

**20 DECEMBER 2011**

**ANNEX IV TO RESPONSES TO COMMENTS DOCUMENT (RCOM) ON ECHA'S DRAFT 3<sup>RD</sup> RECOMMENDATION FOR THE GROUP OF RECOMMENDED COBALT(II) SUBSTANCES - COMMENTS ON COBALT CARBONATE (EC NUMBER: 208-169-4)**

*THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDES THE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON COBALT CARBONATE DURING THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE 3<sup>RD</sup> DRAFT RECOMMENDATION FOR INCLUSION OF SUBSTANCES IN ANNEX XIV OF REACH WHICH TOOK PLACE BETWEEN 15 JUNE AND 14 SEPTEMBER 2011. ECHA'S RESPONSES TO THESE COMMENTS ARE PROVIDED IN THE ABOVE MENTIONED RCOM DOCUMENT.*

*N.B.: All public attachments are provided in a separate zip-file available on ECHA's website (attachments claimed confidential are not provided with the public version of this compilation of comments received).*

**I - GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE RECOMMENDATION TO INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE IN ANNEX XIV, INCLUDING THE PRIORITISATION OF THE SUBSTANCE:**

#	Date (Attachment provided)	Submitted by (name, Organisation/ MSCA)	Comment
---	----------------------------------	--	---------



		trade association Belgium	
1786	2011/09/14 19:51  File attached <b>Confidential</b>	Company Germany	<p>Kobalt(II)-salze finden bei mbw in den Cr(III)-haltigen Passivierungslösungen für Zn- und Zn-Legierungsschichten Anwendung. Vorrangig wird dabei Kobalt(II)-nitrat verwendet. Andere Kobaltsalze sind für die o. g. Passivierungen jedoch grundsätzlich möglich.</p> <p>Arbeitsschutz: Bei sachgemäßer Anwendung der kobalthaltigen Lösungen und Verwendung der vorhandenen persönlichen Schutzausrüstung besteht keine Gefährdung für die Mitarbeiter. Die persönliche Schutzausrüstung besteht dabei aus geeigneter Arbeitskleidung sowie chemiebeständigen Handschuhen. Aufgrund der vorhandenen Absaugeinrichtungen kann eine Gefährdung durch Stäube und/oder Nebel ausgeschlossen werden.</p> <p>Alternativverfahren: Aufgrund der hohen Korrosionsschutzanforderungen an Zink- und Zinklegierungsschichten gibt es zu kobalthaltigen Passivierungslösungen keine adäquaten Alternativen. Passivierungsschichten ohne Kobalt erfüllen die Anforderungen der Kunden, welche vorrangig aus der Automobilindustrie stammen, nicht. Vergleichbare Korrosionsergebnisse können nur mit Chrom(VI)-haltigen Lösungen erreicht werden. „Mit der EU-Richtlinie 2000/53/EG des Europäischen Parlaments über Altfahrzeuge sowie nachfolgend der EU-Richtlinie 2002/95/EG (Elektroschrottverordnung) wurde der Einsatz von Chromatierschichten für Pkw und Elektrobauteile verboten.“ (Quelle: Kommentar des Zentralverbandes Oberflächentechnik e.V. (ZVO) zum Thema Vorschlag zur Priorisierung von Cobalt(II)-sulphate, Cobalt(II)-dinitrate, Cobalt(II)-dichloride, Cobalt(II)-acetate und Cobalt(II)-carbonate zur Aufnahme in den Anhang XIV der REACH Verordnung im Zuge der public consultation bis zum 14.09.2011 - Einsatz der zweiwertigen Kobaltsalze in KONVERSIONSSCHICHTEN In der europäischen GALVANOTECHNIK. – als Anlage hochgeladen)</p> <p>Weitere Betrachtungen In dem als Anlage hochgeladenen bereits oben zitierten Kommentar des ZVO sind die Auswirkungen für die Wirtschaft zu entnehmen. Dem ist grundsätzlich nichts hinzuzufügen. Die</p>

			<p>Erzeugung von in kobalthaltigen Lösungen passivierten Zink- und Zinklegierungsschichten erfolgt branchenübergreifend für viele Kunden. Einen hohen Anteil stellen dabei international agierende Partner der Automobil- und Fensterbeschlagindustrie dar. Bei einem Verbot der Kobaltsalze entsteht der mbw-Gruppe ein deutlicher internationaler Wettbewerbsnachteil. Auch die Auswirkungen auf die bestehenden nationalen Geschäftsbeziehungen dürften erheblich sein. Die Fortführung der Geschäftsbeziehung ist damit erheblich gefährdet. Verbunden damit ist die Gefährdung der ca. 300 Arbeitsplätze der mbw-Gruppe.</p> <p>Einen hohen Anteil des Umsatzes wird mit Kunden aus der Automobil- und Fensterbeschlagindustrie erzielt. Bei einem Verbot der Kobalt(II)-salze wäre die mbw-Gruppe mit ca. 300 Mitarbeitern deutschlandweit so stark betroffen, dass eine Fortführung der Geschäftsbeziehungen und somit der Erhalt der Arbeitsplätze ernsthaft gefährdet ist.</p> <p>„Ein Verbot des Einsatzes von Kobaltsalzen in Passivierungen würde den Korrosionsschutz der beschichteten Teile deutlich vermindern und damit negative Auswirkungen auf die Langlebigkeit und Nachhaltigkeit des industriellen Wirtschaftens in Europa haben. Verstärkter Rohstoffeinsatz und zusätzlicher Energieverbrauch wäre die Folge und würde die europäischen Klimaschutzziele und Senkungsbestrebungen zum CO<sub>2</sub> Ausstoß belasten.“ (Quelle: Kommentar des Zentralverbandes Oberflächentechnik e.V. (ZVO) zum Thema Vorschlag zur Priorisierung von Cobalt(II)-sulphate, Cobalt(II)-dinitrate, Cobalt(II)-dichloride, Cobalt(II)-acetate und Cobalt(II)-carbonate zur Aufnahme in den Anhang XIV der REACH Verordnung im Zuge der public consultation bis zum 14.09.2011 - Einsatz der zweiwertigen Kobaltsalze in KONVERSIONSSCHICHTEN In der europäischen GALVANOTECHNIK. – als Anlage hochgeladen)</p>
1719	2011/09/14 18:04	<p>The Cobalt Development Institute</p> <p>Industry or trade association United Kingdom</p>	<p>CDI Comments for ECHA Public Consultation for Cobalt Salts – September 2011</p> <p>The Cobalt Development Institute (CDI) is an international organisation of a wholly non-profit making character which has been in existence for over 50-years. The CDI is an association of producers, users and traders of cobalt. The CDI has the following objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Promoting the responsible and sustainable use of cobalt in all forms.</li> <li>(2) Consulting organisations, agencies and governments for research or investigations in all matters concerning cobalt.</li> <li>(3) Providing members with topical information on all cobalt matters including health &amp; safety and environmental legislation plus regulatory affairs possibly affecting their interests.</li> <li>(4) Promoting co-operation between members and providing a forum for the exchange of information concerning the resources, production and uses of cobalt.</li> </ol>

		<p>Membership of the CDI includes 32 member companies from 16 countries including all the major cobalt producers.</p> <p>The Board of the CDI has also established three Cobalt REACH Consortia to implement REACH on behalf of the cobalt industry. A separate wholly-owned subsidiary of the CDI called CoRC (Cobalt REACH Consortium Ltd.) acts as the Secretariat to the Consortia.</p> <p>This submission is being made in conjunction with formal submissions made by CoRC on behalf of the Members of the Cobalt REACH Consortium, and we also provide a confidential Technical Annex relating to this cobalt salt.</p> <p>REACH has many ambitions and compelling aims to protect EU citizens and workers from exposure to chemicals, and these are supported by Industry. Over the past five years since adoption of the REACH regulation, the cobalt industry has taken its responsibility to comply with the financial, technical, scientific and administrative burden. By 1st December, 2010 the registration of cobalt and the relevant cobalt compounds (18 in total) had been completed and we are currently continuing with our efforts to ensure that we contribute to the evaluation process. The Cobalt Consortium has already expended some Euro 7million and work continues for the remaining twelve substances covered by the Consortium.</p> <p>The Dossier (Technical Annex)(i) prepared for cobalt carbonate shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the actual tonnage of cobalt carbonate used in the EU market is much lower than quoted in the ECHA consultation document from REACH registration data.</li> <li>- it is used as an intermediate (~95 % of uses) in the manufacture of other chemicals and is therefore not subject to Authorisation (ii) .</li> </ul> <p>The remaining non-intermediate use is as an animal feed supplement (~6%) which will be exempt as this is covered by other Existing EU Legislation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- all uses identified are for industrial uses only, therefore the exposure is limited to workers and there is no expected exposure of professional users from the identified uses.</li> <li>- the occupational environment operates under tightly controlled conditions which are already regulated under existing Community legislation such as the exposure to carcinogens and mutagens at work directive (2004/37/EC), or the risk related to chemical agents at work directive (98/24/EC), DSD (67/548/EEC), DPD (99/45/EC).</li> </ul> <p>A strict control of environmental risk is ensured by the requirements of Directive 96/61/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC) and Directive 2008/1/EC on the control of major accident hazards involving dangerous substances (Seveso II).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cobalt carbonate does not reach the consumer as is it not marketed as an end product nor it is intended for wide-dispersive use. In the rare sectors where it is used as a non-intermediate,</li> </ul>
--	--	---

			<p>and would be of widespread use, any release would be negligible and insignificant for human health and the environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cobalt is a natural element that is essential in humans and some animal species, who are unable to synthesise sufficient quantities of Vitamin B12. While low levels of Vitamin B12 intake can be associated with diseases of deficiency, the ingestion of large amounts of Vitamin B12 has not been reported to be toxic to humans. Its ubiquitous and constant presence in the body tissues is indicative of the fact that low dietary levels of cobalt have no health impact.</li> <li>- although cobalt carbonate is identified as a CMR 1B by inhalation substance, guideline compliant studies indicate it may not be genotoxic in vivo. The CoRC has recently provided ECHA with information on a potential concentration threshold mode of action for carcinogenicity. A report on the threshold mechanism has been uploaded with this response (iii).</li> <li>- no reports of carcinogenicity and genotoxicity associated with cobalt ingestion have been reported in humans or in animals. A report on Essentiality has been uploaded with this response (iv).</li> </ul> <p>The exposure assessments developed by the CoRC for the REACH registration demonstrate that all registered uses of cobalt carbonate can demonstrate effective control of exposure and can be considered as safe uses (i.e. RCR value</p>
1855	2011/09/14 18:04  File attached	The Cobalt Development Institute   Industry or trade association United Kingdom	<p>CDI Comments for ECHA Public Consultation for Cobalt Salts – September 2011</p> <p>The Cobalt Development Institute (CDI) is an international organisation of a wholly non-profit making character which has been in existence for over 50-years. The CDI is an association of producers, users and traders of cobalt. The CDI has the following objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Promoting the responsible and sustainable use of cobalt in all forms.</li> <li>(2) Consulting organisations, agencies and governments for research or investigations in all matters concerning cobalt.</li> <li>(3) Providing members with topical information on all cobalt matters including health &amp; safety and environmental legislation plus regulatory affairs possibly affecting their interests.</li> <li>(4) Promoting co-operation between members and providing a forum for the exchange of information concerning the resources, production and uses of cobalt.</li> </ol> <p>Membership of the CDI includes 32 member companies from 16 countries including all the major cobalt producers.</p> <p>The Board of the CDI has also established three Cobalt REACH Consortia to implement REACH on behalf of the cobalt industry. A separate wholly-owned subsidiary of the CDI called CoRC (Cobalt</p>

		<p>REACH Consortium Ltd.) acts as the Secretariat to the Consortia.  This submission is being made in conjunction with formal submissions made by CoRC on behalf of the Members of the Cobalt REACH Consortium, and we also provide a confidential Technical Annex relating to this cobalt salt.</p> <p>REACH has many ambitions and compelling aims to protect EU citizens and workers from exposure to chemicals, and these are supported by Industry. Over the past five years since adoption of the REACH regulation, the cobalt industry has taken its responsibility to comply with the financial, technical, scientific and administrative burden. By 1st December, 2010 the registration of cobalt and the relevant cobalt compounds (18 in total) had been completed and we are currently continuing with our efforts to ensure that we contribute to the evaluation process. The Cobalt Consortium has already expended some Euro 7million and work continues for the remaining twelve substances covered by the Consortium.</p> <p>The Dossier (Technical Annex)(i) prepared for cobalt carbonate shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the actual tonnage of cobalt carbonate used in the EU market is much lower than quoted in the ECHA consultation document from REACH registration data.</li> <li>- it is used as an intermediate (~95 % of uses) in the manufacture of other chemicals and is therefore not subject to Authorisation (ii) .</li> </ul> <p>The remaining non-intermediate use is as an animal feed supplement (~6%) which will be exempt as this is covered by other Existing EU Legislation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- all uses identified are for industrial uses only, therefore the exposure is limited to workers and there is no expected exposure of professional users from the identified uses.</li> <li>- the occupational environment operates under tightly controlled conditions which are already regulated under existing Community legislation such as the exposure to carcinogens and mutagens at work directive (2004/37/EC), or the risk related to chemical agents at work directive (98/24/EC), DSD (67/548/EEC), DPD (99/45/EC).</li> </ul> <p>A strict control of environmental risk is ensured by the requirements of Directive 96/61/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC) and Directive 2008/I/EC on the control of major accident hazards involving dangerous substances (Seveso II).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cobalt carbonate does not reach the consumer as is it not marketed as an end product nor it is intended for wide-dispersive use. In the rare sectors where it is used as a non-intermediate, and would be of widespread use, any release would be negligible and insignificant for human health and the environment.</li> <li>- cobalt is a natural element that is essential in humans and some animal species, who are unable to synthesise sufficient quantities of Vitamin B12. While low levels of Vitamin B12 intake</li> </ul>
--	--	---

			<p>can be associated with diseases of deficiency, the ingestion of large amounts of Vitamin B12 has not been reported to be toxic to humans. Its ubiquitous and constant presence in the body tissues is indicative of the fact that low dietary levels of cobalt have no health impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- although cobalt carbonate is identified as a CMR 1B by inhalation substance, guideline compliant studies indicate it may not be genotoxic in vivo. The CoRC has recently provided ECHA with information on a potential concentration threshold mode of action for carcinogenicity. A report on the threshold mechanism has been uploaded with this response (iii).</li> <li>- no reports of carcinogenicity and genotoxicity associated with cobalt ingestion have been reported in humans or in animals. A report on Essentiality has been uploaded with this response (iv).</li> </ul> <p>The exposure assessments developed by the CoRC for the REACH registration demonstrate that all registered uses of cobalt carbonate can demonstrate effective control of exposure and can be considered as safe uses (i.e. RCR value</p>
1663	2011/09/14 16:39  File attached	FEFANA asbl and TREAC EEIG   Industry or trade association Belgium	
1650	2011/09/14 16:18	Portuguese Environment Agency   National authority	<p>Taking into consideration the wide dispersion use of the substance "Cobalt(II) carbonate", we consider that this substance fulfills the prioritisation criteria.</p> <p>We therefore support ECHA's recommendation for inclusion of this substance in annex XIV.</p> <p>We also support the proposed application and sunset date.</p>

