The "streamlining" of authorisation: efficiency versus leniency

Alice Bernard Lawyer (*Juriste*)

18 March 2019





• REACH review conclusions v. ClientEarth's conclusions

• Lessons learned from the General Court

ClientEarth's Recommendations for "streamlining"



REACH review conclusions

• Authorisation = "An effective driver for substituting SVHCs"

• Simplification "for the applicants"

• "Good quality applications": key for more efficiency



ClientEarth's conclusions

• Authorisation = "An effective driver for substituting SVHCs"

Simplification "for the applicants public authorities"

• "good quality conform applications": key for more efficiency



Key issue: leniency towards applicants

Flawed applications:

□ Inadequate description of exposure scenarios

- No proof that suitable alternatives available for ALL uses applied for
- . . .
- Evidence in public consultation contradicting analysis of alternative

Authorisation granted anyway





No worries! Permit awarded <u>as</u> <u>long as</u> you come back in 4 years to show me again (?) that you know how to drive

That's a fail, huh?

Lessons learned from the General Court:

• Burden of proof is on the applicant

- Cannot legally remedy the failures of the application with:
 - "Short" review periods
 Requiring the missing info later on
 Leaving the question of alternatives open





That's a fail, huh?

Lessons learned from the General Court:

RAC/SEAC opinions do not bind the Commission

• Commission **must**:

Check coherence, relevance and accuracy of the reasoning of RAC & SEAC

- □ Inquire
- □ State reasons



Recommendations for "streamlining"

• Send clear messages: no data > no authorisation

• Work on RAC & SEAC opinions: □ Clarity on the reasoning □ Clarity on how third party comments are responded to Coherence between reasoning and conclusion Clarity on the remaining unknowns and **why** they remain



abernard@clientearth.org

www.clientearth.org@ClientEarth@ChemicalsCE

