

# **Dechlorane Plus**

## **Second draft risk management evaluation**

Prepared by the intersessional working group on Dechlorane Plus  
Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

May 2022

---

## Table of contents

Table of contents .....	2
<b>Executive summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Chemical Identity .....	5
1.2 Conclusions of the POPs Review Committee regarding Annex E information .....	5
1.3 Data sources .....	5
1.4 Status of the chemical under international conventions .....	6
1.5 Any national or regional control action taken .....	6
<b>2. Summary information relevant to the risk management evaluation.....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Production, use and emissions .....	6
2.2 Identification of possible control measures.....	9
2.3 Efficacy and efficiency of possible control measures in meeting risk reducing goals.....	10
2.3.1 Technical feasibility.....	10
2.3.2 Identification of uses where exemption may be needed.....	12
2.3.3 Cost and benefits of implementing control measures .....	13
2.4 Information on alternatives (products and processes).....	15
2.4.1 Alternative substances .....	15
2.4.2 Alternative techniques .....	18
2.4.3 Summary and conclusion from the assessment of alternatives .....	19
2.5 Summary of information on impacts on society of implementing possible control measures.....	20
2.5.1 Health, including public, environmental, and occupational health .....	20
2.5.2 Agriculture, including aquaculture and forestry .....	20
2.5.3 Biota (biodiversity).....	20
2.5.4 Economic aspects.....	20
2.5.5 Movement towards sustainable development .....	21
2.5.6 Social cost (employment, etc).....	21
2.6 Other considerations.....	22
2.6.1 Access of information and public education.....	23
2.6.2 Status of control and monitoring capacity .....	23
<b>3. Synthesis of information .....</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 Suggested risk management measures.....	23
<b>4. Concluding statement.....</b>	<b>24</b>
References.....	25

## Executive summary

1. At its fifteenth meeting, the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee concluded that Dechlorane Plus (DP, CAS No. 13560-89-9) and its *syn*-isomer (CAS No. 135821-03-3) and *anti*-isomer (CAS No. 135821-74-8) fulfilled the screening criteria in Annex D of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (Decision POPRC-15/2). At its sixteenth meeting the POPs Review Committee considered the draft risk profile and adopted decision POPRC-16/1, by which it decided to defer its decision on the draft risk profile (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.16/INF/19). At its seventeenth meeting the POPs Review Committee completed and adopted draft risk profile (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2) and concluded that DP is likely, as a result of its long-range environmental transport, to lead to significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects such that global action is warranted (Decision POPRC-17/2). While recognizing that the dataset on toxicity and ecotoxicity is limited, but that available short-term toxicity data indicates concern for potential adverse effects to the environment and humans at low levels, the Committee also decided to explore any further information on adverse effects, and, if appropriate, to revise the risk profile for consideration by the Committee at its eighteenth meeting. Parties and observers were invited to submit to the Secretariat the information specified in Annex F and any additional information relating to the adverse effects of DP before 14 March 2022.

2. The “Dechlorane Plus”™ technical mixture is a commercially available polychlorinated flame retardant. The technical DP mixture contains two stereoisomers, *syn*-DP and *anti*-DP, that are present in ratios of about 1:3 or 25 % *syn*-DP and 75 % *anti*-DP. Commercially available DP mixtures may also contain DP monoadducts, mono-dechlorinated DP and other substances as impurities. DP and its isomers are not known to be unintentionally produced.

3. DP is marketed as a replacement substance for decabromodiphenyl ether (decaBDE). It is used as a flame retardant in adhesives, sealants and polymers and also as an extreme pressure additive in greases to a lesser degree. The main use (around 80%) is in cables and wires and in motor vehicles. Other confirmed uses include aerospace and defence applications, electrical and electronic equipment, marine, garden and forestry machinery, consumer electronics and medical and radiotherapy applications.

4. DP production started in the 1960s at the manufacturing plant of Hooker Chemicals and Plastics Corporation (now Occidental Chemical Company (OxyChem)) in Niagara Falls, New York. DP has been classified as a high production volume chemical (>500 tonnes per year chemical) in the United States. The global production of DP is estimated to be in the range of 750-6000 tonnes per year, with an estimated average of 1980 tonnes per year. Production in China started in 2003 and the annual production is reported to be 300–1000 tonnes. Available information suggests that production at the Oxychem facility ceased in mid-2016, but this has not been formally confirmed by the US EPA. The Chinese manufacturer, Anpon Electrochemical Company Ltd., was recently acquired by ADAMA, and may now be the sole global manufacturer. According to Envilience ASIA (2021), China has released a draft of the New Pollutant Management Action Plan and production, use, import and export of DP will be banned from January 1 in 2026. Such a ban could have the implications for the global production of DP.

5. Emissions of DP to the environment occur at all its life cycle stages. Estimates suggests that around 54% of global DP emissions come from the manufacture of DP, while the next highest release to the environment comes from waste dismantling and recycling (35.9%) and landfills (4.3%). In line with these estimates, monitoring data shows that DP levels are generally highest near manufacturing sites, in areas around electronic waste and recycling plants and wastewater discharges. In the post manufacturing phase, polymer raw materials handling, compounding and conversion are estimated to be the the largest emission source, and overall accounts for 2.9 % of the total global emissions. s. While emissions from articles in use are estimated to account for 1.9% of the total DP emissions globally, these emissions are particularly important in relation to human exposure as evidenced by the high levels measured in indoor dust.

6. An assessment of different restriction scenarios suggests that a listing in Annex A that imposes a complete ban on production and use would be the most effective control measure and could reduce global emissions by 91% over the period 2023 – 2042, whereas listing in Annex A with time-limited exemptions according to estimates, could reduce emissions by 89-88 or 75 % over the same period, depending on what exemptions are included with the listing. A listing of DP in the Convention would also contribute to reducing emissions from waste by setting requirements for the environmentally sound management of DP containing wastes. In addition to this measure, requirements on labelling of DP containing products and waste as well as the development of guidances for Best Available Techniques/Best Environmental Practices (BAT/BEP) should be considered.

7. It is not possible to fully assess the socioeconomic impacts of listing of DP in the Convention. The human health and environmental benefits are expected to be highest if DP is listed in Annex A without exemptions, but this option is likely economically costlier than listing DP in Annex A with exemptions for certain uses. Uncertainties in the socioeconomic impacts of listing DP in the Convention relate to ongoing national processes to regulate DP, some of which could have an impact on the availability of DP on the global market, as well as the lack of technical information to determine the availability of alternatives and costs. Notably, ongoing national processes to regulate DP may impact on the pace of substitution in industry sectors that still rely on the production and use of DP.

---

8. Some suitable and commercially available chemical alternatives for the substitution of DP have been identified, with some uncertainties for use of DP in PDAP-resins in motor vehicles. Furthermore, non-chemical alternatives such as non-flammable materials and physical barriers are also available. Annex F information and other available information indicates that markets are transitioning away from DP and that substitutions have been implemented or are in progress for most, if not all, known applications. However, the submitted Annex F information and information from the EU REACH restriction process suggests that there may be challenges for some applications and sectors, i.e., aerospace and defence sector and medical imaging devices and radiotherapy devices/installations due to long phase-in time. Time limited exemptions for applications in these sectors may be needed. In addition, time limited exemptions for use in legacy spare parts for motor vehicles, aerospace and defence applications, medical imaging- and radiotherapy devices/installations and industrial machines may be needed to be able to repair articles that have a long service-life. Considering also available information on emissions, time limited exemptions for these applications and sectors may be justified.

9. A restriction on production and use of DP would have a positive effect on human health and the environment by reducing further emissions. DP persists in the environment for a very long time and accumulates in humans and wildlife, effects of current emissions may be observed or only be apparent in future generations.

## 1. Introduction

10. In May 2019, Norway submitted a proposal to include the chlorinated flame retardant (FR) Dechlorane Plus (DP, CAS No. 13560-89-9) and its *syn*- (CAS No. 135821-03-3) and *anti*- (CAS No. 135821-74-8) isomers in Annexes A, B and/or C to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). At its fifteenth meeting, the POPs Review Committee evaluated the proposal and concluded that DP and its *syn*-isomer and *anti*-isomer met the screening criteria specified in Annex D (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.15/7, Decision POPRC-15/4).

11. In the present document, the acronym DP is used for the commercial mixture “Dechlorane Plus”™ and to denote the sum of the *syn*- and *anti*-DP isomers, when reporting measured data.

### 1.1 Chemical Identity

12. The technical mixture Dechlorane Plus™ (CAS No. 13560-89-9) is a commercially available formulation that contains two stereoisomers, *syn*-DP (CAS No. 135821-03-3) and *anti*-DP (CAS No. 135821-74-8), in concentrations of 25-35 % *syn*-DP and 65-75 % *anti*-DP (Sverko et al., 2011; OxyChem, 2013; Wang et al., 2010a).

13. As reported in the risk profile, DP is a high molecular weight molecule (653.73 g/mol) with the molecular formula C<sub>18</sub>H<sub>12</sub>Cl<sub>12</sub>. The structural formula of DP and its two isomers is shown in Figure 1 below. It is a solid white powder at room temperature (20 °C and at 101.3 kPa), has limited water solubility with reported water solubility values of <1.67 ng/L (20 – 25 °C) and 0.044 – 249 µg/L (insoluble) (ECHA, 2017b; OxyChem, 2004b), and high *n*-Octanol/water partition coefficient (log K<sub>ow</sub> of 9.3) and *n*-Octanol-air partition coefficients (log K<sub>oa</sub> of 12.26) (OxyChem, 2004b). A full overview of the chemical identity; modelled and experimental physico-chemical properties of DP and its two isomers are given in Tables 1 and 2 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INF.xx.doc.




Figure 1. Structural formula of DP and its two isomers

### 1.2 Conclusions of the POPs Review Committee regarding Annex E information

14. The draft risk profile was discussed by the POPs Review Committee at its sixteenth meeting in January 2021, and the Committee adopted decision POPRC-16/1, by which it decided to defer its decision on the draft risk profile (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.16/INF/19) to its seventeenth meeting. In its decision, the Committee noted that, while information on persistence, bioaccumulation and the potential for long-range environmental transport was conclusive, the Committee had been unable to reach agreement that the information on adverse effects was sufficient to reach a conclusion on the risk profile. The committee also decided to establish an intersessional working group to review and update the draft risk profile and invited Parties and observers to submit to the Secretariat additional information relating to the adverse effects of DP before 1 March 2021.

15. At its seventeenth meeting the POPs Review Committee completed and adopted the draft risk profile (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2) and concluded that DP is likely, as a result of its long-range environmental transport, to lead to significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects such that global action is warranted (Decision POPRC-17/2). While recognizing that the dataset on toxicity and ecotoxicity is limited, but that available short-term toxicity data indicates concern for potential adverse effects to the environment and humans at low levels, the Committee also decided to explore any further information on adverse effects, and, if appropriate, to revise the risk profile for consideration by the Committee at its eighteenth meeting. Parties and observers were invited to submit to the Secretariat the information specified in Annex F and any additional information relating to the adverse effects of DP before 14 March 2022.

### 1.3 Data sources

16. The risk management evaluation has been developed using the following sources of information:

- (a) The revised risk profile (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2)
- (b) Annex F information submitted by the following Parties and Observers: Belarus, Canada, Egypt, Japan, Germany, Monaco, The Netherlands, Republic of Korea, UK, Alaska Community Action on Toxics (ACAT) and International Pollutants Elimination Network (IPEN), European Automobile Manufacturers’ Association (ACEA), International Coordinating Council of Aerospace Industries Associations (ICCAIA). Information

---

from the Society of Indian Automobile Manufacturers (SIAM) and the Aerospace Industries Association of Canada (AIAC) provided during the open commenting round of the risk profile;

(c) Reports and other grey literature as well as information from peer-reviewed scientific literature;

(d) Documents (annex, report and response to comments) supporting the Annex XV restriction proposal under the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) regulation in the European Union (EU) (ECHA 2022a-d, f).

(e) Screening assessment report and risk management approach from Canada (Canada, 2019a,b).

#### **1.4 Status of the chemical under international conventions**

17. DP is currently not included in any international conventions.

#### **1.5 Any national or regional control action taken**

18. As described in the risk profile and in Table 3 of UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx regulatory processes to restrict or ban DP have been initiated or are in place in several countries including Australia, Canada, Egypt, EU and the three European Free Trade Association (EFTA) States (Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway), which are part of the European Economic Area (EEA) and Singapore. At POPRC-17, China announced that they are considering a proposal to ban DP (ENB, 2022). According to Envilience ASIA (2021), China has released a draft of the New Pollutant Management Action Plan and production, use, import and export of DP will be banned from 1 January in 2026.

19. Certain limitations and approval, reporting and/or notification requirements for production, import and/or use also apply in New Zealand, Thailand, The Russian Federation and the United States.

20. Generic regulations and recommendations advising against halogenated FRs are also in place in some countries. The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission cautioned electronics manufacturers and retailers to “eliminate the use” of halogenated FRs in consumer products to protect consumers and children (govinfo, 2017). Similarly, a ban on the use of all halogenated FRs in electronic displays entered into force in the EU in 2021 (EU, 2019). This ban, adopted as part of the EU’s Ecodesign Regulation, applies to all electronic displays, including TVs, monitors, and digital signage displays, with size equal or greater than 100 cm<sup>2</sup>, or 15.5 in<sup>2</sup>.

## **2. Summary information relevant to the risk management evaluation**

### **2.1 Production, use and emissions**

21. DP was originally developed as a replacement for the FR and insecticide dechlorane, also known as Mirex (Hoh et al., 2006), and is currently marketed as an alternative/replacement for commercial decabromodiphenyl ether (decaBDE). Available information on the volumes of DP manufactured, imported and exported is sparse, with only a few underlying sources frequently being quoted in most studies, articles and regulatory documents as summarized in Table 4 and 5 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INF/x.

