
FORMAT
for third party submission of information on alternatives for
Applications for Authorisation

PUBLIC VERSION

Legal name of submitter(s): *ArcelorMittal Flat Carbon Europe S.A.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. ALTERNATIVE ID AND PROPERTIES	3
2. TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY	3
3. ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY	3
4. HAZARDS AND RISKS OF THE ALTERNATIVE.....	3
5. AVAILABILITY	3
6. CONCLUSION ON SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY OF THE ALTERNATIVE	3
7. OTHER COMMENTS	3
REFERENCES	4
APPENDIXES	4

1. ALTERNATIVE ID AND PROPERTIES

None.

2. TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

[Insert text here]

3. ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY

[Insert text here]

4. HAZARDS AND RISKS OF THE ALTERNATIVE

[Insert text here]

5. AVAILABILITY

[Insert text here]

6. CONCLUSION ON SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY OF THE ALTERNATIVE

[Insert text here]

7. OTHER COMMENTS

ArcelorMittal is the world's leading steel and mining company, with around 209,000 employees in more than 60 countries. ArcelorMittal is the leader in all major global steel markets, including automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging, with leading R&D and technology.

We are the largest producer of steel in the EU, North and South America and Africa, a significant steel producer in the CIS region, and have a growing presence in Asia, including investments in China and India.

The present application covers, amongst other chromium trioxide uses, the manufacturing of Electrolytic Chromium Coated Steel (ECCS), a particular flat steel product used mostly for packaging applications.

We thank you for having given us the opportunity to comment on the present Application for Authorisation, and confirm so the absence of suitable alternatives available to us for the manufacturing of ECCS covered by the present Application for Authorisation.

We would simply like to refer to the comment #617 issued by the trade association APEAL during the public consultation on the Application for Authorisation #0032-5 (for Chromium Trioxide use#5, by Lanxess et al.), and point out that these are equally valid for the present Application.

Therefore we confirm the current absence of a suitable available alternative and consider that the 7 years review period requested by the Applicant is certainly justified, as a minimum, for that particular use.

REFERENCES

REACH consultation on Application for Authorisation #0032-5 for Chromium Trioxide use#5 (*Surface treatment (except passivation of tin-plated steel (ETP)) for applications in various industry sectors namely architectural, automotive, metal manufacturing and finishing, and general engineering (unrelated to Functional chrome plating or Functional chrome plating with decorative character)*), by Lanxess et al.), comment #617 by the trade association APEAL (The Association of European Producers of Steel for Packaging), 25.09.2015

APPENDIXES

[Insert text here]