

**Question for written answer P-009664/2013
to the Commission**
Rule 117
Paul Rübzig (PPE)

Subject: Review of the Directive on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances (RoHS Directive)

In December 2010 the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers agreed on an amendment to the Restriction of Hazardous Substances Directive 2002/95/EC with respect to the use of hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment (RoHS recast). The European Parliament agreed with the Council to subject the scope of the Directive to review by 22 July 2014 (Article 24). With a view to achieving the objectives set out in Article 1 of the Directive, Article 6 lays down that the list of substances, in particular the list of substances in recital 10, shall be subject to a thorough assessment. The Commission's advisers are once again proposing, in this context, a long list of substances for re-evaluation, although this was decisively rejected by Parliament when the Directive was adopted.

The Commission is requested to answer the following questions in this connection:

1. What action does the European Commission intend to take in order to respect the outcome of the long and thorough discussion of the recast of the RoHS Directive and in particular to comply with the European Parliament's wish that a long list of substances should not be presented?
2. How does the Commission intend to prevent unnecessary economic damage arising in the context of the RoHS Directive - for example as a result of drawing up a long list of substances? Has the Commission conducted an assessment amongst stakeholders, in the context of the RoHS Directive or other sections of the legislation, to show the economic impact of the substances listed for review?
3. Has the Commission or its advisers considered or included in their review the impact which the proposed approach of a long list will have on transatlantic trade?
4. What is the Commission's position on Parliament's demands for the implementation of the RoHS Directive to be simplified and for duplication with regard to REACH to be avoided?
5. Why were stakeholders not brought in from the beginning in developing the methodology used by the advisers? Does the Commission insist on the same degree of transparency with its advisers as is expected from the Parliament and Council?