22. Globally, two manufacturing sites are known, one in the USA and one in China, but production is today assumed to only occur in China (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2; UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/13). Manufacturing in the USA took place in Niagara Falls, New York where it began in the 1960s at the manufacturing site of Hooker Chemicals and Plastics Corporation, that is now owned by the Occidental Chemical Corporation (OxyChem). DP has been considered high production volume chemical (>500 tonnes per year chemical) in the USA. Since 2011, OxyChem claimed their production volumes as confidential business information, but historic volumes manufactured by this company lie in the range of 450-5000 tonnes/year (Ren et al., 2009; Qiu et al., 2007, US EPA, 2002; Hoh et al., 2006). Production in the USA declined from 2008 and ceased mid-way through 2016, however the cease of manufacture has not been formally confirmed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) (ECHA 2022a,b; Annex E IPEN). Manufacturing in China is reported to be in the range of 300–1000 tonnes per year since 2003 (Wang et al., 2010a). In China, DP is produced by Jiangsu Anpon Electrochemical Company Ltd. at manufacturing site in Huai’an. Anpon was recently acquired by Adama Agriculture B.V (ADAMA, 2019). China has released a draft of the New Pollutant Management Action Plan and production, use, import and export of DP will be banned from January 1 in 2026 (Envilience ASIA, 2021). Such a ban could have implications for the global production of DP.

23. DP is used as a FR in adhesives, sealants and polymers. The main use is as a FR in electronic wiring and cables in motor vehicles. Other confirmed FR uses include aerospace and defence applications, electrical and electronic equipment, marine, garden and forestry machinery, and medical and radiotherapy devices/ installations (ECHA 2022b). DP is also used as a FR in construction and infrastructure (Annex F, Japan). A secondary use of DP is as an extreme pressure additive in greases, and it has also a minor use as a colour intensifier in explosives in fire

works (ECHA, 2022a, b) and in the thermoset resin polydiarylpthalate (PDAP) for the purpose of electric insulation in second generation electrical vehicles (Annex F Japan; ECHA, 2022c). A detailed overview of these uses is provided in Tables 6-9 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx).

#### Use in cables and wires

24. Cables and wires are used in motor vehicle, aerospace and defence applications, and consumer electronics. The majority of DP is used in cables and wires in the automotive sector, which is estimated to account for 80% of the total global use in this sector (see Table 10 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). In automotive applications DP is used 'in-engine' components including small and highly flexible cables that need to be able to withstand elevated temperatures from being close to the engine (Eftec, 2021; Annex F, UK). Cables and wires containing DP may also be used in the other sectors (Table 8, 9 and 12 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx).

#### Use in polymers and plastic mouldings

25. Available information confirms the use of DP in the production of polymers. KEMI (2020) have identified DP in nylon and thermoplastic polymers. Information from the manufacturer Oxychem (2007) suggests use also in other polymers such as acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS), natural rubber, polybutylene terephthalate (PBT), polypropylene, and styrene butadiene rubber (SBR) block copolymer. DP may also be used in thermosets such as epoxy and polyester resins, polyurethane foam, polyethylene, ethylene propylene diene monomer rubber, polyurethane rubber, silicon rubber, and neoprene. The amount of DP in these materials ranges from 8% in PBT to up to 40% in silicon rubber (see Table 11, 12 and 14 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). DP is also used in thermoset resin for the purpose of electric insulation, e.g., in PDAP resin which is used in second generation electrical vehicles (Annex F Japan; ECHA, 2022c).

26. Other uses of DP containing plastic polymers and resins, include hard plastic connectors in computer monitors/TVs, and limited specific applications in the aerospace and defence sector (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.16/2; ECHA 2022b,c). DP has also been detected in other polymers used in building materials including plastic roofing materials, sound absorbing foams, expanded polystyrene panels, sealants, particle boards, paint, and wallpapers. The DP detection frequency ranged from 33% to 100% with the highest reported concentrations found in sealants, PVC, sound absorbing foams and expanded polystyrene (ECHA 2022b,c; Hou et al., 2018; see Table 13 in (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx).

#### Use in two-part resins for aerospace and defence applications

27. DP is used in two-part resins for aerospace and defence applications. The uses of DP named by the aerospace and defence industry stakeholders are: epoxy adhesives, syntactic foams, potting compounds, 2-part epoxy void filler, manufactured items for the production and maintenance of aircraft and aircraft components (e.g., aircraft engine), connectors, wire/cables and other plastic components made from polypropylene, nylon, ABS etc (See Table 9 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). No tonnage estimates for the EU or global aerospace sector was provided, but Rolls Royce informed that they use 0.13 tonnes per year of DP, not including use by companies carrying out repair and maintenance for Rolls Royce (Eftec, 2021). The Aerospace and Defence Industries Association of Europe has indicated that total use in the EU is 1,600 tonnes per year and that work is underway to identify alternatives that can replace DP in the next five years or so (ECHA, 2022c).

#### Use in motor vehicles, other motorized vehicles, trains and industrial and household machinery

28. The Society of Indian Automobile Manufacturers (SIAM), on behalf of their members, states that DP is used as an alternative to c-decaBDE in the manufacturing of motor vehicles (SIAM, 2020). The use of DP in motor vehicles is supported by information provided by ACEA and JAPIA which confirm the use of DP in several applications in the automotive sector in both Europe and Japan (Annex F, ACEA and Japan; ECHA 2022c). Confirmed uses in vehicles are in polymers that require flame retardancy, and in grease requiring seizure resistance (See Table 8, 9 and 14 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). Annex E information from the Netherlands further indicates that DP within this sector is used for the following parts; in powertrain, cooling, chassis and bodywork parts (Annex E, 2019). Similar information by JAPIA suggests that the main applications of DP in motor vehicle parts fall in four categories; wire harness, adhesive, tape and PDAP resin (ECHA, 2022a,b). Information from ACEA indicate that DP is used in most part of the car (both interior, exterior and "under the hood") similar to decaBDE (ACEA, Supplementary Annex F information). Information from Japan states that DP is used in motor vehicles, motorcycles, agriculture and construction vehicles, industrial truck, agricultural and constructional machinery, railways, and industrial and household machinery (Annex F, Japan). Other identified uses in the EU are marine, garden and forestry machinery (ECHA 2022a,b,c).

#### Other uses

29. Other identified uses in the EU and Japan include medical imaging and radiotherapy devices (ECHA 2022, a,b,c; Annex F Japan). According to the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) (2022a,b), DP may also be used in fabrics, textiles and apparels, and plastic articles, but this has not been confirmed by consulted stakeholders, so it is

unclear if this is an ongoing use (Annex F Japan; ECHA, 2022c; see Table 7, 9 and 13 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx).

#### Available information on use volumes for different sectors and uses

30. Due to conflicting information provided by different stakeholders, both at global and EU levels, two different use patterns have been defined – a low and high tonnage scenario - based on information received (ECHA, 2022b, Eftec, 2021). Globally, polymers in automotive vehicles account for 57 – 75%, and aerospace for 10% of the total use, while other uses including electronics/electrical equipment, explosives and imported articles account for 15 – 33% of the total use (see Table 1 below). New information on volumes from JAPIA provided under the EU restriction process indicate that global volumes used in the automotive sector may be as high as 70 % in a high volume and 90 % in a low-volume scenario (ECHA 2022b). Stakeholders within the automotive industry reported that they use around 500 tonnes per year globally, comprising 50% of the global volume manufactured (Eftec, 2021). Some of the difference can likely be explained by stakeholders citing tonnage data from different years (Eftec, 2021). For the EU, the reported use volume was in the range of 81-161 tonnes per year for the automotive industry. The highest volume imported by ADAMA to the EU was 300-400 tonnes per year and for 2019 this was reduced to below 100 tonnes per year (ECHA, 2022a).

31. The main uses of DP mentioned by the automotive industry are electric wire (wire harnesses specifically mentioned) (80% of total tonnage used), tape and adhesive (10% of total tonnage used); plastic and rubber parts (8% of total tonnage used), grease (2% of total tonnage used) (see Table 10 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). The two key functions for the automotive sector are flame retardancy (avoids the start or slows down the growth of fire) and seizure resistance (to prevent seizure of metal parts in sliding parts). Global low- and high-volume estimates of DP per user application is provided in Table 2 below.

Table 1. Global volumes of DP per sector according to the stakeholder consultations (Eftec, 2021)

Sectors	Low volume scenario		High volume scenario	
	Share of total	Use volume (t/y)	Share of total	Use volume (t/y)
Motor vehicles*	75%	225	57%	565
Aerospace and defence	10%	30	10%	100
Other**	15%	45	33%	335
<b>All</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,000</b>

Note: The names of the sectors have been adjusted according to ECHA, 2022a. The low- and high-volume scenarios are based on information from different sources, which is why market share as well as the tonnages of the sectors vary between the two scenarios. \*Motor vehicles include all applications within land-based vehicles. \*\* Other includes all other uses apart from the two above.

Table 2: Global volumes of DP per use application (Eftec, 2021)

Uses	Share of total	Low-volume scenario (t/y)	High-volume scenario (t/y)
Polymers Wire and printed circuit board housing, other plastic and rubber parts	93%	279	930
Adhesives etc. Tape, adhesives, sealants	5%	15	50
Greases Lubricant	2%	6	20
<b>All</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>1,000</b>

#### Emission estimates

32. Global emission estimates for DP have been developed and include direct releases to air and surface water and take into account the redistribution in the sewage treatment plants for emissions to wastewater (Eftec, 2021). These estimates suggest that around 54% of global DP emissions come from the manufacture of DP. The next highest release to the environment comes from ‘waste dismantling and recycling’ (35.9%) and ‘landfill’ (4.3%) (Eftec, 2021;

see Table 15 and 16 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). In the post manufacturing phase, polymer raw materials handling, compounding and conversion are estimated to be the largest emission source, but overall only accounts for 2.9 % of the total global emissions. While emissions from articles in use only account for 1.9 % of the total DP emissions globally, these emissions are particularly important in relation to human exposure, as evidenced by the high levels measured in indoor dust (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2).

## 2.2 Identification of possible control measures

33. DP poses a risk to the environment and human health which is not adequately controlled, and it is important that any regulatory measures are effective in eliminating or reducing emissions and releases of DP to prevent harmful exposures to humans and wildlife. In line with the objective of the Stockholm Convention, the purpose of any control measures would be to eliminate and/ or reduce emissions and releases of DP. Available control measures include listing in Annexes A, B and/or C to the Convention.

34. As reviewed in the DP risk profile (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2), monitoring data show that DP is globally distributed and detected in different environmental matrices and biota at different types of locations from urban to remote areas. The data further show that emissions and releases occur during all stages of the chemical's life cycle. As described in Section 2.1 above, the most important sources of emissions/ releases are estimated to be from the manufacture of DP, waste dismantling and recycling, landfills and to a lesser degree, articles in use. According to the DP risk profile (UNEP/POPS/POPRC. 17/3.Add.2) elevated DP levels in urban, suburban, and urban industrialized areas are reported in several studies and from several global regions and include reports of DP air levels at urban sites that are >10 times greater than at background, rural and agricultural sites. The highest DP levels globally have been detected in the environment, humans and wildlife near production sites, electronic-waste (e-waste) recycling sites and also landfills, and suggests that waste, and in particular e-waste, is an important source of DP emissions and releases along with production sites. The available monitoring data presented in the risk profile also suggests that diffuse emissions from articles in use are important sources, particularly in urban environments and with regard to human exposure.

35. DP could be listed in Annex A with or without specific exemptions, or in Annex B with specific exemptions and/or acceptable purposes. For DP, listing in Annex C is not relevant as DP is not known to be unintentionally produced. When listing DP in Annex A or B to the Convention, it is also possible to include specific provisions that would apply to DP as is currently done e.g. for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in Part II of Annex A and dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) in Part II of Annex B.

36. There is limited information available to identify appropriate control measures under the Convention and to assess if exemptions in line with the uses identified in Section 2.3.2, could be justified under the scope of the Convention. The submitted Annex F information provided limited information and European car manufacturers, who require an exemption for motor vehicles and their spare parts, are the only industry stakeholders to have provided information (Annex F, ACEA and UK). Relevant information was also provided by Japan, who in their Annex F submission indicated that DP is used in a wide range of applications including in other means of transportation such as trains, machinery as well as in infrastructure applications (Annex F, Japan), but many of these uses have yet to be verified by industry stakeholders and other independent information.

37. Ongoing national regulatory processes provide additional information that can inform the discussion on possible control measures and the need for exemptions under the Convention. In the EU, different regulatory options to restrict the manufacture, placing on the market and use of DP in concentrations >0.1% are under consideration based on a thorough assessment of identified uses, alternatives and socioeconomic considerations (ECHA, 2022a,b, see Table 17/ UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). All the proposed EU restriction options include a transition period of 18 months and exemptions are being discussed for aerospace and defence application/ equipments and their spareparts, motor vehicles and their spareparts, medical imaging applications and their spare parts, radiotherapy devices/ installations and their spareparts, and for spareparts for certain equipment with long lifetimes including for marine, garden and forestry machinery. Furthermore, it is also relevant to consider the effects of a ban on production, use, import and export of DP in China, that is foreseen to enter into force on January 1, 2026 (Envilience ASIA, 2021). As the only producer currently known to produce DP is in China, this implies that DP will not be available on the global market after 2026, and DP must be phased out before this date. However, some uncertainty still exist as stockpiles of DP may be available to down-stram users outside of China also for some years after 2026.

38. Noting that global ban or regulation on DP could at the earliest enter into force in 2024 for most Parties, the available information suggests that DP should be listed in Annex A, possibly with exemptions for some of identified uses and if these can be justified within the scope of the Convention. The announcement of ban on DP in China suggests that exemptions beyond the initial 5 years period available to parties in the register for specific exemptions would not be required.

