



## **Are Governments Prepared to Keep Our Seas Clean ?**

*Measuring progress with regard to hazardous  
substances from Sintra 1998 to Bremen 2003*



**Published by:** WWF Germany, Frankfurt am Main, May 2003  
**Authors:** Andreas Ahrens & Kerstin Heitmann, Institute for Environmental Strategies (Ökopol), Hamburg  
**Contact:** Stephan Lutter, WWF Germany, Marine & Coastal Division, Phone: +49 421 65846-22, Fax: +49 421 65846-12, E-mail: lutter@wwf.de  
**Editor:** Astrid Ernst  
**Printed by:** Meiners Druck, OHG, Bremen

Printed on recycled paper

© 2003 WWF Germany, Frankfurt am Main

Any reproduction in full or in part of this publication must mention the title and credit the abovementioned publisher as the copyright owner.

**Funded by:**  
**Ministry of Environment,**  
**Bremen**

# Inhalt

Preface .....	4
1. Background of the study.....	5
2. Methodology.....	5
3. Results .....	7
3.1 National contribution to production and use of chemicals (indicator 1-2).....	8
3.2 Contribution to OSPAR´s work (indicator 3).....	9
3.3 Integration into national policies (indicator 5-7).....	10
3.4 Data availability with regard to hazardous substances (indicator 8 and 9) .....	11
3.5 Support to industry and sector initiatives (indicator 10 and 11).....	12
3.6 PBT screening in waste water permit systems (indicator 12-13) .....	13
3.7 National activity on short chained chlorinated paraffins (indicator 14).....	13
3.8 State of internet presentation (indicator 15-16).....	14
4. Summary and conclusions .....	15
Annex 1 - The questionnaire and list of persons contacted .....	17
Questionnaire .....	17
OSPAR Contracting Parties .....	18
HELCOM Contracting Parties .....	21
Annex 2 – Country-specific evaluation .....	22
Evaluation Belgium.....	22
Evaluation Denmark.....	23
Evaluation Finland .....	24
Evaluation France.....	25
Evaluation Germany.....	26
Evaluation The Netherlands .....	27
Evaluation Norway.....	28
Evaluation Sweden.....	29
Evaluation Switzerland .....	30
Evaluation United Kingdom.....	31
Annex 3 - List of websites evaluated.....	32
Annex 4 - List of current OSPAR Priority Substances, 5NSC-List and EPER-List .....	34

## Preface

This study presents an **indicator based evaluation of progress in capacity building to meet OSPAR's objective with regard to hazardous substances.**

We developed a set of indicators reflecting some core elements of the implementation process and the administrative capacities needed. We evaluated Contracting Parties' response to our questions but we did not try to identify "the truth". We took the information as presented.

We would like to thank the OSPAR colleagues who made quite some efforts to answer our questionnaire and hope that the one or the other critical remark from our side may be an incentive to get the national implementation strategies somewhat clearer than they are today.

## 1. Background of the study

In 1998, the Ministers of Environment of the OSPAR Contracting Parties adopted a new strategy with regard to hazardous substances. The ultimate objective is that hazardous substances should not occur in the marine environment at concentrations exceeding the natural background level. For man-made, synthetic substances this is a level close to zero.

At the same time, the Ministers committed to make every endeavour to achieve a cessation of emissions, losses and discharges of hazardous substances by 2020 at the latest.

The current study has been carried out in order to evaluate to which extent OSPAR Contracting Parties have taken steps towards the implementation of the strategy. The Contracting Parties have various possibilities. However, in the light of the strategy the following selection of activities may represent the minimum set of core measures every Contracting Party is expected to take:

- Contribution to the OSPAR work with regard to
  - the development of tools for the identification and prioritisation of hazardous substances;
  - the identification of sources of hazardous substances and the appropriate measures to cease the emissions from these sources.
- Communicating OSPAR's objective to trade and industry; raising awareness and understanding of what it means in practise; giving guidance to manufacturing industry on how to identify products and processes where risk reduction is needed with regard to hazardous substances;
- Introducing OSPAR's objective into other sectors, e.g. chemicals policy, agricultural policy, fisheries policy and water policy; and

- Introducing screening mechanisms related to hazardous substances into waste water discharge permitting systems.

The underlying study concept is based on a set of a few indicators and on a questionnaire that was sent to the OSPAR Heads of Delegation (HOD) and the delegates in the Working Group on Priority Substances (SPS) or the Hazardous Substances Committee (HSC). Parallel to this, the questionnaire was also sent to HELCOM Contracting Parties in order to investigate the state of implementation of HELCOM Recommendation 19/5 (see list of contacted persons in Annex 1).

## 2. Methodology

The OSPAR Strategy with regard to Hazardous Substance targets land based sources and in particular emissions, losses and discharges from the wide disperse use of hazardous substances in products and processes. Consequently, measures need to be taken under various regulatory frameworks and in various sectors of trade and industry. Hence, there may be a huge diversity of activities directly or indirectly contributing to a process towards the cessation target. In order to compile a set of comparable, easily accessible and understandable information on the state of implementation (with the limited resources given), a few indicators were defined, each reflecting topics of strategic relevance. The indicators and the rationale for their selection are listed in Table 1:

**Table 1: Indicators for the evaluation of Contracting Parties' activities**

	Indicator	Reason for selecting the indicator
1	Contribution to the production value of the European Chemical Industry (%) Contribution to the consumption and use of pesticides in Europe (% and number of registered substances) Contribution to EU Population (%)	Reflects the contribution of the countries' economy to the production and use of chemicals.
2	Number of background documents submitted since 1998 <sup>1</sup>	Reflects the contribution of Contracting Parties to the identification of sources of hazardous substances and appropriate measures.
3	Number of documents submitted reflecting a contribution to the development of methodologies	Reflects the contribution of Contracting Parties to the identification of potentially hazardous substances, to priority setting and to other elements in OSPAR's toolbox.
4	Extent of response to the questionnaire	Reflects the organisational capacity and/or willingness to document and present the national implementation work
5	OSPAR's objective and strategy has been transposed into national policy documents.	Reflects to which extent OSPAR's objective has become policy relevant at national level.
6	A national policy plan and a corresponding working process for the implementation exists.	Reflects to which extent OSPAR's objective has been translated into practical measures at national level.
7	Integration into other policies has taken place.	Reflects to which extent OSPAR's objective has been integrated into other policies, e.g. agricultural policy (dangerous pesticides), chemicals policy (dangerous industrial chemicals).
8	A national inventory of sources of hazardous substances exists.	Reflects to which extent national authorities were successful in the identification of major sources.
9	Quantitative data on emissions and losses are available at national level for a) Traditionally measured substances (DDT, PCB, heavy metals), b) OSPAR substances listed before 1998 (musks, flame-retardants, ...); and c) Substances prioritised since 1998.	Reflects to which extent national authorities were successful in obtaining quantitative information on emissions of hazardous substances.
10	Sector specific activities towards implementation.	Reflects the efforts of Contracting Parties to support industry in taking initiative towards the cessation of emissions losses and discharges
11	Specific guidance to industry exists.	
12	Hazardous substances (PBT or equal concern) screening is obligatory in national waste water permit systems.	Reflects whether national authorities found a systematic way to make industry screen the chemicals they use, in order to identify potentially hazardous substances.
13	National action on short chained chlorinated paraffins before 2002	Reflects the political willingness to implement the decision taken by OSPAR at national level.
14	Specific internet site on hazardous substances (PBT and equal level of concern) and marine environment explains the issue in an understandable and up-to-date way.	Reflects to which extent Contracting Parties publicly communicate the issue of "hazardous substances in the marine environment".
15	The criteria for hazardous substances or PBT are given, or a link to the corresponding source at the OSPAR homepage exist	Reflects the efforts of Contracting Parties to explain the hazardous substances issue and actively disseminate information on substances of potential concern.

