MS REACH Reporting Questionnaire

General Information	
Which Member State are you reporting for?	BE
What reporting period are you reporting on?	2010
Primary contact person's name.	Safia Korati
Please provide an email address for the primary contact person.	Safia.Korati@health.fgov.be

Theme 1 - Information on the Competent Authority	
How many Competent Authorities are responsible for REACH?	There is one Competent Authority responsible for REACH.

One Competent Authority Responsible for REACH	
What is the name of the organisation where the Competent Authority is situated?	Risk Management service, DG Environment , Federal Public Service "Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment"
What is the address of the organisation?	Eurostation-Blok II 2nd Floor Victor Hortaplein 40, box 10 B - 1060 Brussels
What is the email address of the organisation?	Catheline.dantinne@health.fgov.be
What is the telephone number of the organisation?	+32(0)2 524.95.87
What is the fax number of the organisation?	+32(0)2 524.96.03

What part of REACH does this part of the Competent Authority deal with?	Evaluation Restriction CLP
Please list the other parts of REACH that this part of the Competent Authority deals with here.	Authorisation
From what part of Government does this part of the Competent Authority have authority from?	Environment Health
Are employees in the Competent Authority directly employed by Government (civil servants)?	Yes
What skills do staff in this part of the Competent Authority have?	Chemistry Toxicology Ecotoxicity
What other chemical legislation are the staff of the REACH CA involved in?	Import/Export Biocides Other
If Other, please list the different legislations here	CLP, Mercury, PIC, POPs, detergents, SAICM, Nanotechnology, CSD, OECD
Are there any other institutions that the Competent Authority works with in relation to REACH issues?	Yes
Please list the other institutions that the Competent Authority works with.	- Walloon Region: D.G.A.R.N.E.- Department of Police and Control, - Brussels-Capital's Region: Brussels Institute for the Management of the Environment (BIME), - Flemish Government : Environment, Nature and Energy Department- Environment Inspection Service, - Federal Public Service Economy, Self Employed and Energy (Helpdesk), - Federal Public Service Employment, Labour and Social Dialogue, - Customs government, - Scientific Institute of Public Health, - Veterinary and Agrochemical Research Centre.
Does the Competent Authority outsource any of its work?	Yes
Please provide details on who the Competent Authority outsources parts of its work to.	External technical experts and scientists.
How adequately resourced is the Competent Authority?	5

Space is available below to provide further comments on the resourcing of the Competent Authority.	As default we have stated 5, the definition of the expression “adequately resourced” should be suggested in order to collect useful information. Following the Belgian interpretation of the previous question, we estimated that our staff is inadequately resourced for the following reasons: - An insufficient number of employees, - Inappropriate profiles (e.g lack of expertise in socio-economic analysis and risk communication, lack of senior toxicology experts…), - Reduced operating funds. We come to this conclusion by comparing our situation to that in other countries and to the estimates made by ECHA on the expected workload for an average member state.

Theme 2 - Information on Cooperation and Communication with other Member States, the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) and the Commission	
How effective is communication between MS for REACH?	7
How could effectiveness of communication between MS be improved?	Instead of the communication by mail, a dedicated platform for the MS communication could be developed.
How effective is collaboration between MS for REACH?	6
How could effectiveness of collaboration between MS be improved?	A dedicated platform for the MS collaboration is suggested to be developed
Are there any special projects/cooperation on chemicals that the MS participates in with other MS outside of REACH?	Yes
Please provide further information.	Within the Risk Management service, we collaborate with others Members States in the fields of the nanomaterials (OECD/WPMN), the Detergents Regulation and the Biocides Regulation, as well as on an international level, e.g., OECD Joint Meeting, SAICM, CSD, IFCS. There are also some research projects (e.g. NanoGenotox) currently ongoing.