---

## 2.3 Efficacy and efficiency of possible control measures in meeting risk reducing goals

39. Solely national regulatory actions may not be adequate to manage the risks of DP. A global ban on production and use of DP is the most effective control measure to prevent harm to human health and the environment and can be achieved by listing DP in Annex A to the Stockholm Convention with no exemptions. An alternative, but less efficient measure would be to list DP in Annex A with time-limited exemptions for uses where substitution is currently not feasible/possible and where continued use will lower the overall risk reduction potential. The least effective measure would be to list DP in Annex B which also allows for acceptable purposes.

40. An assessment of different global restriction scenarios of listing DP in Annex A to the Convention suggests that a listing in Annex A that imposes a complete ban on production and use could reduce global emissions of DP by 91% over the period 2023 – 2042, whereas a listing DP in Annex A to the Convention with time-limited exemptions consistent with the two of the more conservative EU restriction options i.e. for aerospace and defence applications, their spareparts and for spareparts for motor vehicles or alternatively also for production and use in motor vehicles, would respectively reduce emissions by 88% or 75% over the same period (Eftec, 2021, see Table 18 and Figure 1 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). Information from the EU assessment suggests a limited effect of also including exemptions for spare parts for medical imaging applications, radiotherapy devices, and marine, garden and forestry machinery (ECHA, 2022a,b). This restriction option was not assessed in the global assessment by Eftec (2021) but the emission reduction capacity was calculated to 89 % for the EU (ECHA,2022d), and is possibly in the same range at the global level. It should be noted that the assessment by Eftec (2021) only provides crude estimates for the potential efficacy and efficiency of possible control measures. The assessment may therefore not adequately reflect how emissions may disproportionately affect certain groups of workers, populations, communities, and countries.

41. Listing DP in Annex A or B of the Convention would be equally effective in reducing emissions from waste, recycling and stockpiles, and it can be anticipated that emissions and releases from these sources will eventually decline. From Article 6 (d) of the Convention, it follows that wastes, including products and articles upon becoming wastes shall be handled, collected, transported and stored in an environmentally sound manner and disposed of according to the provisions of the Convention<sup>1</sup>. Additionally, Parties shall endeavour to develop appropriate strategies for identifying sites contaminated by chemicals listed in the Convention and if remediation of those sites is undertaken it shall be performed in an environmentally sound manner. Again, the effectiveness of the Convention in reducing these emissions would depend on the status of ratification and entry into force for the Parties, but also on the low POP content value and technical guidelines on the environmentally sound management of wastes consisting of, containing or contaminated with POPs developed by the Basel Convention in close collaboration with the Stockholm Convention (Basel Convention 2019).

### 2.3.1 Technical feasibility

42. Technical feasibility can be understood as the ability to implement a global ban or restriction, and not only the ability to replace or substitute a chemical in known applications. Accordingly, technical feasibility can be very different for different sectors e.g., for industry as compared to national authorities. Technical feasibility would also depend on the nature and complexity of the task. For example, allowing more exemptions would result in a more complex regulation at the national level that can be more difficult to communicate, implement, enforce, control and monitor. This aspect could be more important for governments and national authorities than for industry. On the other hand, a greater number of exemptions could mean that a global ban or restriction could be more technically feasible for industry actors that are currently using DP and have indicated that a global ban or restriction without time-limited exemptions would be challenging.

43. The limited information and bias in the available information concerning suitable alternatives and substitution described in Section 2.3.3. below makes it difficult to fully assess the technical feasibility of the possible control measures.

#### *Prohibition of production and use by listing in Annex A without exemptions*

44. A ban on production and use by listing in Annex A without exemptions would be the most efficient and effective control measure to reduce emission of DP to the environment. Some countries have already imposed a restriction or ban on DP or are in process of doing so (see Table 3 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INF/x). Furthermore, information received as Annex F information and comments received during the open consultation in the EU indicate that some actors have already switched to alternatives or have ongoing substitution projects (Annex F Netherlands,

---

<sup>1</sup> Disposed of in such a way that the POP content is destroyed or irreversibly transformed, or otherwise disposed of in an environmentally sound manner when destruction or irreversible transformation does not represent the environmentally preferable option, or the POP content is low.

UK, ICCIAI, ACEA; ECHA, 2022c). As set out in section 2.3, alternatives to the use of DP that are both technically and economically viable are available for most applications.

#### *Restriction of production and use by listing in Annex A with exemptions*

45. A restriction of production and use by listing DP in Annex A with some time-limited exemptions may be justified based on the information provided in Annex F submissions, as well as in ECHA, (2022a,b). DP is used in some sectors where substitution of substances can be challenging due to strict safety requirements and longer phase-in times. Safety requirements mandate that when a material's chemical property changes, a comprehensive test regime is required to ensure that durability, safety, and quality are not harmed. If control measures are implemented before phasing out is complete, the industry may require a time-limited exemption. Certain actors have indicated that a time-limited exemption is needed to phase out use of DP, in particular in spare-parts for some products that have long service life. However, details on which parts and products must be specified to enable POPRC to narrow down and justify the potential exemptions in a listing. Labelling of articles/products containing DP can be an efficient control measure to identify these exempted products throughout their lifecycle for some products, although this might be difficult for the smaller parts e.g., cables which appears to be the major use of DP.

#### *Restriction of production and use by listing in Annex B*

46. No information has been received to indicate that listing in Annex B is justified.

#### *Analytical methods, enforceability and monitorability*

47. It is expected that enforcement of a DP restriction can be carried out in parallel with enforcement of existing restrictions affecting similar products, e.g. decaBDE, so the additional costs of testing for the presence of one additional substance will likely be low (ECHA, 2022b). Analytical methods for the detection of *syn*- and *anti*-DP are reported in the literature which can be used to measure DP in both abiotic and biotic environmental media (see UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/INF/9). For analysis of articles, products and materials, although there are no standardized analytical methods, it is possible to analytically determine DP, via suitable extraction/ cleanup procedures and established mass spectrometric methods that combine gas chromatography with low- or high-resolution mass spectrometry (GC-LRMS or GC-HRMS), or tandem mass spectrometry (GC-MS/MS) (Brasseur et al., 2016; Zacs et al., 2019; Hou et al., 2018).

48. Initial screening for chlorine in materials can be done using X-ray fluorescence (XRF). This rapid technique can be used as an efficient method to determine potential content of DP in products and waste streams. However, XRF can only be used for crude detection and separation because it only determines the elemental composition of various materials (i.e. if chlorine is present) and not DP. This initial screening has to be combined with other methods to separate DP -containing materials from other chlorine containing materials such as PVC. To identify the presence of DP in material streams, XRF must be combined with more advanced analytical methods that involve mass-spectrometry as described above. Other spectroscopic techniques like Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) will be able to distinguish polymeric bound chlorine from chlorine bound in DP. Although, there are some issues with speed when used in large scale facilities, this might open up for developing a FTIR based rapid screening method to distinguish between chlorine from DP and polymeric bound chlorine in waste fractions if necessary (Becker et al., 2017). Therefore, such methods are mostly used as a first step for identifying materials for further assessment by more targeted approaches using mass-spectrometry or for crude sorting and separation of waste to separate out e.g., waste fractions heavily contaminated with halogenated compounds.

#### *Waste management and clean-up of contaminated sites*

49. Waste dismantling and recycling is the second major source of release. Estimates suggests that around 54% of global DP emissions come from the manufacture of DP, while the next highest release to the environment comes from waste dismantling and recycling (35.9%) and landfills (4.3%) (see Table 15 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INF/x). Measures to decrease releases at the waste stage should be implemented to minimise releases of DP Treatment of wastes must be conducted according to Article 6 obligations and taking into account the Basel Convention technical guidelines and the BAT/BEP guidelines. Labelling or branding requirements for products containing DP, which are produced after a listing in the Convention, would facilitate the identification of articles in use and management of wastes and stockpiles. Likewise, information on presence of DP (and other substances of concern) in products on the market could be collected in databases to inform the public and waste management, as for instances done in the EU SCIP database available at the ECHA website.

50. The major identified use of DP in cable and wires in motor vehicles, which indicates that end-of life vehicles (ELV) and electrical and electronic waste are waste streams, likely to contain DP. Thus, if DP is listed in the Convention, material streams containing DP at or above the low POP content value will have to be treated as a POP waste. This waste will have to be excluded from recycling by sorting and separating before being treated by recommended technologies for the destruction and irreversible transformation of POPs in wastes to ensure the POP content is irreversibly destroyed or transformed. To this end, a rapid on-site detection method to identify relevant

---

objects at the recycling facility should be developed in analogy to the XRF method that detects bromine in plastics, and suitable waste treatment technology for separation of plastics containing DP should be investigated. DP can be removed either during the dismantling stage where DP-containing plastics (e.g., wire harnesses) are separated from the parts not containing DP, or after the shredding of the vehicle where the auto shredder residue goes through post-shredder treatment. Post-shredder treatment to remove DP from the waste material can involve a number of different techniques including separation technologies, such as float-sink tanks, magnetic separation, eddy current separators, or laser and infra-red systems (Rambøll and Fraunhofer, 2021). Sorting technology XRF is, as opposed to laser and infra-red technology, independent of the colour of the input plastics (TOMRA, 2019) and is used to separate polymers containing halogenated FRs from halogen-free polymers. In a small study of recyclers using such sorting methods it was indicated that separation methods used for separating out plastics containing high levels of bromine are highly efficient also for separating out DP. DP was detected in plastic fraction rejected from fridge and small domestic appliances, and in ELV fine- and coarse-grained plastic fraction (Rambøll and Fraunhofer, 2021).

51. According to the Bureau of International Recycling (BIR) which represents over 30,000 recyclers in more than 70 countries around the world, the main issues for recyclers in terms of hazardous chemicals in wastes are: 1) a lack of knowledge on which chemicals are present in products or in wastes; and 2) a lack of economic means to identify and separate the waste containing hazardous chemicals, as well as removing the chemicals or materials containing them from the waste stream before recycling (Eftec, 2021). To ensure proper management of wastes containing DP and other POPs and clean secondary raw materials these issues should be addressed. As indicated above a requirement for better documentation and labelling of articles and products would be a step forward in addressing these issues and would help ensure the technical feasibility for the waste and recycling industry of listing DP under the Convention, as well as the effectiveness of such a listing. In addition, role of technological innovation and development is to consider important.

### **2.3.2 Identification of uses where exemption may be needed**

52. The submitted Annex F information and information from the EU REACH restriction proposal for DP (ECHA 2022a,b,c) suggests that some sectors may have challenges in phasing out DP without any transition time.

53. According to Annex F information, DP is used in a large variety of sectors and products including in motor vehicles, motorcycles, agricultural machinery, construction machinery, industrial machinery, medical instruments, infrastructure equipment, gas and oil equipment, aerospace and defence applications, as well as in railways (see Table 9 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). For some of these products, substitution of substances can be challenging due to strict safety requirements and longer phase-in time. In addition, exemptions for use in legacy spare parts may be justified to avoid a large number of long-lived products being phased out and becoming waste before the end of their expected service life. According to ECHA (2022b) releases from spare parts for some of these sectors also appear to be limited.

54. As further described in Section 2.4.1-2.4.2 potentially alternatives for DP both as a FR and as an extreme pressure additive have been identified (ECHA, 2022b). Only a limited number of stakeholders that provided information in the EU REACH restriction process, indicated that there were no suitable alternatives presently available for their specific application. One of those stakeholders was JAPIA, who indicated that no suitable substitution for DP in PDAP-resin in automotive applications has been identified. The same submission from JAPIA indicated that inorganic FRs are available and to some extent already in use in wire harnesses and tape in the EU. However, none of the stakeholders provided information on specific technical criteria to assess whether DP could be replaced by other FRs or lubricants (ECHA, 2022a,b,c; Annex F).

55. The automotive sector generally has a high level of research and development (R &D), which enable rapid technological changes (ECHA, 2022b). European car manufacturers associations' (Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders (SMMT) and ACEA) have provided information that the automotive industry has already started investigating its uses of DP and is aiming for a complete phase out by 2026 for motor vehicles already in production and for new models (Annex F, UK, ACEA). They have also indicated that a longer phase out period for the supply of legacy spare parts will be needed for vehicles type approved/certified before 2026 (Annex F ACEA, UK; ECHA 2022c).

56. There is limited information on use and use volumes for motor vehicles used in agriculture and forestry, other industrial machinery, infrastructure, railways and leisure boats. Some of these products may have a longer service life than motor vehicles. A ban on the use of DP for those applications without time-limited exemptions for legacy spare parts could have a significant impact on the supply of spare parts and could reduce the service life of the products (Annex F Japan; ECHA 2022c). According to information from JAPIA, the same parts containing DP for motor vehicles are also used for machinery and vehicles of agriculture machinery and construction machinery. Therefore, in their view, the spare parts containing DP in those industries need to be considered in parallel. It is not known if this applies to other countries than Japan.

57. The aerospace and defence sector are subject to strict regulations since new materials or design changes can be introduced to an aircraft only if testing and compliance demonstrations have been approved. In the EU, for example, the approval will result in the issuance of a Supplemental Type Certificate, change approval or repair approval (ECHA, 2015). This implies that transitioning to alternatives can be more time consuming for the aerospace and defence sector than for other industries. Aerospace and defence companies, in collaboration with material suppliers, are actively investigating alternatives that can meet performance and safety requirements. However, there is a lack of available qualified substitutes for aerospace and defence uses (Annex F, ICCAIA). A small share of actors in the EU aerospace industry is, however, assumed to be able to substitute DP by 2025 based on one consulted stakeholder who reported an ongoing substitution process which is expected to be completed within five years (ECHA, 2022a,b,c). In the EU restriction proposal, it is therefore assumed that 20% of DP used in the aerospace and defence sector in the EU can be substituted with alternatives by 2025. By mid-2028, i.e., after a transition period of 5 years, substitution is expected to be feasible for most actors (70%), and 95% of the market is assumed to be able to use alternatives by 2033. It is expected that some niche applications (5%) will not be able to substitute DP before 2035.