<sup>1</sup> The number of country contributions is higher than the actual number of background documents due to co-operation between Contracting Parties on certain substances (e.g. Denmark and France on phthalates).

The questionnaire was sent out in the beginning of February 2003, the last answers arrived in mid April 2003. It was made sure by phone calls that the document had reached every Contracting Party.

The response to the questionnaire can be looked up in Table 2:

**Table 2: Overall responses**

	Sent Out	Response	No Response	Reason
OSPAR	14	10	4	- Spain, Iceland, Ireland and Portugal announced to respond, however, no response was received
HELCOM	4	1	3	- Latvia and Poland made reference to the report of the HELCOM Project Group - In Lithuania no responsible person identifiable.

The questionnaire was evaluated according to the system documented in Annex 2. In parallel, the respective internet site of the relevant ministries or agencies was evaluated with regard to the following questions:

- Is the issue of hazardous substances in the marine environment addressed?
- Do the substances mentioned go beyond traditional compounds like DDT, PCBs, metals, TBT and PAHs?
- Is a consistent explanation given what hazardous substances are? If not, is there a link to the explanation on the OSPAR homepage or to the homepage of the European Chemicals Secretariat?
- How easily can the respective site be found?

During evaluation a few instruments could be identified which are obviously used quite successfully in the national frameworks. These instruments are briefly mentioned under indicator 10-12.

### 3. Results

The results are systematically documented with regard to OSPAR Contracting Parties. Except for indicator 1-4 and 15/16, those OSPAR countries which did not manage to respond in the framework of this study (Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Iceland) are not further mentioned in the evaluation part.

Complete answers to all questions were only received from: Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom. The administrative structure and

capacity of these countries obviously allows for the identification of relevant information in a relatively effective way. The answers received from Estonia, however, show, that motivated staff in comparably small administrations with no traditions in dealing with chemicals issues is able to identify relevant information and provide illustrative answers.

Relevant information related to the HELCOM area is added where appropriate. This information is mostly taken from the HELCOM reports “Implementation of the HELCOM Objective with Regard to Hazardous Substances“ and “The Implementation of the 1988 Ministerial Declaration on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area with regard to Hazardous Substances“<sup>2</sup>. Herein, the activities of Contracting Parties are only partly described in a sufficiently detailed way to serve the information needs of the current study. All four EU accession countries in the HELCOM group responded to the questionnaire by making a reference to this report. Only Estonia provided useful information clearly going beyond. In addition, a report on hazardous substances produced by the three Baltic States in the framework of the Baltic Environmental Forum was used to identify ongoing activity in these countries<sup>3</sup>. However, this report shows

<sup>2</sup> The number of country contributions is higher than the actual number of background documents due to co-operation between Contracting Parties on certain substances (e.g. Denmark and France on phthalates).

<sup>3</sup> Baltic Hazardous Substances Report, Baltic Environmental Forum, January 2003, [www.bef.lv](http://www.bef.lv)

as well that implementation work is lagging behind the commitments given in the framework of HELCOM Recommendation 19/5: the exchange of information on hazardous substances traded and used in the supply chains does not work sufficiently yet. State authorities do hardly have any information in which products and processes environmentally hazardous substances are used.

### 3.1 National contribution to production and use of chemicals (indicator 1-2)

The national break down of production and use of chemicals in Europe can be roughly estimated based on the data presented in Table 3. These numbers may be useful in evaluating the contribution of Contracting Parties to the implementation of OSPAR's objective with regard to hazardous substances. Based on the figures in Table 3, three conclusions can be drawn:

- Germany, France and the UK are most relevant for the production of chemicals in Europe (more than 50 %). In addition, France accounts for about 50 %

of pesticide use in the OSPAR area, followed by Spain with about 19 % and Germany with about 13 %.

- The Nordic countries' contribution to the production and use of chemicals in Europe is comparably low.
- Though not belonging to the top group of chemical producers, chemical companies in Spain and Ireland considerably contribute to the chemicals production in the EU.

Compared to the first conclusion, the contribution of France (and partly also Germany) to the implementation of OSPAR's objective appears to be relatively small (see chapter 3.2). On the other side, the contribution of the Nordic countries is much higher than to be expected when comparing to which extent their national economies contribute to the extent of the problem. The agricultural sector in Spain is the second biggest user of pesticides in Europe. Compared to their chemicals production, the contribution of Ireland and Spain to the hazardous substance work under OSPAR is somewhat disappointing.

**Table 3: Indicator for production and use of chemicals in Europe**

Country	Percent of population in the OSPAR area of about 314 Billion	Percent of turnover of EU chemicals production (about 520 Billion EUR in 2001) <sup>4</sup>	Percent of pesticide use in EU <sup>5</sup> of about 167.000 tonnes in 1999
Belgium	3,3	7	1,8
Denmark	1,7	1,4	1,2
Finland	1,7	1,2	0,4
<b>France</b>	<b>18,9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>49,7</b>
<b>Germany</b>	<b>26,2</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>13,2</b>
Iceland	0,1		
Ireland	1,2	6	0,3
The Netherlands	5,1	6	2,4
Norway	1,4		
Portugal	3,3	0,9	4,7
<b>Spain</b>	<b>12,9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>19,0</b>
Sweden	2,8	2,8	0,6
Switzerland	2,3	(10)	
<b>United Kingdom</b>	<b>19,1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6,8</b>

<sup>4</sup> Without Switzerland (56 billion EUR), Norway and Iceland

<sup>5</sup> Without Austria, Greece and Italy

### 3.2 Contribution to OSPAR's work (indicator 3)

About 27 (draft) background documents on single substances or groups of substances are currently in progress or already finished. As presented in Table 4, Germany in particular took responsibility for substances prioritised after 1998. Some countries contributed to the development of a selection and prioritisation mechanism for hazardous substances (Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Netherlands). In addition, Sweden invested quite some resources to get the OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern into a form and structure that could be published. The proposals to prioritise substances or (on industries proposals) to deselect substances from the list of possible concern are worked out by an Informal Group

of Experts (IGE) under the Working Group on Priority Substances (SPS). This substance assessment group which also works in close contact to the producers of substances was chaired by the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden, the UK contributed with expertise.

Apart from the selection and priority setting work, Sweden made proposals how to organise the work on hazardous substances ("sector by sector approach" instead of "substance by substance") in a more effective way.