		Portugal	
1582	2011/09/14 14:48  File attached	Sønderborg Fornikling A/S  Company Denmark	Vorschlag zur Priorisierung von Cobalt(II)-sulphate, Cobalt(II)-dinitrate, Cobalt(II)-dichloride, Cobalt(II)-acetate seite 7 und Cobalt(II)-carbonate zur Aufnahme in den Anhang XIV der REACH Verordnung
1559	2011/09/14 14:29  File attached	Company Germany	Kommentar des Zentralverbandes Oberflächentechnik e.V. (ZVO) zum Thema Vorschlag zur Priorisierung von Cobalt(II)-sulphate, Cobalt(II)-dinitrate, Cobalt(II)-dichloride, Cobalt(II)-acetate und Cobalt(II)-carbonate zur Aufnahme in den Anhang XIV der REACH Verordnung im Zuge der public consultation bis zum 14.09.2011 Einsatz der zweiwertigen Kobaltsalze in KONVERSIONSSCHICHTEN Seitenzahl 7

1550	2011/09/14 14:24  File attached <b>Confidential</b>	COVENTYA GmbH  Company Germany	<p>Die Verwendung von Cobalt(II)-sulphate, Cobalt(II)-dinitrate, Cobalt(II)-dichloride, Cobalt(II)-acetate und Cobalt(II)-carbonate ist für die Herstellung unserer für die Oberflächenbehandlung relevanten Produkte unabdingbar.</p> <p>Die Ausführungen der Kommentierung des ZVO (siehe Anhang) stimmen voll und ganz mit den Argumenten und Forderungen der Coventya GmbH überein. Auf eine Auflistung wird hier verzichtet und wir verweisen auf die Kommentare des Zentralverbandes Oberflächentechnik e. V. (ZVO) „Einsatz der zweiwertigen Kobaltsalze in Konversionsschichten in der europäischen Galvanotechnik“ und „Einsatz von Cobalt(II)-sulphate, Cobalt(II)-dinitrate, Cobalt(II)-dichloride, Cobalt(II)-acetate und Cobalt(II)-carbonate in Elektrolyten zur elektrochemischen Reduktion in der europäischen Galvanotechnik“.</p> <p>Die Coventya GmbH kann auf Grund der in den Kommentaren aufgeführten Argumenten (siehe Anhang) die Aufnahme der Kobalt-Salze in den Anhang XIV der REACH-Verordnung nicht unterstützen.</p> <p>Im Falle einer Aufnahme der Stoffe Kobalt(II)-dinitrat, Kobalt-dichlorid, Kobalt(II)-sulfat, Kobalt(II)-diacetat, Kobalt(II)-carbonat in den Anhang XIV der REACH-Verordnung fordert die Coventya GmbH eine Ausnahmeregelung für die Verwendung von Kobaltsalzen in Lösungen zur Erzeugung von Konversionsschichten auf Zink- und Zinklegierungsschichten bei galvanischen Korrosionsschutzsystemen, eine Ausnahme von der Zulassungspflicht für die Verwendung von Kobaltsalzen (Cobalt(II)-sulphate, Cobalt(II)-dinitrate, Cobalt(II)-dichloride, Cobalt(II)-acetate und Cobalt(II)-carbonate) zum Zwecke der Erzeugung von kobalthaltigen metallischen Schichten bei der galvanischen Beschichtung und eine Ausnahmeregelung über die Verwendung für die Herstellung von Additiven/Präparaten für die Galvanotechnik.</p> <p>The use of Cobalt(II)-Sulphate, Cobalt(II)-Dinitrate, Cobalt(II)-Dichloride and Cobalt(II)-Acetate is essential for the manufacture of our products are relevant for the surface treatment.</p> <p>The remarks commenting on the ZVO (see Appendix) votes fully agree with the arguments and requirements of Coventya GmbH. On a collection is omitted here and we refer to the comments of the Central Association of Surface Treatment Professionals Germany (ZVO) “Application of divalent cobalt salts in Conversion layers in the European electroplating Industry” and “Application of divalent cobalt salts in cobalt and cobalt-alloy-layers in the European electroplating Industry”.</p> <p>As described in the statements (see Appendix) Coventya GmbH cannot follow the arguments to include the Cobalt Salts (cobalt(II)-sulphate, cobalt(II)-nitrate, cobalt(II)-chloride and cobalt(II)-acetate) into the Appendix XIV of the REACH regulations.</p> <p>In the event that these substances are included in Appendix XIV of the REACH regulations</p>
------	---	--	---

			Coventya GmbH demand that there has to be an exception to the rules to allow the use of Cobalt(II)-Salts for the purpose of anti-corrosion, decorative and bright Cobalt-Alloy-Plating, the use of Cobalt(II)-Salts for the purpose of functional, decorative and bright Cobalt- and Cobalt-Alloy-Plating and an exception on the use for the manufacture of additives / supplements for electroplating.
1519	2011/09/14 12:52  File attached	Enthone GmbH  Company United Kingdom	See attached
1426	2011/09/14 09:51	Germany  MemberState Germany	The German CA supports the ECHA proposal on prioritisation of cobalt(II) carbonate due to its carcinogenic properties and toxicity for reproduction. Supplementary Note: Conclusion, taking regulatory effectiveness considerations into account, page 6: We agree that all cobalt(II) compounds on the Candidate List should be treated equally with respect to prioritisation, because of the overall addition of divalent cobalt as the toxicologically relevant species from different cobalt(II) sources.

1226	2011/09/14 00:57  File attached	CETS aisbl   Industry or trade association Germany	<p>The aim of this report is to focus upon the shortcomings of the Annex XV dossier for the substances cobalt(II)-sulphate, cobalt(II)-nitrate, cobalt(II)-chloride, cobalt(II)-acetate and cobalt(II)-carbonate. In particular, its intermediate use in plating industry. At the outset, cobalt(II)-sulphate, cobalt(II)-nitrate, cobalt(II)-chloride, cobalt(II)-acetate and cobalt(II)-carbonate were part of the third priority list of existing substances under the legal framework of Regulation 793/93.</p> <p>The use of Cobalt(II) salts by the plating industry should be regarded as an intermediate in accordance with the definition of Article 3(15) of REACH. ECHA's interpretation of the concept of 'intermediate' (as given in its June 2010 clarification document) excludes substances used as surface treatments, e.g. Cobalt(II) salts used in metal finishing. However, the conclusion reached in the clarification document of June 2010 cannot be supported. The abovementioned clarification document was reviewed by two independent legal experts at the request of Industry. In Cefic's position paper of December 2010, the following was reported: "Both legal advisory statements conclude that the interpretations for intermediates as elaborated in the [clarification] document go far beyond the Article 3 (15) of the REACH Regulation and therefore the concept of intermediates was narrowed tremendously by ECHA, Commission and the Member States." That position was subsequently endorsed by Cefic itself (see December 2010 document) and supported in a number of recent petitions made by Industry associations, such as AIAS and the Institute of Metal Finishing.</p> <p>In this connection, it is worthwhile noting at the outset that ECHA's guidance document for the preparation of an Annex XV dossier on the identification of substances of very high concern states in its point 3.3.4 that, "certain types of information, including exposure-related information, are needed for the later process used to prioritize the substances for inclusion on Annex XIV, once the dossier has been accepted." The guidance then continues to make reference to 'available' information on exposures.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Occupational safety       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No risk in application of Cobalt(II) salts for the end-consumer or industrial client since only pure Cobalt metal is deposited on the substrate and there is no Cobalt(II) salt on top of the plated parts.</li> <li>b. Safe handling of the solutions to minimize the risk for the co-workers for dermal or respiratory tract absorption (as evidenced by of regular medical visits and vaccination of the co-workers involved).</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Alternative processes</li> </ol> <p>There are a variety of familiar alternatives for Cobalt plating. These alternatives do not include</p>
------	--	--	---

			<p>one universal substitute process, capable of replacing Cobalt plating on a one to one basis (For details see attachment).</p> <p>3. Overall implications:</p> <p>a. The application of Cobalt plating shows a high socio-economic benefits due to the functional properties in a wide range of products (For details see attached document).</p> <p>4. Summarized comments:</p> <p>Metallic layers with a cobalt or cobalt alloy surface are well established and widely used in the market place. The tendency in the electronic industry and other industrial sectors continues to emphasise the look and technical advantages cobalt or cobalt alloys while taking into account the existing quality standards.</p> <p>Long-term studies of the alternatives demonstrate the irreplaceability of cobalt or cobalt alloy surfaces made using electrolytes containing cobalt(II)-sulphate, cobalt(II)-nitrate, cobalt(II)-chloride, cobalt(II)-acetate and cobalt(II)-carbonate for most applications.</p> <p>The finish color, corrosion protection and solderability offered by layers made using cobalt or cobalt alloy electrolytes is noticeably poorer, which has a negative effect on the lifetime of the products to which the process is applied. This necessitates increased use of raw materials which is contrary to achieving sustainability targets set by European programmes.</p> <p>5. Resulting requirements:</p> <p>1. According to the available data there is no basis for an inclusion of the Cobalt(II) salts in Annex XIV of the REACH regulation.</p> <p>2. In the case of an inclusion it is absolutely necessary to realize a derogation rule for the application of Cobalt plating.</p>
1205	<p>2011/09/13 20:43</p> <p>File attached</p>	<p>ERAMET SA</p> <p>Company France</p>	

1204	2011/09/13 20:35  File attached	ERAMET SA  Company France	
1199	2011/09/13 20:22  File attached	European Biogas Association   International NGO Czech Republic	
1181	2011/09/13 19:40  File attached <b>Confidential</b>	Verband der Automobilindus- trie VDA   Industry or trade association Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is difficult to see why the current justification and proportionality of the relevant provisions to handle Cobalt (II) carbonate) should need further approvals. National and European law already requires aspects of regulatory monitoring and control as well as to the increasing internationalization of requirements. Any additional configurable prioritization and approval of changes will only reproduce the current national requirements</li> </ul>

1125	2011/09/13 18:12  File attached	Central Association of Surface Treatment Professionals Germany (ZVO)          Industry or trade association Germany	<p>The Central Association of Surface Treatment Professionals Germany (ZVO) herewith comments Application of divalent cobalt salts in cobalt or cobalt alloy layers in the European electroplating Industry:</p> <p>In the following the summarizing arguments and comments will be presented. For the detailed statements we do refer to the uploaded document.</p> <p>The comments are also valid for the other Cobalt Compounds.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>----</p> <p>Cobalt (II) Sulphate, Cobalt (II) Dinitrate, Cobalt (II) Dichloride, Cobalt (II) Acetate and Cobalt (II) Carbonate</p> <p>a. Electrochemical processes for generating Cobalt and/or Cobalt-Alloy layers based on Cobalt compounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These processes involve immersing the components to be coated in an aqueous cobalt salt solution. Metallic cobalt is deposited by the process of electrochemical reduction as metal themselves or in cobalt-alloys.</li> <li>- Cobalt and cobalt-alloy plating is considered to be the most desirable final finish for a majority of electroplated consumer goods and electronic equipment. Other surfaces cannot provide the same levels of quality and economy</li> <li>- The addition of cobalt-salts is necessary in particular if hardness is required in Gold alloy deposits.</li> <li>- The result of this coating process is that the final surface of the component contains only metallic cobalt, which is a completely harmless substance from a consumer viewpoint.</li> </ul> <p>b. Potential health hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are no figures available for absorption of soluble cobalt salts through the skin, but a sensitising effect on the skin is believed to exist.</li> <li>- No figures on acute inhalation toxicity of soluble cobalt compounds are available. However, two-year tests on rats indicate that there may be a hazard of chronic toxicity including damage to the respiratory tract.</li> <li>- Health hazards through unintentional oral intake of soluble cobalt salts do not exist. Wherever cobalt salts or compounds containing cobalt salts are handled, there are strict prohibitions in force to prevent eating, drinking and smoking. Unintentional intake can, therefore, be discounted.</li> <li>- Sensitisation of the skin can also be excluded. Sufficient protection exists by applying personal protective equipment (PPE). Employers are required to monitor the compliance of staff with the</li> </ul>
------	--	---	--

		<p>prescribed use of PPE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If existing safety regulations are not adhered to, there are potential health hazards in handling cobalt (II) salts in day-to-day production environments, which is why workers must be subjected to regular health checks in order to detect any possible health damage at an early stage. It is important to note that, in coatings firms, only fluid mixtures are used for generating cobalt gold alloy layers.</li> <li>- Preventative health checks are required for workers who may be at risk from inhalation of cobalt compounds in the shape of respirable dust or aerosols or who may have skin contact.</li> <li>- To protect its workers, companies are required to take suitable measurements in the workplace to determine the extent of any effects of cobalt compounds and, in this way, to monitor the long-term effectiveness of the protective measures implemented – e.g. the efficiency of air extractors.</li> <li>- The employer is required to commission an approved doctor to carry out the preventative examinations. The requirement for an “approved” doctor is to ensure that he/she has the necessary technical knowledge, understands the technical equipment and work environment and is able to implement the regulations as required.</li> </ul> <p>c. Environmental protection when dealing with conversion layers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Solutions containing cobalt for generating cobalt or cobalt alloy layers require electricity. The application usually takes place at temperatures between 25 and 40°C. Where appropriate technical equipment has been installed on site, such as an air extractor, this manufacturing process does not generate any hazardous aerosols and the air in the workplace will not be contaminated in fact,</li> <li>- Cobalt is found in aqueous solutions as a cation. By adjusting the pH value to the alkaline range, the cobalt can be precipitated out as cobalt hydroxide at &lt; 1 mg/L. There is currently no limit value in the German Waste Water Regulations for electroplating firms or in Appendix 40 to the regulations.</li> </ul> <p>d. Economic importance of electrochemical cobalt plating</p> <p>Cobalt and cobalt-alloy plating is considered to be the most desirable final finish for a majority of electroplated consumer goods and electronic equipment. Other surfaces cannot provide the same levels of quality and economy. The economic advantage is in the attractive appearance of the surface and the high degree of hardness in different alloys, chemical resistance and toxicological harmlessness, achieved with very little effort. Products plated in this way can be expected to have a long service lifetime. To cite just one example, consider the decorative cobalt-tin or cobalt-gold alloy plating of taps and fittings in sanitary installations. Even where they are subjected to tough professional use and cleaned with abrasive cleaners, these cobalt included</p>
--	--	---

