

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

*Session document*

16.3.2005

B6-0000/2005

## **MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION**

pursuant to Rule 81 of the Rules of Procedure

by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

on the draft Commission decision amending for the purposes of adapting to the technical progress the Annex to Directive 2002/95/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment (CMT-2005-151 and CMT-2005-642)

**European Parliament resolution on the draft Commission decision amending for the purposes of adapting to the technical progress the Annex to Directive 2002/95/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment (C6-0000/2005)**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to European Parliament and Council Directive 2002/95/EC<sup>1</sup>,
  - having regard to the draft Commission decision amending for the purposes of adapting to the technical progress the Annex to Directive 2002/95/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment (CMT-2005-151 and CMT-2005-642),
  - having regard to the opinion delivered on [16 March 2005] by the committee referred to in Article 7 of the above directive,
  - having regard to Article 8 of Council Decision 1999/468/EC of 28 June 1999 laying down the procedures for the exercise of implementing powers conferred on the Commission<sup>2</sup>, and the Agreement between the European Parliament and the Commission on procedures for implementing Council Decision 1999/468/EC<sup>3</sup>,
  - having regard to Article 95(3) of the EC Treaty,
  - having regard to Rule 81 of its Rules of Procedure,
- A. Whereas Article 4 (1) of Directive 2002/95/EC restricts the use of lead, mercury, cadmium, hexavalent chromium, polybrominated biphenyls (PBB) and polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDE) in new electrical and electronic equipment put on the market from 1 July 2006 unless exempted under the Annex,
- B. Whereas on 10 December 2004, the committee established under Article 7 of Directive 2002/95/EC voted in favour of a Draft Commission Decision to amend the Annex of Directive 2002/95/EC to add new exemptions and to modify existing ones,
- C. Whereas Article 7(3) of the Comitology Decision and Article 1 of the Agreement provide that the European Parliament "receive, at the same time as the members of the committees and on the same terms, the draft agendas for committee meetings, the draft implementing measures submitted to the committees... and the results of voting and summary records of the meetings and lists of the authorities to which the persons designated by member States to represent them belong",

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 37, 13.2.2003, p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 184, 17.7.1999, p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> OJ L 256, 10.10.2000, p. 19

- D. Whereas the European Parliament received the Draft Decision pursuant to its right of scrutiny pursuant to the Comitology Decision only on 28 January 2005 and only upon request,
- E. Whereas by that date, the European Parliament had received almost none of the documents that it should have received in relation to the meetings of the committee for the adaptation to scientific and technical progress of EC-legislation on waste in the course of 2004,
- F. Whereas the committee responsible in Parliament raised the Commission's non-compliance with the Comitology Decision and the Agreement with the Commission on 3 February 2005; whereas the Commission committed to start a new comitology procedure and to submit all the missing documents on 16 February 2005,
- G. Whereas the European Parliament received a new Draft Decision on 25 February 2005,
- H. Whereas Article 5(1) of Directive 2002/95/EC allows for amendments necessary to adapt the Annex to scientific and technical progress,
- I. Whereas safer alternatives to the hazardous substances covered by Article 4(1) of Directive 2002/95/EC are available or being developed for applications that currently benefit from an exemption,
- J. Whereas Article 5(1) (b) of Directive 2002/95/EC provides for "exempting materials and components of electrical and electronic equipment from Article 4(1) if their elimination or substitution via design changes or materials and components which do not require any of the materials or substances referred to therein is technically or scientifically impracticable, or where the negative environmental, health and/or consumer safety impacts caused by substitution are likely to outweigh the environmental, health and/or consumer safety benefits thereof",
- K. Whereas Article 5(1)(b) of Directive 2002/95/EC provides the sole criteria that can be taken into consideration with a view to preparing a Draft Decision for additional exemptions;
- L. Whereas the Commission asserts in recital 2 of its Draft Decision that the 'use of these hazardous substances in those specific materials and components is still unavoidable',
- M. Whereas pursuant to Article 5(2) of Directive 2002/95/EC, the Commission shall inter alia consult stakeholders before amending the Annex and 'shall provide an account of the information it receives';
- N. Whereas scrutiny of the stakeholder consultation revealed the following problems:
- the burden of proof concerning the validity or non-validity of the requested exemptions was put on the stakeholders and not on the applicant,
  - the requests for exemptions have not been made publicly available, which jeopardises Parliament's ability to exercise effective scrutiny, in particular to assess whether the statement in recital 2 of the Draft Decision is justified,
  - cost considerations were included in the stakeholder consultation, although Directive