Under the OSPAR working group on Point and Diffuse Sources (PDS), a tool to identify hazardous substances in wastewater was further developed (Whole Effluent Assessment, WEA), with major contribution from Sweden, Germany and the Netherlands.

**Table 4: Indicator for contribution to OSPAR work**

Country	Number of substance background reports	Major contribution to the assessment of substances in the IGE	Contribution to tool development in DYNAMEC and SPS related work	Website of responsible authority has a link to OSPAR's website
Belgium	3	No	0	Yes
Denmark	2	Till 2001	1 (DYNAMEC <sup>6</sup> )	Yes
Finland	3	No	1 (DYNAMEC <sup>6</sup> )	Yes
France	3	Yes	0	Yes
Germany	6	Since 2001	0	Yes
Iceland	0	No	0	Yes
Ireland	0	No	0	Yes
The Netherlands	2	Yes	2 (DYNAMEC <sup>6</sup> , WEA)	Yes
Norway	2	No	1 (DYNAMEC <sup>6</sup> )	Yes
Portugal	0	No	0	no
Spain	1	No	0	no
Sweden	3	Yes	5 (DYNAMEC <sup>6</sup> , Public List of Potential Concern, Sector by Sector, Substitution, WEA)	Yes
Switzerland	1	No	0	Yes
United Kingdom	4	Yes	0	Yes

<sup>6</sup> Dynamic Selection and Prioritisation Mechanism for Hazardous Substances

### 3.3 Integration into national policies (indicator 5-7)

Among those OSPAR countries who responded to the questionnaire, Sweden, the UK, Norway and the Netherlands started specific policy processes to implement OSPAR's objective and strategy (see Table 5). This is somewhat less clear in the case of Denmark and Finland. Germany, however, clearly stated that

implementation work follows the EU legislation and hence, no specific implementation work related to the OSPAR strategy is carried out. Two responses to the questionnaire were difficult to interpret as they did not address the process of transposing and implementing the international commitments at all.

**Table 5: Indicator for integration in national policies**

Country	OSPAR's objective transposed into national policy document	National programme for implementation exists	Integration into chemicals policy	Integration into agricultural	Integration into fishery policy
Belgium	response could not be interpreted by the authors				
Denmark	Yes	Yes	?	?	?
Finland	Yes	?	?	?	?
France	response could not be interpreted by the authors				
Germany	Yes	No	No	no	no
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	partly	partly
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	no
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	?	yes	?
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	yes

### 3.4 Data availability with regard to hazardous substances (indicator 8 and 9)

Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and Norway made reference to the data provided for the 5<sup>th</sup> North Sea Conference (NSC) Progress -Report 2002. However, only 11 substances out of the 27 priority substances or groups of substances under OSPAR<sup>7</sup> are addressed in this report (see Annex 4). Only Norway and The Netherlands provided data based on a source-oriented approach<sup>8</sup> for these substances. In particular, for some of the substances already prioritised before the DYNAMEC mechanism came into operation, there is an obvious lack of information on sources and emission quantities at national level (see Table 6 and Annex 2).

Only the Nordic countries and Switzerland have the tools to regularly monitor the sales of hazardous substances in non-pesticide products on their national markets. Hence, information by which losses to the environment can be predicted is readily available in these countries. Unfortunately this group of countries represents only less than 15 % of the chemicals market in the OSPAR area.

Based on the responses to the questionnaire it can be concluded that only Norway and Sweden (reporting system in the context of IPPC) so far have an overview at national level from which sources and in which quantities current OSPAR priority substances could enter the environment.

**Table 6: Indicator for available of data related to sources and emissions at national level**

Country	Quality of data provided for the 5NSC progress Report <sup>9</sup>	Information beyond NSC reporting available
Belgium	Fair	No
Denmark	Fair	No
Finland	-	Yes
France	Fair	Yes
Germany	Fair	No
The Netherlands	Good	Yes
Norway	Good	Yes
Sweden	Fair	Yes
Switzerland	Fair	Yes
United Kingdom	Fair	Yes

<sup>7</sup> chemicals for which background documents have been or are being prepared

<sup>8</sup> in compliance with HARP-HAZ prototype (reporting format for the 5<sup>th</sup> NSC)

<sup>9</sup> Fifth International Conference on the Protection of the North Sea (5NSC), 20.-21. March Bergen, Norway, Progress Report (ISBN – 82-457-0353-2), Table 5.3, Page 83. Assessment of quality of data (discharges/releases to water) based on the categorisation of the approach and level of detail contained in national reports: source oriented approach (SOA); load oriented approach (LOA); sales statistics (SS) for pesticides; no reporting (NR) or inconclusive data; [related to others than traditional substances of the DDT group].

### 3.5 Support to industry and sector initiatives (indicator 10 and 11)

Most of the OSPAR countries provide specific guidance to their national industries on how to identify "hazardous" substances used in processes or products (see Table 7). Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Norway use lists, worked out by the authorities based on transparent criteria, containing substances which need particular attention when used in industry. In addition, Finland and Germany offer specific substitution guides on the respective websites. The Netherlands and Denmark have worked out guidance for risk based screening (SOMS)<sup>10</sup>, general assessment methodology (GAM) and hazard classification (Advisory List for Self-Classification of Dangerous Substances). The Nordic Countries have developed the N-Class Database, containing data on the environmental

classification of about 7400 substances. Switzerland has focussed on an appropriate assessment methodology for integrated product policy (IPP). Germany and France believe that also the national environmental label gives important orientation to industry.

Sector initiatives and dialogues have a long tradition in Sweden and have been maintained since more than a decade. Currently, in particular the UK and the Netherlands have set up broad stakeholder processes to develop their national chemicals strategy providing guidance to industry on how to take responsibility towards identification and elimination of hazardous substances in a broad sense.

No specific information on such initiatives was provided by Germany and France.

**Table 7: Indicator for the support of industry and sector initiatives**

Country	Sector-specific activities	Guidance to industry
Belgium	?	?
Denmark	?	yes
Finland	Yes	yes
France	?	?
Germany	?	yes
The Netherlands	Yes	yes
Norway	Yes	yes
Sweden	Yes	yes
Switzerland	Yes	?
United Kingdom	Yes	yes

<sup>10</sup> SOMS: Strategy On Management of Substances

### 3.6 PBT screening in waste water permit systems (indicator 12-13)

No clear information was presented by Denmark, France and Germany (see Table 8) as to what extent hazardous substances and/or PBT screening has been made obligatory for granting waste water permits. In contrast, Belgium, Finland, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands and the UK obviously have introduced mechanisms in their permitting procedures, requiring the applicant to screen the chemicals applied in products and processes whether they contain specific

hazardous substances compiled in a corresponding official list (partly based on EC Directive 76/464).

Only Switzerland stated that no mechanisms specifically addressing the PBTs and/or OSPAR are in place yet. In addition, Norway and the Netherlands have implemented criteria-based screening mechanisms, and several countries are working on the Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA) Approach (specifically mentioned for the Netherlands and the UK).