			<p>surfaces will provide decades of protection on high-grade taps and similar parts. The technical and decorative cobalt alloy surface is thus a contribution to careful use of natural resources.</p> <p>e. Resulting Requirements</p> <p>&gt; As described in the statements above the Central Association of Surface Treatment Professionals Germany (ZVO) cannot follow the arguments to include the Cobalt Salts (cobalt(II)-sulphate, cobalt(II)-nitrate, cobalt(II)-chloride and cobalt(II)-acetate) into the Appendix XIV of the REACH regulations.</p> <p>&gt; In the event that these substances are included in Appendix XIV of the REACH regulations we demand that there has to be an exception to the rules to allow the use of Cobalt(II)-Salts for the purpose of anti-corrosion, decorative and bright Cobalt-Alloy-Plating.</p>
1114	2011/09/13 18:06	<p>Atotech Deutschland GmbH</p> <p>Company Germany</p>	<p>This Comment is provided on behalf of the following organizations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech Deutschland GmbH</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech Österreich GmbH</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech CZ, a.s. , Česká Republika</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech SK, s.r.o., Slovenská Republika</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech France</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech Italia S.r.l.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> OOO Atotech-Chemeta, Lithuania</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech Nederland B.V.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech Poland</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech España S.A</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech Skandinavien AB</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech Slovenija, proizvodnja kemicnih izdelkov, d.d.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Atotech UK Ltd.</li> </ul> <p>Comment on the applied approach of prioritization</p> <p>Article 58 paragraph 3 of the REACH regulation defines 3 criteria for the substances to be prioritized for inclusion in Annex XIV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) PBT or vPvB properties or</li> <li>(b) Wide dispersive use or</li> <li>(c) High volumes.</li> </ul> <p>To (a)</p>

		<p>None of the proposed Cobalt salts has PBT or vPvB properties.</p> <p>ECHA uses a scoring system for the determination of substances for prioritization of SVHC for inclusion in the List of Substances Subject for Authorization taking into account the aforementioned 3 criteria. The weighting of the single scoring results is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PBT or vPvB properties: 18%</li> <li>- Wide dispersive use: 41%</li> <li>- Volumes: 41%.</li> </ul> <p>There is no justification for this weighting based on the REACH regulation. Following ECHA's explanation for the weighting, the substances on the Candidate List are defined as a selection of substances with very severe hazard properties. However the European Commission chose to highlight PBT and vPvB properties over e.g. CMR properties in the REACH regulation (e.g. Art. 58, para. 3) as risks of first mentioned substances are deemed to be higher. Keeping this in mind the weighting should be equal throughout the 3 criteria as otherwise the hazard (PBT and vPvB) properties would be underestimated against the volume and the wide dispersive use.</p> <p>To (b)</p> <p>The term 'wide-dispersive use' is explained in Chapter R.16.2.1.6 of the Guidance on Information Requirements and Chemical Safety Assessment as follows: 'Wide-dispersive use refers to many small point sources or diffuse release by for instance the public at large or sources like traffic. ... Wide-dispersive use can relate to both indoor and outdoor use'. In the Technical Guidance Document for Risk Assessment of new and existing substances and biocides (2003, Chapter 5) this term is defined as follows: 'Wide-dispersive use refers to activities which deliver uncontrolled exposure. Examples relevant for occupational exposure: Painting with paints; spraying of pesticides. Examples relevant for environmental/consumer exposure: Use of detergents, cosmetics, disinfectants, household paints.' In addition, the ECETOC Report No. 93 on Targeted Risk Assessment (Appendix B) states: 'A substance marketed for wide-dispersive use is likely to reach consumers, and it can be assumed that such a substance will be emitted into the environment for 100% during or after use.'</p> <p>Definitions above do clearly not apply for the use of cobalt containing solutions in industrial application. Such applications are strictly controlled equipment-technology-wise, personnel-training-wise, safety-wise and personnel-safety wise respectively. Furthermore strict requirements apply for waste water and exhaust air cleaning technology. Consequently the use is absolutely not comparable with "sources like traffic", "painting with uncontrolled exposure" or (outdoor) "spraying of pesticides".</p>
--	--	---

		<p>In contrary to the definition of ECETOC Report No. 93 the substance never reach consumers and exposure to environment is minimal as a result of aforementioned measures.</p> <p>ECHA disregards the given definitions of wide dispersive use and postulates that this criterion can be regarded as directly driven by the number of sites. ECHA defines already a number of 100 sites in Europe where cobalt salts are used as "high" (maximum scoring = 3). The "Guidance on Information Requirements and Chemical Safety Assessment" gives traffic as an example for "many small point sources" with 240 million point sources in total.</p> <p>For the scoring the "number of sites" is multiplied by "Release". Here an inconsistency is present in the evaluation of the use of cobalt(II)sulphate in industrial surface treatment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is noted that the number of sites of use is unknown, however rated as "high".</li> <li>• It is stated that "Releases and exposure to workers might be controlled in most instances, however some of the uses appear to have a potential for significant worker exposure".</li> </ul> <p>Consequently the majority of uses is controlled and should be rated accordingly (score '1'). Assuming that few cases have a potential for high exposure does not justify the classification as "wide-dispersive use", which would base on a high number of point sources with uncontrolled exposure.</p> <p>In addition the approach of ECHA disregards the fact that the number if sites is not relevant for exposure of workers but the number of workers in contact with the concerned substance. For surface treatment application in industrial settings the number of persons working near the process solutions is very low. It can be estimated by 1-2 persons per site for automated systems and 4-5 persons per site for non-automated systems.</p> <p>Regulatory effectiveness</p> <p>ECHA extends the scoring approach with a verbal-argumentative evaluation. This shall facilitate the determination of the regulatory effectiveness of the authorization process. Considering that there are no existing alternatives for different uses of cobalt salts there will be no environmental or human health benefit as an authorization has to be granted for this specific technology. But this process will result in considerable costs and workload for the companies affected, resulting in downsides competition-wise on global level as other economies will simply continue using the substance without any bureaucratic hurdles.</p> <p>It should be the aim of European authorities that existing technology and operational conditions are optimized there where the exposition elevated. Please note here that this is only the case for some exceptions. Regulatory effectiveness would be much higher if consistent exposure and emission standards are agreed throughout Europe and forcefully controlled by member states authorities.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Conclusion</p> <p>It is to note that cobalt salts in surface treatment applications do neither fulfill the criteria "PBT or vPvB properties" nor "wide-dispersive use" and regulatory effectiveness is also not present for this case.</p> <p>Consequently neither facts nor the formal process justify a prioritization of cobalt salts for REACH Annex XIV.</p>
1047	2011/09/13 16:46	<p>Agoria</p> <p>Industry or trade association Belgium</p>	<p>The prioritization of the different cobalt salts does not seem appropriate for Agoria. The classification makes these substances surely eligible to be prioritized but there are serious doubts on the claimed widespread use of cobalt dichloride as well as on the lack of clear exposure which has an impact on the prioritization. Agoria does not believe that these cobalt salts should be prioritized at this stage.</p> <p>The reported quantity for the different cobalt salts in the Annex XV dossier, are not reflecting the actual reality within the EU. In global the actual use is significantly less than the volume mentioned in the Annex XIV files. On top of this between 90 to 99% of the use is an intermediate use which is exempted from the authorization procedure. (cobalt sulphate &gt;97%, cobalt diacetate &gt; 90%, cobalt carbonate &gt; 94%, cobalt dinitrate &gt; 99% and cobalt dichloride &gt; 99%) This means that the volume of cobalt dichloride in the scope of the authorization procedure is negligible according to our estimations.</p> <p>The exposure to cobalt salts is furthermore well controlled as is documented by the Chemical Safety report submitted for the REACH registration for these cobalt salts. The CSR includes an exposure scenario for each identified and reported use and each of these exposure scenario resulted in a risk characterization ratio below 1. This means that all identified uses of cobalt salts within the EU are well controlled.</p> <p>Cobalt salts are also already controlled by different existing legislations to protect human health as well as the environment. The carcinogen at work directive (2004/37/EC) imposes the need for a risk management at the work place including the taking of the necessary risk management options. Also the IPPC directive (2008/1/EC) is providing the framework for limiting the impact</p>

		<p>on the environment. The general restriction of the supply of CMR's for supply to the general public is also limiting the consumer exposure. (REACH)</p> <p>On the potential substitution there is a general misconception regarding interchangeability. Cobalt salts cannot be substituted by other cobalt salts in most of the applications. In nearly all cases this is neither technical nor economically feasible to implement such a substitution. In this respect we are not supporting at all the grouping of all cobalt salts to be prioritized which is according to our information done out of 'fear' of this NON-existing potential for substitution. The socio-economic impact of the authorization is clearly underestimated according to Agoria. First of all, we are confused of the diverging signals given, taken into account that cobalt was identified as a critical raw material within the Raw Materials Initiative of the European Commission linked to the economic importance in different future technologies such as batteries, combating air pollution. In this report the substitution potential is described as: "Substitutes for cobalt are constantly being sought mainly because of the metal price volatility. However, due to the unique properties of cobalt, there are limited options for substitution and almost all substitutes result in reduced product performance." This seems a conflicting signal with this proposal to prioritize cobalt salts for authorization and thus affecting even further the long term availability for cobalt salts.</p> <p>The different cobalt salts are used in a broad range of applications the following sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use as catalysts in the oil refining, synthetic fibres, plastics, desulphurised fuels, oxidation catalyst for the car industry, esterfication,</li> <li>- Hardmetals</li> <li>- Rechargeable batteries for industrial applications, hybrid cars, computers, power tools, phones,</li> <li>- Electroplating such as anodizing, wear resistance, electronics, corrosion resistance,</li> <li>- Other applications such as animal feed, ceramics, tyres, inks/dyes, paint driers, pigments, biotechnology.</li> </ul> <p>Several of these applications, in which cobalt salts are used, in general as an intermediate, contribute strongly to the evolution to a more sustainable society. Finding alternatives is not that easy given the broad applications, the technical and economic challenges linked to substitution. The cobalt salts are not found in the final product given that it is mostly used as an indispensable intermediate within the value chain. This means also that exposure to the end-consumer can be exempted.</p>
--	--	---

1003	2011/09/13 15:37	Vale Europe Limited  Company United Kingdom	<p>Vale is a member of the Cobalt Development Institute (CDI) and the Cobalt REACH Consortium (CoRC). Vale Europe Limited is also lead registrant for cobalt carbonate.</p> <p>Volumes, imports/exports (2.2.1): It is stated that maximum of the range manufactured/imported in the EU is 10,000 tonne/year. Data obtained by CoRC indicates that this number is a considerable overestimate. When corrected for the cobalt carbonate exported from the EU it would drop by two thirds, to only 3,000 tonnes or so. It should also be clarified that this number refers to total cobalt carbonate which includes the vast proportion of uses that are exempt from the authorisation process. In fact additional data obtained by industry suggests that there is negligible tonnage expected to fall within the scope of authorisation.</p> <p>Uses and releases from uses (2.2.2.2): According to information collected by CoRC the manufacture of other chemicals including the manufacture of catalysts would account for 93% of the use and consumption of cobalt carbonate. In the manufacture of catalysts, cobalt carbonate is completely converted to another cobalt substance ie cobalt oxide. There is no evidence that cobalt carbonate is ever used as a component of a catalyst. Manufacture of other chemicals is clearly an intermediate use and outside the scope of authorisation.</p> <p>A further 6% of the cobalt carbonate is used as an animal feed supplement. This use is also exempt from authorisation and therefore should be considered outside the scope for prioritisation.</p> <p>The use of cobalt carbonate in surface treatment processes and the manufacture of pigments, frits, glass and ceramic ware are according to industry data minimal or non existent in the EU and certainly well below 1% of the total use. According to the wording of the REACH regulation these uses are as intermediate and not in the scope of authorisation. There is no information available that cobalt carbonate is used as an additive in fertilizers in the EU.</p> <p>The section on releases from uses indicates that cobalt carbonate is used potentially by a medium to high number of professional users. From information gathered by CoRC there is no evidence that cobalt carbonate is used in this way and probably refers to cobalt metal or other cobalt substances.</p> <p>In conclusion we consider all significant uses of cobalt carbonate are as intermediate or as a feed supplement and outside of the scope of authorisation. In addition CoRC have developed exposure scenarios as part of the REACH registration dossiers, for all identified industrial uses which include risk characterization ratios and demonstrate safe use in all cases.</p> <p>Availability of information on alternatives (2.3):</p>
------	---------------------	---	---

		<p>It is not a reasonable assumption that cobalt carbonate can be replaced by other cobalt salts in its applications or indeed replace other cobalt salts in their specific uses. Even though this may seem chemically feasible in the laboratory it is not technically or economically practical on an industrial scale. One of the best examples of this is the manufacture of catalysts which accounts for approximately 25% of the intermediate use of the substance. In this reaction cobalt carbonate is transformed into the active species cobalt oxide without releasing a residual contaminating anion into the catalyst substrate. This would not be possible with other cobalt salts. The key point to note is that all indentified uses of cobalt carbonate are as intermediate or as an animal feed supplement and are therefore exempt from authorisation – it is not necessary to seek alternatives for these uses, and substitution with other cobalt salts would not be possible. Existing specific Community legislation relevant for possible exemption (2.4): As previously noted the use of cobalt carbonate as an animal feed supplement is exempt from the authorisation process as it is covered by the feed safety regulation (EC178/2002). Although all other uses of cobalt carbonate are as intermediates they are also covered by the carcinogens directive 2004/37/CE.</p> <p>Any other relevant information (2.5): The cobalt containing catalysts produced from cobalt carbonate are highly efficient and are used in a number of industrial applications. Because catalysts enhance chemical reactions they can be operated at lower temperatures thereby consuming less energy with corresponding lower carbon dioxide emissions. In particular catalysts manufactured from cobalt carbonate contribute to a large scale reduction of sulphur and nitrogen in fuels and hence the reduction of sulphur dioxide (SOx) and nitrogen dioxide (NOx) emissions to the atmosphere during the burning of fossil fuels. Although the use of cobalt carbonate to manufacture catalysts is an intermediate use and exempt from authorisation, its inclusion in Annex XIV could have consequences for the availability of the raw material with serious implications for manufacture and use of the catalysts in the EU.</p> <p>Prioritisation (3.1): Based on information obtained by CoRC virtually all identified uses in the EU are either as an intermediate or animal feed supplement and therefore not in the scope of authorisation. The volume of the substance that can be considered for prioritisation would therefore be negligible. Hence the volume score of 3 developed in the consultation document would appear to be excessive. Likewise if there are a minimal number of uses subject to authorisation then the numbers of 2 and 3 used in the uses-wide dispersiveness (WDU) calculation must also be very high. Based on these criteria the overall 'Total Score' would therefore be well below 9-10, making</p>
--	--	--

			cobalt carbonate of low priority. It is therefore disproportionate to prioritise cobalt carbonate for Annex XIV.
986	2011/09/13 14:54  File attached	Company Germany	<p>Our company cannot follow the arguments to assume the cobalt-salts into the appendix XIV of the REACH regulations.</p> <p>According to this, we agree with the former statement of the Central Association of Surface Treatment Professionals Germany (ZVO). Link : <a href="http://www.zvo.org/uploads/media/Kommentierung_ZVO_Cobaltsalze_galvanisch_V20110911_ENGLISCH.pdf">http://www.zvo.org/uploads/media/Kommentierung_ZVO_Cobaltsalze_galvanisch_V20110911_ENGLISCH.pdf</a></p> <p>Another aspect is the global market. The ban of cobalt-salts would weaken the european industry, especially the export-oriented mechanical engineering.</p> <p>After the real-estate crisis 2007-2010 and the Euro-crisis, started in 2011, another self-made mechanical-engineering-crisis would damage Europe.</p> <p>As small company of craftsmanship, we estimate, that our company is going to loose up to 50% of the workplaces if cobalt-salts were assumed into the appendix XIV of the REACH regulations.</p>
972	2011/09/13 14:37	Sweden  MemberState Sweden	We support the prioritisation of cobalt carbonate for inclusion in Annex XIV. Based on the criteria, the substance has moderate priority, but as cobalt salts may be replaced by other cobalt salts with the same hazard profile, a grouping approach is warranted.