58. Medical imaging and radiography devices have an expected lifetime of 10 - 20 years or more. Access to spare parts will allow repair and avoid downtimes. In the EU restriction process it is assumed on a qualitative basis that a time-limited derogation for this use including for their spare parts will not significantly increase the emissions of DP in Europe (ECHA, 2022a).

59. In the EU restriction proposal (ECHA, 2022a,b) derogation for use in the electric and electronic sector, or their spare parts were not suggested, as many electronic devices and electrical equipment have a short lifespan. A derogation for spare parts for specific, long-lived devices could be warranted, however, no information to base such a derogation on has been submitted in the consultation on the Annex XV report. No information on the volume of DP used in the electrical and electronic equipment sector has been provided in the consultations of the EU REACH restriction proposal (ECHA, 2022a,b,c).

60. The recycling industry has indicated that they do not require any derogations for manufacturers and downstream users of DP, as this pushes problems into the future and harms the prospects of recyclers. Legacy issues from chemicals already on the market is a problem for the industry due to a lack of knowledge on chemicals in products and wastes, and a lack of economic means for identifying and separating out waste containing hazardous chemicals before recycling the material (Eftec, 2021).

61. To conclude, technical and feasible alternatives appear to be available for all uses of DP, with some uncertainty for the use in PDAP-resin and the minor use as an extreme pressure additive in greases. The need for time limited exemptions for production and use of DP for in some applications and sectors, i.e., aerospace and defence sector and medical imaging devices and radiotherapy devices/installations has been claimed due to long phase-in time. Time-limited use in legacy spare parts may be justified to avoid that a large number of long-lived products are phased out and become waste before their expected service life. However, more information is needed for POPRC to narrow down, specify and evaluate any potential exemption in a listing.

### **2.3.3 Cost and benefits of implementing control measures**

62. The impacts in terms of costs and benefits resulting from a listing of DP under the Convention would depend on the Annex in which it is listed as well as the specific exemptions included and the entry into force of any restriction or ban.

63. As discussed in Eftec (2021), quantification of benefits of a global ban or restriction on DP is challenging. For POPs like DP, the potential benefits would be linked to the environmental stock and a reduction of emissions as well as a reduction in DP contained in articles in use, stockpiles and waste that would reduce exposure and adverse health outcomes in humans including workers, consumers, the general public and the environment. If DP is not listed in the Convention, emissions may continue and DP concentrations in environmental compartments will likely increase over time. As DP is persistent in the environment it will take considerable time before a global ban or restriction of DP under the Stockholm Convention would lead to substantial reductions in the environmental stock. The resulting benefits associated with any reductions in environmental stock will therefore take place over a long time-period and may occur only after many years. Accordingly, a main benefit to society from a restriction of DP is the avoidance of the potential long-term impacts on the environment and human health in the future, through reductions in emissions and exposure. The emission reduction potential as a proxy for benefits, the possible control measures and their efficiency and efficacy discussed in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 suggests that the greatest benefits in terms of emission reductions would be achieved if DP was listed Annex A without exemptions, but fairly similar to listing DP in Annex A to the Convention with certain time-limited exemptions for aerospace and defence applications and spare parts for these applications as well as for and motor vehicles (Eftec, 2021, see Table 18 and Figure 1 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). A main benefit of allowing use in spare parts for complex products with a long-life time, and where substitution is challenging due to stringent safety requirement and testing, is that it can avoid premature replacements of those products. Premature replacements will induce costs to society both in terms of

---

additional resource use to manufacture new vehicles and aircrafts, but also environmental costs like increased energy use and wastes (ECHA, 2022b).

64. A ban or restriction on the production and use of a chemical can also induce several types of costs but like for the assessment of benefits there is limited information on the cost of substitution or other costs associated with restricting production and use of DP, particularly at a global level (Eftec, 2021). Under the Stockholm Convention, information on costs associated with listing DP in the Convention was provided by the UK and Japan (Annex F, UK and Japan).

65. In Japan, the costs of substituting DP have not been estimated yet because the influence of substitution would be huge in the broad range of industries where DP is currently still in use in Japan (Annex F Japan). The UK in their Annex F submission, on the other hand, indicate that there may be significant costs associated with substituting DP from reformulation and redevelopment of technologies. As well as costs of redevelopment there will be costs from disposal of materials and articles contaminated with DP. They also note that the impact of a restriction is likely to fall on the electrical, construction and automotive sectors in which there is the primary use of DP. As use in cables has been identified as a significant use of DP, impacts will be felt in this area of industry in particular. Costs related to cables waste being redirected from recycling may be significant. As there is no production of DP in the UK, the economic impacts of a restriction are however thought to be low. Additionally, figures on costs of waste disposal in the UK also indicate that the listing of DP as could significantly increase disposal costs for users of DP containing articles and materials and for local authorities if DP containing materials will have to be irreversibly destroyed. The UK further notes that there will also be environmental costs, as much of the contaminated waste is likely to be plastics, and that incineration of plastics which were previously recycled can result in higher greater emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and that it may have a negative impact on the circular economy and increase demand for virgin plastics.

66. Canada who is in process of proposing regulations for DP nationally, has indicated that a cost benefit analysis will be available following the publication of the Regulatory Impact Analysis Statement (RIAS), which will be published concurrent to proposed changes to the *Prohibition of Certain Toxic Substances Regulations, 2012*. The proposed changes to the *Prohibition of Certain Toxic Substances Regulations, 2012* and RIAS are targeted to be published in 2022 (Annex F Canada).

67. Adding to the above information, a quantitative analysis of costs was performed as part of socio-economic analysis that was developed to support the EU restriction proposal (ECHA, 2022b,d). Due to a lack of data, it was only possible to quantify a few cost components, and the analysis includes partly quantified substitution costs and costs/lost profits associated with temporary or permanent reductions in production as well as relocation. These quantified costs may not be directly applicable at the global level as the assessment does not consider the impacts of a ban on production, but nonetheless provides relevant insights into costs associated with a ban or restriction on the use of DP.

68. In brief, the EU assessment found that the two most stringent restriction options, which would correspond to listing DP in Annex A without exemptions or of listing DP in Annex A with an exemption on production on use for aerospace and defence applications as well as for spare parts for this sector and for motor vehicles, had the highest environmental and human health benefits (ECHA, 2022b,d). These were also the more costly options, and the costs in terms of profits potentially lost (i.e., at risk) for these regulatory options were substantially higher than for a less stringent restriction option which would correspond to listing DP in Annex A with an exemption on production on use for aerospace and defence applications as well for motor vehicles and for spare parts for these sectors. Under all scenarios considered, the automotive sector was found to be the largest contributor to costs in terms of lost profits. The profits potentially lost (i.e., at risk) for this sector are not linked to the tonnage of DP used but rather the value of manufactured products at risk, which is assumed to be the same regardless of the input chemical. The difference in costs between the different restriction options under consideration in the EU is therefore explained by the extended transition period for the use of DP in the manufacture of motor vehicles granted under the least stringent restriction option. Overall, a ban on production and use was deemed the most effective restriction option as it is the only restriction option that will effectively mitigate all sources of emissions of DP, but uncertainties in the analysis prevent a robust conclusion on proportionality of each restriction scenario. The uncertainties are primarily driven by the lack of information on the technical function(s) fulfilled by DP in particular for uses where where exemption may be needed, i.e., why DP is needed, potential alternatives and their feasibility as well as the cost of and time required for transitioning to alternatives.

69. As indicated above, information from stakeholders was actively sought in the consultations on the EU REACH restriction proposal, but the information received was very limited (ECHA, 2022a,b,c). No information was provided on possible R&D activities, investments costs and other substitution costs. This limits the options of how to estimate the cost of transitioning to alternatives, and it was only possible to quantify changes in the cost substituting DP as a FR. Interestingly, the cost of identified chemical FR alternatives was found to be overall cheaper than DP (both price and loading accounted for), and the differences in the cost of chemicals were found to be fairly small between the four restriction scenarios under consideration. Due to a lack of information on loading, it was not possible

to quantify the change in the cost of chemicals when used as an extreme pressure additive in greases/lubricants. However, by comparing the prices, it was concluded that the loading of the substances must be considerably higher than that of DP for the cost of chemicals to be significant. Furthermore, the share of the total tonnage of DP used as an extreme pressure additive is ~2%, which means that omission of these costs or cost savings is not likely to have a major impact on the estimated total costs of the restriction options.

70. Transitioning to alternatives is usually associated with R&D and investment costs (e.g., changes in the production process) unless the alternative is a known drop-in alternative. For DP, and for the reasons discussed in the above paragraph and in more detail in Section 2.4 below, there is some uncertainty as to whether the identified alternatives would be suitable for all applications within the identified uses set out. According to ECHA (2022b), it is therefore reasonable to assume that R&D and investment costs will be incurred. Additional operational costs such as increased energy or water use may also contribute to the overall costs, however, no information has been found related to R&D investments or other operational costs. Due to a lack of information, it was not possible to quantify these other costs.

## 2.4 Information on alternatives (products and processes)

71. When substituting DP, the alternatives range from a basic chemical substitution of DP with another chemical which can be used for the same application to the complete elimination of the use due to a redesign of a production process, the material used, the end product or even the way the ultimate service is provided (“system change”). When substituting DP, all these options should be considered, aiming to find the best way to substitute DP in a sustainable manner (ECHA, 2022e). FRs are generally used to meet performance-based flammability requirements. These requirements do not specify that chemical FRs need to be used; rather they may require a product or component to pass a laboratory test such as a cigarette smoulder or open flame ignition test (ASTM 2020). Using chemical FRs in their products is one means through which companies can achieve flammability requirements for their products. As indicated above, design-based solutions that rely on alternate technologies as well as non-chemical-based alternatives may also be used to replace FRs in various applications (Canada 2019b). Such solutions may involve e.g., use of inherently flame retarded materials such as wool, stone or aluminium as barriers or adaptation of traditional fire design methodologies. Adding to this, changes in Fire safety regulations and standards to allow for design-based approaches that avoids the use of FRs are necessary. For example, one manufacturer reduced flame retardants in TV cases by removing the power supply from inside the TV. An external power source was used (like in a laptop power cord), thus eliminating the need for flame retardants in the plastic case around the TV (Blum et al., 2019).

72. More specifically, substitution of DP can occur at three different levels: 1) by substituting the FR additive; 2) the basematerial; or 3) the endproduct itself. Thus, alternatives can either replace (i) the FR additive (without changing the base polymer), (ii) the base polymer with flame retardants and other additives (with another material, plastic or non-plastic, and other additives), or (iii) the product can be replaced by a different product, or the function can be fulfilled using a totally different solution (Danish EPA, 1999, Defra, 2010).

73. The alternative to DP would need to be technically and economically feasible, but also have a favourable hazard profile to avoid regrettable substitution. Given the wide range of materials that require FR and grease/lubricant properties, a universal alternative will likely not be available, and any alternative will need to be considered for each use individually.

74. Relevant information about alternatives in the open peer-reviewed literature is limited. Thus, most of the information set out in this section comes from the EU process to restrict DP (ECHA, 2022a,b).

75. This section identifies and analyses potential alternatives to DP in terms of hazards, technical feasibility, economic feasibility, and availability. Both chemical and alternative techniques/ non-chemical alternatives are discussed.

### 2.4.1 Alternative substances

76. ECHA (2022b) identified a shortlist of 20 chemical alternatives for DP in its function as both a FR and as an extreme pressure additive in grease/lubricant (Table 19 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). All 20 alternatives were then assessed more in detail in terms of their hazard, technical feasibility, economic feasibility, and availability. Due to the limited available information in the literature and lack of information provided by stakeholders, technical feasibility could only be assessed in terms of proven or confirmed uses of DP. It may therefore be that some of the uses of DP are not covered in this analysis of alternatives. The shortlist of 20 chemical alternative substances was identified as follows:

*Step 1:* As DP has been marketed as an alternative/replacement for decaBDE, a list of almost 200 alternatives substances to decaBDE developed by RPA (2014) was used as a starting point to identify possible alternatives to DP. DecaBDE has similar physico-chemical properties to DP and has been used as an additive FR in many of the same applications as DP.

**Step 2:** From the longer list of alternatives, a shortlist of 20 substances was prepared based on known uses of DP and additional information on the alternatives. Chlorendic anhydride, was added to the short list based on information from the Velsicol’s website (Velsicol, 2020). Velsicol was the sole importer of DP in the EU according to information from stakeholders in 2020.

**Step 3:** The suitability of these alternatives was assessed based on a review of existing literature.

**Step 4:** To avoid regrettable substitutions, hazard criteria were used to screen out substances that are persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic (PBT) or carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic for reproduction (CMR) in the selection of alternatives to DP as far as feasible.

77. Based on this assessment of alternatives, the EU restriction proposal indicates that there are three potentially suitable chemical alternatives for DP when used as a FR, but chlorendic anhydride was found to be not suitable (see Tabel 3 below and Table 20 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). The remaining three substances found to be potentially viable alternatives are ammonium polyphosphate, aluminium hydroxide and decabromodiphenyl ethane (DBDPE) or (ethane-1,2-bis (pentabromophenyl) (EBP)). Two chemical alternatives were also found to be potentially suitable for DP when used as extreme pressure additive. These were long chain chlorinated paraffins (LCCPs) and tricresyl phosphate (TCP) (ECHA 2022b). ECHA (2022b) notes however that DBDPE/EBP, LCCPs and TCP might be regrettable substitutes and that DBDPE/EBP is a suspected PBT/vPvB and has a high aggregated tonnage and wide dispersive use. Similar concern regarding DBDPE/EBP was reached by Canadian and Australian authorities (Canada, 2019c; AICIS, 2021). LCCPs has been detected in top predators in the Arctic and might exhibit POPs characteristics (Yuang et al., 2021).

