The International Chemical Secretariat

- Initiated by NGOs / based on governmental funding
- A forum for parties working for better chemical control
- We follow the development of chemical policies and their implementation
- We build alliances for progressive legislation, in particular among business actors
The "common sense" test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals in daily use have been checked for dangerous properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies &amp; consumers can access info on what chemicals are present in products they purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a rule, toxic chemicals are replaced if safer alternatives are available</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions to use a toxic chemical cover its use also in articles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Failure of today’s system:

A lack of…

…knowledge – 95 % uncontrolled
…scope - chemicals in articles excluded
…info access – no public “Right-to-know”
…producer responsibility – authorities obliged to prove harm
…efficiency: “Paralysis by Analysis”
Reasons for a legislative reform

- Protect health
- Protect the environment
- Better for governments
- Better for business
What about **costs**?

What is the realistic cost for implementing REACH?
What is cost of the current system?
What is the cost of doing nothing to improve control?

And what about **benefits**?

Which costs savings can be made?
How can REACH influence innovation?
Will REACH improve European industry competitiveness?
REACH costs in relation to other expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Fluctuation in % of turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy costs 1996-2000</td>
<td>2,6-3,4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Expenditure 1996-2000</td>
<td>1,9-2,9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluctuation of World market prices</td>
<td>+/- 20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(exchange rates) 1999-2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REACH, October proposal</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,05 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REACH costs in relation to other expenses:

Estimated cost for removal and destruction of PCB in jointing sealings in Swedish buildings alone:

€ 100m  (In EU25: 10ths of billions)

Estimated occupational health benefits over 30 years from the identification and action on a number of cancerogenic substances:

€ 18-54 billion
Cry wolf

– predicted costs by industry in the face of new regulations
Arguments for industry to support REACH…

• Reduced risks of future liabilities
• New markets for new, ”Greener” products
• New markets for more environmentally sound manufacturing processes
• More information provided by suppliers
• Improved trust among consumers, workers, investors, etc.
• Creating a ”producer responsibility” for Chemical Industry
REACH EXPLAINED

October 2003 draft

The most problematic substances will only be allowed for uses that has been authorised by the EU.

EU will evaluate available data, in particular for chemicals used in large quantities, and ask for data gaps to be filled.

Producers and importers of chemicals will have to register to provide test data and register all substances where use exceeds 1 ton.

Chemicals that cause concern may also be restricted through an alternative route - serving as a "safety net".

Info for users of chemicals ▶

Info for industry further down the supply chain and importers of articles ▶
REACH Plus

The final REACH proposal is only a shadow of the original plans described in the White Paper from 2001. The proposal includes a number of gaping loopholes, flawed approaches and unwarranted exemptions. The Commissions’ proposal must be amended on several crucial points to make it able to deliver its original objective of ensuring a high level of protection of human health and the environment.

This section – REACH Plus – summarises the most important changes needed to make REACH an efficient and robust reform.

The amendments proposed here are based on the policy of major environmental NGOs in Europe as e.g. WWF, EEB, FoE, and Greenpeace. Other amendments have originally been suggested by Workers Unions, consumer organisations or Member-States’ Competent Authorities. The proposals will be evaluated further to produce a more exhaustive list of amendments at a later stage.

Testing Chemicals

Replace the worst ones

Right to know

Producers’ responsibility

Substances in articles

More changes →

Why should you support the changes →