958	2011/09/13 14:22	United Kingdom  MemberState United Kingdom	<p>Based on the prioritisation criteria and the possibility of significant workplace exposure we agree with the proposal to recommend the following substances for inclusion in Annex XIV.</p> <p>Cobalt (II) Sulphate Cobalt (II) diacetate</p> <p>However, whilst we agree that grouping certain compounds, such as transition metal salts, together is a sensible approach, there should be evidence to support their interchangeability. In the case of the following cobalt compounds we are not sure that this is the case and this warrants further investigation before these substances, which only score moderately according to the prioritisation criteria, are recommended for inclusion in Annex XIV.</p> <p>Cobalt (II) dinitrate Cobalt (II) Carbonate Cobalt dichloride</p>
929	2011/09/13 13:13	Dr. Kubitz GmbH  Company Germany	<p>Cobalt sulfate solutions with additions of phosphorus are being used as electrolyte for the deposition of cobalt phosphorus coatings. These serve after coding as scale in automatic angular or distance measuring e.g. in the machine tool industry. Their advantage over all competing systems is robustness against dirt and adverse environmental conditions and their modest requirements for space. They are contained in some of the products of at least one of the largest ball bearing manufacturers (who however might not be aware of this fact)</p>
848	2011/09/12 19:20  File attached	LKS Kronenberger GmbH Metallverdlungs werk  Company Germany	<p>LKS Kronenberger GmbH Metallveredlung will give the same comments to Cobalt(II)-Dicarbonate like done by Cobalt(II)-Chlorid. To avoid repeating the same arguments many times please see our comments on Cobalt(II)-Chlorid made at the same day ! Sorry, first input for Co(II)-carbonate was wrong in one point !!</p>

839	2011/09/12 18:55  File attached	LKS Kronenberger GmbH Metallveredlung swerk   Company Germany	LKS Kronenberger GmbH Metallveredlung will give the same comments to Cobalt(II)-Carbonate like done by Cobalt(II)-Chlorid. To avoid repeating the same arguments many times please see our comments on Cobalt(II)-Chlorid made at the same day !
803	2011/09/12 16:28	Company Germany	Cobalt in gold electrolytes Cobalt as cobalt sulphate and cobalt carbonate is used in gold electrolytes as alloy metal and hardener. The deposited gold layers contain circa 0,3% Cobalt and is responsible for the hardness and wear resistance of the gold layers. These gold/cobalt alloys are used in the electronic industry as a common contact surface.
784	2011/09/12 15:32	Company United Kingdom	Our company provides comments as EU producer of Cobalt carbonate. Our company is member of the Cobalt REACH Consortium and as such, participated to its mapping exercise and provided information on tonnages, manufacture, uses and releases; aggregated results from this exercise are available from the Consortium and in the REACH registration dossier. Manufacture and releases from manufacture (section 2.2.2.1. – page 2): We do not think that exposure data reported in the Lison study from 1994 are relevant to describe the current EU manufacturing releases: this study appears not to be specific to Cobalt carbonate exposure and is quite old to be representative of current practice. Updated exposure data from manufacture have been provided in REACH registration dossiers (prepared by Cobalt REACH Consortium) and can be used as reference. Uses and releases from uses (section 2.2.2.2. – pages 2 to 5): We confirm the following uses on customers' information:

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use as intermediate to produce other chemicals – exempted from Authorisation: This includes the manufacture of catalysts: customers report that Cobalt carbonate is used as an intermediate to produce hydrotreating catalysts. Cobalt carbonate is also used as intermediate in ceramic applications: it is used as raw material in the manufacture of colorant.</li> <li>• Use in animal feed – exempted from Authorisation: The use of cobalt carbonate as an animal food supplement would fall within the scope of feed safety regulation (EC 178/2002). Uses reported are only industrial uses and ca. 100% of Cobalt carbonate tonnage falls under Authorisation exemptions. We do not think that the exposure data from Danish Environmental Agency are relevant: they appear not to be specific to Cobalt carbonate. Similarly, the dust concentrations measured in production facilities and refineries have not been identified to be specifically Cobalt carbonate dusts. Updated exposure data from uses have been provided in REACH registration dossiers (prepared by Cobalt REACH Consortium) and can be used as reference. Availability of information on alternatives (section 2.3. – page 5): Even a number of common uses have been registered for Cobalt carbonate and other salts, the assumption of mutual substitution is incorrect. Customers confirmed that the uses of Cobalt carbonate are specific and no substitution is available including the substitution by any other Cobalt salt. Existing specific Community Legislation relevant for possible exemption (section 2.4. – page 5): The use of Cobalt carbonate in animal feed falls under the scope of food safety regulation (EC 178/2002) and, as such, is exempted from Authorisation. As per REACH legislation (Title 1 – Article 2 – 8b), intermediate uses are exempted from Authorisation. Cobalt carbonate is used as intermediate to produce catalysts. Ceramic applications are also recognized as intermediate uses. On top of that, CMR compounds are already covered by other legislations including: the Carcinogens Directive 90/394/EEC, Directive 98/24/CE, Directive 2004/37/EC and IPPC directive (Dir. 2008/1/EC) cover already risk management of carcinogens at work. Global comments on prioritization (section 3.1. – page 6): Based on information gathered, we do not think that Cobalt carbonate should be placed on Annex XIV. Reasons are the followings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ca. 100% of our tonnage of Cobalt carbonate is exempt from Authorisation either because</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			<p>uses are intermediate uses or fall under other specific legislations,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exposure data gathered by REACH Cobalt Consortium show that the releases at workplaces are well-controlled,</li> <li>• Assumption on interchangeability is not correct and uses are specific to Cobalt carbonate only,</li> <li>• New data available tend to show a carcinogen threshold mechanism.</li> </ul>
739	2011/09/12 11:15	Company Germany	<p>Cobalt containing passivations are right now widely used to improve corrosion protection of zinc and zinc-alloy plated parts. Cobalt free passivations with similar or even improved corrosion protection are available and are also already used, so in our point of view there is no need for cobalt salts in the use of passivations.</p>
719	2011/09/10 17:47	Company Finland	<p><b>INTRODUCTION</b>          The company manufactures Cobalt carbonate in Finland and supplies this substance to customer's world wide. The company is one of those who registered the substance under REACH in 2010.          We provided a response to the first consultation conducted for Cobalt carbonate in 2010 (SVHC proposal and Annex XV dossier by the Netherlands).          The company is also a member of the Cobalt REACH Consortium Ltd (CoRC) together with 49 other members representing manufacturers and/or importers of cobalt substances. It should be highlighted that some downstream users are also members of the Cobalt REACH consortium.          We fully supports the joint response comments provided by the Secretariat of the Cobalt REACH Consortium on the behalf of the Consortium member companies. As a coalition, the Cobalt REACH Consortium is in a better position to answer key questions on for instance volumes and usages for the substance.  <b>VOLUME(S) IMPORTS/EXPORTS (Section 2.1.1, page 1)</b>          As a company we do not have access to consolidated information on volumes manufactured /imported in EU or to EU nor to information corrected for export. Therefore we as a company are dependent on the information consolidated by the Secretariat of CoRC.</p>

		<p>Data on tonnages from registration information presented in the consultation document indicates a volume range of 1 000 – 10 000 t/y manufactured/imported into the EU. Although it is mentioned that volumes reported by the CoRC are in the same range it would be correct to indicate that the CoRC volumes (corrected for export) actually are less than a third of the maximum range 10 000 t/y (i.e. less than 3 300 t/y).</p> <p>In addition this section may give the impression that the mentioned volume (or volume range 1 000 -10 000 t/y) is expected to fall within the scope of Authorisation. It is our understanding that volumes subjected to authorization should be indicated in this section. This would give the public an overview of the tonnages and help them to take part in the public consultation.</p> <p>Referring to information collected by CoRC – there are no volume (zero tonnages) subjected to authorisation. A very small portion (&lt;&lt; 1%) of EU tonnages may be within the scope of authorisation depending on the interpretation of intermediate status for some uses.</p> <p>As a company and because of Confidential Business Information issues , we are not in the position to indicate manufactured volume , exports outsideof EU and sales within EU, and therefore we rely on information provided by the CoRC</p> <p>MANUFACTURE AND RELEASE FROM MANUFACTURE (Section 2.2.2.1, page 2)</p> <p>Release from Manufacture:</p> <p>Our manufacturing operations are located in Finland. The release into the environment is regulated by national environmental permits which include e.g. limit values for cobalt release into the sea and air, emission monitoring programs, evaluation on best available technique (BAT) and reporting to the authorities on an monthly and yearly basis. It must be highlighted that the environmental permit is not only demanding emission control but also monitoring of any potential impact to the environment.</p> <p>Exposure:</p> <p>Exposure information included in the ECHA document is not specific to Cobalt carbonate and in addition it would be proper to present information originating from EU countries.</p> <p>As an manufacturer we are following national TWA limits for workers, which in Finland is 0,05 mg/m<sup>3</sup> for Cobalt. Regular occupational exposure measurements are conducted including both stationary and personal sampling. Measurements are also conducted based on workers job description. Because of it's classification as carcinogen and toxic for reproduction (1B), manufacturing areas are marked with CMR-signs, and workers in potential contact with the substance are reported annually to a national ASA-register. Based on the aforementioned, an effective exposure control can be demonstrated and can be considered safe use.</p> <p>As a manufacturer and registration of Cobalt carbonate we provided together with the</p>
--	--	---

		<p>registration dossier a comprehensive assessment, which incorporate both the inherent exposure potential of a use in combination with recommended risk management measures. All registered uses of cobalt carbonate can demonstrate effective control of exposure and can be considered safe uses.</p> <p>As the registration dossier contains exposure scenarios for all identified uses of cobalt carbonate, these scenarios should be used in preference to the historic or literature values currently quoted in the background document that could be relevant to uses that are not supported under REACH or are not consistent with the exposure scenarios established for cobalt carbonate.</p> <p>USES AND RELEASES FROM USES (Section 2.2.2.2, pages 2 to 5)</p> <p>It would be beneficial to indicate uses subjected and not subjected to authorization in this section. This would give the public an overview of these and help them to take part in the public consultation.</p> <p>To the best of our knowledge the following uses can be considered as intermediates and should be exempt from Authorization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manufacture of cobalt carbonate</li> <li>• Manufacturing of other cobalt chemicals</li> <li>• Industrial use of cobalt carbonate in the manufacture of other cobalt compounds during catalyst production.</li> <li>• Industrial use of cobalt carbonate in surface treatment processes</li> <li>• Industrial use of cobalt carbonate in the manufacture of inorganic pigments &amp; frits, glass and ceramic ware</li> <li>• industrial use of cobalt carbonate in the manufacture of chemicals and in other wet chemical processes.</li> </ul> <p>The animal feed usage sector is exempted under REACH. Reach Regulation No 1907/2006, Article 2:</p> <p>The provisions of Titles II (REGISTRATION OF SUBSTANCES), V (DOWNSTREAM USERS), VI (EVALUATION) and VII (AUTHORISATION) shall not apply to the extent that a substance is used:</p> <p>(b) in food or feeding stuffs in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 including use:</p> <p>(iii) as an additive in feeding stuffs within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2003 on additives for use in animal nutrition (9).</p> <p>However authorization dossiers are required according to the EU regulation on additives for use in animal nutrition (1831/2003). Authorization dossiers have been made for cobalt sulphate, cobalt carbonate and cobalt diasetate according to 1831/2003. These dossiers contain in section</p>
--	--	---

		<p>III information on safety of the additive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risks for Workers who manufacture the cobalt salt</li> <li>• Workers who use cobalt salt for preparing premixtures</li> <li>• Users of premixtures</li> <li>• Risk for target species</li> <li>• Risk for consumers</li> <li>• Risk for environment</li> </ul> <p>It would be proper to indicate this in the consultation document so that the public would have information that this usage is already covered by another EU regulation than REACH. The company do not consider there to be any consumer uses of cobalt carbonate.</p> <p><b>AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ON ALTERNATIVES (Section 2.3, page 5)</b></p> <p>It is not reasonable to assume that other cobalt salts could replace cobalt carbonate for its applications. Although common uses have been identified for the purposes of generic exposure scenarios, but this does not mean that the exact use is the same, nor that it is technically or economically feasible to implement such changes</p> <p>As an example, cobalt carbonate is used as a starting material in the manufacture of certain catalysts. It is our understanding that during these manufacturing process steps cobalt carbonate is transformed into cobalt oxide (the catalytically active species), without leaving residual anions potentially poisoning or reducing the activity of the catalyst. This is not possible if Cobalt carbonate was replaced with other cobalt salts like chloride, sulphate or another anion.</p> <p>Limiting industry to non-cobalt alternatives for the production of catalysts would significantly affect further development of efficient catalysts and would result in less efficient processes associated with higher energy consumption and higher emissions.</p> <p>There is to our understanding no need to find alternatives to cobalt carbonate because the usages are outside the scope of authorisation and in addition the Chemical Safety Report (CSR) demonstrate safe uses for man and environment.</p> <p><b>EXISTING SPECIFIC COMMUNITY LEGISLATION RELEVANT FOR POSSIBLE EXEMPTION (Section 2.4, page 5)</b></p> <p>The use of cobalt carbonate as an animal food supplement would fall within the scope of feed safety regulation (EC 178/2002).</p> <p>The use of cobalt sulphate in animal nutrition fall within the scope of EU regulation 1831/2003.</p> <p>The Carcinogens Directive (90/394/EEC), Directive 98/24/CE, Directive 2004/37/CE all apply to CMR compounds. Risk management is already required by existing legislation as for example the carcinogens at work directive (Dir. 2004/37/EC) and the IPPC directive (Dir.2008/1/EC).</p>
--	--	---

