EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Brussels, 8.5.2024
C(2024) 2882 final

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION

of 8.5.2024

granting an authorisation under Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council to Gerhardi Kunststofftechnik GmbH and others for a use of chromium trioxide

(Only the German text is authentic)

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION

of 8.5.2024

granting an authorisation under Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council to Gerhardi Kunststofftechnik GmbH and others for a use of chromium trioxide

(Only the German text is authentic)

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC[1], and in particular Article 64(8) thereof,

Whereas:

(1) Chromium trioxide is listed in Annex XIV to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 and uses of that substance are subject to the authorisation requirement in Article 56(1), point (a), of that Regulation.

(2) On 22 February 2016, Gerhardi Kunststofftechnik GmbH, C. Hübner GmbH, SAXONIA Galvanik GmbH, Karl Simon GmbH & Co. KG, Fischer GmbH & Co. surface technologies KG, WAFA Germany GmbH, Boryszew Oberflächentechnik Deutschland GmbH, Bolta Werke GmbH, Heinze Gruppe GmbH, C+C Krug GmbH, BIA Kunststoff- und Galvanotechnik GmbH & Co KG and Aludec Galvanic s.a. (‘the applicants’) submitted an application in accordance with Article 62 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 for authorisation for a use of chromium trioxide. The use for which authorisation was sought is in the plating on plastics for automotive applications.

(3) The European Chemicals Agency sent the opinions[2] on the application adopted by its Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC) and its Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC) to the Commission pursuant to Article 64(5), third subparagraph, of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006. On 27 March 2017, the Commission received the opinions.

(4) On 13 October 2017, the Agency received a notification that the application had been transferred from one of the original applicants, Fischer GmbH & Co., surface technologies KG to Fischer Surface Technologies GmbH. In its assessment, the Agency concluded that the notified change had no implications for the RAC and SEAC opinions. The Commission accepts that conclusion.

[1] OJ L 396, 30.12.2006, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2006/1907/oj.

[2] https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/85a1bf1a-0df4-d224-8192-3d0335cdf391.

(5) On 22 October 2018, Fischer Surface Technologies GmbH informed the Agency of an error in the original application and requested that its name be replaced by the names of the companies Galvanoplast Fischer Bohemia, s.r.o., and Fischer Oberflächentechnologie GmbH. In its assessment, the Agency concluded that the rectification had no implications for the RAC and SEAC opinions. The Commission accepts that conclusion.

(6) On 11 April 2019, the Agency received a notification that the application had been transferred from one of the original applicants, Karl Simon GmbH & Co. KG, to Simon Systems GmbH & Co. KG. In its assessment, the Agency concluded that the notified change had no implications for the RAC and SEAC opinions. The Commission accepts that conclusion.

(7) On 11 May 2019, Heinze Gruppe GmbH informed the Agency of an error in the original application and requested that its name be replaced by the names of two entities, Hero Galvanotechnik GmbH and Sächsische Metall- und Kunststoffveredelung GmbH. In its assessment, the Agency concluded that the notified change had no implications for the RAC and SEAC opinions. The Commission accepts that conclusion.

(8) On 11 May 2019, the Agency received a notification that Winning Plastics – SMK GmbH had succeeded in the rights and obligations of Sächsische Metall- und Kunststoffveredelung GmbH. In its assessment, the Agency concluded that the notified change had no implications for the RAC and SEAC opinions. The Commission accepts that conclusion.

(9) The judgment of the General Court of 7 March 2019 in Case T-837/16[3], *Sweden v. Commission*, provided an interpretation of the condition set out in Article 60(4) and (5) and Article 62(4), point (f), of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 as regards the suitability of alternatives and the requirement of a substitution plan. On 6 May 2020, the Commission therefore sent a request to the applicants to complement the information provided in the application for the use for which authorisation is sought accordingly, including by submitting an explanation as to the availability of suitable alternatives in general for the utilisations or groups of utilisations covered by the use and a substitution plan for those utilisations or groups of utilisations for which suitable alternatives are available in general.

