Question for written answer E-001403/2014
to the Commission
Rule 117
Paul Rübig (PPE)

Subject: Review of the meaningfulness of a REACH authorisation and restriction process

During the consultation period regarding the prioritisation of Al-RCF and Zr-RCF for inclusion in Annex XIV of the REACH Regulation, the ECHA received a great number of comments from scientists and users casting doubt on the necessity of the authorisation. Despite these unanimous comments, the ECHA/MSC recommended that Al-RCF and Zr-RCF be included in Annex XIV. In a Minority Statement, several significant Member States (UK; AT; CZ; HU) raised serious legal and competition-related objections.

1. Why are 'products' such as Al-RCF and Zr-RCF prioritised for the REACH authorisation process?

2. Is the Al-RCF classification based on the latest available knowledge (e.g. the Fraunhofer study, 2001; IARC, 2002; Brown et.al, 2005; SCOEL, 2011; UBA Austria, 2010/2011)?

3. Why is the European classification the only classification that departs from the globally applicable IARC classification for Al-RCF?

4. Given the fact there is scientifically substantiated criticism of the classification, why are none of the RMO analyses recommended by the ECHA carried out for Al-RCF and Zr-RCF as part of the REACH/CLP process?

5. How can the conflicts between the aims of various EU regulations be resolved by means of an authorisation requirement?

6. How does the Commission intend to prevent market shifts and/or distortions of competition caused by the authorisation of Al-RCF with imports of Al-RCF products?

7. How is the Commission guaranteeing availability, product safety, quality and price in respect of products made from Al-RCF?

8. Would a regulation on health and safety protection at the workplace under the overall control of the DG for Employment not be more expedient (using BOELV occupational exposure limit values, for example)? If not, what are the reasons for not doing so?