			<p>PRIORITISATION (Section 3.1, page 6)  The data in the registration dossier and updates to be submitted by the end of this year indicate that cobalt carbonate is non genotoxic in vivo, suggesting a threshold mode of action. Based on information (intermediate uses or exempt ) we find that uses of cobalt carbonate in EU are outside the scope of authorization.  In case for any uses that are not exempt, risk management is already required by existing legislation for example the carcinogens at work directive (Dir. 2004/37/EC and the IPPC directive (Dir. 2008/1/EC).  REFERENCES (Section 4, page 7)  It was not possible to make proper assessment or comments on this section because the internet link was not working.</p>
715	2011/09/10 11:58  File attached	Adolf Krämer Metallveredlung GmbH & Co KG   Company Germany	<p>We made surface technologie for automotive, windcraft, solar and so on. For high corrosion resistance in off shore or winter geographic lands we need Cobalt for the corrosion resistance. Without cobalt and Cr-VI you ´ve got a rersistence from minus 90%! For us means we lost round about 70 peoples and 8 Mio € turn around.</p>

641	2011/09/08 18:30	Xstrata Nikkelverk AS  Company Norway	<p>Cobalt Carbonate</p> <p>We have serious concerns that the quality of the data in the supporting documents is insufficient for a valid Prioritisation of cobalt carbonate. It is flawed and misleading in many key respects. This important decision must be based on facts, and not speculation, to protect the integrity of the REACH process. We respectfully request that ECHA and the Member State representatives take the necessary time to correct the quality of the data in the supporting documents in all the key areas BEFORE any Prioritisation evaluation of the five cobalt compounds is attempted, in order to avoid unnecessary economic hardship to the European cobalt chemical industry and its downstream users.</p> <p>Our concerns are detailed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ranking process - We are concerned that there has been a significant over-estimate of the risks posed by this substance in the ranking process. This appears to have been the result of a lack of detailed understanding of these substances in all the key ranking criteria. From work commissioned by the Cobalt REACH Consortium (CoRC), the following elements of the ranking process criteria should be urgently reviewed before any decision is taken to place cobalt carbonate on Annex XIV:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Tonnage – REACH registration tonnage bands have been used to estimate tonnage produced / used. This approach guarantees an overestimate of the tonnage in question because of the use of the upper end of the range in the ranking process, and also because it will ignore production volumes destined for export, which are within the scope or REACH registration, but outside the scope of Authorisation. It is our understanding from a survey commissioned by the CoRC that the EU/EEA tonnage of this substance, adjusted for exports is only one third of the 10,000 mt p.a. upper end of the range used in the ranking. This is significant and should result in a reduction in the score for this criterion within the ranking process. Furthermore, when adjusted for the uses outside the scope of REACH this tonnage effectively drops to zero.</li> </ol> <p>The tonnage ranking as stated in the supporting documents is significantly overstated and should only be based on the tonnage within the scope of Authorisation</p> <li>b. Uses – Many of the uses listed in the document are not specific to cobalt carbonate, and relate to applications of other cobalt chemicals, and even cobalt metal and alloys (welding/soldering). This is inaccurate and misleading, especially where these uses are then stated to be related to high exposures and wide dispersive use. These statements are then inappropriately reflected in the ranking score for these criteria. Only uses of the compound in question should be considered in the Prioritisation process in line with the legislation.</li> </li></ol>
-----	---------------------	---	--

			<p>A current CoRC survey reveals the following end use split for cobalt carbonate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 95% to manufacture other chemicals (includes 20% as catalysts) ... intermediate status</li> <li>- Less than 6% to manufacture animal feed supplements ..... outside scope of Authorisation</li> </ul> <p>Other applications such as use in the manufacture of pigments, and in surface finishing is negligible. Contrary to the supporting document statements, there are no identified 'professional uses' of cobalt carbonate with its attendance concerns for high exposure and wide dispersive use. It is critical for the integrity of the Prioritisation process that assumptions used for value judgments on wide dispersive use, non-intermediate status, etc. in the supporting document MUST be based on data, and not the absence of data, as seems to be the case here.</p> <p>c. 'Intermediate status' – From the CoRC survey, approximately 95% of uses (above) meet the guideline definition of intermediate status, and so are exempt from Authorisation. In the case of catalysts, cobalt carbonate is an intermediate in a multi-step process in the manufacture of catalysts, and their intermediate status is not in question. There is no cobalt carbonate in the finished catalyst. With the animal feed application covered by other EU legislation, effectively 100% of the applications are outside the scope of Authorisation.</p> <p>d. Wide dispersive use – the quantification of the 'wide dispersive use' has been impacted by inappropriate assumptions on the uses of cobalt carbonate, and should be adjusted for the actual applications shown above. If there is effectively no use within scope of authorisation, this should be reflected within the ranking score for this criterion.</p> <p>e. Interchangeability / Substitutabilty - It is our understanding that it is not possible to substitute cobalt carbonate by the other cobalt compounds for these applications. There are two reasons for this. The first is due to the purity of the resulting products made from cobalt carbonate due to the fact that the carbonate anion can be reduced without leaving other aqueous or solid impurities other than cobalt. The second is more generic in that, to make any process change, even if chemically possible, would involve extensive development costs and changes to the flow diagram of the entire process. The cost of such changes would not be economic, and so means that the substances would not be interchangeable in any practical sense. We understand interchangeability is a core assumption to 'grouping' the five cobalt substance, and we recommend that this be reconsidered in the light of this information.</p> <p>2. Lack of good data - The lack of detailed information in the documentation is exemplified by the widespread use of "appear to be", "seem to be", etc. prefacing the key statements about</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>tonnages, uses, and what is in, and what is out, of the scope of Authorisation. Given the very significant economic impact on companies and employees of a decision to place substances on Annex XIV, we would strongly recommend that more time is taken to improve the quality of the data used to make the Prioritisation determination for this substance, particularly at this time of economic hardship across Europe. This important decision must be based on facts and not speculation.</p> <p>3. Exposure data – We understand that much of the exposure data used in the background document dates from 1994. The REACH registrations for these substances contain a wealth of data about exposure scenarios, and risk characterisation. Given that Authorisation is a part of the REACH process, it seems, at the very least, ‘inappropriate’ to decide on the prioritisation of this substance without considering the REACH data available as the basis of the supporting document. We do not understand why this has not been done.</p> <p>4. Regulatory efficiency – Given that effectively all uses of cobalt carbonate are exempt from, or outside the scope of, Authorisation, that all applications are in an industrial setting covered by existing workplace regulation, that there is therefore no consumer exposure issue, and that interchangeability is not technically or economically possible, there is no environmental or health benefit to be realized by placing cobalt carbonate on Annex XIV that we can identify. We are concerned that the credibility of the REACH and Authorisation process could be put at risk by decisions taken on incomplete and, in some cases, misleading information. Political expediency is no substitute for good, data based, decision-making particularly where people’s livelihood is at risk.</p> <p>5. Economic impact - The cobalt industry is small but significant in value terms for Europe. Cobalt carbonate, as are the other cobalt compounds subject to this review, is a critical raw material that is the starting point for a range of downstream industries that are crucial to many other EU initiatives, such as clean air and energy and resource efficiency, to say nothing about the economic added value for the European economy. Catalysts produced from these substances are essential to the economy of European chemical manufacturing industry, enabling reactions to take place at low temperatures, low pressures, with wider benefits for energy and resource efficiency. Desulphurized fossil fuels are just one of the resulting products that are vital to Europe’s efforts to improve the health of the population by producing clean air. All engineering companies in Europe rely on cutting tools that have employed the use of one or more of these compounds at an early stage of their manufacture. Modern electronic devices such as computers, mobile phones, and hybrid cars use rechargeable batteries, the latest generations of</p>
--	--	--

			<p>which use components which used at least one of these cobalt compounds at an early stage in their manufacture. Meanwhile, Cobalt has been designated a 'critical raw material' by the European Commission. There has been no impact assessment for the effect on industry or these other cornerstone EC policies as part of this Prioritisation.</p> <p>These products are so fundamental to our daily lives that they will continue to be produced. These downstream products will still be imported into Europe, regardless of whether any of the five cobalt substances are placed in Annex XIV or not, as they do not contain any of the five cobalt compounds. However, Annex XIV listing will create uncertainty as to the ability of European industry to produce these products in future, and downstream users will need to develop new non-European sources to protect their supply chain, taking market share away from European manufacturers. The small tonnage of uses within scope will not justify companies applying for Authorisation. Only European Industry will be adversely impacted. We believe that these decisions should not be taken lightly as their economic impact on Europe can be profound. If necessary, more time should be taken to improve the quality of the data used to make the Prioritisation determination for these substances, particularly at this time of economic hardship across Europe.</p> <p>Xstrata Nickel produces high purity cobalt metal, and does not produce any of the cobalt compounds under review. However, our concern is for the cobalt market in Europe as a whole, and for the efficacy and credibility of the REACH and the Authorisation process. To the best of our knowledge, the above statements contained here are correct, and are provided in good faith.</p>
613	2011/09/08 09:42  File attached	Schaeffler Technologies GmbH & Co. KG   Company Germany	see attached statement

595	2011/09/07 13:11  File attached	Adolf Krämer GmbH & Co KG  Company Germany	<p>The surface technologie is a small key technologie worldwide. When ECHA mean they must prohibit the metals and their connections, so they prohibit the european market! Computertechnologie, Medical Industrie, Automotiveindustrie, Windcraft, Solartechnologie and much more are living from these metals and more.</p> <p>Also need the human body thes metals as a trace element in his body, because wiouth all these elemens the man will not survive!</p> <p>We need Cr-III, Co, Ni, As and all other elements of the periodic system!</p>
573	2011/09/01 13:30	Umicore NV/SA  Company Belgium	<p>We would like to emphasize the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The actual EU tonnage of cobalt carbonate is less than a third of the range maxima of 10.000 tpa as reported in the consultation document. In addition approx. 95% is used as intermediate and up to 6% is used in animal feed. These uses are exempted from REACH, suggesting there is no (zero) volume of cobalt carbonate in scope of authorization.</li> <li>• A REACH registration dossier and chemical safety report were submitted for cobalt carbonate by the end of 2010. This includes an exposure scenario for each identified and supported use, each resulting in a risk characterization ratio below 1. Therefore it can be safely assumed that all uses of cobalt carbonate in the EU are well controlled and the criteria of 'wide dispersive use' are not met.</li> <li>• Cobalt carbonate is already controlled by existing legislation to protect human health and environment. As an example risk management is already imposed by the carcinogens at work directive (2004/37/EC) and the IPPC directive (2008/1/EC). Furthermore all CMR compounds are restricted for supply to the general public, excluding consumer exposure (REACH, Annex XVII, entry 28-30).</li> <li>• There is a misconception regarding interchangeability. It should be noted that cobalt carbonate cannot be easily substituted by other cobalt salts in its applications. In nearly all cases it is neither technically and/or economically feasible to implement such a change.</li> <li>• Highly efficient cobalt-containing catalysts, derived from cobalt carbonate (intermediate use), are necessary to optimize industrial processes (chemical and petrochemical), making them more eco-friendly and cost-efficient. They are critical to comply with existing pieces of EU legislation (e.g. Ambient Air Quality) and to achieve the EU's ambitions in reducing emissions of CO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>x</sub>. Despite the fact that this intermediate use is exempted, listing in Annex XIV could have serious consequences for the availability of this critical raw material and the non-availability of cobalt-containing catalysts.</li> </ul>

			<p>Based on the above Umicore is of the opinion that including cobalt dichloride in Annex XIV seems disproportionate.</p> <p>In addition to the above we support the comments made by the Cobalt REACH Consortium (CoRC).</p>
564	<p>2011/08/30 21:18</p> <p>File attached</p>	<p>Cobalt REACH Consortium Ltd (CoRC)</p> <p>Industry or trade association United Kingdom</p>	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The following joint response comments are provided by the Secretariat of the Cobalt REACH Consortium Ltd (CoRC) on behalf of the Consortium member companies. The Cobalt REACH Consortium was founded in November 2007 by the Board of Directors of the Cobalt Development Institute (CDI) to implement REACH on behalf of the cobalt industry. There are currently 50 Regular members of the Consortium. The Consortium member companies and their affiliates constitute over 80 industry companies involved in the manufacturing and/or import of cobalt substances in Europe as well as other international jurisdictions. There are also some downstream users represented amongst the Consortium membership.</p> <p>The Cobalt Consortium provided joint response comments to the first consultation conducted for cobalt carbonate in 2010 (SVHC proposal and Annex XV dossier by The Netherlands).</p> <p>VOLUME(S) IMPORTS/EXPORTS (Section 2.1.1, page 1)</p> <p>Data on the tonnage of cobalt carbonate collated by the CoRC from EU manufacturers and downstream users in 2011 indicate that the maximum of the range reported in the background document (10,000tpa) derived from registration data is a significant overestimate of the volume of cobalt carbonate on the EU market. The total EU tonnage of cobalt carbonate, corrected for export, is less than a third of the range maxima of 10,000 tpa. In addition, this section does not</p>

		<p>detail what proportion of the total EU tonnage is expected to fall within the scope of Authorisation. Data collated by the CoRC from EU Manufacturers and Downstream Users suggests that there is no volume (zero tonnage) expected to be within the scope of authorisation, although a very small proportion &lt;&lt; &lt;&lt;1% of the EU tonnage may fall within the scope of Authorisation depending on the interpretation of intermediate status for some uses. MANUFACTURE AND RELEASE FROM MANUFACTURE (Section 2.2.2.1, page 2)</p> <p>In addition to the manufacturing processes identified by ECHA cobalt carbonate can also be manufactured by the precipitation of a cobalt metal containing solution (e.g. cobalt dinitrate) with sodium carbonate.</p> <p>The exposure data cited in the background document is from 1994 and is not specific to cobalt carbonate. A summary of exposure scenarios developed by the CoRC for the REACH registration of cobalt carbonate is attached to this consultation response for information. Based on these comprehensive assessments, which incorporate both the inherent exposure potential of a use in combination with recommended risk management measures, all registered uses of cobalt carbonate are considered as safe uses. As the REACH dossier contains exposure scenarios for all identified uses of cobalt carbonate the data from these assessments should be used in preference to the historic or literature values currently quoted in the background document that could be relevant to uses that are not supported under REACH or not consistent with the exposure scenarios established for cobalt carbonate.</p> <p>France should be added to the list of manufacturing locations.</p> <p>USES AND RELEASES FROM USES (Section 2.2.2.2, pages 2 to 5)</p> <p>The section on uses in the background document is not specific to the identified uses of cobalt carbonate and does not clearly identify or distinguish between those uses of cobalt carbonate that are outside of the scope of Authorisation and those uses that are likely to be within the scope of Authorisation. The CoRC would welcome any revision to section 2.2.2.2 that allows the identified uses of cobalt carbonate that are within scope of Authorisation to be clearly distinguished from the identified uses that are clearly outside of the scope of Authorisation (e.g. general exempted uses). In addition, it would be beneficial if uses were listed within each section from the largest to the smallest tonnage.</p> <p>Data collated by the CoRC from EU manufacturers and downstream users in 2011 indicate that the identified uses of cobalt carbonate and their respective proportions are as follows: Approximately 95 % of EU tonnage is used as an intermediate in the manufacture of other chemicals (and therefore exempt from Authorisation, REACH Title 1, Chapter 1, Article 2, 8b), these uses can be further summarised as:</p>
--	--	--

