



# The European Parliament and REACH - January 2005

**Axel Singhofen**

**Adviser for Health and Environment Policy**



**The Greens | European Free Alliance**  
in the European Parliament



# Committee Overview

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Rapp/Draftsman</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Direction</b>
<b>Environment</b>	Guido Sacconi	PSE	Italy	2
<b>Industry</b>	Lena Ek	ALDE	Sweden	+/-
<b>Internal Market</b>	Hartmut Nassauer	PPE	Germany	- - -
<b>Budget</b>	?	PSE		
<b>Econ. Affairs</b>	Satu Hassi	Greens/EFA	Finland	2 2 2
<b>Social Affairs</b>	Thomas Mann	PPE	Germany	- - -
<b>Legal Affairs</b>	Kurt Lechner	PPE	Germany	- - -
<b>Trade</b>	G. Quisthoudt-Rowohl	PPE	Germany	- - -
<b>Women</b>	Hiltrud Breyer	Greens/EFA	Germany	2 2 2



## Planned Timetable for 2005 of the lead committee (Environment)

- ‘ **19 January:** EP full-day hearing
- ‘ **2-3 February:** second exchange of views
- ‘ **14-15 March:** consideration of draft report
- ‘ **May:** deadline for amendments
- ‘ **June:** discussion of amendments
- ‘ **14-15 September:** vote in committee
- ‘ **October:** vote in plenary (= first reading)
  
- ‘ **Opinion-giving committees will have to have voted in July**



# REACH hearing in EP January 2005

- **Negative aspects**
- ‘ **Lost opportunity for proper debate**
  - 4 no focus on specific subjects
  - 4 panels unbalanced
  - 4 civil society groups only at the very end
  - ♥ no real discussion, just a series of well-known statements
- ‘ **Temporary confusion about further procedures**
  - 4 Verheugen: “*open when COM will modify proposal*”
    - before first reading: EP to postpone further work
    - after first reading: normal procedure
  - 4 Nassauer added to the confusion to push for revision before first reading (misrepresented co-decision procedure)
  - 4 however: Director DG ENV stressed repeatedly that there will be NO modified proposal before first reading!



## REACH hearing in EP January 2005

- **Positive aspects**
- ‘ **Everyone, including industry (!), wants to go ahead, no further delays** (except for some PPE members)
- ‘ **Clarity about nature of additional impact ass. (IA)**
  - 4 Dimas:
    - “*COM Extended IA not affected by additional IA*”
    - “*additional IA are industry studies*”
    - “*no extrapolation from individual negative findings*”
  - 4 Verheugen:
    - “*I would not have agreed to them the way they are*”
    - “*IA only credible if all stakeholders involved*”
  - 4 Lux: “*we will counterbalance missing aspects/benefits*”



# REACH hearing in EP January 2005

- **Positive aspects**
- ‘ **More clarity about positions of stakeholders**
  - 4 REACH-Plus:  
environmental + animal welfare + consumer NGOs,  
trade unions, health experts
  - 4 REACH-modified (same level of protection):  
individual downstream users and retailers
  - 4 REACH-Minus:  
chemical industry, importers, industry trade associations



# Key issues discussed at EP hearing

## ‘ **“Prioritisation”**

- 4 industry pushes massively for “risk-based” approach
- 4 industry supported by PPE, not by Sacconi
- 4 ENGOs against
- 4 Commission stresses that entire REACH “risk-based”

## ‘ **Substances in (import) articles**

- 4 nobody satisfied with current provisions

## ‘ **One-substance one-registration**

- 4 industry pretends support, “provided it is not mandatory”
- 4 civil society and EP in general favourable
- 4 Commission sees workability problems



## Summary and preview

- ‘ Real work in the EP starting now
  - ‘ Major differences between the key persons in the three key committees
  - ‘ A minority (Nassauer) campaigns for modified proposal (along the lines of VCI-proposal), but not even with full support in the PPE
  - ‘ So far, EP more open to industry concerns than Council
  - ‘ So far, demands of manufacturing industry dominate the discussion in the EP, but major divisions within manufacturing industry and pro-REACH downstream users gets more vocal
- è **Impossible to make any predictions!**