**Table 8: Indicator for available of data related to sources and emissions at national level**

Country	Obligatory hazardous substance screening in waste water permit systems: a) whole effluent assessment, b) screening list for hazardous substance in purchased products, c) properties of purchased chemicals, d) others
Belgium	b)
Denmark	?
Finland	b)
France	?
Germany	?
The Netherlands	b) and c)
Norway	b) and c)
Sweden	b)
Switzerland	No
United Kingdom	b)

### 3.7 National activity on short chained chlorinated paraffins (indicator 14)

Apart from the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden no OSPAR country had fully implemented PARCOM Decision 95/1 prior to the decision taken at EU Level in 2002.

### 3.8 State of internet presentation (indicator 15-16)

The websites of the ministries and agencies responsible for the OSPAR hazardous substance work were visited and evaluated. Table 9 shows to which extent those sites are used to disseminate up-to-date information related to OSPAR's strategy. Due to technical problems, the websites in Spain and Portugal could not be evaluated. On all other sites, except for Portugal and Spain, that had technical problems, on all websites OSPAR is at least mentioned. Most of the countries, except for France and Ireland, also specifically address and explain the issue of hazardous substances in the

marine environment. However, easily accessible, understandable and well-linked websites only exist in Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Norway and the United Kingdom. A detailed explanation of the criteria and/or a link to specific lists of hazardous substances was identified on the respective websites of Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland. The German and the Dutch website were the most helpful ones explain to the issue of hazardous substances related to the marine environment. However, it was difficult to navigate on the latter one.

**Table 9: Indicator for distribution of information via the internet**

Country	An up-to-date <sup>11</sup> and understandable presentation of the hazardous substance issue related to the marine environment is accessible on the net	Criteria to identify hazardous substances are explained and a list of substances is contained or a link to OSPAR's list of possible concern is made.
Belgium	Good	Good
Denmark	Good	Good
Finland	Good	Good <sup>12</sup>
France	No	No
Germany	Good	Good
Iceland <sup>13</sup>	?	?
Ireland	No	No
The Netherlands	Good	Good
Norway	Good	Fair
Portugal <sup>14</sup>	?	?
Spain <sup>15</sup>	?	?
Sweden	Fair	Good
Switzerland	Fair	Good
United Kingdom	Good	Fair

<sup>11</sup> Up-to-date means: the issue is explained on the basis of OSPAR's "Hazardous Substance" definition, refers to diffuse sources and makes reference to more substances than just the traditional DDT, PCB, PAH and heavy metals.

<sup>12</sup> The website contains additional information in Finnish which is considered to sufficiently complement the English parts

<sup>13</sup> Information on OSPAR and hazardous substances are only available in Icelandic, assessment not possible

<sup>14</sup> Technical problems to access the website

<sup>15</sup> Technical problems to access the website

## 4. Summary and conclusions

Based on the information provided by the persons contacted (see Annex 1), the following conclusions can be drawn:

- There is a huge number of useful guidance and instruments available which enable trade and industry to identify and eliminate hazardous substances from products and processes. The full toolbox is available and more use of these instruments should be made.
- The implementation of the hazardous substance concept in national water legislation is one of the most important regulatory tools at national level. The establishment of national priority lists, identification of sources and pressures related to river basins and the introduction of a systematic screening in waste water permit processes seem to be very relevant tools to implement OSPAR's strategy with regard to hazardous substances. Finland and the Netherlands may be good examples for this strategy.
- In addition, within the Dutch SOMS process, a tool for a "Quick Scan" of the stock of chemicals currently applied in industry has been developed. A comparable process seems to be underway in the UK<sup>16</sup>. These developments may also be seen as a spin-off from the OSPAR process. The Nordic countries have recently published their SPIN Database<sup>17</sup> which can be used to identify hazardous substances in chemical products. It has the potential to contribute to the identification of needs to reformulate certain chemical products.
- In the Nordic Countries, the UK and the Netherlands stakeholder processes and national strategy development have been launched. However, there is an obvious lack of national strategy and stakeholder processes in France and

Germany. Given that available tools are only used in an effective way if public authorities, trade and industry and other stakeholders in the civil society co-operate in a common process, this structural lack of participation and strategy in France and Germany has dramatic consequences. In about 40 - 50 % of the OSPAR chemicals market there is no such intrinsic policy driver towards sustainable production and use of chemicals.

- With regard to the new European Chemicals Policy, the role of Germany and France in the European Council will be crucial. Apart from the water policy, the chemicals policy is the second arena where OSPAR's objective with regard to hazardous substances needs sufficient backing.
- Spain, Ireland, Portugal and partly also Belgium, France, Denmark and Germany obviously had insufficient resources to provide simple, transparent and detailed information regarding to the questionnaire. Whether this is due to the organisational setup in the involved national administrations, whether it already reflects a low policy profile on OSPAR or whether it was simply a result of time-constraints cannot be judged by the authors. However, it is obvious that, except for Denmark, this group of countries is identical with those where integration of national policies related to chemicals has not yet been sufficiently promoted. This leads to difficulties in reporting progress: information is not easily obtainable within the administration, responsibilities are distributed among various officials and the lack of national strategy makes it difficult to evaluate progress internally. Compared to that, in Denmark, once having been one of the driven of the OSPAR process, the decrease in performance under OSPAR is obviously politically intended by the new Government.

---

<sup>16</sup> See documents under the UK Chemicals Stakeholder Forum (CSF)

<sup>17</sup> Substances in Preparations in Nordic Countries, <http://www.spin2000.net/spin.html>

- The group of EU accession countries among HELCOM Contracting Parties (Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) was involved in the HELCOM Implementation Project (1999 – 2002). Accordingly, these countries made reference to the Project Report when responding to the questionnaire. However, not much information is contained in this report on practical implementation work at national level with regard to the issues raised in the questionnaire. Only Estonia provided extensive additional information from which it can

be concluded that national implementation makes progress. In the framework of the Baltic Environmental Forum, the three Baltic States have produced a common report reflecting the state of knowledge with regard to the occurrence of hazardous substances on the national markets and the strategies to increase the availability of information. This is considered a good starting point for effective implementation of HELCOM's objective with regard to hazardous substances.

## Annex 1 - The questionnaire and list of persons contacted

### Questionnaire

Status of implementation of the OSPAR Strategy with regard to Hazardous Substances into national policy – questionnaire commissioned by WWF

- 1) Did your country transpose OSPAR's Objective and Strategy into national environmental legislation or policy?
  - Can you provide a written document? (Internet address would be sufficient)
  - Does a central co-ordinator exist and in which administrative body is he/she located?
  - Is the OSPAR Objective integrated into your national agricultural, fisheries and chemicals policy? If yes, how?
- 2) Which are the major sources of substances from the OSPAR List of Chemicals for Priority Action (last revised in June 2002) in your country? Is information available indicating the trends of discharges, emissions and losses from these sources?
- 3) Have you started a dialogue with industrial sectors concerning measures to reduce the releases of certain hazardous substances from products and processes? Which sectors have been addressed? What has been the outcome so far?
- 4) What guidance do you offer to trade and industry to identify hazardous substances and to find suitable alternatives. (Including internet address if available)
- 5) Does the application for a permit for discharging waste water (into sewer or river) in your country include an obligatory screen for persistent, toxic, bioaccumulative<sup>18</sup> substances (OSPAR hazardous substances)? If yes, since when?
- 6) In which way was PARCOM Decision 95/1 on the Phasing Out of Short-Chained Chlorinated Paraffins implemented in your country? What are the results?
- 7) Do environment protection authorities in your country run an internet page that includes information for public and industry about the sensitivity of the marine environment and the needs and measures to protect it against hazardous chemicals? Does this information include a link to the OSPAR strategy and the OSPAR List of Substances of Possible Concern published on the net in 2002?

