and to reduce the number of fatalities and non-fatal accidents.

Justification

Based on the arguments in recitals 6, 7 of the Commission proposal and recital 7a and 7b by the rapporteur, DCM should be completely banned also for professional use in line with the impact assessment commissioned by the European Commission. The use of hazardous substances at the workplace should be replaced, where possible, and not legitimized by training about personal protection measures. Even the best training will not ensure that professionals will comply with occupational exposure limits due to the high costs of such measures.

Amendment 10

Proposal for a decision – amending act Recital 8 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(8a) As professionals may have access to DCM-based paint stripper despite the ban through the distribution chain intended for industrial users, a warning phrase should be included on the product.

Justification

Linked to the amendment shifting the recital in modified form to recital 8a (new), and to the amendments prohibiting DCM for professional use.

Consumers do not normally have access to the supply chain for industrial users, but professionals may have such access. It is therefore appropriate to maintain a warning, targeting professionals.

Amendment 11

Proposal for a decision – amending act Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) The number of fatalities and non-fatal accidents registered during industrial activities is an indication of inadequate enforcement of the workplace legislation. The exposure to DCM remains high and further risk reduction measures should apply to workers in industrial installations. Preventive measures such as good ventilation of the workplace, appropriate personal protective equipment and additional modification of tanks should be adopted.

Amendment

(9) The number of fatalities and non-fatal accidents registered during industrial activities is an indication of inadequate enforcement of the workplace legislation. The exposure to DCM remains high and further risk reduction measures should apply to workers in industrial installations. Preventive measures such as good ventilation of the workplace ***that meets occupational exposure limits or respiratory protective equipment with an independent air supply, separate ventilated areas for the drying of stripped articles***, appropriate personal protective equipment and additional modification of tanks should be adopted.

Justification

It needs to be specified that the workplace ventilation should be such that occupational exposure limits are met, or alternatively, respiratory protective equipment with an independent air supply is to be used. To reduce exposure to DCM in industrial use as much as possible, the drying of stripped articles should take place in separate ventilated areas.

Amendment 12

**Proposal for a decision – amending act
Recital 9 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(9a) In November 2007, the Scientific Committee on Occupational Exposure Limits recommended limit values for an eight hour Time Weighted Average and for a 15 minute Short Term Exposure Level. It is appropriate to establish these levels as maximum limits that are to be achieved by effective exhaust ventilation for industrial use, without prejudice to any lower levels set pursuant to national legislation.

Justification

The recommendations of the Scientific Committee on Occupational Exposure Limits should be put into action as references for the exhaust ventilation systems in industrial use. Their recommendations should be the EU maximum level, while Member States may choose to set lower one (as is already the case for e.g. Hungary).

Amendment 13

Proposal for a decision – amending act

Annex

Directive 76/769/EEC

Annex I – point (xx) – column 2 – point 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2) By way of derogation to paragraph (1), Member States may authorise the supply of paint strippers containing dichloromethane to licensed professionals. ***deleted***

Justification

Authorising DCM paint strippers for licensed professionals is very difficult to justify in the light of EU legislation on worker's health and safety, which requires replacement of a hazardous substance where possible. Moreover, it disregards the clear findings that many professionals do not have the means to ensure compliance with occupational exposure limits and are not investing in adequate personal protection equipment. Finally, it disregards the fact that it is virtually impossible to enforce adequate use conditions due to the large number,

small size and mobile nature of the enterprises involved.

Amendment 14

Proposal for a decision – amending act

Annex

Directive 76/769/EEC

Annex I – point (xx) – column 2 – point 3

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(3) The licence referred to in paragraph (2) shall be granted to professionals trained in the safe use of paint strippers containing dichloromethane. The training shall cover:

deleted

(a) awareness, evaluation and management of risks to health,

(b) use of adequate ventilation,

(c) use of appropriate personal protective equipment

Justification

The impact assessment commissioned by the European Commission found a high degree of non-compliance with existing legislation on worker's health and safety, which is perpetuated by an inherent lack of enforcement. As professionals do not have the measuring devices to ensure compliance with occupational exposure limits and are not investing in adequate personal protection equipment due to their high costs, training will not rectify these problems. In such a situation, a complete prohibition is the only meaningful measure.