		<p>-Manufacture of other chemicals. Approximately 70% of EU tonnage          -Production of other chemicals during catalyst manufacture. 25% of EU tonnage          -Manufacture of inorganic pigments. Very low, &lt;1% of EU tonnage          Use in animal feed grade materials and fertilizers. Up to 6% of EU tonnage          Surface treatment. Extremely low, &lt;&lt;1% EU tonnage          None of the identified uses are considered by the CoRC to be within the scope of Authorisation. The majority of the cobalt carbonate produced or imported into the EU (~95%) is used as an intermediate in the manufacture of other chemicals. This includes use during the production of catalysts, other compounds, pigments and surface treatments. Cobalt carbonate itself is not used as a catalyst. Use of a substance as an intermediate is exempt from Authorisation under REACH, and therefore these tonnages should be considered outside of the scope of authorisation for prioritization.          Up to 6% is used as an animal feed supplement. This use is also exempt from Authorisation under REACH, and therefore these tonnages should be considered outside of the scope of authorisation for prioritization.          Data collated from EU Manufacturers and Downstream Users on the use of cobalt carbonate in pigments and surface treatments indicate that these uses are as an intermediate as described in the REACH regulation and the registration dossier.          As noted, an updated summary of exposure scenarios developed by the CoRC for the REACH registration of cobalt carbonate is attached to this consultation response.          The ECHA background document states that all the identified uses of cobalt carbonate have been registered as industrial, apart from the professional use of granular fertilisers/feed grade materials.          The data reported for consumer exposure to cobalt salts (i.e. hobby paints, cosmetics and dinnerware) are not specific to cobalt carbonate (but relate to cobalt metal) and should be revised or omitted from the background document as they are not directly relevant to cobalt carbonate. The CoRC do not consider there to be any consumer uses of cobalt carbonate.  <b>GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION AND CONCLUSIONS IN TERMS OF (ORGANISATION AND COMMUNICATION IN) SUPPLY CHAINS (Section 2.2.2.3, page 5)</b>          This section could be made clearer by identifying the uses that are within scope of Authorisation, if any. As the complexity of the supply chain is one of the factors that feeds into the prioritisation score this section should relate solely to the geographical distribution and supply chain of the uses that are potential candidates for Authorisation. CoRC would welcome that the structure of section 2.2.2.3. be changed to only include uses in scope of Authorisation.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>As we consider that none of the EU tonnage is within the scope of authorisation, this section could simply state this.</p> <p>AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ON ALTERNATIVES (Section 2.3, page 5)</p> <p>It is not reasonable to assume that other cobalt salts could generally replace cobalt carbonate for its applications. Although common uses may have been identified for the purposes of generic exposure scenarios this does not mean that the exact use is the same, nor that it is technically or economically feasible to implement this change.</p> <p>For instance, cobalt carbonate is used as an intermediate in the manufacture of certain catalysts because it is transformed into cobalt oxide (the active species), without leaving a residual anion. This is not possible if carbonate was replaced with chloride, sulphate or another anion. Limiting industry to non-cobalt alternatives for the production of catalysts would significantly affect further development of efficient catalysts and would result in less efficient processes associated with higher energy consumption and higher emissions.</p> <p>The only other species used in a similar way as an intermediate for the production of other cobalt compounds in catalyst production is cobalt dinitrate. However the processes used and equipment are entirely different and cobalt carbonate and dinitrate cannot be used interchangeably in the same plant.</p> <p>Irrespective of the comments above, alternatives do not need to be sought as all the identified uses of cobalt carbonate are considered to be outside of the scope of Authorisation and the REACH registration has demonstrated that use is safe for man and the environment.</p> <p>EXISTING SPECIFIC COMMUNITY LEGISLATION RELEVANT FOR POSSIBLE EXEMPTION (Section 2.4, page 5)</p> <p>The use of cobalt carbonate as an animal food supplement would fall within the scope of feed safety regulation (EC 178/2002).</p> <p>The Carcinogens Directive (90/394/EEC), Directive 98/24/CE, Directive 2004/37/CE all apply to CMR compounds. Risk management is already required by existing legislation as for example the carcinogens at work directive (Dir. 2004/37/EC and the IPPC directive (Dir. 2008/1/EC).</p> <p>ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION (e.g. for Priority setting) (section 2.5, page 5)</p> <p>Despite the fact that the use of cobalt carbonate as intermediate for the manufacture of other cobalt compounds in the catalyst industry is exempted from Authorisation, a listing in Annex XIV could have serious consequences for the availability of this critical raw material and the non-availability of cobalt-containing catalysts in the EU resulting in reduced economic and environmental efficiency. This potential consequence should be considered carefully before the final decision on inclusion of cobalt carbonate in Annex XIV is made. Highly efficient cobalt-</p>
--	--	--

		<p>containing catalysts are beneficial for industrial (chemical, petrochemical) applications. With a catalyst, chemical reactions can be performed at lower temperature, lower pressure or with lower by-product formation. Highly efficient catalysts are essential for the further improvement of chemical processes to make them more eco-friendly and more cost efficient by reducing hydrogen consumption and hence CO<sub>2</sub> emission.</p> <p>Catalysts manufactured using cobalt carbonate intermediates contribute to a large-scale reduction of sulphur and nitrogen in fuels and hence the reduction of sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>x</sub>) and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions to the atmosphere during the burning of fossil fuels. For example, one tonne of cobalt applied as catalyst mixture contributes to a SO<sub>x</sub> emission reduction of 25,000 tons and a NO<sub>x</sub> emission reduction of 750 tonnes per year. Cobalt-containing catalysts are needed to comply with several EU Directives on Ambient Air Quality. Reduction of SO<sub>x</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from fuel burning is dependent on the production of low sulphur and nitrogen containing fuels, which is only achievable with cobalt-containing catalysts.</p> <p>PRIORITISATION (Section 3.1, page 6)</p> <p>Based on both scoring (i.e. &lt;10) and the verbal argumentative approach it seems to be disproportionate to prioritise cobalt carbonate for Annex XIV listing. It is also acknowledged by ECHA to only be of moderate priority.</p> <p>The data in the registration dossier and updates to be submitted by the end of this year indicate that cobalt carbonate is non genotoxic in vivo, suggesting a threshold mode of action. We acknowledge that ECHA have taken account of the new data indicating that cobalt carbonate has a threshold concentration for carcinogenicity in the scoring for inherent properties.</p> <p>Based on the uses identified in the consultation document, all of the uses in the EU are as an intermediate or animal feed supplement and therefore exempt from Authorisation. Data collected by the CoRC also indicate that all uses are exempt. Risk management is already required by existing legislation as for example the carcinogens at work directive (Dir. 2004/37/EC and the IPPC directive (Dir. 2008/1/EC) and is in our opinion sufficiently effective.</p> <p>As such, there is no reason to calculate a prioritisation score. However, as this has been done in the background document we have provided comments on this.</p> <p>As all uses are considered to be exempt the volume score should also be zero.</p> <p>All uses of cobalt carbonate would be controlled under various pieces of existing legislation and have been shown in REACH exposure assessment to be safe uses (i.e. to have RCR values below 1). The appropriate release score would therefore be 1. As all uses are considered exempt, the number of sites within scope of Authorisation is zero. Therefore the site score should be 0.</p> <p>The overall prioritization score would therefore be: 0-1 (properties) + 0 (volume) + 0 (WDU) =</p>
--	--	--

			<p>0-1          ECHA states the cobalt carbonate is of moderate priority but should be placed on Annex XIV as there are other cobalt compounds that could replace it. We argue that all uses of cobalt carbonate are exempt and we disagree with the statement that other cobalt compounds could replace cobalt carbonate in its uses. We therefore do not believe that cobalt carbonate should be prioritized for inclusion on Annex XIV.          REFERENCES (Section 4, page 7)          Please note that the internet links provided under '4. References' are no longer working. Without being able to retrieve the information on which the Annex XV is based it is not possible for independent third parties to make a proper assessment and comments.</p>
547	2011/08/24 13:58	WWF European Policy Office  International NGO Belgium	WWF supports the prioritisation for inclusion in Annex XIV based on the fact that the substance could replace other cobalt (II) compounds.
538	2011/08/19 16:13  File attached Confidential	European Catalyst Manufacturer's Association (ECMA)  Industry or trade association Belgium	<p>2.2.2.1 Manufacture and releases from manufacture p. 2:          Cobalt carbonate is a transported isolated intermediate (i.e. raw material), or on-site isolated intermediate, or non-isolated intermediate in the manufacturing process of catalysts. During the manufacturing process the carbonate is completely converted into other cobalt compounds (e.g. cobalt oxide, tricobalt tetraoxide) by e.g. co-precipitation and/or heat-treatment. As an intermediate release/exposure from manufacture is minimal. (See confidential annex submitted already to ECHA in the first consultation period).</p> <p>2.2.2.2 Uses and releases from uses:          Manufacture of other chemicals.          p. 2 'uses' 2. par: The European catalyst manufacturers association (ECMA) has confirmed the use of Cobalt carbonate as an intermediate for the production other cobalt compounds during catalyst manufacture.          Cobalt carbonate is used as an intermediate in the manufacturing process of hydroprocessing catalysts (HPC), hydrodesulphurization catalysts (HDS), catalysts for Fischer Tropsch reaction (GTL - conversion from gas to liquid fuel), and certain hydrogenation catalysts.</p>

		<p>Cobalt carbonate is transformed by e.g. precipitation and/or calcination processes and the substance is entirely consumed in the course of the catalyst manufacturing process. This salt is not contained in the final catalyst mixture and cannot be considered as catalyst itself.</p> <p>As a catalyst:</p> <p>P3: Bullet point "As a catalyst:" We as ECMA can confirm that the statement in the ECHA document is correct for ECMA member companies.</p> <p>Releases from uses:</p> <p>P 4: Releases and occupational exposure data of the catalyst industry are available and were considered in the registration dossier and CSR. According to this assessment the exposures are well controlled and would not constitute a relevant risk for humans and the environment.</p> <p>2.2.2.3 Geographical distribution and conclusions in terms of (organisation and communication in) supply chains:</p> <p>Pg 5. The use as an intermediate in manufacture of catalysts is actually a production of other chemicals and thus cobalt carbonate does not appear as a component in the final catalyst mixture and thus there are no direct downstream users.</p> <p>2.3 Availability of information on alternatives:</p> <p>Pg 5. ECMA has already provided the following information: The performance of a catalyst is based on its adsorption properties. These properties are based on the electronic structure (chemical) but also on physical properties (e.g. specific surface area). Development of efficient catalysts is a complex task, as in most cases not only one substance is involved. Catalyst performance is a sophisticated interaction of many different metals. Suppression of one metal influences the whole interaction and will result in a significant drop or even loss of performance. Limiting industry to non-Cobalt alternatives would significantly affect further development of efficient catalysts and would result in less efficient processes associated with higher energy consumption and higher emissions at the sites of the catalyst users and from the use of the products resulting from the processes catalysts are used in. For example emissions of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxide from burning of fossil fuels will most likely rise.</p> <p>3.1 Prioritisation:</p> <p>Pg 6. Based on both scoring (i.e. 80% of the use in the EU is in catalyst manufacture (recent data of the cobalt consortium suggest the volume is likely &gt;90%) and thus this volume should not be in the scope of the authorisation (as it is exempt).</p> <p>Risk management is already required by existing legislation as for example the carcinogens at work directive (Dir. 2004/37/EC and the IPPC directive (Dir. 2008/1/EC) and is in our opinion sufficiently effective.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Other comments on the draft Background documentation:</p> <p>Although the use of Cobalt carbonate as intermediate for the manufacture of other cobalt compounds in the catalyst industry is exempted from authorisation, a listing in Annex XIV could have serious consequences for the availability of this crucial raw material and the subsequent availability of cobalt containing catalysts in the EU and worldwide. This possible consequence should be considered carefully before the final decision on inclusion of Cobalt carbonate in Annex XIV.</p> <p>Economic and Environmental efficiency:</p> <p>Highly efficient Cobalt-containing catalysts are beneficial for industrial (chemical, petrochemical) applications. Using a catalyst, chemical reactions can be performed at lower temperature, lower pressure or with lower by-product formation. Highly efficient catalysts are crucial for further improvement of chemical processes to make them more eco friendly and more cost efficient by reducing hydrogen consumption and hence CO<sub>2</sub> emission.</p> <p>Environmental benefits of low-sulphur and low-nitrogen fuels:</p> <p>The applications of catalysts manufactured using Cobalt carbonate intermediates contributes to large scale positive effects in the reduction of sulphur and nitrogen in fuels and hence the reduction of sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>x</sub>) and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions upon burning of fossil fuels. For comparison 1 ton Cobalt applied as catalyst mixture contributes to a SO<sub>x</sub> emission reduction of 25,000 tons and a NO<sub>x</sub> emission reduction of 750 tons per year.</p> <p>Cobalt-containing catalysts are needed to comply with other pieces of EU legislation:</p> <p>Compliance with several EU Directives on Ambient Air Quality and reduction of SO<sub>x</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from fuel burning is dependent on the production of low sulphur and nitrogen containing fuels, which is only achievable with cobalt containing catalysts.</p> <p>Comments relating to chemical inter-changeability:</p> <p>ECMA has already provided the following information on replacement of Co-carbonate in the catalyst manufacturing process by other Co-salts:</p> <p>As illustrated in the confidential annex Cobalt carbonate and Cobalt dinitrate may be used depending on the processes at different stages of a multistage reaction and therefore are not interchangeable in the catalyst production with other cobalt salts (on the candidate list). In cases where cobalt carbonate is used as a raw material it cannot easily be replaced by Co-nitrate. For example, technically different installations (e.g. DENOX treatment of exhaust air to prevent NO<sub>x</sub> releases) would be needed in the production plant.</p> <p>During thermal treatment (drying and calcination steps) carbonate anion will decompose to CO<sub>2</sub> which is easily removed from the resulting cobalt oxides containing catalysts or catalyst</p>
--	--	---