Please provide further information.	Within the Risk Management service, we collaborate with others Members States in the fields of the nanomaterials (OECD/WPMN), the Detergents Regulation and the Biocides Regulation, as well as on an international level, e.g., OECD Joint Meeting, SAICM, CSD, IFCS. There are also some research projects (e.g. NanoGenotox) currently ongoing.
How could effectiveness of communication with ECHA be improved?	The communication via email from ECHA to MS could be improved. In order to avoid the loss of emails, as happened previously, ECHA is suggested to use the same mailing list as the COM or to clearly identify the group concerned, e.g., differentiate between the MS and the CA. Another suggestion for improvement of the communication is the delivery of the information to some groups in relation to decisions or reference documents. For example, the Security Network received no input or feedback from ECHA on developments ongoing at MS and documents on the subject communicated to CARACAL.
How effective is MS collaboration with ECHA?	5
How could effectiveness of collaboration with ECHA be improved?	ECHA is suggested to use the CARACAL more as a working group, and not only as an informed group, to improve the work on issues dealing with the organization of MS' work (dissemination, registration files,…).
How effective is MS communication with the Commission (specifically Article 133 Committee)?	8
How could effectiveness of communication with the Commission be improved?	The communication with the Commission could be improved by developing CIRCA for the REACH Committee. That administrator centre's development could avoid the problems with the reception of mails, happened in the past, and could resolve some difficulties with the downloading of heavy mails. The internal communication between the different entities of the Commission could be improved as well in order to avoid problems as, e.g., happened with the harmonised Classification and Labelling of former NONS substances.
How effective is MS collaboration with the Commission (specifically Article 133 Committee)?	6

How could effectiveness of collaboration with the Commission be improved?	Discussion meetings in the form of expert working groups are indispensable before the publication of a formal COM proposal. In some areas, this kind of WG are organized to help the COM in the drafting such a proposal (e.g. in ANNEX II for the CLP part) and we would like to encourage this. We also welcome formal discussions in the CARACAL but, in view of the current duration of the CARACAL meetings and the specificity of the technical discussions, we will be in favor of the establishment of ad hoc working groups for each proposal.
Has use been made of the safeguard clause of REACH (Art. 129)?	No

Theme 3 - Operation of the National Helpdesk and Provision of Communication to the Public of Information on Risks of Substances	
Please provide the name of the organisation responsible for operating the National Helpdesk for REACH.	Directorate Basic Industry, Directorate-General Economic Potential , Federal Public Service "Economy, S.M.E.s, Self-employed and Energy"
What is the address of the Helpdesk?	FPS Economy, S.M.E.s, Self-employed and Energy Directorate-General Economic Potential Directorate Basis Industry - Chemistry HELPDESK REACH City Atrium C, Rue du Progrès 50, 1210 Brussels Belgium
What is the web page address of the Helpdesk?	Dutch: http://www.economie.fgov.be/nl/ondernemingen/specifieke_domeinen/chemie/REACH/index.jsp // French: http://www.economie.fgov.be/fr/entreprises/domaines_specifiques/Chimie/REACH/index.jsp
What is the email address of the Helpdesk?	Jean-Pierre Feyaerts (Advisor) : reachinfo@economie.fgov.be
What is the telephone number of the Helpdesk?	(+32) 0800/120.33
What is the fax number of the Helpdesk?	(+32)02/2775304
Are there any more organisations responsible for operating the National Helpdesk for REACH?	No

Please indicate the number of each type of staff that are involved in the Helpdesk.

Toxicologist	
Ecotoxicologist	
Chemist	1-5
Risk Assessor	
Economist	1-5
Social Scientist	
Exposure Assessor	
Other (please list)	
If you have specified that there are a number of other staff that are involved in the Helpdesk, please list the type of staff here.	
Is the same Helpdesk used to provide help to Industry on CLP?	No
Does the Helpdesk receive any non-governmental support?	No
How many enquiries does the Helpdesk receive per year?	101-1000
In what format can enquiries be received by the Helpdesk?	Email Phone Fax
How are the majority of enquiries received?	Email
Do you provide specific advice to SME's?	Yes
Who are the majority of enquiries from?	Small-medium enterprises
What type of enquiries does the Helpdesk receive?	Pre-registration SIEFs Registration

For each type of enquiry received, please provide the proportion in percentage of the total enquiries.

Pre-registration (%)	8
Registration (%)	42
Enforcement (%)	3
CLP (%)	13
SIEFs (%)	10
REACH-IT (%)	3
IUCLID5 (%)	3
Downstream user obligations (%)	2
Safety Data Sheets (%)	11
SVHC (%)	5

What proportion of enquiries received are deemed to be 1) straight forward, 2) complex, OR No information	
Straight forward (%).	0
Complex (%).	0
No information (%).	100

How long, on average, does it take to respond to the following types of questions?	
Straight forward questions	1 day
Complex questions	2 weeks
Are any types of enquiry outsourced?	Yes
What types of enquiry are outsourced?	CLP
Does the Helpdesk seek feedback on its performance?	Yes
Does the Helpdesk review its performance and consider ways to improve its effectiveness?	Yes