Amendment 15

Proposal for a decision – amending act

Annex

Directive 76/769/EEC

Annex I – point (xx) – column 2 – point 4

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(4) Paint strippers containing dichloromethane in concentrations equal to or greater than 0.1% by mass may be used in industrial installations only if the following conditions are met:

(4) Paint strippers containing dichloromethane in concentrations equal to or greater than 0.1% by mass may be used in industrial installations only if the following conditions are met:

(a) effective exhaust ventilation or respiratory protective equipment with an independent air supply,

(b) **enclosed** strip tanks covered when not in use,

(c) appropriate protective gloves for operators.

(a) **operation of** effective exhaust ventilation **proven to ensure full compliance with national occupational exposure limits that shall not exceed 100 ppm (353 mg/m³) for an eight hour Time Weighted Average or 200 ppm (706 mg/m³) for a 15 minute Short Term Exposure Level**, or **proven use of** respiratory protective equipment with an independent air supply,

(b) **all** strip tanks covered when not in use,

(ba) separate ventilated area for the drying of stripped articles,

(c) appropriate protective gloves **and masks** for operators.

Justification

1. *The number of fatalities and non-fatal accidents registered during industrial activities is a clear indication of inadequate enforcement of workplace legislation. Any industrial use of DCM should be subjected to clear proof that occupational exposure limits are respected. As a minimum, the exhaust ventilation should achieve the limit values recommended by the Scientific Committee on Occupational Exposure Limits, while Member States may choose to set lower ones. Alternatively, the use of adequate respiratory protective equipment with independent air supply needs to be proven.*

2. *Covering all systems, including those that are not "truly closed" will decrease emissions of DCM vapour.*

3. *To reduce exposure to DCM in industrial use as much as possible, the drying of stripped articles should take place in separate ventilated areas.*

4. *DCM is highly volatile. The primary route of uptake of DCM in humans is considered to be inhalation (ATSDR, 2000 Toxicological Profiles for Methylene Chloride, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, GA, USA.). By using appropriate gloves and masks, the operators would be protected from dermal and inhalation exposure to DCM.*

Amendment 16

Proposal for a decision – amending act

Annex

Directive 76/769/EEC

Annex I – point (xx) – column 2 – point 5

Text proposed by the Commission

(5) Without prejudice to other Community legislation concerning the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances and preparations, paint strippers containing more than 0.1% by mass of dichloromethane shall be legibly and indelibly marked by [24 months *after the entry into force of the Decision*] as follows: “Reserved for industrial **and professional** uses”.

Amendment

(5) Without prejudice to other Community legislation concerning the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances and preparations, paint strippers containing more than 0.1% by mass of dichloromethane shall be legibly and indelibly marked by [24 months *after the entry into force of the Decision*] as follows: “**Dangerous!** Reserved for industrial uses **only**”.

Justification

The consumer will be alarmed and more firmly convinced that the content is harmful for him.

If professional use is prohibited, the warning needs to be adapted accordingly.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

“Despite good ventilation, stripping of small areas, immediate collection of stripped off paint residues and closing of paint stripper cans, the exposure limit (100 ppm) is regularly exceeded. Therefore, one must use self-contained respirators at such work places, except it is proven without doubt through measurements that for specific paint strippers or through special protection procedures the exposure limit is not exceeded.

Filtering masks are not an effective protection. When using respirators, general precaution examination has to be applied to the persons wearing them. If the paint stripping work will last more than 20% of the weekly work hours, a special permission has to be requested from the responsible regulatory body for workplace safety.”

VCI - the German Chemical Industry Association, 2000

1. Introduction

Dichloromethane (DCM) is a colourless chemical compound with a penetrating ether-like or mild sweet odour. The key markets are: production of pharmaceuticals, solvent and auxiliary applications, paint stripper manufacture and adhesives. Of the total production of 244 000 tonnes in 2005, **13 000 tonnes of "virgin" DCM were used for paint strippers (ca. 5%)**, with another 1 500 - 11 000 tonnes being reclaimed from pharmaceutical production for use as paint stripper.

DCM has a **unique profile of adverse effects to human health** - and it is listed as one of 33 priority substances under the Water Framework Directive. DCM-based paint strippers contain between 60-90% of DCM. DCM boils between 30-40°C and is extremely volatile - i.e. it evaporates very fast. DCM is classified as a carcinogen category 3. It has a narcotic effect, leading to depression of the central nervous system, loss of consciousness, and to cardio-toxicological effects at high exposure, with a direct risk of death as a result of misuse. Other effects include irritation of the eyes and respiratory tract, lung oedema and acute effects on the heart, liver and kidneys. It also leads to light-headedness and headache.