			<p>precursors.</p> <p>Anions of other common Cobalt salts like Cobalt dichloride and Cobalt sulphate are less easily removed and would stay on the catalyst surface. This is not desired as chlorides and sulphates reduce the catalyst reactivity. Furthermore chloride is known to be highly corrosive, an undesirable property in the catalyst performance that also dictates the use of more expensive corrosion-resistant material for construction of catalytic reactors and piping as well as additional measures in handling these materials.</p> <p>The use of Cobalt carbonate as intermediate for the manufacture of other cobalt compounds in the catalyst industry is exempted from authorisation according to Article 2.8. (b) of Regulation (EC 1907/2006).</p> <p>Details of the use of Co-carbonate in the ECMA member companies are given in the confidential annex.</p>
536	2011/08/19 13:31  File attached <b>Confidential</b>	Albemarle Catalysts Company B.V.   Company Belgium	<p>2.2.2.1 Manufacture and releases from manufacture, P. 2          Import facilities are also located in the Netherlands.</p> <p>2.2.2.2 Uses and releases from uses, Manufacture of other chemicals. (P. 2): Albemarle catalysts company B.V. confirms that in our production process cobalt carbonate is a transported isolated intermediate (i.e. raw material), in the manufacturing process of catalysts. During the manufacturing process the carbonate is completely converted into other cobalt compounds (e.g. cobalt oxide) during dissolution and heat-treatment and the substance is entirely consumed in the course of the catalyst manufacturing process. Cobalt carbonate is not contained in the final catalyst mixture and cannot be considered as catalyst itself.</p> <p>As a catalyst (P. 3) Albemarle catalysts company B.V. confirms that the statement in the ECHA document is correct and cobalt carbonate is only used as an intermediate in the manufacture of other cobalt compounds during catalyst production.</p> <p>Volume per sector or use (P. 4) Following the most recent information of the Cobalt REACH consortium more than 90% of the volume of cobalt carbonate is used as an intermediate in the manufacture of other cobalt compounds during catalyst production.</p> <p>Releases from uses (P.4): In the registration dossier more recent exposure data are provided, this should be analysed instead of relying on published information only that may be already out of date. Releases and occupational exposure data of the catalyst industry are available and were considered in the registration dossier and CSR. According to this assessment the exposures are well controlled and would not constitute a relevant risk for humans and the environment.</p>

		<p>2.2.2.3 Geographical distribution and conclusions in terms of (organisation and communication in) supply chains, P. 5.          The use as an intermediate in manufacture of catalysts is actually a production of other chemicals and thus cobalt carbonate does not appear as a component in the final catalyst mixture and thus there are no direct downstream users.</p> <p>2.3 Availability of information on alternatives, P. 5          In catalyst production cobalt carbonate 's use as an intermediate in the production of other cobalt compounds cannot easily be replaced by other cobalt salts for the following reasons. During the production process Cobalt carbonate will decompose to carbon dioxide which is easily removed from the reaction product, e.g. Cobalt oxide in the catalyst or catalyst precursor. If other common cobalt salts like cobalt dichloride or cobalt sulphate are used the anions (sulphate and chloride) are less easily removed and would stay on the surface of the catalyst. This would result in an undesired loss of activity of the catalyst product. Furthermore chloride is known to be highly corrosive and would dictate the use of more expensive corrosion-resistant material for construction of catalytic reactors and piping as well as additional measures in handling these materials. The intermediate use of Cobalt carbonate cannot easily be replaced by Co-nitrate in the same plant. For example, technically different installations (e.g. DENOX treatment of exhaust air to prevent NOx releases) would be needed in the production plant. In any case a replacement of Co-carbonate would lead to the use of higher amounts of chemicals and more waste streams, as additional purification steps would be needed. No suitable alternative for the use of cobalt containing catalysts is available to date. The performance of a catalyst is based on its adsorption properties. These properties are based on the electronic structure (chemical) but also on physical properties (e.g. specific surface area). Development of efficient catalysts is a complex task, as in most cases not only one substance is involved. Catalyst performance is a sophisticated interaction of many different metals. Suppression of one metal influences the whole interaction and will result in a significant drop or even loss of performance. If cobalt containing catalysts cannot be used anymore this would result in less efficient processes due to less effective catalysts. The consequences will be higher energy consumption and higher emissions at the sites of the catalyst users, e.g. oil refineries and from the use of the products resulting from the processes catalysts are used in. For example emissions of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxide from burning of fossil fuels will most likely rise, even to the extend that some refineries will not be able to meet product specifications and legislative requirements for those emissions.</p> <p>3.1 Prioritisation P. 6          Based on both scoring (i.e. 90% of the use in the EU is as an intermediate for the manufacture of</p>
--	--	---

		<p>other cobalt compounds during catalyst manufacture and thus this volume should not be in the scope of the authorisation as it is exempt. Risk management is already required by existing legislation as for example the carcinogens at work directive (Dir. 2004/37/EC and the IPPC directive (Dir. 2008/1/EC) and is in our opinion sufficiently effective.</p> <p>Other general comments:</p> <p>Although the use of Cobalt carbonate as intermediate for the manufacture of other cobalt compounds in the catalyst industry is exempted from authorisation, a listing in Annex XIV could have serious consequences for the availability of this crucial raw material and the subsequent availability of cobalt containing catalysts in the EU and worldwide. This possible consequence should be considered carefully before the final decision on inclusion of Cobalt carbonate in Annex XIV.</p> <p>Economic and Environmental efficiency:</p> <p>Highly efficient Cobalt-containing catalysts are beneficial for industrial (chemical, petrochemical) applications. Using a catalyst, chemical reactions can be performed at lower temperature, lower pressure or with lower by-product formation. Highly efficient catalysts are crucial for further improvement of chemical processes to make them more eco friendly and more cost efficient by reducing hydrogen consumption and hence CO<sub>2</sub> emission.</p> <p>Environmental benefits of low-sulphur and low-nitrogen fuels due to the use of cobalt containing catalysts in oil refineries:</p> <p>The applications of catalysts manufactured using Cobalt carbonate intermediates contributes to large scale positive effects in the reduction of sulphur and nitrogen in fuels and hence the reduction of sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>x</sub>) and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions upon burning of fossil fuels. For comparison 1 ton Cobalt applied as catalyst mixture contributes to a SO<sub>x</sub> emission reduction of 25,000 tons and a NO<sub>x</sub> emission reduction of 750 tons per year. Cobalt-containing catalysts are needed to comply with other pieces of EU legislation:</p> <p>Compliance with several EU Directives (Examples: Directives 2008/50/EC, 1999/30 EC, 80/779/EC and amendments, 93/12/EEC and amendments, 2005/33/EC) on Ambient Air Quality and reduction of SO<sub>x</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from fuel burning is dependent on the production of low sulphur and nitrogen containing fuels, which is only achievable with cobalt containing catalysts.</p>
--	--	--

474	2011/07/06 12:47  File attached	Individual France	<p>REACH point 12 of official text establish that "An important objective of the new system to be established by this Regulation is to encourage and in certain cases to ensure that substances of high concern are eventually replaced by less dangerous substances or technologies where suitable economically and technically viable alternatives are available."</p> <p>ECHA document called "Draft background document for cobalt dichloride", dated June 15th 2011, confirmed that for cobalt chloride use as humidity indicator "other organic humidity indicators that give for example a colour change from orange to colourless (France, 2008). Consultation with industry (ENTEC, 2008) regarding this use showed that alternatives to cobalt dichloride (e.g. other metal salts, such as iron or copper salts, as proposed by France in their Annex XV dossier) did not allow the same range of humidity indication and therefore these substances were not considered to be technically suitable. According to industry, the only alternative substance identified so far allowing humidity indicator cards to fulfil all quality and performance requirements specified in military and industrial standards is cobalt bromide, which probably has a similar hazard profile to cobalt dichloride."</p> <p>Conclusion as ECHA(official organisation) recognize that alternatives to cobalt chloride must be not "considered to be technically suitable" Cobalt Dichloride as humidity indicator is not in the scope of REACH and must be not in the list of product submitted to European authorization.</p> <p>I must add that produce, as Phenolphthalein, advice by French administration to replace cobalt chloride as humidity indicator are forbidden of the European market since 1975 by a European directive; so this kind of advice, from a competent authority, is very questionable.</p> <p>Other alternatives proposed by French administration, if you take time to read MSDS, represent more health risks than Cobalt Chloride.</p> <p>In addition, I advice you to read the position of your Canadian colleagues (at <a href="http://www.ec.gc.ca/ese-ees/default.asp?lang=En&amp;n=8E18277B-1">http://www.ec.gc.ca/ese-ees/default.asp?lang=En&amp;n=8E18277B-1</a>, after a complete and serious study, confirmed that: "There are limited health effects data on the chronic effects of oral exposure to cobalt; however, there is no evidence in the available short-term and subchronic studies that would indicate cancer as a potential endpoint following oral exposure.</p> <p>and concluded that "On the basis of the adequacy of the margins between upper-bounding estimates of exposure and critical effect levels in humans, it is concluded that elemental cobalt,</p>
-----	--	----------------------	--

			<p>cobalt chloride, and cobalt sulfate are not entering the environment in a quantity or concentration or under conditions that constitute or may constitute a danger in Canada to human life or health.” Question: is there, for ECHA and European competent authorities, a difference between Canadian and European human health and environment?</p>
--	--	--	---

**II - TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS. COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DATES:**

#	Date (Attachment provided)	Submitted by (name, Organisation/ MSCA)	Comment
1805	2011/09/14 20:48  File attached	ACEA - European Automobile Manufacturers Association   Industry or trade association Belgium	See attachment.
1719	2011/09/14 18:04	The Cobalt Development Institute   Industry or trade association United Kingdom	Please refer to the following document for technical details: 1) final Joint Response Comments (JRC) on the five cobalt salts that were submitted into the present ECHA stakeholder consultation on Tuesday 30 August 2011 2) Technical Annex to the Cobalt Reach Consortium's (CoRC) Joint Response to ECHA's Consultation on the Proposed Inclusion of cobalt diacetate in Annex XIV of REACH (submitted September 2011)

1855	2011/09/14 18:04  File attached	The Cobalt Development Institute   Industry or trade association United Kingdom	Please refer to the following document for technical details: 1) final Joint Response Comments (JRC) on the five cobalt salts that were submitted into the present ECHA stakeholder consultation on Tuesday 30 August 2011 2) Technical Annex to the Cobalt Reach Consortium's (CoRC) Joint Response to ECHA's Consultation on the Proposed Inclusion of cobalt diacetate in Annex XIV of REACH (submitted September 2011)
1519	2011/09/14 12:52  File attached	Enthone GmbH   Company United Kingdom	See attached
1226	2011/09/14 00:57  File attached	CETS aisbl   Industry or trade association Germany	Should cobalt(II)-sulphate, cobalt(II)-nitrate, cobalt(II)-chloride, cobalt(II)-acetate and cobalt(II)-carbonate be prioritised for Annex XIV inclusion, it is imperative that the application and sunset dates be extended. As a non-threshold carcinogen, an application for authorization for the Cobalt salts will need to include a socio-economic analysis. Given the complexity of the supply chains of articles subject to surface treatment, additional time is needed. In that respect, the following dates should apply: application date (date for submitting applications for authorisation): July 2015 ; and sunset date: January 2017. A failure to grant additional time would have the practical effect of transforming the Annex XIV listing into an outright ban.

1114	2011/09/13 18:06	Atotech Deutschland GmbH  Company Germany	<p>If the cobalt salts are included in Annex XIV in the near future the proposed timeframe is too short for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article 55 says that it is the aim to “ensure the good functioning of the internal market” by progressively replacing SVHC by “suitable alternative substances or technologies where these are economically and technically viable”.</li> </ul> <p>The regulation specifically uses the word “progressively” implying that the users must be granted an appropriate timeframe for the transition from one technology/substance to another, where possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authorization process is new and has never been used before. This implies that the applicants as well as all associated supporting entities need time to adapt to this new requirement in order to be able to provide information and documentation in accordance with regulation’s requirements. 18 months are not an appropriate timeframe considering that             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o small and medium users need external support for this process,</li> <li>o users may wish to organize in groups for cost sharing,</li> <li>o users have to select appropriate supporters,</li> <li>o documents need to be finalized including reviews etc.,</li> <li>o the capacity of supporting entities is limited.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Five cobalt salts are present in ECHA’s draft recommendation for inclusion on Annex XIV. As these salts and chromium trioxide are used for surface treatment, this sector of industry does not have the capacity of handling two authorization processes at a time. Surface treatment shops usually are small to medium size companies that do not have the capacity to handle regulatory requirements of this extent as dedicated personnel is required.</li> <li>• Transitions to new technologies or new requirements involve a considerable complex process, investments and time. A complex process involving the whole supply-chain is triggered. Solely qualification processes for example for electronics applications take several years from the developed technology until application at the final product. Clearly these processes are very complex as the final product’s properties may be safety-relevant.</li> </ul>
------	---------------------	--	--

1003	2011/09/13 15:37	Vale Europe Limited  Company United Kingdom	Based on information obtained by CoRC all of the uses of cobalt carbonate are not in the scope of authorisation and therefore transitional arrangements and timescales are not applicable. However, if the substance were to be placed in Annex XIV then the 24 month period to submit an application would be acceptable. In contrast the 18 month sunset date seems very short considering the time it would take to implement a change in process or substitution of reagent on an industrial scale. A minimum period of 36 months would be more reasonable.
972	2011/09/13 14:37	Sweden  MemberState Sweden	We agree with the proposed dates.
929	2011/09/13 13:13	Dr. Kubitz GmbH  Company Germany	Too early
784	2011/09/12 15:32	Company United Kingdom	Taking into account the time needed for eventual changes in industrial process or substitution at industrial scale, we think it is reasonable to propose a sunset date 36 months after the application date for the eventual (if any) uses under the scope of Authorisation.

719	2011/09/10 17:47	Company Finland	<p>Comments on the proposed dates: 24 months to submit an application would seem reasonable. The sunset date of 18 months seems very short considering the time it would take to implement a change in process at an industrial scale. A minimum period of 36 months would be more reasonable.</p> <p>The company consider that all uses of cobalt carbonate are exempt from Authorisation, and therefore that these time scales would not apply.</p>
564	2011/08/30 21:18  File attached	Cobalt REACH Consortium Ltd (CoRC)  Industry or trade association United Kingdom	<p>24 months to submit an application would seem reasonable and longer than some of the other substances listed. However the sunset date of 18 months seems extremely short considering the time it would take to implement a change in process or substitution at an industrial scale for the uses in scope of Authorisation. A minimum period of 36 months would be more reasonable.</p> <p>However, based on data received to date we consider that all uses of cobalt carbonate are exempt from Authorisation, and therefore that these time scales would not apply.</p>
547	2011/08/24 13:58	WWF European Policy Office  International NGO Belgium	<p>The timelines foreseen for transitional arrangements are too long. They should be shortened to an application date of 12 months (sun set date 30 months) after the date of inclusion in Annex XIV.</p>

**III - COMMENTS ON USES THAT SHOULD BE EXEMPTED FROM AUTHORISATION, INCLUDING REASONS FOR THAT:**

#	Date (Attachment provided)	Submitted by (name, Organisation/ MSCA)	Comment
1805	2011/09/14 20:48  File attached	ACEA - European Automobile Manufacturers Association   Industry or trade association Belgium	See attachment.
1786	2011/09/14 19:51  File attached Confidential	Company Germany	Die mbw-Gruppe kann auf Grund der oben angeführten Argumente die Aufnahme der Kobalt-Salze in den Anhang XIV der REACH-Verordnung nicht unterstützen. Im Falle einer Aufnahme der Stoffe Kobalt(II)-dinitrat, Kobalt-dichlorid, Kobalt(II)-sulfat, Kobalt(II)-diacetat, Kobalt(II)-carbonat in den Anhang XIV der REACH-Verordnung fordert die mbw-Gruppe eine Ausnahmeregelung für die Verwendung von Kobaltsalzen in Lösungen zur Erzeugung von Konversionsschichten auf Zink- und Zinklegierungsschichten bei galvanischen Korrosionsschutzsystemen.