---

<sup>18</sup> Including substances of equal level of concern

## **OSPAR Contracting Parties**

HOD: Heads of Delegation for the Joint Meeting

SPS: Participant of the Working Group on Priority Substances

HSC: Participant of Hazardous Substance Committee (HSC)

### **BELGIUM**

Dr Georges Pichot (HOD)

*Prime Minister's Services*

*MUMM*

reply by Michael Kyramarios

and Sofie Van Volsem

*Flemish Environment Agency (VMM)*

Mr Michael Kyramarios (SPS)

*MUMM*

### **DENMARK**

Mr Jørgen Magner (HOD)

*Ministry of Environment and Energy*

*Danish Environmental Protection Agency*

reply by Jens Brøgger Jensen

Mr Jens Brøgger Jensen (SPS)

*Ministry of Environment and Energy*

*Danish Environmental Protection Agency*

### **FINLAND**

Ms Eeva-Liisa Poutanen (HOD)

*Ministry of the Environment*

reply by Timo Seppälä

Mr Timo Seppälä (SPS)

*Finnish Environment Institute*

*Chemicals Division*

### **FRANCE**

Mr Marcel Jouve (HOD)

*Ministère des Affaires Étrangères – DE/ENV*

reply by Chrystèle Tissier

and Nicolas Jeanjean

*Ministry of Environment*

Ms Chrystèle Tissier (INERIS) (SPS)

*c/o IFREMER Centre de Nantes*

### **GERMANY**

Dr Fritz Holzwarth (HOD)

*Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und*

*Reaktorsicherheit*

reply by Heinz-Jochen Poremski

Mr Heinz-Jochen Poremski (SPS)

*Umweltbundesamt*

## **ICELAND**

Mr Olafur Petursson (HOD)

*Environmental and Food Agency of Iceland*

Mr Thor Tomasson (HSC)

*Hollustuvernd ríkisins*

## **IRELAND**

Ms Mary Lally (HOD)

*Department of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources*

Ms Mary O' Brien (forwarded)

*Department of the Environment and Local Government  
Water Quality Division*

## **NETHERLANDS**

Mrs Els M. de Wit (HOD)

*Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management  
Directorate General for Water Management*

reply by Jeannette Plokker

Ms Jeannette Plokker (SPS)

*Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management, Institute on Inland Water Management and Waste Water Treatment/RIZA*

## **NORWAY**

Ms Lindis Nerbø (HOD)

*Ministry of the Environment*

reply by Toralf Kaland

Mr Toralf Kaland (SPS)

*Norwegian Pollution Control Authority*

## **PORTUGAL**

Ms Teresa Vinhas (HOD and HSC)

*Institute of Environment*

## **SPAIN**

Mr Victor Escobar

*Ministerio de Medio Ambiente*

Ms Ana Garcia Gonzalez (SPS)

*Ministerio de Medio Ambiente*

**SWEDEN**

Mr Lars Ekecrantz (HOD)  
*Ministry of the Environment*

Dr Håkan Björndal (SPS)  
*Swedish Environmental Protection Agency*

reply by Ana Wiberg  
*Ministry of the Environment*  
*Division for Environmental Quality*

**SWITZERLAND**

Mr Ulrich Sieber  
*Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape*

reply by Ulrich Sieber

Mr Andreas Weber (SPS)  
*Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape*

**UNITED KINGDOM**

Mr John Roberts (HOD)  
*Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)*

reply by Richard Moxon

Mr Richard Moxon (SPS)  
*Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)*

## **HELCOM Contracting Parties**

### **ESTONIA**

Mr Harry Liiv  
*Ministry of Environment of Estonia*

reply by Annika Tenno  
*Ministry of Environment of Estonia*

Ms. Eda Andresmaa  
*Ministry of the Environment*  
*Water Department*

### **LATVIA**

Ms Baiba Zasa  
*Latvian Environment Agency*  
*Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional*  
*Development*

Mr. Andris Roska  
*Environmental State Inspectorate*

### **LITHUANIA**

Mr Tadas Navickas  
*Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Lithuania*

Ms. Liucija Ramanauskiene  
*Ministry of Environment of Lithuania*  
*Environmental Technologies Division*

### **POLAND**

Mr Dariusz Stanislawski  
*Ministry of the Environment*

Ms. Adriana Dembowska  
*Ministry of the Environment of Poland*  
*Department of Environmental Protection*

## Annex 2 – Country-specific evaluation

### Evaluation Belgium

Indicator	Unit	value	Belgium
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%	7	
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	5	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DYNAMEC Mechanism</li> <li>- Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts)</li> <li>- Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i></li> <li>- Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA)</li> <li>- Sector by Sector approach</li> <li>- Substitution</li> </ul>	Number	0	
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	partly	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	? no information on national implementation	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	?	
Integration into other fields of policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chemicals policy</li> <li>- Agricultural policy</li> <li>- Fishery Policy</li> </ul>	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	?	
National list of current sources available	Yes/no	Yes, 5 <sup>th</sup> NSC	
Quantification of emissions or losses available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb)</li> <li>- Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998)</li> <li>- Prioritised after 1998</li> </ul>		Data reported for 5 <sup>th</sup> NSC: (SOA: source oriented approach, SS: Sales statistic) SOA SS for TBT, SOA for dioxins and PAHs  SOA for TCB, SS for pesticides	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	?	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	?	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whole effluent assessment</li> <li>- Substance list to be screened</li> <li>- Properties of purchased chemicals</li> </ul>		Flemish region: substances mentioned in EU Dir 76/464, a number of PBT-substances are included (heavy metals and pesticides) OSPAR priority substances are included in the revision for implementation of 76/464	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	No	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	No (instead: support of EU Directive)	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	Good, but as new substance only trichlorobenzenes are mentioned; no website was suggested with the reply	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	Fair	