(10) On 8 December 2020, the applicants submitted to the Agency a substitution plan. On 28 July 2021, the Commission received from the Agency an addendum to the opinion adopted by SEAC[4].

(11) On 7 December 2023, the Agency received a notification that the application had been transferred from one of the original applicants, Bolta Werke GmbH, to Winning Plastics Diepersdorf GmbH, following a merger. In its assessment, the Agency concluded that the notified change had no implications for the RAC and SEAC opinions. The Commission accepts that conclusion.

(12) In its opinion, RAC concluded that it is not possible to determine a derived no-effect level for the carcinogenic properties of chromium trioxide in accordance with Section 6.4 of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 and that therefore chromium trioxide

[3] Judgment of the General Court of 7 March 2019, Sweden v. Commission, T-837/16, ECLI:EU:T:2019:144, paragraphs 75 and 76.

[4] https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/20d19044-76bc-827a-56fa-e403c3cd7388.

is a substance for which it is not possible to determine a threshold for the purposes of Article 60(3), point (a), of that Regulation. As a result, Article 60(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 does not apply to chromium trioxide and an authorisation may therefore only be granted with respect to that substance under paragraph 4 of that Article.

(13) In its opinion, RAC concluded that the risk management measures and operational conditions described in the application are appropriate and effective to limit the risk both to workers and to members of the general population, who could potentially be exposed via the environment, posed by the use of chromium trioxide described in the application. However, due to the limited representativeness of the workers' exposure measurements provided in relation to the number of sites and tasks and the variable sensitivity of methodologies used for measurements in worker contributing scenarios, RAC recommended carrying out a monitoring programme for occupational exposure to hexavalent chromium (Cr(VI)), the hazardous component of chromium trioxide.

(14) Having evaluated RAC's assessment, the Commission agrees with that conclusion and recommendation. However, the Commission notes that the estimated excess cancer risk values for workers are higher than for most other comparable applications for authorisation for the use of Cr(VI) substances. Although the Commission acknowledges that those values are conservative estimates of the most likely excess risk values, taken for the purpose of carrying out a risk-benefit analysis, it considers it appropriate to set out the measures concerning occupational exposure recommended by RAC as a condition for authorisation, and to request expanding the human biomonitoring programme to include also the sites where no biomonitoring programme is in place yet.

(15) In its opinion, SEAC concluded that the overall socio-economic benefits arising from the use of chromium trioxide described in the application outweigh the risk to human health or the environment arising from that use. The Commission, having evaluated SEAC's assessment, agrees with that conclusion.

(16) A suitable alternative should be safer, available, and technically and economically feasible. Where suitable alternatives are available in the Union, but not technically or economically feasible for the applicant or its downstream users, the applicant is required to submit a substitution plan.

(17) An alternative that provides the functionality and level of technical performance necessary for the use for which authorisation is sought should be considered to be technically feasible. Certain potential alternatives may provide the functionality but at some loss of performance or in a manner that involves technical compromises that would impair the functionality. In such cases, unless justified by particular circumstances, the Commission should not consider a potential alternative to be technically feasible for the applicant where the applicant has demonstrated that it, or its downstream users, are not able to accommodate such losses of performance or technical compromises by applying a reasonable additional effort, taking into account the circumstances of the case.

(18) In its opinion, SEAC concluded that there were no suitable alternatives available for the applicants by the sunset date. The Commission, having evaluated SEAC's assessment and all relevant information available in the application, in the associated public consultation, as well as in other similar applications for authorisation, recognises that the applicants have identified alternatives to substitute chromium trioxide that are commercially available and are likely to become technically and

economically feasible for the applicant in the future for utilisations or groups of utilisations falling within the scope of the use applied for. However, the applicants demonstrated that those alternatives, although providing the overall functionality needed for the use applied for, often have a worse performance in terms of corrosion resistance, wear/abrasion resistance, chemical resistance, adhesion and for complex geometries. In this regard, the Commission acknowledges that the applicants have demonstrated that they are not yet able to accommodate such loss of performance and would need more time to develop and implement one of the most promising alternatives to make it technically feasible for them. Therefore, the Commission agrees with SEAC's conclusion that there are no technically feasible alternatives for the applicants, but concludes that there are suitable alternatives available in the Union.