2002/95/EC does not include cost considerations; whereas the undue consultation about costs raises doubts about the basis of the Draft Decision,

- O. Whereas scrutiny of the report commissioned by the Commission to assess the validity of the requests revealed the following problems:
- costs are explicitly considered a criterion for granting exemptions, which is against the provisions of Directive 2002/95/EC; whereas the undue consideration about costs questions the validity of the report,
  - the major difference between expiry dates providing a clear signal to economic operators and a general review clause which is open by nature is not understood; whereas a general review clause cannot be considered to be equal to clear expiry dates,
  - information about currently available substitutes does not fully represent the actual situation; whereas this questions the validity of the report for assessing the criteria of Article 5(1)(b),
- P. Whereas scrutiny of the draft Decision in light of the limited information available from the stakeholder consultation and the report commissioned by the Commission revealed the following problems in the draft Decision:
- Exemptions have been provided where substitutes are available (item 7 (second indent), 10, 12, 13 and 14), contrary to Article 5(1)(b),
  - One exemption was extended without any stakeholder consultation (item 8, cadmium in electrical contacts), contrary to Article 5(2),
  - The expiry date for item 7 (second indent) of 2010 was removed with no justification,
  - No other expiry dates were set by the Decision – not even on item 7 (third indent) of the Directive, contrary to the clear mandate in point 10 of the Directive,
  - Expiry dates suggested on a number of Items by the applicants themselves have not been included (items 10, 11, 13, 14),
  - Some exemptions have been granted a broader scope than requested and/or justified (items 10, 12), contrary to Article 5(1)(b),
  - Exemptions have been provided based on unsubstantiated or unquantified technical discussions (Items 7(second indent), 10, 14), contrary to Article 5(1)(b),
  - The erroneous numbering of item 10 of the Annex was reintroduced, although the Commission had committed to rectify it following a misleading interpretation of the directive due to this numbering (Item 15),
- Q. Whereas Article 8 of the Comitology Decision lays down Parliament's right to adopt a Resolution to indicate that the draft implementing measures 'would exceed the implementing powers provided for in the basic instruments',
1. Considers on the basis of the limited information available that the Commission has not acted in accordance with Article 5(1), 5(1)(b) and 5(2) of Directive 2002/95/EC and has therefore exceeded the implementing powers provided for in this Directive;
  2. Calls on the Commission to re-examine its Draft Decision amending for the purposes of adapting to the technical progress the Annex to Directive 2002/95/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment in the light of this resolution, and to ensure that any

amendment to the Annex fully respects the provisions of Directive 2002/95/EC;

3. Confirms that subsequent scrutiny of other comitology files has revealed that the Commission's non-compliance with Council Decision 1999/468/EEC and the Agreement in terms of the procedural provisions is not an isolated case;
4. Calls on the Commission to make a detailed assessment of all cases of non-compliance with Council Decision 1999/468/EEC and the Agreement since the modification of the procedures at the end of 2003, specifying the act and the exact form of non-compliance and to forward the full assessment to Parliament within 3 months;
5. Calls on the Commission to respect Parliament's right to information and scrutiny pursuant to Council Decision 1999/468/EEC and the Agreement;
6. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission, and the parliaments and governments of the Member States.