## Evaluation Denmark

Indicator	Unit	Value	Denmark
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%	1,4	
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	2	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DYNAMEC Mechanism</li> <li>- Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts)</li> <li>- Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i></li> <li>- Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA)</li> <li>- Sector by Sector approach</li> <li>- Substitution</li> </ul>	Number	IGE DYNAMEC	
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	Partly	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	Yes: <a href="http://www.mst.dk/chemi/02020500.htm">www.mst.dk/chemi/02020500.htm</a>	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	Yes, several action plans and bans but no central coordinator	
Integration into other fields of policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chemicals policy</li> <li>- Agricultural policy</li> <li>- Fishery Policy</li> </ul>	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	Not answered	
National list of current sources available	Yes/no	Not answered	
Quantification of emissions or losses available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb)</li> <li>- Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998)</li> <li>- Prioritised after 1998</li> </ul>		Data reported for 5NSC: (SOA: source oriented approach, SS: Sales statistic, NR: nor reporting) SOA for Hg, Pb, Cd SOA for TBT, PCP, PAH*, dioxins*  NR for TCB	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	Not answered	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	Advisory List for Self-Classification of Dangerous Substances, List of undesirable substances (LOUS)	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whole effluent assessment</li> <li>- Substance list to be screened</li> <li>- Properties of purchased chemicals</li> </ul>		Not answered	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	Not answered	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	No	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	Good (no website was suggested with the reply)	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	Fair, OSPAR-lists are explained, no link to PBT-list included	

\* Insufficient data for either 1985 or 1999/2000

## Evaluation Finland

Indicator	Unit	Value	Finland
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%	1,2	
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	3	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments - DYNAMEC Mechanism - Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts) - Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i> - Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA) - Sector by Sector approach - Substitution	Number	DYNAMEC	
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	Partly	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	Yes: Finland's Baltic Sea Protection Programme	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	Not answered	
Integration into other fields of policy - Chemicals policy - Agricultural policy - Fishery Policy	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	Not answered	
National list of current sources available	Yes/no	Yes (included)	
Quantification of emissions or losses available - Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb) - Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998) - Prioritised after 1998		Yes, quantitative data on Cd, Pb, Hg, PCB Yes, quantitative data on PCDDs, PCDFs  No quant. Data (planned for 2004: national priority list under WFD and substances of concern on national level)	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	Yes, not concerning OSPAR (no details)	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	Yes: guidance for permitting authorities Substitution guide for industry (requirements on substitution of dangerous by less dangerous substances) Both available on internet	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems - Whole effluent assessment - Substance list to be screened - Properties of purchased chemicals		Governed by Environmental Protection Act (implementation of IPPC-Dir)  Grey list of Dir 76/464, and Annex 8 WRRL	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	Yes: Obs-List PBT-criteria + special considerations	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	No	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	Good (no website was suggested with the reply)	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	Good (the website contains additional information in Finnish which is considered to sufficiently complement the English parts)	

## Evaluation France

Indicator	Unit	Value	France
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%	16	
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	3	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DYNAMEC Mechanism</li> <li>- Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts)</li> <li>- Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i></li> <li>- Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA)</li> <li>- Sector by Sector approach</li> <li>- Substitution</li> </ul>	Number	IGE	
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	Partly	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	Yes, partly with the regulation about „water abstraction and consumption ....“; text available on the French legislative website	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	Yes, by the control of registered industries	
Integration into other fields of policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chemicals policy</li> <li>- Agricultural policy</li> <li>- Fishery Policy</li> </ul>	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	Yes No Yes	
National list of current sources available	Yes/no	RNDE, several water related databases: water quality, water consumption, fishery, discharges... <a href="http://www.rnde.tm.fr">www.rnde.tm.fr</a>	
Quantification of emissions or losses available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb)</li> <li>- Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998)</li> <li>- Prioritised after 1998</li> </ul>		Data reported for 5 <sup>th</sup> NSC: (SOA: source oriented approach, SS: Sales statistic, NR: no reporting) SOA NR for dioxins and PAHs  SS for pesticides	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	Not answered	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	Yes, environmental label for products	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whole effluent assessment</li> <li>- Substance list to be screened</li> <li>- Properties of purchased chemicals</li> </ul>		Systematic monitoring of a number of chemicals in waste water (some are PBTs and OSPAR priority substances)	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	No	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	No	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	No (OSPAR is mentioned, but no hazardous substances issue related to marine environment)	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	No	

## Evaluation Germany

Indicator	Unit	Value	Germany
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%	26	
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	6	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DYNAMEC Mechanism</li> <li>- Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts)</li> <li>- Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i></li> <li>- Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA)</li> <li>- Sector by Sector approach</li> <li>- Substitution</li> </ul>	Number	IGE WEA	
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	Partly	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	Principles and approaches of marine environmental policy <a href="http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/wasser/themen/meere.htm">http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/wasser/themen/meere.htm</a>	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	No (only related to EU legislation)	
Integration into other fields of policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chemicals policy</li> <li>- Agricultural policy</li> <li>- Fishery Policy</li> </ul>	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	No EU legislation only	
National list of current sources available	Yes/no	Research and development programmes (heavy metals and lindan), data reported for 5 <sup>th</sup> NSC	
Quantification of emissions or losses available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb)</li> <li>- Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998)</li> <li>- Prioritised after 1998</li> </ul>		Data reported for 5 <sup>th</sup> NSC: (SOA: source oriented approach, SS: Sales statistic, NS: not specified, NR: no reporting) SOA NR for dioxins and PAHs  NS for TCB, SS for trifluralin	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	Yes, voluntary agreements on substitution of hazardous chemicals in several sectors; no details Eco labelling	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	Yes: Guidance for the use of environmentally sound chemicals, part I and II	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whole effluent assessment</li> <li>- Substance list to be screened</li> <li>- Properties of purchased chemicals</li> </ul>		Not answered	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	Not answered	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	Not answered	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	Good	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	Good	

## Evaluation The Netherlands

Indicator	unit	Value	Netherlands
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%	6	
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	2	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DYNAMEC Mechanism</li> <li>- Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts)</li> <li>- Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i></li> <li>- Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA)</li> <li>- Sector by Sector approach</li> <li>- Substitution</li> </ul>	Number	IGE WEA DYNAMEC	
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	Full	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	Yes: 4 <sup>th</sup> national environmental policy plan 4 <sup>th</sup> national water management plan overview on implementation of OSPAR objectives: <a href="http://www.steunpunt.wateremissies.nl/thema/internationaal/ospar/Overzicht%20implementatie%20OSPAR%20NL.pdf">http://www.steunpunt.wateremissies.nl/thema/internationaal/ospar/Overzicht implementatie OSPAR N L.pdf</a>	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	Yes: Implementation of SOMS is ongoing, depending on the outcome of EU Chemicals-Legislation coordinator: DG Environment of the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment	
Integration into other fields of policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chemicals policy</li> <li>- Agricultural policy</li> <li>- Fishery Policy</li> </ul>	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	Yes not fully not fully	
National list of current sources available	Yes/no	NSC and national emission inventories; substances like NP and musk xylenes are recently included, but not much quantitative information available	
Quantification of emissions or losses available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb)</li> <li>- Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998)</li> <li>- Prioritised after 1998</li> </ul>		Data reported for 5NSC: (SOA: source oriented approach) SOA SOA SOA	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	SOMS (Strategy on Management of Substances)	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	Yes: water protection Act (GAM= general assessment methodology) and QUICK Scan	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whole effluent assessment</li> <li>- Substance list to be screened</li> <li>- Properties of purchased chemicals</li> </ul>		In development Yes	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	Yes: GAM in Water Protection Act	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	Yes (1999)	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	Good, overview with links to the corresponding OSPAR-websites	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	Good	