78. Available information on prices and loadings used for the identified chemical alternatives are given in Tables 21 and 22 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx, while the overall conclusions from the EU assessment of chemical alternatives carried out for identified and confirmed uses of DP (ECHA, 2022b) are summarized in Table 3 below (see also Table 20 in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). In the table, color-coding has been used to indicate the level of suitability per category (i) Availability, (ii) Hazards, (iii) Technical feasibility, and (iv) Economic feasibility, as well as for the overall suitability. Prior to considering the adoption of any potential alternatives, further analysis may be warranted on the potential implications to human health and the environment. Determined efforts ought to be made to avoid regrettable substitution.

Table 3: Summary of assessment of alternatives relative to DP (net changes from the current situation)

Substance	Availability	Hazards	Technical feasibility	Economic feasibility	Overall suitability
Alternatives to DP as a flame retardant					
Chlorendic anhydride	Potentially similar	Potentially similar	Potentially similar	Potentially worse	Potentially worse
Ammonium polyphosphate	Potentially similar	Clearly better	Potentially similar	Potentially better	Clearly better
Aluminium hydroxide	Potentially similar	Clearly better	Potentially similar	Clearly better	Clearly better
DBDPE/EBP	Potentially similar	Potentially similar	Potentially similar	Clearly better	Potentially better
Alternatives to DP as an extreme pressure additive					
LCCPs	Potentially similar	Potentially similar	Potentially similar	Unknown	Potentially similar
TCP	Potentially similar	Potentially similar	Potentially similar	Unknown	Potentially similar
Diallyl chlorendate	Potentially worse	Potentially similar	Potentially similar	Unknown	Potentially worse

79. According to the ECHA (2022b), aluminium hydroxide seems to be the overall cheaper alternative to DP used as a FR, which is why it is assumed that the majority (40%) of companies affected will choose this alternative when choosing an alternative FR. However, there will likely be different technical criteria for different applications, and it is unlikely that one alternative would be suitable for all uses. This is in line with information from stakeholders indicating that there are no drop-in alternatives to DP.

80. Among the chemicals identified in ECHA (2022b) as potential replacements for the use of DP in extreme pressure additives LCCP is the cheapest if considering price per tonne only. LCCP is therefore likely to be a favored drop in alternative to DP for this application, but there are uncertainties regarding its economic feasibility. As explained in ECHA (2022a,b) due to a lack of information on loading it is not possible to quantify the change in the cost of chemicals when replacing DP for LCCP in extreme pressure additive in greases/lubricants. However, by comparing the prices, ECHA (2022, b) concluded that the loading of the alternative substances must be considerably higher than that of DP for the cost of chemicals to be significant. Furthermore, ECHA (2022b) also points out that the share of the total tonnage of DP used as a lubricant is ~2%, which means that omission of these costs or cost savings is not likely to have a major impact on the estimated total costs of the restriction options.

81. Alternatives will need to be commercially available and cost effective to feasibly replace current uses of DP (Annex F, UK). FRs require specific properties or requirements for these to be feasible replacements for DP. This includes, but may not be limited to, substances that are easy to incorporate into and compatible with the host polymer, without significantly altering its mechanical properties. These may also need to be colourless or at least non-discolouring, resistant towards ageing and hydrolysis, and stable to light. Based on a recent literature review, the UK in their Annex F submission proposes that halogenated alternatives to DP in its use as a FR include DBDPE/EBP and bis(tetrabromophthalimide) (EBTBP). Besides being a regrettable substitute as indicated above, DBDPE/EBP may be used in combination with other non-halogenated FRs to improve performance. This may present a cost issue for transition. EBTBP has been identified as a possible substitute for DP primarily in applications in electric and electronic equipment, including wire and cable insulation, switches, and conductors. However, it is only registered in the EU with an annual tonnage band in the range 100 – 1000 tonnes, suggesting use and availability may be more niche.

82. According to the UK (Annex F), non-halogenated FR alternatives can already meet many of the specifications needed to replace DP but tend to have weaker efficacy than the halogenated alternatives and may need to be used in greater concentrations (JRC, 2014). The key non-halogenated alternatives identified by the UK include: 1) metal hydroxides such as aluminium trihydroxide (ATH), 2) metal phosphinates and polyphosphates, inorganic metal phosphinates, 3) masteret (a non-halogenated flame retardant based on red phosphorus developed by Italmatch Chemicals), 4) polymeric non halogenated FRs such as those produced by FRX polymers and NOFIA polymers (HM1100, HM9000, HM7000, HM5000) which can be used for carpet and textiles, foams, electronic connectors, wire, and cable, building and construction (e.g. decorative laminates, wall panels), 5) reactive flame retardants such as dihydro oxaphosphaphenanthrene (DOPO) and phosphonate oligomers. A wide range of these non-halogenated alternatives are fully commercialized.

83. Japan notes that the feasibility of alternatives is still under investigation and has not been finalized yet, because the compatibility of flame retardancy, molding characteristics, and material properties is difficult and currently presents a challenge to substitution in many industries and sectors in Japan (Annex F, Japan).

84. ACEA in their Annex F submission state that the possible alternative substitutes for DP in motor vehicles would be brominated or phosphoric FRs or inorganic FRs, and that these alternatives are under evaluation to ensure their safety functions for all automotive applications. For PDAP resin, ACEA notes that alternatives to DP for use in PDAP resin have not been identified so far but that alternatives are under consideration to satisfy requirements of the Japanese Automobile Manufacturers Association for parts (inverters, switches, etc.) using high voltage (Annex F, ACEA).

85. In many cases, a major concern identified with chemical alternatives is that they often require higher loading levels in order to obtain equivalent flame retardant properties. However, DP is already typically used at much higher concentrations than other additive halogenated FRs (US EPA, 2014; Canada 2019b).

86. In the end the choice of a chemical alternative will depend on the technical requirements and as there will likely be different technical criteria for different applications and uses, it is unlikely that one alternative would be suitable for all uses. This is also in line with information from stakeholders indicating that there are no drop-in alternatives to DP. As indicated by the UK (Annex F) several chemical alternatives identified are in use in different applications and have therefore been developed and tested for their technical feasibility. Testing may however be required to determine technical feasibility in specific applications for which DP is currently still in use (ECHA 2022c, Annex F, UK and Japan).

## 2.4.2 Alternative techniques

87. As described above, affected actors can move away from using DP by – instead of switching to a chemical alternative - changing the production process, by choosing an alternative material or redesigning the material used, the end product or even the way the ultimate service is provided.

88. Starting from the technical function of the substance rather than its chemical structure and the associated risks will generally allow a wider range of substitution solutions to be considered (ECHA, 2022b). Rather than focusing on similar chemical drop-in substitutes, which often have similar toxicity profiles, this approach – known as ‘functional substitution’ – helps to avoid regrettable substitution and can lead to process and product innovation opportunities. In the absence of detailed information on the technical function of DP, the alternative techniques for DP in its function as a FR and as an extreme pressure grease/lubricant are only broadly described in the below text (Tickner et al., 2015).

### Alternative techniques to DP in its function as a flame retardant

89. As identified in ECHA (2022b; Eftec 2021), a number of alternative techniques are available that can be used to substitute DP in its function as a FR, but their suitability was not assessed in detail due to the lack of detailed information about technical requirements for the use of DP in specific applications. Alternative techniques available include intumescent systems, nanocomposites, polymeric nanocomposites, expandable graphite, smoke suppressants, polymer blends, use of layering, inherently flame-retardant materials, technological developments and product redesign, and are described in more detail in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Non-chemical potential alternatives to DP in its function as a FR (adapted from ECHA, 2022b)

Alternative techniques	Technical and economic feasibility
Intumescent systems	Issues around the economic and technical viability have not been fully resolved and as substances utilised in intumescent systems often belong to nitrogen-containing or organophosphate FRs, they are not viewed as suitable alternative technologies for DP as a FR additive.
Nanocomposites	Polymeric nanocomposites have demonstrated great potential as FR materials, however they have not been adequately evaluated for safety. Nanoparticles in polymer nanocomposites have demonstrated a simultaneous reduction in heat release rate (HRR) and an increase in thermal stability (Carretier et al., 2020).
Expandable Graphite	Without further information on the precise technical function of DP additives in FRs it is not possible to assess if expandable graphite would be a suitable alternative technique although it is considered a promising material for flame retardancy for cellulosic materials (Mazela et al., 2020).
Smoke suppressants	In the event of fire these systems lead to the formation of glassy coatings or intumescent foams or dilution of the combustible material, which prevents further formation of pyrolysis products and hence smoke (Keml, 2005). Such systems are of relevance to transportation applications of DP.
Polymer blends	The more expensive polymers – in the presence of a synergist (such as a fluorinated polymer) – such as polycarbonate, PPO and PPS may also be used as a non-chemical alternative as the polymer blend can achieve an acceptable level of processability and will readily undergo recycling and exhibits a similar level of flame retardancy to that of the less expensive but more readily flammable polymer and a halogenated FR (JRC, 2007)
Use of inherently flame retardant materials	Some examples of new inherently flame retardant materials are mentioned in literature or in commercial websites, and these are often promoted as replacements for decaBDE (Albemarle, 2015, Great Lakes Solutions, 2013, UK HSE, 2012). It may be necessary to change product designs to adopt these alternative materials and their implementation would require higher level of R&D activities than the substitution of DP with an alternative flame retardant.
Technological Developments	It is possible to make components of materials that do not require additive FRs, e.g., naturally flame-retardant materials like some metals, glass, or ceramics, instead of plastics, which can reduce flammability (Shaw et al., 2010). Thermally stable polymers can be designed but may exhibit performance limitations and are often too expensive and difficult to process (SpecialChem, n.d.).
Product Redesign	To change the product design for polymers containing DP in the automotive industry, extensive research, and development into the performance of alternatives as a FR would be required to meet the strict safety criteria required. Currently, this level of R&D is not available and as such, product redesign would not be a suitable non-chemical solution to the use of DP in its flame-retardant function.

90. In relation to cables and wires, which have been identified as a main application for DP particularly in the automotive sector, the UK points out that cables need to be small and flexible while able to withstand high temperatures and that non-chemical alternatives may be limited and require significant redesign or use of alternative materials to provide physical or thermal barriers. The UK further suggest that redesign or use of alternative materials is likely to involve significant costs and redevelopment and may not be viable for specific applications of DP (Annex F, UK).

### Alternative techniques to DP in its function as an extreme pressure grease/lubricant

91. According to ECHA (2022b) it is not possible to analyse the putative alternative techniques to DP in its function as an extreme pressure grease/lubricant due to the lack of data available for review (Spurlock, 2005).

92. The analysis of the availability of alternative techniques that could replace DP in extreme pressure grease/lubricants would require a high level of understanding of the function fulfilled by DP in this application and would require information such as the composition of the extreme pressure grease/lubricant, the required viscosity in relation to speed, specific additives, and lubricating regimes. This type of information is considered as confidential business information by many companies and is not available in the public domain. As the different components in the grease/lubricant provide unique properties, it is not possible to select an alternative technique as a substitute based on the available information on the application of DP for this use. More information regarding the circumstances and conditions concerning a specific application will enable further analysis of the suitability of alternative techniques for this specific application.

### **2.4.3 Summary and conclusion from the assessment of alternatives**

93. According to the information provided above, and in ECHA (2022a,b) and Eftec (2021), alternatives to DP in its use as a FR and as an extreme pressure grease/lubricant exist. However, identification of specific alternatives for DP, in particular for the use as an extreme pressure additive is not possible without detailed information on its technical function in existing uses and technical knowledge from the industries within which the applications are required (in this case automotive) and also from technologists within the manufacturing companies that place substances on the market (extreme pressure (EP) lubricant manufacturers). Due to limited information available in the public domain, confidentiality issues relating to known uses and limited responses from stakeholders such information has so far not been possible to gain for DP, in particular as regards its use as an extreme pressure grease/lubricant. Thus, according to ECHA (2022b), there is some uncertainty as to whether the identified alternatives to DP in its use as a FR and as an extreme pressure grease/lubricant would be suitable for all applications within these use areas. Similarly, UK in their Annex F information states that the complexity and diversity of applications (particularly cabling) where DP is used means that no single non-halogenated 'drop-in' replacement is available, and that it may be necessary to use combinations of chemicals to achieve the correct standards. This would have implications both in terms of development to commercialise blends and costs where multiple substances are used together to replace DP. Based on information from a socioeconomic study on DP in the Canadian market, fully tested alternatives are not currently available for all applications. Thus, the potential for less effective alternatives to result in product failure and increased fire risks should be a significant concern. It is however possible that alternatives could be developed in the future with time for appropriate R&D, testing and re-certification (Annex F Canada). In Japan, the feasibility of alternatives is still under investigation and has not been finalized yet, because the compatibility of flame retardancy, molding characteristics, and material properties is challenging in many different industries/ use areas (Annex F Japan).

94. Generally, if alternatives that are equally effective and/ cheaper than DP are available, there is already an economic incentive for companies to switch to these alternatives regardless of whether a restriction is implemented or not. The fact that DP is still in use may therefore indicate that there are some further technical criteria that are not fulfilled by the identified alternatives and that cannot be found by looking at the substance properties alone. Alternatively, or in addition, there could also be other costs (e.g., R&D and investments) not reflected in the cost of chemicals (price x loading) that might outweigh cost savings from purchase of chemical compounds. A third possibility is that some stakeholders have identified feasible alternatives but have not yet completed the substitution process. Furthermore, the specific functional requirements of DP as an extreme pressure additive as described above is not precisely known, and it is therefore not completely clear whether the available substitutes are technically feasible and available for use.

