

***Workshop 1: Consequences of REACH for
environmental licensing.***

A decorative graphic consisting of several overlapping circles of varying sizes, rendered in a light blue color, is positioned on the right side of the slide. The circles overlap each other and the text area, creating a modern, abstract design.

Statement 1

The information generated in the framework of REACH is far too much and complicated for local authorities to deal with in environmental licensing

Results of the discussion

- REACH Information is useful for local authorities
- Information provided for DU should be obligatory available for local authorities (SDS as minimum)
- Expertise may exist at local level but depends on circumstances in individual MS (resources)
- Information should be focussed for local authorities
 - Central expert group may provide a solution
 - Training
 - Guidance
 - Identification of duties for authorities
- Important role of helpdesk (incl. link to other environmental legislation)
- Question on access to IT information

Statement 2

For the environmental licensing local authorities can demand more far-reaching obligations than REACH if the specific situation makes this necessary. (general agreement, no diverting points of view)

Statement 3

Local authorities are not obliged to control whether activities described in the application of a permit are in line with restrictions, authorisations or risk reduction measures prescribed under REACH.

Results of the discussion

- Statement correct from legal point of view (art.125):
 - licensing authorities should be obliged to control if authorisation/restriction conditions are met
 - Control of risk reduction measures?
- Depends on national system
 - Open for other authorities to introduce conditions
 - Environmental permit with clearance from other authorities
 - Modular permit; REACH CA could incorporate specific REACH-items

Statement 4

Local authorities should refuse an environmental permit if a company is not able to provide enough information on the substances he is using and emitting. This should even be the case in the situation that the information is not available due to the transitional period of eleven years.

Results of discussion

Two different opinions:

1. Obligation to provide enough information only when substance is registered under REACH or already regulated
 1. Pragmatic approach: temporary permits
 2. Unless industry may hide information
2. Obligation to provide enough information should always take place
 - Industry is responsible for having enough substance information and taking RRM
 - Difference between theory and practice
 - Especially necessary when substance is suspected to be hazardous

Statement 5

Local authorities should incorporate extra severe demands in environmental permits for substances which are placed in the candidate list for authorisation

Results of the discussion

Two opinions:

1. Information that a substance is SVHC should lead to more severe demands
 1. Candidate list if one information source
 2. This severe demands would depend case by case on local situation
 3. Candidate substance is first step for substance evaluation > many information about use of the substance is needed which is a weak point
practical use information from the permits would be useful
2. Authorisation procedure is already quite demanding; what is additional benefit of more pressure to industry
 - Substances are only on the candidate list
 - Is it allowed for local authorities from a legislative point of view