

**International Workshop: Consequences of REACH
for other legal and administrative environmental instruments**
Evaluating the Environmental Effectiveness of REACH (REACH:EEE)
October 11 & 12, 2007 Berlin

Working Group 3:

**Substances of very high concern (SVHC):
precaution and strategic points for an integrated monitoring**

Andreas Hermann, Öko-Institut e.V., Germany, Darmstadt Office, www.oeko.de

Stefanie Merenyi, sofia e.V., Germany, Darmstadt, www.sofia-darmstadt.de

Results from the discussion

- Different types of monitoring have to be distinguished:
 - Compliance-Monitoring in order to control the compliance of the applicants behaviour with authorisation conditions (also regarding Art. 60 (10) REACH); this would cover emission-control and eventually regional ambient monitoring (depending on substance and authorised use)
 - ambient monitoring
- Division of responsibility:
 - Compliance-Monitoring is in the responsibility of the holder of an authorisation (self-responsibility !)
 - Ambient monitoring is in the responsibility of the competent national authority

Results from the discussion

- **A definition of monitoring has to consider the existence of these different types
→ a differentiated terminology is needed**
- **Monitoring requirements could be established in the context of EPER and IPPC**

Results from the discussion

- **Aim and Focus of monitoring:**
 - **The subjects for monitoring in the proposed new Annex XVa REACH (emissions and immissions as well as unforeseen effects of SVHC and their degradation products) were considered to be the right focus.**
 - **All point and diffuse sources are relevant and should be monitored, but there should be a practical approach to concentrate on some sources. However, especially for ambient monitoring concentration on only some sources could lead to wrong focus for monitoring!**
 - **The duty of a holder of an authorisation to monitor SVHC shall not oblige national competent authorities to do ambient monitoring for that SVHC**
 - **There is a strong need for better exchange on information between national competent authorities (horizontal) and MS and Commission/ECHA (vertical) concerning especially BAT (best available technologies) for Risk Management Measures**

Results from the discussion

- **No clear position on the consequences of ineffective Risk Management Measures (RMM).
Proposals:**
 - To revoke the authorisation according to Art. 61 REACH
Restriction of the substance may be the better alternative
 - Who will have to propose effective RMM: Commission or Applicant?
- **Concerns about ambient monitoring:**
 - Who will pay the costs for ambient monitoring? Included in the authorisation fees? Polluter-pays principle should be applied.
 - Different level of the enforcement of Monitoring in the Member States can lead to competitive disadvantages
 - Limited resources for control laboratories in the Member States
 - Regarding new substances: probably not enough information available