95. Only the affected actors have the specific information required to fully assess the alternatives to DP, it therefore depends on them to provide the necessary data to enable the public to carry out a fair assessment. Since no specific technical criteria have not been provided by stakeholders in the Annex F or as part of the EU restriction process (ECHA, 2022b), it is assumed that the assessment of alternatives for the functions of DP as a FR and lubricant and its conclusions are valid.

96. The lack of information on alternatives and documentation by stakeholders to substantiate their need for exemptions present a challenge in the assessment of the alternatives and uses. Importantly, information has been submitted by only a limited number of stakeholders and only stakeholders reporting challenges in substituting DP, while information from peer-reviewed literature and other independent sources are largely absent. Furthermore, the type of information received, and in particular low level of technical details in the provided information, is an issue. Overall, this implies that there is both a gap and bias in the available information that makes it difficult to fully assess the availability of alternatives, but also information on uses where specific exemptions may be needed.

---

## 2.5 Summary of information on impacts on society of implementing possible control measures

97. The POP properties of DP, suggest that past and current emissions will likely remain in the environment for a very long time, resulting in long-term exposures of the human health and the environment.

### 2.5.1 Health, including public, environmental, and occupational health

98. A restriction on production and use of DP is expected to have a positive effect on human health and the environment by reducing further emissions. Since DP persists in the environment for a very long time and accumulates in humans and wildlife, effects of current emissions may be observed or only be apparent in future generations. DP has been detected in human tissue, including the cord blood and breast milk as well as in foodstuff and indoor dust (as reviewed in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2). DP has been detected frequently in baby foods, including infant formula, cereals, and puree in samples from the US and China, with very high DP concentrations found in a Chinese formula sample and in a U.S. cereal sample—in addition to the presence of DP in cord blood and breast milk, the presence of DP in infant formula and baby foods presents a further threat to children's health (Liu et al., 2014). High serum levels of DP compared to the general public have been measured in workers in both the informal and formal e-waste sector (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2). The continued use of DP presents a risk to human health for workers in the e-waste and industrial sectors but also the general public being indirectly exposed via ambient air, dust, food and drinking water.

### 2.5.2 Agriculture, including aquaculture and forestry

99. A positive impact on agriculture, aquaculture and forestry may be expected by implementing control measures that reduce emission to the environment. DP has been detected in WWTP sludge and biosolids that in some countries are used to amend agricultural soil where concentrations will build up over time due to the persistent properties of DP. This will serve as an open emission source to air and water over time (Annex F, UK). Studies indicate that DP may be taken up from the soil, by some plants such as the peanut plant, but also from ambient air (Fan et al., 2020). DP has been detected in foodstuffs both from terrestrial, and aquatic origin (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2). High levels of DP have been observed in free-range hen eggs and vegetables grown close to affected areas such as production sites and waste treatment plants in China (Huang et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2013a). Higher levels of DP have also been observed in aquatic biota close to affected sites compared to less affected sites (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add.2).

### 2.5.3 Biota (biodiversity)

100. Pollution is one of the key drivers of biodiversity loss. The Stockholm Convention along with the Basel, Rotterdam, and Minamata Conventions address some of the most significant chemicals and waste pollution that has been identified over the last several decades and are contributing to the conservation of biological diversity (BRSM, 2021a,b). DP has been detected in a wide variety of species, including endangered wildlife such as polar bears and amphibians (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.17/3.Add2). Listing DP in the Convention would thus contribute to efforts to protect biodiversity.

### 2.5.4 Economic aspects

101. Limited data on economic aspects has been provided through the Annex F responses. Listing DP in Annex A or B of the Convention would likely have some economic impacts, but the impacts would depend on how DP is listed.

102. Industry, at least in some countries may already be in progress of substituting DP given that national regulations on its production and use are in place or under consideration in Australia, Canada, China, Egypt, the EU, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Singapore (see Section 1.5 and Table 3 of UNEP/POPS/POPRC.18/INFx). Furthermore, the sole global manufacturer of DP has to end its production in China by 1 January 2026 (Envilience ASIA, 2021). A ban on DP in China from 2026 will impact down-stream users in also in other countries, and may, considering the timelines for a global regulation under the Stockholm Convention and the 5 years duration of any possible exemptions, result in a more rapid transition to alternatives that would otherwise have occurred.

103. Lastly, as also described elsewhere in this risk management evaluation, although affordable alternatives to DP are available DP is still in use in many applications, and there are indications that drop in alternatives may not be available for all uses. It is therefore possible that countries that still produce and use DP could experience some negative economic impacts of a global ban or restriction.

104. The economic impacts of a global ban or regulation of DP is hard to assess at the global level, in particular given the lack of information provided by relevant stakeholders on uses, technical requirements related to the known uses, alternatives and progress in substituting DP (Eftec, 2021). Additional economic aspects to consider also include costs to society such as e.g., costs incurred for the management and safe destruction of any remaining stockpiles of

and wastes containing DP. Eliminating or restricting the use of DP would also induce enforcement costs to national authorities. However, it is expected that enforcement can be carried out in parallel with enforcement of existing restrictions affecting similar products, e.g., decaBDE, so the additional costs of testing for the presence of one additional substance would likely be low. The enforcement costs would in all cases not be significant compared to other costs of the restriction (ECHA, 2022b).

105. In summary, although negative economic impacts could occur, there are also indications to suggest that the impact of a global restriction could be limited, in particular if certain uses are exempted.

### **2.5.5 Movement towards sustainable development**

106. As highlighted by two recent reports produced by the UN Secretariats of the Basel, Minamata, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, it is necessary to work in close collaboration and adopt a more holistic approach to improve decision-making and simultaneously address shared environmental challenges and sustainability related to biodiversity loss, climate change and hazardous chemicals (BRSM, 2021a,b).

107. Elimination of DP is consistent with the United Nations sustainable development plans that seek to reduce emissions of toxic chemicals and that link chemical safety, sustainable development and poverty reduction. Elimination of DP is also relevant to several of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) under the 2030 Agenda, in particular SDG 3 (good health and well-being), SDG 12 (responsible consumption and production) SDG 14 (life below water) and SDG 15 (life on land).

108. The Global Plan of Action of the Strategic Approach to International Chemical management (SAICM) contains specific measures to support risk reduction by promoting the use of safe and effective alternatives to chemicals, including non-chemical alternatives to organic chemicals that are highly toxic, persistent and bioaccumulative (UNEP, 2006). The Overarching Policy Strategy of SAICM includes POPs as a class of chemicals to be prioritized for halting production and use and substitution with safer substitutes. The concept of green chemistry (also known as sustainable chemistry) can boost innovation for safe and sustainable alternatives to DP. Green chemistry is the design of chemical products and processes that reduce or eliminate the use or generation of hazardous substances. It applies across the life cycle of a chemical product, including its design, manufacture, use, and ultimate disposal (UNEP, 2006).

109. POPs like DP can result in continued emissions from waste disposal activities for many years to come. In developing countries, the informal sector may play an important role in waste management, this can lead to exacerbated environmental and human health impacts due to unsafe recycling of waste containing POPs. Integration of the informal sector into formal waste management can therefore present a way forward not only to reduce the negative environmental and health impacts of POPs and other hazardous chemicals by improving environmentally sound recycling, but also to create sustainable employment (ILO, 2012). Under the Convention sustainability in waste management is addressed by inviting the appropriate bodies of the Basel Convention, in line with Article 6 to develop technical guidelines for the environmentally sound management of POP-containing waste.

110. Recycling that reduces toxic wastes and environmental pollution provides immediate benefits to both human health and the environment. However, to prevent the unintentional transfer of DP and other POPs into consumer goods and materials, like children's toys, food contact materials etc. adequate control of recycled material streams is necessary (e.g., Alghamdi et al., 2022; Arnika, 2018). Identifying DP containing articles/products and wastes can be a challenge. SAICM identified the global need for information on Chemicals in Products (CiP) throughout the whole lifecycle of the product (SAICM/ICCM.2/15) and initiated a voluntary program to share information about chemicals in products in the global value chain.

### **2.5.6 Social cost (employment, etc)**

111. Social impacts are impacts which may affect workers, consumers and the general public that are not covered under health, environmental or economic impacts, including employment, working conditions, job satisfaction and education of workers and social security. Social costs can also be defined more broadly as costs which businesses shift to society (Berger, 2017).

112. There is limited information available to assess the social costs associated with the listing of DP in the Stockholm Convention but, based on the information provided in ECHA (2022b) and Eftec (2021), a ban or restriction on production and use of DP would not be expected to have substantial social impacts, besides effects on employment. Globally, the largest impacts on employment can be expected at the primary producer (China) and subsequently at the downstream users.

113. Impacts on employment are closely linked to the potential for production halts, or any permanent reduction in production and relocation of production. It should also be noted that the total number of jobs lost will not be equally distributed over time but will be concentrated in the period before most of the market has transitioned to alternatives. Furthermore, it can be assumed that human resources will be redistributed over time, i.e., that jobs lost are only temporary (ECHA, 2008). Time-limited exemptions can increase the practicability for industry of a listing in the

---

Convention, as they increase the probability for industry actors to be able to transition to alternatives before the end of the transition period in a cost-effective manner (ECHA, 2022b).

114. In the EU, most of the impacts associated with a ban or restriction on the production and use of DP are expected to be either small or temporary, and no further (significant) macroeconomic impacts are anticipated. Information received in the consultations of the EU REACH restriction proposal further indicates that the main sectors adversely affected by a restriction on DP production and use are the automotive and aerospace and defence industries. These are both large sectors and are, as industries, likely to be resilient to small-to-moderate changes in the market. Although the industry as a whole is considered resilient, small and medium size enterprises within the supply chain might still be adversely affected, especially with a ban or a stricter regulation with more limited derogations. A risk is that smaller companies may not have the financial means for investments needed to transition to an alternative, nor withstand periods of production halts. Larger companies may therefore become more dominant in the market. It is not known whether the aviation sector has a similar structure as the automotive sector, but according to ECHA (2022b) it is likely that similar impacts may be seen in this sector.

115. Social impacts at the global level may be similar to those anticipated for the EU with the exemption that impacts to manufacturers were not considered in the EU assessment. For nations still manufacturing and using DP both positive and negative impacts are likely. There could for example be negative impacts related to loss of employment for workers at facilities producing DP. However, today, production of DP is known to occur only at one manufacturing site globally. The direct impact of a ban or restriction on DP production is therefore anticipated to be limited primarily to this one manufacturing site, manufacturer, and country. If production at the one known production site could be switched to other products, this would limit the impact and any social costs. Production of DP appears to be only one of several chemicals produced by this manufacturer at its manufacturing site in Huai'an, China, and the negative social costs on employment are likely to be limited.

116. A ban or restriction on the production and use of DP can also affect importers/vendors as well as downstream users in other industries and thus possibly also employment in these industries in several countries globally. However, most importers/vendors likely also import and sell other substances, including alternatives to DP. While production would cease or be reduced if DP is listed in Annexes A or B to the Convention, an increase in the production and use of chemical and/ or non-chemical alternatives can be anticipated, and any negative economic impacts and social costs may thereby be off-set by an increase in the sales volumes of DP-alternatives and non-DP containing products.

117. A ban or restriction on the production and use of DP would also result in social benefits in terms of avoided costs associated with the negative impacts of DP on human health and the environment. However, to fully achieve these benefits, care is needed in the selection of alternatives, noting that some of the alternatives may have their own human health and environmental impacts. As discussed in more detail in Section 2.5.6 above, the social benefits in terms of avoided costs associated on human health and the environment also largely depend on whether and what exemptions for continued production and use of DP are granted and are anticipated to be highest if DP is listed in Annex A without exemptions.

118. In summary, although some information on social costs is available (ECHA, 2022b; Eftec, 2021), there is limited information on the social costs at a global scale. Based on the available evidence the negative social impacts (e.g., employment) of listing DP in the Convention are likely limited given that DP is produced by only one manufacturer that also produces a wide range of other chemicals, and that chemical and non-chemical alternatives are available.

## **2.6 Other considerations**

119. To assist Parties in meeting their obligations under the Convention with respect to listed chemicals, the Stockholm Convention has in the past developed inventory guidances for listed POPs. The objectives of developing such guidances have been to provide step-by-step guidance to enable Parties to establish inventories of newly listed POPs, develop strategies/action plans, and thereby to collect national baseline data on the listed POPs, as well as other information that can be of use to the official contact points and national focal points for the Convention, e.g., when revising and updating their national implementation plans.

120. In the past, guidances on BAT/BEP have also been developed for some POPs. Thus, if DP is listed in the Convention, the Conference of the Parties should consider the need to develop similar guidance material for DP. Furthermore, many countries seem to be facing challenges in identifying newly listed POPs in products and articles and the effectiveness evaluation recommends that draft guidance on labelling for the newly listed POPs should be completed, and that collaboration on chemicals in products with other relevant international activities, such as the ongoing collaboration with SAICM, should be maintained as appropriate (UNEP/POPS/COP.8/22, UNEP/POPS/COP.8/22/Add.1). The Conference of the Parties would also adopt a decision whereby it invites the appropriate bodies of the Basel Convention to update or prepare technical guidelines for the environmentally sound

management of POPs waste to assist Parties in fulfilling their obligations in relation to the management of POP-containing wastes.

### **2.6.1 Access of information and public education**

121. Listing DP in Annex A without exemptions would involve control measures that are straightforward to communicate and enforce. This would be a benefit, in particular for countries that have limited chemical regulatory infrastructure and capacity. In contrast, a listing in Annex A or B with specific exemptions/acceptable purposes may not be as straightforward to communicate and enforce.