(19) In its addendum to the opinion, SEAC concluded that the substitution plans submitted by the applicants corresponding to the two utilisations covered by the use for which authorisation is sought, namely pre-treatment (etching) and main treatment (electroplating), are credible and provide additional information on research and development activities compared with the application for the use for which authorisation is sought. SEAC noted that the plans are well structured, factors affecting substitution are transparently presented, and the utilisations are well defined and of sufficiently narrow scope to allow for a meaningful evaluation of the substitution activities, which are supported by comments provided in the consultation. The Commission, having evaluated SEAC's assessment, concurs with the conclusion that the substitution plans are credible and, taking into account the availability of suitable alternatives in the Union for the use for which authorisation is sought and the related obligation to submit a substitution plan, considers that the applicants have discharged their burden of proof in demonstrating the absence of suitable alternative substances or technologies.

(20) The Commission recalls that the aim of the authorisation system is to ensure that substances of very high concern are progressively replaced by suitable alternative substances or technologies where these are available and technically and economically viable. The Commission also acknowledges that, as the substitution of chromium trioxide progresses, the applicants expect to reduce the overall quantities of that substance used throughout the review period, in accordance with the figures provided in the substitution plan. Therefore, the Commission considers it appropriate to set out as a condition for authorisation that the quantity of chromium trioxide used in the use for which authorisation is sought should be reduced in line with the figures provided in the substitution plan, in order to ensure that the substitution strategy is duly implemented and to facilitate the enforcement of that obligation.

(21) Therefore, having regard to the conditions laid down in Article 60(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006, it is appropriate to authorise the use of chromium trioxide described in the application, provided that the risk management measures and operational conditions described in the chemical safety report, as well as the conditions set out in this Decision, are fully applied.

(22) The Commission has based its assessment on all relevant scientific evidence currently available, as assessed by RAC and SEAC, and, after having carried out a detailed examination, has concluded on the basis of a sufficient amount of material and reliable information. Nevertheless, additional scientific evidence would allow the Commission to perform its assessment on a more robust or broad evidentiary basis in the future. Hence, it is appropriate to require additional occupational exposure and emission information to be submitted.

(23) In its opinion, SEAC recommended that the review period referred to in Article 60(9), point (e), of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 be set at 12 years. The Commission agrees with that recommendation, considering the relevant elements from RAC's and SEAC's assessments and, in particular, that the implemented risk management measures and operational conditions are appropriate and effective in limiting the risk, the applicants' research and development activities, the time and investment necessary to develop and implement an alternative, including the time needed for qualification by the applicants' downstream users, as reflected in the substitution plan, the conclusion that the socio-economic benefits of continued use outweigh the risk by a significant margin, as well as the complexity of the supply chain. More specifically, the Commission considers that the applicants' strategy to reduce the quantity of chromium trioxide used during the review period, as reflected in the substitution plan, is a key factor for its agreement with SEAC's recommendation on the review period.

(24) The language used to describe the risk management measures and operational conditions in the application for authorisation may be different from the official language of the Member State where the use takes place. Therefore, in order to facilitate supervision and enforcement of compliance with the authorisation, it is appropriate to require the authorisation holders to submit, upon request, a brief summary of those risk management measures and operational conditions to the competent authority of that Member State in an official language of that Member State.

(25) This Decision does not affect the obligation of the authorisation holders to ensure that a use of a substance does not adversely affect human health or the environment, having regard to the principle set out in Article 1(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006. Furthermore, this Decision does not affect the obligation of the authorisation holders under Article 60(10) of that Regulation to ensure that the exposure is reduced to as low a level as is technically and practically possible or the obligation of the employer under Article 4(1) and Article 5 of Directive 2004/37/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council[5] to reduce the use of carcinogens, mutagens or reprotoxic substances at the place of work, in particular by replacing those substances, in so far as is technically possible, and to prevent workers' exposure to a risk to their health or safety. This Decision does not affect the application of Union law in the area of health and safety at work, in particular Council Directives 89/391/EEC[6], 92/85/EEC[7], 94/33/EC[8] and 98/24/EC[9] and Directive 2004/37/EC, or

---

5 Directive 2004/37/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to carcinogens, mutagens or reprotoxic substances at work (Sixth individual Directive within the meaning of Article 16(1) of Council Directive 89/391/EEC) (OJ L 158, 30.4.2004, p. 50, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2004/37/oj).