According to the Scientific Committee on Health and Environment Risks, a major concern from the toxicity of DCM is the risk to especially susceptible populations. **Children are more susceptible** due to a potential for higher exposure (higher ventilation rate than adults; the concentration of DCM is higher at floor level). People with a predisposition to cardiovascular disease may be at a higher risk, too.

According to the Commission, between 1989 and 2007, **18 fatalities** (9 for industrial use, 8 for professional use, 1 for consumer use) and **56 non-fatal injuries** have been registered in the EU.

The risks from DCM in paint strippers have been assessed in **three Commission studies** (1999, 2004 and 2007) - all of which concluded the need for risk reduction measures for consumer and professional use, and two of which also called for further risk reduction

measures for industrial use¹.

Various alternatives to DCM-based paint strippers are already available on the market: physical/mechanical stripping, pyrolytic/thermal stripping, and chemical stripping involving other chemicals than DCM. Alternative chemical paint strippers are the most widely used. They contain a large variety of chemicals. These substances have very diverse hazard profiles and could pose other risks to the user than DCM. However, according to the Commission studies and its own impact assessment, on balance, **there are alternatives with a (much) better human health and environmental hazard and risk profile.**

A number of European countries have already put in place **national measures to ban or substitute DCM** (Austria, Denmark, Sweden) or are in the process of doing so (Germany).

2. Why ban consumer use of DCM?

There is no way to ensure the safe use of DCM by consumers:

- they are not able to assess the risk;
- they do not have access to the same equipment (especially engineering controls) as users involved in industrial uses - and in some cases, the working conditions at home may be much worse than those for tradesmen (for example, paint stripping may be undertaken in a basement, or an enclosed area with closed windows, due to bad weather, or in the presence of vulnerable persons such as children, elderly relatives or those with health conditions); and
- they do not know about the adequate personal protection equipment, and even if they did, it would be highly unlikely that they would be ready to pay for it (cost of independent air supply with compressor and mask, plus appropriate gloves: ca. € 2750; cost of DCM paint stripper: ca. € 10/litre).

As a result of the above, and taking into account the fact that alternatives are available, and their use is likely to result in little if any economic impact to the consumer, consumer uses of DCM-based paint strippers should be banned.

3. Why ban professional use of DCM?

Council Directive 98/24/EC on the protection of the health and safety of workers from the risks related to chemical agents at work sets out a clear hierarchy of norms. Employers shall first seek to **replace** a hazardous chemical by another chemical or process which, under its condition of use, is not hazardous or less hazardous, and only apply protection and prevention measures where such substitution is not possible. Given the availability of safer alternatives, it is clear from current EU law on workers' health and safety that DCM should be substituted.

DCM bears the safety phrase "**do not breathe gas/fumes/vapour/spray**". Given its very high volatility, the only way to comply with this is to use independent air supply respirators. However, the full equipment costs around € 2750 - and working in a full-body overall with an oxygen flask and fluororubber gloves is rather unpleasant, and therefore rarely undertaken.

Occupational exposure limits (OELs) are regularly exceeded significantly, even in conditions of good ventilation, including outdoor use (see also the introductory quote). Note

¹ See Commission impact assessment accompanying the proposal

that DCM only becomes detectable to the human nose at concentrations well above OELs. Professionals might think they are not exposed because they do not smell anything - yet they may already be well above the OEL.

It also bears the safety phrase "avoid contact with skin and eyes" and "**Wear suitable protective clothing and gloves**". However, the different types available all have serious limitations: The cheapest ones (EVA - ca. € 10/pair) have little mechanical strength, and DCM will break through quickly. PVA gloves (ca. € 25/pair) have a good chemical resistance, but cannot be used where water is present. Fluororubber gloves (€ 50/pair) are the most appropriate, but DCM will break through at the latest after 3 hours.

Importantly, current enforcement practices are inherently inadequate, especially due to the large number, small size and mobile nature of the enterprises involved.

Finally, EU legislation on workers' health and safety does not apply to self-employed workers, which however represent a significant number of painters and decorators.

In summary, current legislation on workers' health and safety either does not apply (self-employed workers) or is largely ignored (no substitution, inadequate personal protection), and is not enforced.

4. Economic impact

The Commission proposes a ban on the professional use of DCM in paint strippers, unless a Member State establishes a training and licensing system for such use. This stands in contrast to the recommendations of the RPA impact assessment from 2007¹.

The Commission estimates the **costs for its training and licensing proposal** at € 1,9 million in the first year and € 1,3 million in the subsequent years (training of 10 000 employees). The licensing of 10 000 individuals and 800 businesses would result in further costs of € 1,34 million. These costs do not yet include the costs of engineering controls and/or personal protective equipment (PPE).