122. Access to information and public awareness are important factors for the effective implementation of the Convention. At present, access to relevant information on DP in line with Article 10 of the Convention is limited. In particular, information on uses, alternatives and progress in substitution still remain scarce as open calls for information/ evidence have failed to provide sufficient information from stakeholders in the private sector/ industry that is currently using DP (ECHA, 2022a,b). However, some information on DP is publicly available and accessible to many via the websites of the ECHA and national authorities in some countries including, e.g., the US EPA, Environment and Climate Change Canada and the official website of the UK Government.

123. The U.S. National Centre for Biotechnology Information and Environment PubChem database contains information on the physical chemical properties of DP, while PubMed provides an overview of literature on DP extracted from MEDLINE, life science journals, and online books. Information on scientific literature on DP is also available via Google Scholar. As more scientific literature in recent years is published as open access, an increasing amount peer-reviewed literature, including some on DP, is now available online without any financial, legal, or technical barriers other than gaining access to the internet, itself. The EU SCIP database contains information on DP in articles and products that could be relevant also in other countries. In addition, monitoring data on DP from some countries and regions are also available to the public via reports, websites and/or searchable databases.

### **2.6.2 Status of control and monitoring capacity**

124. As described in Section 2.3.1, analytical methods for controlling and monitoring DP in the environment and biota, as well as in articles/products and waste are available. Available information also shows that DP is included in monitoring programs and activities in some countries, and that monitoring data are also generated through research.

125. The second cycle of the Global Monitoring Plan showed regional differences in the availability of monitoring data. For legacy POPs, data are available for several regions but long-time series providing information on changes in concentrations over time is very limited in Africa and in Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC). In addition, information on changes over time in concentrations of the newly listed POPs is still limited (UNEP/POPS/COP.8/21, UNEP/POPS/COP.8/21/Add.1). The effectiveness evaluation therefore concluded that there is a need for sustained capacity building activities to strengthen national scientific and technical research capabilities in developing country Parties, and furthermore that research, monitoring, modelling, risk evaluation and data sharing should be sustained in the long term, and even enhanced in developing country Parties, including at the regional level, to advance national and regional capacities.

## **3. Synthesis of information**

126. DP is a commercially available additive chlorinated FR used in adhesives, sealants and polymers. It also as a minor use as an extreme pressure additive in greases. The main use (around 80%) is in cables and wires and in motor vehicles. Other confirmed uses include aerospace and defence applications, electrical and electronic equipment, marine, garden and forestry machinery, consumer electronics and medical and radiotherapy applications.

127. DP is detected in environmental samples, humans and wildlife at different locations around the globe. It has been found in remote regions far from sites of production and use. Emissions of DP to the environment occur at all its life cycle stages. Estimates suggest that around 54% of global DP emissions come from the manufacture of DP, while the next highest release to the environment comes from waste dismantling and recycling (35.9%) and landfills (4.3%). In the post manufacturing phase, polymer raw materials handling, compounding and conversion are estimated to be the the largest emission source, and overall accounts for 2.9 % of the total global emissions. While emissions from articles in use are estimated to account for 1.9% of the total DP emissions globally, these emissions are particularly important in relation to human exposure as evidenced by the high levels measured in indoor dust. Monitoring data shows that DP levels are generally highest near wastewater discharges and in areas around electronic waste- and recycling plants.

### **3.1 Suggested risk management measures**

128. The most efficient and effective control measure to reduce the releases of DP would be to list DP in Annex A without exemptions. Listing DP in Annex A would also mean that the provisions of Article 3 on export and import and of Article 6 on identification and sound disposal of stockpiles and waste would apply.

---

129. Based on the available information, time limited exemptions for use in legacy spare parts for motor vehicles, aerospace and defence applications, medical imaging- and radiotherapy devices/installations and industrial machines may be justified to be able to repair articles that have a long service-life. In addition, there may be challenges in substituting DP for some applications in some sectors which may require exemption for production and use due to long phase-in time, i.e., the aerospace and defence sector, medical imaging devices and radiotherapy devices/installations (Eftec, 2021; ECHA, 2022 b,c). Considering available information on emissions from these uses, time limited exemptions for applications in these sectors may be considered. Additional risk management measures could include an obligation to label new articles that contains DP.

130. The drivers behind the emission reductions and hence the benefits to human health and the environment are the date for entry into force of a ban or restriction and the specific exemptions and/ or acceptable purposes. Specific exemptions and/or acceptable purposes should be well defined and narrowly tailored to match the needs expressed by Parties or others for any uses, with the aim of limiting the negative impacts of continued production and use of DP to human health and the environment.

#### **4. Concluding statement**

131. Having decided that Dechlorane Plus with its *syn* and *anti*-isomer, is likely, as a result of long-range environmental transport, to lead to significant adverse effects on human health and/or the environment such that global action is warranted;

132. Having prepared a risk management evaluation and considered the management options, and;

133. Noting that there is limited information and therefore considerable uncertainty regarding availability of alternatives for certain uses, the need for exemptions, emissions and releases from uses where an exemption for DP has been requested;

134. Noting also that technical and feasible alternatives appear to be available for all uses of DP, with some uncertainty for the use in PDAP-resin;

135. The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee recommends, in accordance with paragraph 9 of Article 8 of the Convention, the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention to consider listing Dechlorane Plus in Annex A with specific exemptions for production and use in legacy spare parts for motor vehicles, aerospace and defence applications and for medical imaging- and radiotherapy-devices/installations due to the long-life time of these products. In addition, time-limited exemptions for production and use in aerospace and defence applications and for medical imaging- and radiotherapy-devices/installations could also be considered considering the stringent safety requirements that give long phase-in time.

## References

- AIAC, Aerospace Industries Association of Canada (2020). Letter to the Stockholm Convention secretariat on applications of Dechlorane Plus (DP) and its syn- and anti-isomers in the aerospace industry submitted as a comment to the second draft of the Dechlorane Plus risk profile. 30 March 2020.
- AICIS, 2021. Australian Industrial Chemicals Introduction Scheme, Public report. Benzene, 1,1'-(1,2-ethanediy)bis[2,3,4,5,6-pentabromo. Available at: [STD 1676 public report \(industrialchemicals.gov.au\)](https://www.industrialchemicals.gov.au/STD1676publicreport)
- ADAMA (2019). ADAMA Reports on Progress Towards Anpon Acquisition. Available at: <https://www.adama.com/en/449/adama-reports-on-progress-towards-anpon-acquisition>
- Albemarle (2013). Chemical Safety Report, 1,1'-(ethane-1,2-diyl)bis[pentabromobenzene] (EBP), EC No. 284-366-9, CAS No. 84852-53-9.
- Alghamdi M, Abou-Elwafa Abdallah M and Harrad S. (2022). The utility of X-Ray fluorescence spectrometry as a tool for monitoring compliance with limits on concentrations of halogenated flame retardants in waste polymers: A critical review. *Emerging Contaminants*. 8. 9-20. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emcon.2021.12.002>.
- Annex E (2019). Submissions of Annex E (risk profile) information on Dechlorane Plus. 2 December 2019. Available at: <http://chm.pops.int/tabid/8225/Default.aspx>.
- Annex E (2020). Comments on the draft risk profiles on Dechlorane Plus. 30 March 2020. Available at: <http://chm.pops.int/tabid/8366/Default.aspx>.
- Annex F (2022). Submissions of Annex F (Risk management) information on Dechlorane Plus 14 March 2022. Available at: <http://chm.pops.int/TheConvention/POPsReviewCommittee/Meetings/POPRC17/POPRC17Followup/AnnexFDPSubmission/tabid/9099/Default.aspx>
- Arnika (2018). Recycling Hazardous Waste into New Products. Toxic Loophole. Authors: Jitka Straková, Joseph DiGangi, Génon K. Jensen Contributing Authors: Jindřich Petrlík, Lee Bell. Available at: [Toxic Loophole: Recycling Hazardous Waste Into New Products | IPEN](https://www.ipen.org/publications/toxic-loophole-recycling-hazardous-waste-into-new-products)
- ASTM (2020). ASTM E2187-20a. Standard Test Method for Measuring the Ignition Strength of Cigarettes. Available at: <https://www.astm.org/e2187-20a.html>
- Basel Convention (2019). Technical Guidelines for the Environmentally Sound Management (ESM) of Wastes Consisting of, Containing or Contaminated with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) <http://www.basel.int/Implementation/TechnicalMatters/DevelopmentofTechnicalGuidelines/TechnicalGuidelines/tabid/8025/Default.aspx>
- Becker W, Sachsenheimer K, Klemenz M (2017). Detection of Black Plastics in the Middle Infrared Spectrum (MIR) Using Photon Up-Conversion Technique for Polymer Recycling Purposes. *Polymers*, 9, 9.
- Berger, 2017. Sebastian Berger, *The Social Costs of Neoliberalism: Essays on the Economics of K. William Kapp*, Spokesman, 2017, ISBN 0851248640 9780851248646
- Blum A, Behl M, Birnbaum LS, Diamond ML, Phillips A, Singla V, Sipes NS, Stapleton HM, Venier M (2019). Organophosphate Ester Flame Retardants: Are They a Regrettable Substitution for Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers? *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*. 6 (11), 638-649 DOI: 10.1021/acs.estlett.9b00582
- Brasseur C, Pirard C, L'Homme B, De Pauw E, Focant JF (2016). Measurement of emerging dechloranes in human serum using modulated gas chromatography coupled to electron capture negative ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry. *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*, 30, 2545-2554.
- BRSM (2021a). Secretariats of the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm Conventions (BRS), and the Minamata Convention on Mercury (MC), May 2021a. Chemicals, Wastes and Climate Change. Interlinkages and potential for coordinated action.
- BRSM (2021b). Secretariats of the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm Conventions (BRS), and the Minamata Convention on Mercury (MC), May 2021b. Interlinkages between the chemicals and waste multilateral environmental agreements and biodiversity: Key Insights. Available at: <https://www.brsmeas.org/biodiversity-report/>
- Canada (2019b). Dept. of the Environment. Dept. of Health. Certain Organic Flame Retardants Grouping Risk Management Approach For 1,4:7,10-Dimethanodibenzo[a,e]cyclooctene, 1,2,3,4,7,8,9,10,13,13,14,14-dodecachloro 1,4,4a,5,6,6a,7,10,10a,11,12,12a-dodecahydro- Dechlorane Plus (DP), Chemical Abstracts Service Registry Number 13560-89- 9. Available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate->

---

change/services/evaluating-existing-substances/certain-organic-flame-retardants-grouping-risk-management-approach-dimethanodibenzo-cyclooctene-dodecachloro-dodecahydro-dechlorane-plus-dp.html.

Canada (2019c). Screening assessment certain organic flame retardants substance grouping benzene, 1,1'-(1,2-ethanediyl)bis [2,3,4,5,6-pentabromo- decabromodiphenyl ethane (DBDPE)\_ May 2019. Available at: [Screening assessment certain organic flame retardants substance grouping benzene, 1,1'-\(1,2-ethanediyl\)bis \[2,3,4,5,6-pentabromo- decabromodiphenyl ethane \(DBDPE\) - Canada.ca](#)

Carretier V, Delcroix J, Pucci M F, Rublon P, Lopez-Cuesta J-M. (2020). Influence of Sepiolite and Lignin as Potential Synergists on Flame Retardant Systems in Polylactide (PLA) and Polyurethane Elastomer (PUE). *Materials*, 13, 2450.

Danish EPA (1999). Danish Environmental Protection Agency. Brominated Flame Retardants – Substance Flow Analysis and Assessment of Alternatives. Available at: [https://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/Publications/1999/87-7909-416-3/html/kap07\\_eng.htm](https://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/Publications/1999/87-7909-416-3/html/kap07_eng.htm)

Defra (2010). Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Annex 3: Review of Alternative Fire Retardant Technologies. Available at: [https://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/Publications/1999/87-7909-416-3/html/kap07\\_eng.htm](https://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/Publications/1999/87-7909-416-3/html/kap07_eng.htm)

ECHA (2022a). RAC & SEAC (draft) Background document to the Opinion on the Annex XV dossier proposing restrictions on 1,6,7,8,9,14,15,16,17,17,18,18- Dodecachloropentacyclo[12.2.1.16,9.02,13.05,10]octadeca-7,15-diene (Dechlorane Plus) [covering any of its individual anti- and synisomers or any combination thereof] – Revision 1 of 21/01/2022. <https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/7e20005d-b5b0-13c2-84f9-5ce47f849c09>

ECHA (2022b). RAC & SEAC (draft) Background document Annex to the Opinion on an Annex XV dossier proposing restrictions on 1,6,7,8,9,14,15,16,17,17,18,18-Dodecachloropentacyclo[12.2.1.16,9.02,13.05,10]octadeca-7,15-diene (Dechlorane Plus) [covering any of its individual anti- and synisomers or any combination thereof] - Revision 1 of 21/01/2022. <https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/cfbcfefd-c6ba-923a-72ff-b70b2786ff70>

ECHA (2022c). Response to comments submitted on the restriction report from 23/6/2021 to 03/01/2022. Submitted restrictions under consideration - ECHA (europa.eu) [https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/17233/rest\\_dechlorane\\_plus\\_rcom\\_en.docx/5f0eb4ad-2bbc-e602-c49b-3488b78e4135?t=1647418105766&download=true](https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/17233/rest_dechlorane_plus_rcom_en.docx/5f0eb4ad-2bbc-e602-c49b-3488b78e4135?t=1647418105766&download=true).