6 Council Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work (OJ L 183, 29.6.1989, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/1989/391/oj).

7 Council Directive 92/85/EEC of 19 October 1992 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health at work of pregnant workers and workers who have recently given birth or are breastfeeding (tenth individual Directive within the meaning of Article 16(1) of Directive 89/391/EEC) (OJ L 348, 28.11.1992, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/1992/85/oj).

8 Council Directive 94/33/EC of 22 June 1994 on the protection of young people at work (OJ L 216, 20.8.1994, p. 12, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/1994/33/oj).

9 Council Directive 98/24/EC of 7 April 1998 on the protection of the health and safety of workers from the risks related to chemical agents at work (fourteenth individual Directive within the meaning of

any national binding occupational limit values which may be stricter than the applicable limit values under Union law.

(26) This Decision does not affect any obligation to comply with emission limit values or other requirements set in accordance with Directive 2008/50/EC[10] or Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council[11], nor any obligation to comply with emission limit values set to achieve compliance with the environmental quality standards established by Member States in accordance with Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council[12] or the environmental quality standards established in Directive 2008/105/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council[13]. Compliance with the provisions of this Decision does not necessarily imply compliance with any emission limit values or environmental quality standards under any other provisions of Union law, which may include further or more onerous requirements.

(27) The measures provided for in this Decision are in accordance with the opinion of the Committee established by Article 133 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

An authorisation is hereby granted in accordance with Article 60(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 to the following persons for the following use of chromium trioxide (EC No 215-607-8; CAS No 1333-82-0):

Authorisation number	Authorisation holder	Authorised use
REACH/24/10/0	Gerhardi Kunststofftechnik GmbH	Plating on plastics for automotive applications
REACH/24/10/1	C. Hübner GmbH	
REACH/24/10/2	SAXONIA Galvanik GmbH	
REACH/24/10/3	Simon Systems GmbH & Co. KG	
REACH/24/10/4	Galvanoplast Fischer Bohemia, s.r.o.	

Article 16(1) of Directive 89/391/EEC) (OJ L 131, 5.5.1998, p. 11, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/1998/24/oj).

[10] Directive 2008/50/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe (OJ L 152, 11.6.2008, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2008/50/oj).

[11] Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 on industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control) (OJ L 334, 17.12.2010, p. 17, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2010/75/oj).

[12] Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2000/60/oj).

[13] Directive 2008/105/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on environmental quality standards in the field of water policy, amending and subsequently repealing Council Directives 82/176/EEC, 83/513/EEC, 84/156/EEC, 84/491/EEC, 86/280/EEC and amending Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 348, 24.12.2008, p. 84, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2008/105/oj).

REACH/24/10/5	Fischer Oberflächentechnologie GmbH
REACH/24/10/6	WAFA Germany GmbH
REACH/24/10/7	Boryszew Oberflächentechnik Deutschland GmbH
REACH/24/10/8	Winning Plastics Diepersdorf GmbH
REACH/24/10/9	HERO Galvanotechnik GmbH
REACH/24/10/10	Winning Plastics – SMK GmbH
REACH/24/10/11	C+C Krug GmbH
REACH/24/10/12	BIA Kunststoff- und Galvanotechnik GmbH & Co KG
REACH/24/10/13	Aludec Galvanic s.a.

The authorisation is granted subject to the risk management measures and operational conditions described in the chemical safety report[14], and to the conditions set out in Article 2.

Article 2

1. The authorisation is subject to the conditions set out in paragraphs 2 to 10.

2. The authorisation holders shall reduce, by 21 September 2029 at the latest, the total annual quantity of chromium trioxide used for the authorised use compared to the total annual quantity of that substance used in 2018, by the following amounts:

   (a) 57 % for the use of chromium trioxide in etching on plastics;

   (b) 100 % for the use of chromium trioxide in plating on plastics.