It is interesting to compare these figures to the **estimated profits** of the manufacturers of DCM. The annual profit for the industry is estimated at between € 430 000 and € 1,1 million for professional use by RPA.

In other words, if 10 000 employees and 800 businesses were to be trained and licensed across the EU, the costs for this would clearly outweigh the profits of the manufacturing industry. It is difficult to see why professional users and authorities should pay millions for training and licensing (and additional millions for PPE) to uphold a comparatively small profit for the manufacturer.

Moreover, many DCM manufacturers also offer alternatives to DCM, so they could compensate part if not all of their losses by shifting to alternatives.

¹ RPA - Risk and Policy Analysts Ltd, UK

5. The "risk reduction measures" proposed by industry

The manufacturers of DCM propose the following measures instead of a ban for consumers:

- container equal to or smaller than 1 litre,
- narrow-neck containers with child-safe closure,
- addition of vapour retardant,
- a visible safety label requiring use only with adequate ventilation.

For professional use, they propose the following measures:

- addition of vapour retardant,
- provision of safety information.

The impact assessment by RPA has shown clearly that **these measures are entirely inadequate**. In fact, most of them are non-measures, as they represent the status quo. The most common container size for consumers is already 1 litre. Narrow-neck containers with child-safe closure are already mandated by law. While narrow-necks may be effective in reducing spillage, they do not reduce exposure during use (the user still needs to decant (parts of) the content into a jar, so that in the end exposure would not be reduced).

Almost all products on the market contain vapour retardants - above all to increase the effectiveness of DCM, as it would otherwise evaporate before it can be fully effective as a paint stripper.

DCM already has to be labelled by law to warn the user not to breathe gas/fumes/vapour/spray (appropriate wording to be specified by the manufacturer). Adding a provision on "adequate ventilation" adds nothing and is of no use: what does it mean, all the more so since the human nose can detect DCM only at levels well above occupational exposure limits?

Finally, it goes without saying that manufacturers are already obliged by law to provide safety information to downstream professional users.

All in all, the measures proposed by industry - and unfortunately echoed by some Member States - are to be seen as a cynical attempt to stop a long overdue restriction of a chemical with a unique profile of adverse effects with suggestions that are already status quo, and that have clearly failed to provide adequate protection.

PROCEDURE

Title	Dangerous substances and preparations (dichloromethane)
References	COM(2008)0080 – C6-0068/2008 – 2008/0033(COD)
Date submitted to Parliament	14.2.2008
Committee responsible Date announced in plenary	ENVI 11.3.2008
Committee(s) asked for opinion(s) Date announced in plenary	IMCO 11.3.2008
Not delivering opinions Date of decision	IMCO 25.3.2008
Rapporteur(s) Date appointed	Carl Schlyter 3.3.2008
Discussed in committee	24.6.2008
Date adopted	9.9.2008
Result of final vote	+: 54 –: 4 0: 1
Members present for the final vote	Adamos Adamou, Georgs Andrejevs, Margrete Auken, Liam Aylward, Pilar Ayuso, Johannes Blokland, John Bowis, Frieda Brepoels, Martin Callanan, Dorette Corbey, Magor Imre Csibi, Chris Davies, Avril Doyle, Mojca Drčar Murko, Anne Ferreira, Matthias Groote, Françoise Grossetête, Satu Hassi, Gyula Hegyi, Marie Anne Isler Béguin, Dan Jørgensen, Christa Kläß, Eija-Riitta Korhola, Holger Kraemer, Aldis Kušķis, Marie-Noëlle Lienemann, Peter Liese, Roberto Musacchio, Riitta Myller, Péter Olajos, Miroslav Ouzký, Vladko Todorov Panayotov, Vittorio Prodi, Frédérique Ries, Dagmar Roth-Behrendt, Guido Sacconi, Amalia Sartori, Carl Schlyter, Richard Seeber, María Sornosa Martínez, Antonios Trakatellis, Evangelia Tzampazi, Thomas Ulmer, Anja Weisgerber, Glenis Willmott
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Giovanni Berlinguer, Iles Braghetto, Nicodim Bulzesc, Philip Bushill-Matthews, Bairbre de Brún, Milan Gaľa, Genowefa Grabowska, Jutta Haug, Erna Hennicot-Schoepges, Caroline Lucas, Alojz Peterle, Donato Tommaso Veraldi
Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote	Elisabetta Gardini, Graham Watson