Questionnaire

Exemption 3 Annex II Directive 2000/53/EC

"Lead as an alloying element in copper alloy containing up to 4 % lead by weight"

Stakeholders are invited to clarify the following specific questions as detailed as possible. In your contribution, please state which question number you are referring to.

1) Leaded copper alloys are still used in a wide range of vehicle components. For some of the listed applications it is not comprehensible why a substitution to lead-free alternatives is not possible, e.g. mountings of radios, various mountings, pins, fittings, etc. Please explain or comment this!
2) Please make a distinction between applications in which the use of lead is unavoidable (e.g. due to safety reasons) and less important applications.
3) Please indicate whether the less (safety) relevant applications can be substituted by other lead-free applications providing the same functionality.
4) Based on the total lead amount per car (max. 500 g per car), please specify the approximate amount of lead per car in listed single applications (in order to find out which uses are relevant on a quantity basis): valve guides, valves for tyres, fuel injectors, jet nozzles, windscreens, battery terminals, temperature sensor housing, carburettor nozzles, mountings e.g. for radios, door locks, parts of brake system, plug connectors, pins and fittings. Which of these applications do contain copper alloys with a lead content of 0.2%, which of them do require higher lead contents up to 4%? Please explain why do certain applications need higher lead contents?
5) Different statements regarding the maximum concentration value of lead in copper alloys were submitted during the last revision of ELV Annex II. One stakeholder states that a reduction of the maximum concentration value from 4% to 3% lead by weight in copper alloys is principally possible whereas in another statement provided by ECI and WVM it is emphasized that the concentration value of 4% lead is still justified and necessary. Please specify if the reduction of the maximum concentration value from 4% to 3% lead is feasible from a technical point of view!
6) During the last revision of the ELV Annex II it was not possible to evaluate whether or not lead-free alternatives could substitute leaded copper alloys (at least in some applications), since no detailed data or documentation on test results on lead-free alternatives (e.g. "Ecobrass") were provided. Please provide summary documentation (e.g. summaries of test reports) on the research work that has been carried out in the last year to search for lead-free substitutions. Are there comparative studies available comparing the machinability of both leaded copper alloys and lead-free copper alloys?

7) Please specify in which fraction(s) of the ELV recycling process leaded copper alloys will end up. Is recycling of lead in secondary copper process possible?

Furthermore, the following general questions can be used to support the exemption or taken as a basis for requesting an amendment or the discontinuation of the exemption:

- What is the application in which the substance/compound is used for and what is its specific technical function?
- What is the specific (technical) function of the substance/compound in this application?
- Please justify why this application falls under the scope of the ELV Directive (e.g. is it a finished product? is it a fixed installation? What category of the WEEE Directive does it belong to?).
- What is the amount (in absolute number and in percentage by weight) of the substance/compound in: i) the homogeneous material[1], ii) the application and iii) total EU annually for relevant applications?

Documentation provided by stakeholders including replies to the questions above should take the following points into consideration:

- Please justify your contribution according to Article 4 (2) (b) (ii) ELV Directive, i.e.
  - Justification for exemption still given or not given anymore according to technical and scientific progress;
  - Substitution of concerned hazardous substances via materials and components not containing these is technically or scientifically either practicable or impracticable;
  - Elimination or substitution of concerned hazardous substances via design changes is technically or scientifically either practicable or impracticable.
- Please provide sound data/evidence on why substitution/elimination is either practicable or impracticable (e.g. what research has been done, what was the outcome, is there a timeline for possible substitutes, why is the substance and its function in the application indispensable or not, is there available economic data on the possible substitutes, where relevant, etc.).
- Please also indicate if feasible substitutes currently exist in an industrial and/or commercial scale for similar use.
- Please indicate the possibilities and/or the status for the development of substitutes and indicate if these substitutes were available by 1 July 2003 or at a later stage.
- Please indicate if any current restrictions apply to such substitutes. If yes, please quote the exact title of the appropriate legislation/regulation.

[1] Please refer to the FAQ document on RoHS and WEEE Directives available at http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/environment/waste/weee_index.htm

- Please indicate benefits/advantages and disadvantages of such substitutes.
- Please state whether there are overlapping issues with other relevant legislation such as e.g. the Energy-using Products (EuP) - EuP Directive (2005/32/EC) that should be taken into account..
- If a transition period between the publication of an amended exemption is needed or seems appropriate, please state how long this period should be for the specific application concerned.

Stakeholder contributions shall be clearly marked "NOT FOR PUBLICATION" if they are not be posted as comments on the consultation website (http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/env/elv_4/library).