   The authorisation holders shall, upon request, provide the relevant documentation, including the reduction progress to the competent authority of the Member State where the authorised use takes place.

3. The authorisation holders shall carry out a monitoring programme measuring occupational exposure to hexavalent chromium (Cr(VI)) at all sites. Those measurements shall:

   (a) take place at least annually and more frequently where a significant increase of chromium trioxide consumption takes place on a site. The frequency of the measurements shall be sufficient to capture any potential increase in exposure of workers to Cr(VI);

   (b) be based on relevant standard methodologies or protocols;

   (c) ensure a sufficiently low limit of quantification;

   (d) comprise both static and personal inhalation exposure sampling;

[14] https://ec.europa.eu/docsroom/documents/22343 .

(e) be representative of all the tasks with possible exposure to Cr(VI), including maintenance tasks, the operational conditions and risk management measures for each of these tasks, and the total number of workers that are potentially exposed;

(f) be recorded with contextual information about the tasks performed during sampling.

4. The authorisation holders shall continue the annual biomonitoring programme for workers potentially exposed to Cr(VI), for the sites where biomonitoring is already performed, and shall implement an annual biomonitoring programme in all other sites, that generates data comparable to the data from the sites where biomonitoring programmes are already in place.

5. The authorisation holders shall use the information gathered in accordance with paragraphs 3 and 4 to confirm and review, at least annually, the effectiveness of operational conditions and risk management measures in place, with a special focus on the effectiveness and maintenance of general mechanical and local exhaust ventilation and segregation of activities with and without potential exposure to Cr(VI). While doing so, the authorisation holders shall also review and, if needed, update their assessment of the combined exposure for the different groups of workers. If needed, the authorisation holders shall introduce measures to further reduce to as low a level as technically and practically possible workplace exposure to Cr(VI) in accordance with the hierarchy of control principles set out in Article 5 of Directive 2004/37/EC.

6. The authorisation holders shall, by 8 May 2025, use the information referred to in paragraphs 3 and 4 to review and validate the exposure estimates in the chemical safety report.

7. The authorisation holders shall, by 8 May 2025, and afterwards when new information becomes available, assess the appropriateness of using respiratory protection equipment with demonstrated effectiveness and the appropriateness of etching and plating bath covers and of mist suppressants for all sites, and shall act in accordance with the outcome of that assessment.

8. The authorisation holders shall finalise by 8 May 2025, and afterwards when new information becomes available, a study to assess the feasibility to upgrade the dosing system to allow the use of liquid chromium trioxide solution instead of solid chromium trioxide flakes for the concentration adjustment in electroplating baths (workers contributing scenario 7 in the chemical safety report) and to upgrade and further automate the sampling of the etching and electroplating baths, in accordance with the hierarchy of control principles, and shall act in accordance with the outcome of that study.

9. The authorisation holders shall finalise by 8 May 2025 and afterwards when new information becomes available, a study to assess the feasibility to install a system of alarm or shutdown of the etching and plating operations, in case the local exhaust ventilation is not functioning properly. The authorisation holders shall act in accordance with the outcome of that study.

10. The authorisation holders shall document and keep the information obtained in accordance with paragraphs 3 and 4, including the contextual information associated with each set of measurements, as well as the outcome and conclusions of the review and any measure taken in accordance with paragraphs 5 to 9. The authorisation

holders shall make that information available, including any pseudonymised or aggregated biomonitoring results, upon request, to the competent authority of the Member State where the authorised use takes place.

Article 3

The review period shall expire on 21 September 2029.

The authorisation shall cease to be valid on 21 September 2029 with regard to any authorisation holder who has not submitted the review report in accordance with Article 61(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 by 21 March 2028.