ECHA (2022d). Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC) Draft Opinion on an Annex XV dossier proposing restrictions on 1,6,7,8,9,14,15,16,17,17,18,18- Dodecachloropentacyclo[12.2.1.16,9.02,13.05,10]octadeca-7,15-diene (Dechlorane Plus) [covering any of its individual anti- and synisomers or any combination thereof]. <https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/d7ee107b-dc56-77ae-c992-a89d3ffabd5e>

ECHA (2022e). Substances of concern: Why and how to substitute. *Available at:* [https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/3079426/why\\_and\\_how\\_to\\_substitute\\_en.pdf/93e9c055-483c-743a-52cb-1d1201478bc1](https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/3079426/why_and_how_to_substitute_en.pdf/93e9c055-483c-743a-52cb-1d1201478bc1)

ECHA (2022f). Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC) Opinion on an Annex XV restriction report proposing restrictions on 1,6,7,8,9,14,15,16,17,17,18,18- Dodecachloropentacyclo[12.2.1.16,9.02,13.05,10]octadeca-7,15-diene (“Dechlorane Plus”™) [covering any of its individual anti- and syn-isomers or any combination thereof]. <https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/83e5e642-875d-4003-0027-5d50ab8ac808>

ECHA (2017b). Member State Committee support document for identification of 1,6,7,8,9,14,15,16,17,17,18,18- Dodecachloropentacyclo- [12.2.1.16,9.02,13.05,10]octadeca-7,15-diene (“Dechlorane Plus”™) [covering any of its individual anti- and syn-isomers or any combination thereof] as a substance of very high concern because it meets the criteria of Article 57 (e). Adopted on 30 November 2017. Available at: <https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/acd1ca10-4d98-5537-3d5c-54cf8f3570c4> .

ECHA (2015). European Chemicals Agency. Bis(pentabromophenyl)ether Background Document. 2015. Available at: <https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/2c27ddcc-dd0c-49e3-85ba-fa64b0813775>

ECHA (2008). Guidance on Socio-economic Analysis – Restrictions. Available at: [https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/23036412/sea\\_restrictions\\_en.pdf/2d7c8e06-b5dd-40fc-b646-3467b5082a9d](https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/23036412/sea_restrictions_en.pdf/2d7c8e06-b5dd-40fc-b646-3467b5082a9d)

Eftec (2021). Economics for the Environment Consultancy Ltd (eftec). Socio-economic considerations of regulating Dechlorane Plus under the Stockholm Convention. Draft report for the Norwegian Environment Agency, April 2021. Available at: <https://www.miljodirektoratet.no/publikasjoner/2021/juni-2021/socio-economic-considerations-of-regulating-dechlorane-plus-under-the-stockholm-convention/>

- ENB (2022). Earth Negotiation Bulletin. Summary of the Seventeenth Meeting of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee: 24-28 January 2022, Volum 15, No277. Available at: <https://enb.iisd.org/stockholm-convention-pops-review-committee-17>
- Envilience ASIA (2021). China releases draft plan for new chemical pollutants management. Available at: [https://envilience.com/regions/east-asia/cn/report\\_4504](https://envilience.com/regions/east-asia/cn/report_4504)
- EU (2019). Commission Regulation (EU) 2019/2021 of 1 October 2019 laying down ecodesign requirements for electronic displays pursuant to Directive 2009/125/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, amending Commission Regulation (EC) No 1275/2008 and repealing Commission Regulation (EC) No 642/2009. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32019R2021>
- Fan Y, Chen S-J, Li Q-Q, Zheng Y, Yan X, Mai B-X (2020). Uptake of halogenated organic compounds (HOCs) into peanut and corn during the whole life cycle grown in an agricultural field. *Environ Pollut.* 263, 114400.
- govinfo (2017). Consumer Products Safety Commission, Guidance Document on Hazardous Additive, Non-Polymeric Organohalogen Flame Retardants in Certain Consumer Products. Federal Register; CPSC Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022. Available at <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2017-09-28/pdf/2017-20733.pdf>
- Great Lakes Solutions (2013). Recent developments in flame retardants for sustainable fire safety solutions. May 2013. [Online presentation] <http://greatlakes.com/deployedfiles/ChemturaV8/GreatLakes/Flame%20Retardants/FR%20Brochures/GLS%20-%202013%20Chinaplas.pdf>.
- Hoh E, Zhu LY, and Hites RA (2006). Dechlorane plus, a chlorinated flame retardant, in the Great Lakes. *Environ Sci Technol* 40 (4), 1184–1199.
- Hou M, Wang Y, Zhao H, Zhang Q, Xie Q, Zhang X, Chen R, Chen J (2018). Halogenated flame retardants in building and decoration materials in China: Implications for human exposure via inhalation and dust ingestion. *Chemosphere.* 203:291-299.
- Huang C-C, Zeng Y-H, Luo X-J, Tang B, Liu Y-E, Rena Z-H, Mai B-X (2018). Level changes and human dietary exposure assessment of halogenated flame retardant levels in free-range chicken eggs: A case study of a former e-waste recycling site, South China / *Science of the Total Environment* 634, 509–515.
- ILO (2012). International Labour Office. The global impact of e-waste: Addressing the challenge. Author Karin Lundgren. Program on Safety and Health at Work and the Environment (SafeWork), Sectorial activities Department (SECTOR), Geneva, pp 1-71.
- JRC (2014). European Commission Joint Research Centre. ‘Development of European Ecolabel for televisions’, technical proposals working document. Main report: [Link](#) and Screening exercise: [Link](#)
- JRC (2007). European Commission Joint Research Centre. Review on production processes of decabromodiphenyl ether (decaBDE) used in polymeric applications in electrical and electronic equipment, and assessment of the availability of potential alternatives to DecaBDE <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC36323/EUR%2022693.pdf>
- KEMI (2020). Swedish Chemicals Agency. Commodity Guide [database on Internet]. CAS no 13560-89-9 Dechlorane Plus. Available from: <https://webapps.kemi.se/varuguiden/AmneMaterial.aspx>
- Kemi (2005). Survey and technical assessment of alternatives to Decabromodiphenyl ether (decaBDE) in plastics, Stockholm: Swedish Chemicals Inspectorate (KEMI). <https://www.kemi.se/global/rapporter/2005/rapport-1-05.pdf>
- Liu LY, Salamova A, Hites RA (2014). Halogenated flame retardants in baby food from the United States and from China and the estimated dietary intakes by infants. *Environ Sci Technol.* 48(16):9812-8. doi: 10.1021/es502743q. Epub 2014 Aug 1. PMID: 25084546.
- Mazela B, Batista A, Grzeskowiak W (2020). Expandable Graphite as a Fire Retardant for Cellulosic Materials - A Review. *Forests*,11, 755. doi:10.3390/f11070755.
- OxyChem® Dechlorane Plus® (2013). Available at: <https://www.oxy.com/OurBusinesses/Chemicals/ResponsibleCare/Documents/Dechlorane%20Plus.pdf>.
- OxyChem® Dechlorane Plus® Manual. (2007). Ver. 07-27-2007. Available from: [https://www.oxy.com/OurBusinesses/Chemicals/Products/Documents/dechloraneplus/dechlorane\\_plus.pdf](https://www.oxy.com/OurBusinesses/Chemicals/Products/Documents/dechloraneplus/dechlorane_plus.pdf).
- OxyChem test-plan for Dechlorane plus (2004b). Available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.578.5473&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- Qiu XH, Marvin CH and Hites RA (2007). Dechlorane plus and other flame retardants in a sediment core from Lake Ontario. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 41 (17), 6014–6019.

---

Rambøll and Fraunhofer (2021). Environmental Pollutants in Post-Consumer Plastics. For the Norwegian Environment Agency. Case Number M-2059/2021. Final report 2nd June, 2021. Available at: [Environmental Pollutants in Post-Consumer Plastics - Miljødirektoratet \(miljodirektoratet.no\)](https://www.miljodirektoratet.no)

Ren GF, Yu ZQ, Ma ST, Li HR, Peng PG, Sheng GY, Fu JM (2009). Determination of Dechlorane Plus in serum from electronics dismantling workers in South China. *Environ Sci Technol* 43 (24), 9453–9457.

RPA (2014). Risk and Policy Analysts (2014) Multiple Framework Contract with Re-opening of competition for Scientific Services for ECHA, Reference: ECHA/2011/01 - Support to an Annex XV Dossier on Bis-(pentabromophenyl) ether (DecaBDE), Final Report Prepared for ECHA. [https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13641/annex\\_xvi\\_consultant\\_report\\_decabde\\_en.pdf/337cc41c-0964-41a3-8d97-40b785f22fad](https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13641/annex_xvi_consultant_report_decabde_en.pdf/337cc41c-0964-41a3-8d97-40b785f22fad)

Shaw SD, Blum A, Weber R, Kannan K, Rich D, Lucas D, Koshland CP, Dobraca D, Hanson S, Birnbaum LS (2010). Halogenated flame retardants: do the fire safety benefits justify the risks?. *Reviews on environmental health*, 25(4), p.261. Available at: [https://www.shawinstitute.org/sites/default/files/uploaded/PDF/Shaw\\_et\\_al\\_2010\\_Halogenated\\_Flame\\_retardants.pdf](https://www.shawinstitute.org/sites/default/files/uploaded/PDF/Shaw_et_al_2010_Halogenated_Flame_retardants.pdf)

SIAM, (2020). Society of Indian Automobile Manufacturers. Letter to the Stockholm Convention secretariat on applications of Dechlorane Plus (DP) and its syn- and anti-isomers in the aerospace industry submitted as a comment to the second draft of the Dechlorane Plus risk profile. 30 March 2020

SICEM/ICCM2/15: SAICM, Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (2009). Background information in relation to the emerging policy issue of electronic waste, paper presented at the International Conference on Chemicals Management, Geneva, 11–15 May (SAICM/ICCM.2/INF36).

Spurlock, M. 2005. A Hands on Approach to Limit Selection and Uses. *Practising Oil Analysis Magazine*. Sept-Oct 2005. Available online at: <https://www.machinerylubrication.com/Read/804/oil-analysis-data> . [Accessed].

SpecialChem, Date unknown. Webpage ‘Flame Retardants for Fire Proof Plastics’ <https://polymer-additives.specialchem.com/selection-guide/flame-retardants-for-fire-proof-plastics#content>

Sverko E, Tomy GT, Reiner EJ, Li YF, McCarry BE, Arnot JA, Law RJ and Hites RA (2011). Dechlorane Plus and related compounds in the environment: a review. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 45 (12), 5088–5098.

Tickner J, Schifano JN, Blake A, Rudisill C, Mulvihill MJ (2015) Advancing Safer Alternatives Through Functional Substitution, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 49, 742–749. Available at <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es503328m>

TOMRA, (2019). Removal of flame-retardant plastics from WEEE waste streams. Available at: [https://www.recovery-worldwide.com/en/artikel/removal-of-flame-retardant-plastics-from-weee-waste-streams\\_3356563.htm](https://www.recovery-worldwide.com/en/artikel/removal-of-flame-retardant-plastics-from-weee-waste-streams_3356563.htm)

UNEP (2006) Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management: SAICM texts and resolutions of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, “We are determined to realize the benefits of chemistry, including green chemistry, for improved standards of living, public health and protection of the environment.” [http://www.saicm.org/images/saicm\\_documents/saicm%20texts/SAICM\\_publication\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.saicm.org/images/saicm_documents/saicm%20texts/SAICM_publication_ENG.pdf)

UK HSE (2012). Proposal for identification of a PBT/vPvB substance bis(pentabromophenyl) ether (decabromodiphenyl ether); decaBDE). Available at: [SVHC-UK-2012-027\\_AXVREP\\_published \(europa.eu\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/102122/SVHC-UK-2012-027_AXVREP_published_europa.eu)

US EPA (2002). Non-confidential Production Volume Information Submitted by Companies for Chemicals Under the 1986-2002 Inventory Update Rule (IUR). Dechlorane Plus (13560-89-9). Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/oppt/iur/tools/data/2002-vol.html>

US EPA (2014). US Environmental Protection Agency. 2014. An alternative assessment for the flame retardant decabromodiphenyl ether (DecaBDE) (final report). Available at: [https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2014-05/documents/decabde\\_final.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2014-05/documents/decabde_final.pdf)

VELSICOL (2020). High performance flame retardant for polyester and related systems [Online]. [https://www.velsicol.com/products/chlorendicanhydride?gclid=Cj0KCCQjwvIT5BRCqARIsAAwwD-T684B3Zaw8Jp2KtksT4mY68GsK18QtI676C5Mm2ni-7nAp2EUsXlcaAmdUEALw\\_wcB](https://www.velsicol.com/products/chlorendicanhydride?gclid=Cj0KCCQjwvIT5BRCqARIsAAwwD-T684B3Zaw8Jp2KtksT4mY68GsK18QtI676C5Mm2ni-7nAp2EUsXlcaAmdUEALw_wcB). [Accessed].

Wang DG, Alae M, Byer JD, Brimble S, Pacepavicus G (2013a). Human health risk assessment of occupational and residential exposures to dechlorane plus in the manufacturing facility area in China and comparison with e-waste recycling site. *Sci. Total Environ.* V: 445-446, p. 329-336.

Wang DG, Yang M, Qi H, Sverko E, Ma WL, Li YF, Alae M, Reiner EJ and Shen L (2010a). An Asia-specific source of Dechlorane Plus: concentration, isomer profiles, and other related compounds. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 44 (17): 6608–6613

Yuan B, McLachlan MS, Roos AM, Simon M, Strid A, de Wit CA (2021). Long-Chain Chlorinated Paraffins Have Reached the Arctic. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* 8 (9), 753-759. DOI: 10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00470

Zacs D, Perkons I, Bartkevics V (2019). Evaluation of analytical performance of gas chromatography coupled with atmospheric pressure chemical ionization Fourier transform ion cyclotron resonance mass spectrometry (GC-APCI-FT-ICR-MS) in the target and non-targeted analysis of brominated and chlorinated flame retardants in food. *Chemosphere*, 225, 368-377.

---