## Evaluation Norway

Indicator	Unit	value	Norway
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%		
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	2	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DYNAMEC Mechanism</li> <li>- Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts)</li> <li>- Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i></li> <li>- Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA)</li> <li>- Sector by Sector approach</li> <li>- Substitution</li> </ul>	Number	DYNAMEC	
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	Full	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	Yes: national environmental targets: <a href="http://www.environment.no/templates/Page.aspx?id=2172">http://www.environment.no/templates/Page.aspx?id=2172</a>	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	Yes: Pollution Control Act Product Control Act Coordinator at Norwegian Pollution Control Authority	
Integration into other fields of policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chemicals policy</li> <li>- Agricultural policy</li> <li>- Fishery Policy</li> </ul>	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	Yes Yes: Environmental Action Plan Yes: Environmental Action Plan	
National list of current sources available	Yes/no	Yes: national priority list: phase out and substantial reduction targets (lists and 5 <sup>th</sup> NSC-reported data included)	
Quantification of emissions or losses available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb)</li> <li>- Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998)</li> <li>- Prioritised after 1998</li> </ul>		Data reported for 5 <sup>th</sup> NSC: (SOA: source oriented approach) SOA SOA  Not in use	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	Yes: dialogues and agreements, substitution Projects: paints, wood preservation, textiles GRIP-Centre	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	Yes: Obs-List: <a href="http://www.environment.no/datasok/obs/obs.asp?topmenuindex=2&amp;leftmenuindex=1&amp;pagename=the+observation+list">http://www.environment.no/datasok/obs/obs.asp?topmenuindex=2&amp;leftmenuindex=1&amp;pagename=the+observation+list</a>	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whole effluent assessment</li> <li>- Substance list to be screened</li> <li>- Properties of purchased chemicals</li> </ul>		Applicant must provide information on all hazardous substances, screening on PBT-substances by testing not generally obligatory (case by case)	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	Yes OSPAR + health criteria	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	Yes	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	Good	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	Fair, some criteria like persistence and endocrine disruption are explained, no list included	

## Evaluation Sweden

Indicator	unit	Value	Sweden
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%	2,8%	
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	3	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DYNAMEC Mechanism</li> <li>- Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts)</li> <li>- Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i></li> <li>- Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA)</li> <li>- Sector by Sector approach</li> <li>- Substitution</li> </ul>	Number	DYNAMEC IGE Publication of List Substitution Sector by Sector approach WEA	
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	Full	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	Yes: A Chemicals Policy for a Non-toxic environment <a href="http://www.kemi.se">www.kemi.se</a>	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	Yes, Coordinator located at Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	
Integration into other fields of policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chemicals policy</li> <li>- Agricultural policy</li> <li>- Fishery Policy</li> </ul>	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	Yes Yes (use of pesticides) No	
National list of current sources available	Yes/no	Yes: reporting system in the context of the European Pollutant Emission Register (EPER) under the IPPC, including OSPAR-Substances (first report this summer)	
Quantification of emissions or losses available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb)</li> <li>- Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998)</li> <li>- Prioritised after 1998</li> </ul>		Data reported for 5 <sup>th</sup> NSC: (SOA: source oriented approach, NS: not specified, NR: no reporting) SOA NR for dioxins, PAHs, NS for TBT  NS for TCB	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	Continuous dialogue (since 1980) with textile, pulp and paper, paint, leather, metal surface treatment, chemicals-industry. OSPAR-substances included, too early to comment the outcome	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	Yes: Obs-List with 250 Substances	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whole effluent assessment</li> <li>- Substance list to be screened</li> <li>- Properties of purchased chemicals</li> </ul>		Reporting List (s. above) in the context of EPER  Yes	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	?	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	Yes, implemented on a voluntary basis, SCCP phased out in Sweden	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	Fair	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	Good	

## Evaluation Switzerland

Indicator	unit	Value	Switzerland
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%	56 bil € corresponding to approximately 10 % of EU chemicals turnover	
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	1	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments - DYNAMEC Mechanism - Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts) - Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i> - Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA) - Sector by Sector approach - Substitution	Number		
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	Partly	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	Yes: Water Protection Regulation of Switzerland	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	Yes	
Integration into other fields of policy - Chemicals policy - Agricultural policy - Fishery Policy	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	Yes	
National list of current sources (not principal potential) available	Yes/no	Yes: national monitoring sewage sludge (SEA): measuring of selected substances in sewage sludge for source approach, some OSPAR priority substances included, reports on selected substances based on SEA-projects (organo tin, musks, PAH ...)	
Quantification of emissions or losses available - Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb) - Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998) - Prioritised after 1998		Data reported for 5NSC: (SOA: source oriented approach, NS: not specified, SS: Sales statistic) SOA/NS for heavy metals NS for dioxins; SS* for TBT; NR for PAH  SS for pesticides	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	Legal obligation to work on solutions together with industry, voluntary measures were partly successful (e.g. tar containing corrosion protection paints, without success: APEOS)	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	Yes: related to IPP, development and distribution of suitable assessment tools and a database	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems - Whole effluent assessment - Substance list to be screened - Properties of purchased chemicals		No Annex 3.2 and 3.3 of Gewässerschutz V: requirements depending on process, limitations for certain substances e.g. chlorinated hydrocarbons (no OSPAR prio) and heavy metals	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	No	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	Yes, but not implemented yet	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	Fair (sources not mentioned)	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	Good (short description with links to the corresponding OSPAR-website)	

\* insufficient data for either 1985 or 1999/2000

## Evaluation United Kingdom

Indicator	unit	Value	UK
Contribution of the Chemical Industry Sector to the EU Chemicals Production	%	11	
Number of OSPAR Substance Background Documents	Number	4	
Contribution to the development of implementation instruments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DYNAMEC Mechanism</li> <li>- Substance by substance assessment for prioritisation and/or de-selection (IGE, Informal Group of Experts)</li> <li>- Publication of <i>OSPAR's List of Substances of Possible Concern</i></li> <li>- Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA)</li> <li>- Sector by Sector approach</li> <li>- Substitution</li> </ul>	Number	-	
Response to the questionnaire	No, partly, full	Full	
Policy documents demonstrating national implementation	Yes/no	Yes: sustainable Production and Use of Chemicals <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/chemicals/strategy/03.htm">www.defra.gov.uk/environment/chemicals/strategy/03.htm</a>	
National implementation plan and implementation process existing	Yes/no	Yes, Coordinator Richard Moxon, DEFRA	
Integration into other fields of policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chemicals policy</li> <li>- Agricultural policy</li> <li>- Fishery Policy</li> </ul>	Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no	Yes Yes Yes	
National list of current sources available	Yes/no	UK National Atmospheric Emission Inventory ( <a href="http://www.naei.org.uk/reports.php">http://www.naei.org.uk/reports.php</a> ) UK inputs reports (RID), Trend data for air emissions of Hg, Cd, Pb, PAH, dioxins, furans, PCB, HCH, PCP	
Quantification of emissions or losses available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traditional (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb)</li> <li>- Old OSPAR substances listed (before 1998)</li> <li>- Prioritised after 1998</li> </ul>		Data reported for 5NSC: (LOA: load oriented approach, NR: no reporting) LOA for heavy metals LOA for HCH and PCP, NR for dioxins a. PAHs  LOA	
Specific sector activities characterised by sector and type of activity	Yes/no	10 substances for priority action include discussions with the relevant industrial trade associations and individual companies APEOs: working on voluntary agreement	
Specific guidance to industry existing	Yes/no	Yes: papers and proceedings of Chemical Stakeholder Forum (CSF).	
Extended PBT screen obligatory in waste water permit systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whole effluent assessment</li> <li>- Substance list to be screened</li> <li>- Properties of purchased chemicals</li> </ul>		obligatory screen for 50 PBT-Substances + information on further used chemicals developing Yes	
Other OSPAR obligatory screens?	Yes/no	Criteria of CSF, quite close to OSPAR	
National legislative action on short chained chlorinated paraffins prior to EU Directive 2002 ( taking into account reservations)	Yes/no	Yes	
Website containing the hazardous substance issue related to marine environment	No, fair, good	Good (although information on addressed substances are difficult to find)	
PBT-criteria explained and reference to substance list made	No, fair, good	Fair (no substance list indicated)	