Article 4

1. The monitoring arrangements set out in paragraphs 2 to 5 shall apply.

2. The authorisation holders shall carry out a monitoring programme for environmental releases of Cr(VI). The monitoring programme shall:

   (a) as regards emissions to wastewater, be carried out at least quarterly;

   (b) as regards air emission, be carried out at least annually, or more frequently if a significant increase of chromium trioxide consumption takes place on site, in which case the frequency of the measurements shall be sufficient to capture any potential increase in emissions of Cr(VI);

   (c) be based on relevant standard methodologies or protocols and be representative of the operational conditions and risk management measures used at the site where the authorised use takes place;

   (d) ensure a sufficiently low limit of quantification;

   (e) be recorded so as to include contextual information associated with each of the measurements.

3. The authorisation holders shall use the information gathered via the measurements referred to in paragraph 2 and related contextual information to confirm and review, at least annually, the effectiveness of operational conditions and risk management measures in place. While doing so, the authorisation holders shall also review and, if needed, update their assessment of the exposure of the general population via the environment. If needed, the authorisation holders shall introduce measures to further reduce emissions to the environment of Cr(VI) to as low a level as technically and practically possible.

4. The authorisation holders shall document and maintain the information from the monitoring programme referred to in paragraph 2, including the contextual information associated with each set of measurements, as well as the outcome and conclusions of the review and any action taken in accordance with paragraph 3, and shall make it available, upon request, to the competent authority of the Member State where the authorised use takes place.

5. The authorisation holders shall document the steps taken to substitute chromium trioxide in accordance with the substitution plan, including information on the efforts to convince the authorisation holders' customers to accept alternative Cr(VI)-free solutions and justification in case their customers do not accept such solutions. Information on any deviations from the initial substitution plan and on contingency

measures taken shall also be included in the documentation. The authorisation holders shall make that documentation available, upon request, to the competent authority of the Member State where the authorised use takes place.

Article 5

Where an authorisation holder submits a review report, it shall include the following:

(a) the information referred to in Article 2(10) as well as in Article 4(4) and 4(5);

(b) the figures detailing the reduction of the quantity of chromium trioxide, in line with the commitments set out in the updated substitution plan.

Article 6

Upon request, the authorisation holders shall submit a brief summary of the applicable risk management measures and operational conditions described in the chemical safety report to the competent authority of the Member State where the authorised use takes place in an official language of that Member State.

Article 7

This Decision is addressed to:

(1) Gerhardi Kunststofftechnik GmbH, Schlittenbacher Str. 2, 58513, Lüdenscheid, Germany;

(2) C. Hübner GmbH, Sudetenstr. 1, 87616, Marktoberdorf, Germany;

(3) SAXONIA Galvanik GmbH, Erzstraße 5, 09633, Halsbrücke, Germany;

(4) Simon Systems GmbH & Co. KG, Sulgener Str. 19-23, 78733, Aichhalden, Germany;

(5) Galvanoplast Fischer Bohemia, s.r.o., Kubelíkova 1OO6/71 - 46006 Liberec - Liberecký kraj, Czechia ;

(6) Fischer Oberflächentechnologie GmbH, Auf der Wahnsbach 3, 56368, Katzenelnbogen, Germany;

(7) WAFA Germany GmbH, Schafweidstraße 37, 86179, Haunstetten, Augsburg, Germany;

(8) Boryszew Oberflächentechnik Deutschland GmbH, Armaturenstraße 8, 17291, Prenzlau, Brandenburg, Germany;

(9) Winning Plastics Diepersdorf GmbH, Industriestr. 22, 91227, Leinburg, Bavaria, Germany;

(10) Hero Galvanotechnik GmbH, Eupener Straße 35, 32051 Herford, Germany;

(11) Winning Plastics – SMK GmbH, Hofer Straße 96-98, 09353 Oberlungwitz, Sachsen, Germany

(12) C+C Krug GmbH, Am Eichelberg 3, 01458, Ottendorf-Okrilla, Germany;

(13) BIA Kunststoff- und Galvanotechnik GmbH & Co KG, Untengönrather Straße 73, 46514, Solingen, Germany;

(14) Aludec Galvanic s.a., Monte Louredo 15, 36158, Pontevedra, Spain.

Done at Brussels, 8.5.2024

For the Commission
Thierry BRETON
Member of the Commission