1719	2011/09/14 18:04	The Cobalt Development Institute  Industry or trade association United Kingdom	Please refer to the following document for technical details: 1) final Joint Response Comments (JRC) on the five cobalt salts that were submitted into the present ECHA stakeholder consultation on Tuesday 30 August 2011 2) Technical Annex to the Cobalt Reach Consortium's (CoRC) Joint Response to ECHA's Consultation on the Proposed Inclusion of cobalt diacetate in Annex XIV of REACH (submitted September 2011)
1855	2011/09/14 18:04  File attached	The Cobalt Development Institute  Industry or trade association United Kingdom	Please refer to the following document for technical details: 1) final Joint Response Comments (JRC) on the five cobalt salts that were submitted into the present ECHA stakeholder consultation on Tuesday 30 August 2011 2) Technical Annex to the Cobalt Reach Consortium's (CoRC) Joint Response to ECHA's Consultation on the Proposed Inclusion of cobalt diacetate in Annex XIV of REACH (submitted September 2011)
1663	2011/09/14 16:39  File attached	FEFANA asbl and TREAC EEIG  Industry or trade association Belgium	please see attached pdf

1519	2011/09/14 12:52  File attached	Enthone GmbH  Company United Kingdom	See attached
1226	2011/09/14 00:57  File attached	CETS aisbl  Industry or trade association Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Cobalt(II) carbonate for plating</li> </ul> <p>National and European law already require aspects of regulatory monitoring and control as well as to the increasing internationalization of requirements. Any additional configurable prioritization and approval of changes will only reproduce the current national requirements. Taking these experiences into account an inclusion of cobalt(II)-sulphate, cobalt(II)-nitrate, cobalt(II)-chloride, cobalt(II)-acetate and cobalt(II)-carbonate for plating in Annex XIV of the REACH regulation is not necessary.</p> <p>Relating to Article 58(2) of the REACH regulation it is hereby proposed to exempt the use of cobalt(II)-sulphate, cobalt(II)-nitrate, cobalt(II)-chloride, cobalt(II)-acetate and cobalt(II)-carbonate from the authorisation requirements.</p> <p>In accordance with the provisions of REACH the risk of the application is properly controlled by European and national laws.</p> <p>In the EU, the human health and environmental aspects for safe handling of Cobalt(II) salts are regulated the following laws and regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EG 1907/2006 (REACH-regulation)</li> <li>• EG/1272/2008 (GHS-regulation)</li> <li>• 2002/95/EG (ROHS)</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2002/96/EG (WEEE)</li> <li>• 196/82/EG (Seveso-II-RL)</li> <li>• 2010/75/EU (IVU)</li> <li>• 2000/60/EG (WRR)</li> <li>• 98/249/EG</li> </ul>
1199	2011/09/13 20:22  File attached	European Biogas Association   International NGO Czech Republic	<p>Biogas production and utilization is an integral part of many environmental technologies like sewage sludge treatment, bio-waste treatment and also an important part of agricultural manure treatment in sustainable agriculture.</p> <p>Cobalt(II) carbonate is an indispensable element of methanogenic bacteria metabolism, as it is the source of the trace element Cobalt. Cobalt is needed as a catalytic element for chemical reactions catalyzed by various Cobalt-based enzymes.</p>

1181	2011/09/13 19:40  File attached <b>Confidential</b>	Verband der Automobilindus- trie VDA    Industry or trade association Germany	Relating to Article 58(2) of the REACH regulation it is hereby proposed to exempt the use of Chromium trioxide (-solutions) from the authorisation requirements. In accordance with the provisions of REACH the risk of the application is properly controlled by the German laws.
1125	2011/09/13 18:12  File attached	Central Association of Surface Treatment Professionals Germany (ZVO)    Industry or trade association Germany	In the event that these substances are included in Appendix XIV of the REACH regulations we demand that there has to be an exception to the rules to allow the use of Cobalt(II)-Salts for the purpose of anti-corrosion, decorative and bright Cobalt-Alloy-Plating. Attachment (additional non-confidential information) ZVO Kommentierung: Application of divalent cobalt salts in Cobalt and Cobalt-Alloy-Layers in the European electroplating Industry

1114	2011/09/13 18:06	Atotech Deutschland GmbH  Company Germany	<p>Uses where cobalt salts can not be replaced</p> <p>Corrosion Protection Conversion Layers</p> <p>Despite extensive research and development activities there is currently no alternative to cobalt salts in corrosion protection conversion layers if very high corrosion protection is required. Particularly the following industries depend on these coating systems and would be heavily affected if the high level of corrosion protection would be jeopardized by inclusion of cobalt salts in Annex XIV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Automotive industry</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Aerospace industry</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Defense</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other parts of industry where corrosion protection is vital for safety</li> </ul> <p>Hard Gold Coating</p> <p>Gold-cobalt layers are used in manufacturing of electronic equipment (contactors) and jewellery. The addition of cobalt is essential for the required characteristics of the layer: hardness, abrasion resistance and microstructure.</p> <p>Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Gold-nickel: significantly different characteristics of the surface. Particularly reduced hardness, solderability and long-term stability limit applicability in electronics.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Gold-iron: No industrial application and very limited experiences about long-term stability</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Cyanide-Gold: Partially applicable for decorative applications (jewellery). Advantage from the health, safety and environmental point of view is doubtful.</li> </ul> <p>Tin-Cobalt Coating</p> <p>Tin-cobalt layers are used for decorative plating (substitute for decorative chrome plating). For barrel plating (screws and other small parts) chrome plating is not applicable and no alternative for tin-cobalt plating is available.</p> <p>Safe use</p> <p>The background documents for cobalt sulphate and cobalt dichloride state that "Releases at workplaces in industrial settings seem to be controlled in most cases but some processes, involving handling of powder forms of the substance have a potentially significant exposure potential for industrial workers." No handling of powder form of cobalt salts take place in industrial surface treatment. No other indications of significant exposure of workers or emissions to the environment are provided in the background documents or in the Annex XV reports. Existing specific Community regulations and national exposure limit ensure that risks are properly controlled.</p>
------	---------------------	--	--

			<p>PPORD</p> <p>The product and process oriented research and development (PPORD) should be clearly exempted from the authorization process. Please note the following reasons:</p> <p>a. Alternative technology development has to use cobalt salts in order to develop further. Restrictions would hinder PPORD from fulfilling his role in the REACH framework.</p> <p>b. Following Article 55, the aim of the authorization is to control the risks from SVHC. In order reduce the risks from SVHC the need for PPORD is evident, which may result in optimized processes reducing the risks for human health and the environment.</p> <p>c. Personnel's exposure in PPORD is significantly reduced against production processes as the time of exposure is reduced, the throughput is lower by decimal powers and usually equipment with latest safety measures is used.</p>
1047	2011/09/13 16:46	<p>Agoria</p> <p>Industry or trade association Belgium</p>	<p>Agoria propose to integrate clearly the fact that most of the uses of the different cobalt salts are used as intermediate and thus exempted from the authorization procedure.</p>
1003	2011/09/13 15:37	<p>Vale Europe Limited</p> <p>Company United Kingdom</p>	<p>All intermediate uses of cobalt carbonate are exempt from authorisation. This includes the manufacture of cobalt containing catalysts and the manufacture of all other chemicals. The use of the substance as an animal feed supplement is exempt from authorisation in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 178/2002. The use of cobalt carbonate in surface treatment processes and in the manufacture of pigments, frits, glass and ceramic ware would account for less than 1% of consumption and according to the wording of the REACH Regulation would also be exempt.</p>

929	2011/09/13 13:13	Dr. Kubitz GmbH  Company Germany	It is not possible to find or develop suitable substitutes in the available time.
848	2011/09/12 19:20  File attached	LKS Kronenberger GmbH Metallverdlungs werk  Company Germany	Because of a safety application, properly controlled risks by German laws regulations and according to article 58 (2) we file/demand an exemption of the application of Cobalt(II)-Dicarbonate in surface treatment processes/galvanic surface treatment technologies. Sorry, first input for Co(II)-carbonate was wrong in one point !!
839	2011/09/12 18:55  File attached	LKS Kronenberger GmbH Metallveredlun gswerk  Company Germany	Because of a safety application, properly controlled risks by German laws regulations and according to article 58 (2) we file/demand an exemption of the application of Cobalt(II)-Chlorid in surface treatment processes/galvanic surface treatment technologies.

784	2011/09/12 15:32	Company United Kingdom	<p>The use of Cobalt carbonate in animal feed falls under the scope of food safety regulation (EC 178/2002) and, as such, is exempted from Authorisation.</p> <p>As per REACH legislation (Title 1 – Article 2 – 8b), intermediate uses are exempted from Authorisation. Cobalt carbonate is used as intermediate to produce catalysts. Ceramic applications are also recognized as intermediate uses.</p> <p>On top of that, CMR compounds are already covered by other legislations including: the Carcinogens Directive 90/394/EEC, Directive 98/24/CE, Directive 2004/37/EC and IPPC directive (Dir. 2008/1/EC) cover already risk management of carcinogens at work.</p>
719	2011/09/10 17:47	Company Finland	<p>Comments on uses that should be exempted, including reasons for that: We consider the following uses as intermediates and should therefore be exempt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manufacture of cobalt carbonate</li> <li>• Manufacturing of other cobalt chemicals</li> <li>• Industrial use of cobalt carbonate in the manufacture of other cobalt compounds during catalyst production.</li> <li>• Industrial use of cobalt carbonate in surface treatment processes</li> <li>• Industrial use of cobalt carbonate in the manufacture of inorganic pigments &amp; frits, glass and ceramic ware</li> <li>• industrial use of cobalt carbonate in the manufacture of chemicals and in other wet chemical processes.</li> </ul> <p>Authorisation under REACH is not required when a substance is used in food or feeding stuffs in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 178/2002. Use as animal feed additive is also exempt from authorisation (EU 1831/2003).</p>
573	2011/09/01 13:30	Umicore NV/SA  Company Belgium	<p>According to REACH Title 1, Chapter 1, Article 2, 8b all intermediate uses are exempted from Authorisation. We are therefore of the opinion that all supported uses to which PC19 is assigned (cfr. registration dossier) should be specifically listed as being exempted in the recommendation for prioritisation of ECHA.</p>

564	2011/08/30 21:18  File attached	Cobalt REACH Consortium Ltd (CoRC)   Industry or trade association United Kingdom	Use of cobalt carbonate as an intermediate to manufacture other chemicals is exempt (REACH Title 1, Chapter 1, Article 2, 8b). Specific uses considered as intermediates are listed below: -Manufacture of cobalt carbonate. -Manufacture of cobalt carbonate as an intermediate during catalyst production. -Industrial use of cobalt carbonate as intermediate in the manufacture of other cobalt compounds during catalyst production. -Industrial use of cobalt carbonate in surface treatment processes (intermediate use). -Industrial use of cobalt carbonate in the manufacture of inorganic pigments & frits, glass and ceramic ware (intermediate use). -industrial use of cobalt carbonate in the manufacture of chemicals and in other wet-chemical processes as intermediate. Authorisation under REACH is not required when a substance is used in food or feeding stuffs in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 178/2002.
538	2011/08/19 16:13  File attached Confidential	European Catalyst Manufacturer's Association (ECMA)   Industry or trade association Belgium	The use of Cobalt carbonate as intermediate for the manufacture of other cobalt compounds in the catalyst industry is exempted from authorisation according to Article 2.8. (b) of Regulation (EC 1907/2006).

536	2011/08/19 13:31  File attached <b>Confidential</b>	Albemarle Catalysts Company B.V.   Company Belgium	The use of Cobalt carbonate as intermediate for the manufacture of other cobalt compounds in the catalyst industry is exempted from authorisation according to Article 2.8. (b) of Regulation (EC 1907/2006).
474	2011/07/06 12:47  File attached	Individual France	Humidity indicator and desiccant where the desiccant is not designed to be regenerated and manipulated by human and no exposure for environment during use of the life of article that contains desiccant.

**IV - COMMENTS ON USES FOR WHICH REVIEW PERIODS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN ANNEX XIV, INCLUDING REASONS FOR THAT:**

#	Date (Attachment provided)	Submitted by (name, Organisation/ MSCA)	Comment
1805	2011/09/14 20:48  File attached	ACEA - European Automobile Manufacturers Association   Industry or trade association Belgium	See attachment.
1719	2011/09/14 18:04	The Cobalt Development Institute   Industry or trade association United Kingdom	Please refer to the following document for technical details: 1) final Joint Response Comments (JRC) on the five cobalt salts that were submitted into the present ECHA stakeholder consultation on Tuesday 30 August 2011 2) Technical Annex to the Cobalt Reach Consortium's (CoRC) Joint Response to ECHA's Consultation on the Proposed Inclusion of cobalt diacetate in Annex XIV of REACH (submitted September 2011)

1855	2011/09/14 18:04  File attached	The Cobalt Development Institute   Industry or trade association United Kingdom	Please refer to the following document for technical details: 1) final Joint Response Comments (JRC) on the five cobalt salts that were submitted into the present ECHA stakeholder consultation on Tuesday 30 August 2011 2) Technical Annex to the Cobalt Reach Consortium's (CoRC) Joint Response to ECHA's Consultation on the Proposed Inclusion of cobalt diacetate in Annex XIV of REACH (submitted September 2011)
1519	2011/09/14 12:52  File attached	Enthone GmbH   Company United Kingdom	See attached
1003	2011/09/13 15:37	Vale Europe Limited   Company United Kingdom	Based on information obtained by CoRC all of the uses of cobalt carbonate are not in the scope of authorisation and therefore setting of review periods is not applicable. However, any review period would need to be developed based on a full understanding of the supply/value chain for cobalt carbonate. This is being developed, but it is requested that ECHA do not set any review periods until suitable data exists.

929	2011/09/13 13:13	Dr. Kubitz GmbH  Company Germany	Use in electrolytes for the deposition of cobalt layers intended as scale for magnetic measurements of distances and angles.
719	2011/09/10 17:47	Company Finland	Comments on uses for which review periods should be included in Annex XIV, including reasons for that: The company consider that all uses of cobalt carbonate are exempt from Authorisation, and therefore that these review periods would not apply.
564	2011/08/30 21:18  File attached	Cobalt REACH Consortium Ltd (CoRC)  Industry or trade association United Kingdom	We acknowledge that ECHA have not proposed review periods for any uses during this prioritisation. Any review period would need to be developed based on a full understanding on the supply/value chain for cobalt carbonate. Such an understanding is not available at present and would only be possible given sufficient time to investigate the supply/value chain further. We would urge ECHA not to set review periods until suitable robust data are available. However, based on data received to date we consider that all uses of cobalt carbonate are exempt from Authorisation, and therefore that these review periods would not apply.