## **Annex 3 - List of websites evaluated**

### **BELGIUM**

<http://www.mumm.ac.be/EN/index.php>

*Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences (RBINS),  
The Management Unit of the North Sea  
Mathematical Models and the Scheldt estuary  
(MUMM)*

### **DENMARK**

<http://www.mst.dk/homepage/>

*Ministry of Environment and Energy  
Danish Environmental Protection Agency*

### **FINLAND**

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/eng/>

*Environmental Administration*

### **FRANCE**

<http://www.environnement.gouv.fr/dossiers/eau/PAGES/POLITIQUE/politiqueau/politique.htm>

*Environmental Ministry, le domain de léau*

### **GERMANY**

<http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/>

*German Environmental Protection Agency*

### **ICELAND**

<http://umhverfisraduneyti.is/interpro/umh/umh-english.nsf/pages/front>

*Ministry for the Environment*

### **IRELAND**

<http://www.environ.ie/environ/envindex.html>

*Department of the Environment and Local  
Government*

### **NETHERLANDS**

[http://www.waterland.net/smartsite.dws?id=45  
&PageID=13&si=2](http://www.waterland.net/smartsite.dws?id=45&PageID=13&si=2)

*Waterland net*

### **NORWAY**

<http://www.environment.no/>

*Ministry of the Environment, State of the  
Environment Norway*

### **PORTUGAL**

<http://www.ambiente.gov.pt/>

*Ministry of Environment*

### **SPAIN**

<http://www.mma.es>

*Ministry of Environment*

**SWEDEN**

<http://www.naturvardsverket.se/>

<http://www.internat.environ.se/>

*Swedish Environmental Protection Agency*

**SWITZERLAND**

<http://www.umwelt-schweiz.ch/>

*Bundesamt für Umwelt, Wald und Landschaft*

**UNITED KINGDOM**

<http://www.defra.gov.uk/>

*Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs*

**ESTONIA**

<http://www.envir.ee/baltics/>

*Estonian Ministry of Environment, HELCOM,  
Stockholm Environmental Institute*

**LATVIA**

<http://www.varam.gov.lv/Esakums.htm>

*The Ministry of Environment of the Republic of  
Latvia*

**LITHUANIA**

<http://www.am.lt/EN/VI/>

*Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Lithuania*

**POLAND**

[http://www.mos.gov.pl/index\\_main.shtml](http://www.mos.gov.pl/index_main.shtml)

*Ministry of the Environment of Poland*

## Annex 4 - List of current OSPAR Priority Substances<sup>19</sup>, 5NSC-List and EPER<sup>20</sup>-List

OSPAR Priority Substances	a,b,c <sup>21</sup>	5NSC-List	EPER
4-tert-butyltoluene	c		
cadmium	a	cadmium	Cd and compounds
lead and organic lead compounds	a	lead	Pb and compounds
mercury and organic mercury compounds	a	mercury	Hg and compounds
organic tin compounds <sup>22</sup>	b	TBT- and TPT- compounds	organotin-compounds
neodecanoic acid, etheny ester*	b		
tetrabrombisphenol A (TBBA)	c		
hexachlorocyclopentadiene (HCCP)	c		
trichlorobenzene <sup>23</sup>	c	trichlorbenzene	trichlorbenzenes
brominated flame retardants <sup>24</sup>	b		brominated diphenylether
polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)	a		
polychlorinated dibenzodioxins (PCDDs and – furans (PCDFs)	b	dioxins	PCDD and PCDF
short chain chlorinated paraffins (SCCPs)	b		Chloro-alkanes (C <sub>10-13</sub> )
4-(dimethylbutylamino)diphenylamin (6PPD)*	c		
triphenyl phosphin	c		
hexamethyldisiloxane (HMDS)	c		
dicofol	c		
endosulphan	c	endosulphan	
hexachlorocyclohexane isomers (HCH)	b	HCH (incl. lindane)	HCH
methoxychlor	c		
pentachlorophenol (PCP)	b	PCP	PCP
trifluralin	c	trifluralin	
clotrimazole	c		
2,4,6-tri-tert-butylphenol	c		
nonylphenol/ethoxylates (NP/NPEs) and related substances	b		
octylphenol	c		
certain phthalates: DBP, DEHP	b		
polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)	b	PAHs	PAHs
musk xylene <sup>25</sup>	b		

<sup>19</sup> for which background documents have been or are being prepared

<sup>20</sup> European Pollutant Emission Register

<sup>21</sup> a: traditional substances (DDT, PCB, Hg, Cd, Pb);

b: Old OSPAR Substances (before 1998);

c: prioritised after 1998

<sup>22</sup> addressing TBT and TPT

<sup>23</sup> addressing: 1,2,3- and 1,2,4- and 1,3,5-Trichlorbenzene

<sup>24</sup> addressing: polybrominated diphenylethers,; polybrominated biphenyls; hexabromocyclo-dodecane

<sup>25</sup> addressing musk xylene, musk ketone, moskene and musk tibetene

\* currently no lead country, substances will have to be considered at a later date





WWF is one of the world's largest and most experienced independent conservation organisations, with almost 5 million supporters and a global network active in more than 90 countries.

WWF's mission is to stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature, by

- conserving the world's biological diversity,
- ensuring that the use of renewable resources is sustainable and
- promoting the reduction of pollution and wasteful consumption.

#### **WWF Germany**

Rebstöcker Straße 55  
D- 60326 Frankfurt am Main

Tel.: +49 069 / 7 91 44 - 0  
Fax: +49 069 / 61 72 21  
E-Mail: [info@wwf.de](mailto:info@wwf.de)

#### **WWF Germany Marine & Coastal Division**

Am Gütpohl 11  
D-28757 Bremen

Tel.: +49 0421 / 6 58 46 10  
Fax: +49 0421 / 6 58 46 12  
E-Mail: [bremen@wwf.de](mailto:bremen@wwf.de)

