



Ministerstvo životního prostředí

# SECOND REACH REVIEW

*Karel Bláha*

*Director, Dept. of Environmental Risks  
And Ecological Damage*

*Ministry of Environment of the Czech  
Republic*



# Scope of the presentation (1)

**COM(2018) 116 final**

**Commission General Report on the  
operation of REACH and review of  
certain elements Conclusions and  
Actions**

**„Report“**

***Brussels, 5.3.2018***



# Scope of the presentation (2)

## Evaluation of the Report in the Czech Republic



# Legal background

Arc. 118, para.4

Every five years, the Commission shall publish a general report on

a) The experience acquired with the operation of this regulation.....

b) The amount and distribution of funding made available by the Commission for the development and evaluation of alternative test methods

***The first report shall be published by June 1, 2012***



## Achievement of REACH objectives (1)

- ❖ REACH is fully operational and delivering results towards achieving its objectives.
- ❖ Costs have been higher than anticipated (EUR 1.7 billion), in particular for the first registration deadline. Substantial part results from registration, additional costs result from evaluation, authorisation and restrictions.



## Achievement of REACH objectives (2)

### The issues requiring most urgent action

- ❖ non-compliance of registration dossiers;
- ❖ simplification of the authorisation process;
- ❖ ensuring a level playing field with non-EU companies through effective restrictions and enforcement;
- ❖ **clarifying the interface between REACH and other EU legislation, in particular that on occupational safety and health (OSH) and on waste.**



# Industry responsibility

- ❖ Compliance with the information requirements by registrants is considered insufficient
- ❖ The authorisation requirements could be harming the competitiveness of EU companies because articles imported to the EU are exempt from the authorisation obligations.





# Action by Member States and the Commission

- ❖ Member States have used their right to initiate actions under evaluation, authorisation and restriction, but insufficient resources reduce their activities
- ❖ When analysing the coherence between REACH and other EU legislation, some critical elements have been addressed by the Commission. The interface between REACH and other legal measures calls for systemic solutions to address the main overlaps and discrepancies



# ECHA

- ❖ ECHA has been instrumental in the implementation of REACH and has now built up a significant competence in chemicals management
- ❖ ECHA has established the world's largest database on chemicals
- ❖ Around 2020, the fee income of ECHA will be substantially reduced and the Commission will need to assess how to maintain ECHA's expertise and independence



# ACTIONS (1)

## Knowledge and management of chemicals throughout the supply chain

- 1. Encourage updating of registration dossiers*
- 2. Improve evaluation procedures*
- 3. Improving the workability and quality of extended SDSs*
- 4. Tracking substances of concern in the supply chain*



# ACTIONS (2)

## Enhanced risk management

- 5. Promote substitution of SVHCs***
- 6. Simplification for a more workable authorisation process***
- 7. Early socio-economic information for possible regulatory measures***
- 8. Improve Restriction Procedure (incl. MSs)***
- 10. Frame the application of the precautionary principle***
- 11. Interplay between authorisation and restriction***



# ACTIONS (3)

## Coherence, enforcement and SMEs

***12. Interface REACH and OSH legislation***

***13. Enhance enforcement***

***14. Support compliance by SMEs***



# ACTIONS (4)

## Fees and future of ECHA

### *15. Fees and the future of ECHA*

#### Need for further assessment

### *16. Review of registration requirements for low tonnage substances and polymers*



# Evaluation of the Report in the Czech Republic

## Process

- 1. When circulated, MSCAs were asked to prepare the opinion within a week.  
**CZ Has taken the note and indicated that the internal review will require 3 months as a minimum***
- 2. Discussion in the Council was expected  
**MoE has prepared the Informal opinion (June 30, 2018)***



# Evaluation of the Report in the Czech Republic

## Development of the Informal Opinion

- 1. Report has been distributed to all stakeholders*
- 2. Based on the comments received, MoE has prepared a draft of the Informal opinion*
- 3. The draft has been discussed By the Intersectoral Council for Chemical Safety (June 23, 2018)*
- 4. No formal steps were taken*





# Informal opinion – main elements

## General

- 1. CZ highly appreciates the fact-based approach, taken by the Commission and supports all 16 Actions proposed in the Report**
- 2. CZ invites the Commission to develop a detailed work plan to implement the Actions**



# Informal opinion – main elements

## Crucial specific points

- 1. Non-compliance of registration dossiers*
- 2. Around 2020, the fee income of ECHA will be substantially reduced*
- 3. clarifying the interface between REACH and other EU legislation, in particular that on occupational safety and health (OSH) and on waste*



*Thank you for your attention!*  
*Karel.blaha@mzp.cz*



Ministerstvo životního prostředí

Ministerstvo životního prostředí  
Vršovická 65, 100 10 Praha 10  
Česká republika

[www.mzp.cz](http://www.mzp.cz)