What level of cooperation is there between Helpdesks?	
What level of cooperation is there between Helpdesks under REHCORN?	5
What level of cooperation is there between Helpdesks outside REHCORN?	3
How frequently do you use RHEP?	Weekly
Has the MS carried out any specific public awarness raising activities?	Yes
What type of activities have been carried out?	Newspaper Leaflets Speaking events

How effective was each type of activity?	
Newspaper	3
Speaking events	3

Leaflets	3
Do you have a REACH webpage/website?	Yes
Do you have a single webpage for REACH or multiple pages?	Multiple webpages
How frequently is the REACH webpage visited (per month)?	No information
Please describe the scope of the number of REACH webpage visits.	No information available.

Theme 4 - Information on the Promotion of the Development, Evaluation and Use of Alternative Test Methods	
Does the MS contribute to EU and/or OECD work on the development and validation of alternative test methods by participating in relevant committees?	Yes
What has been the overall public funding on research and development of alternative testing in your MS each year?	Euros 10,001-100,000

Theme 5 - Information on Participation in REACH Committees (FORUM, MS, RAC, SEAC, CARACAL, PEG, RCN, REHCORN)	
On a scale of 1-10, how effective do you think the work of the Committees associated with REACH are?	6

How could the effectiveness of the Committees be improved?	The previous estimation is based on the average evaluation of the different committees. Following, a general comment and different notes have been drawn up for each committee. For some Committees, we would like to notify that it was not easy to propose effective ways due to the few organised meetings to date. 1. General comments: - The deadline for uploading documents to CIRCA or sending them to the members should be respected. Actually, unless the Chair of the committee shortens the period, documents shall be made available no later than ten calendar days before the meeting (Art.14, Rules of procedure for the committees, MB/4/2010 final).It is important to communicate all the relevant information in due time to enable the members of each committee to organize a coordination with their experts and to prepare a position on each relevant issue. - There is no equal Member State support among the appointed members. This results in different levels of contribution to the discussions and a possible threat for a non-evenly shared workload within the committee. 2. RAC: RAC benefits from the experience of several members who were involved in former scientific committees. Also the support of the RAC secretariat is very helpful. However: - ECHA should provide a substantial remuneration for the Member States that nominate committee members in order to ensure a full participation of all members. - Although the workload of this committee will continue to rise, it is advisable not to exceed a frequency of 5-6 meetings/year of maximum 3-4 days/meeting. Priority should be given to careful planning of meeting agendas to allow for sufficient time for substance-related discussions. 3. SEAC: SEAC was not yet actively involved in the REACH process. SEAC is in place for 2 years now and unfortunately it is still dealing with the theory. It is our feeling that there is a few practical experiences with SEA among the members. 4. CARACAL: The group deals with political issues and the interpretation of REACH where all the MS are represented, together with the COM and ECHA. It enables to have a real overview of the REACH discussion in all the other fora and to identify the gaps and needs. However: - The duration of the meetings should be adapted. In its current form, all the agenda points cannot be discussed in detail. Furthermore, the political and technical discussions are mixed. It is suggested to have some more logic grouping of the agenda points. 5. RCN: Due to the different level of experiences in risk communication among the Member States, exchanges of knowledge (encouraged by workshops and presentations) between the less and the most experienced members are enabled Furthermore, it is important to notice that although participation to the RCN is voluntary, the meetings are attended by most MS. However: - The guidance documents should be regularly updated in order to prevent confusion and interpretation discussions during the meetings. - Different working groups, each one specialized in a scientific field, e.g., toxicology, exposure, eco-toxicology…could be established in order to improve the analysis of each scientific issue. 6. MSC: - Information obtained by ECHA (and its experts) should

- Information obtained by ECHA (and its experts) should reach the members in due time in order to prepare for the meetings. - Although timing within the REACH procedures is limited, it is important to allow room for consulting experts on the issues that are being discussed. - New information often comes up within the meeting discussions. This doesn't leave time for verification or consultation within the MS. 7. SON: The Security Officer Network has been involved with initiating the thinking on the implementation of REACH-IT in a secure way for all actors. The start of the process was quite slow, due to lack of resources on the one hand, but certainly also due to general delay of the development of the application. The process of the development and ratification of Standard Security Requirements was difficult to manage from the side of the MSCAs since the discussions held in the various fora were not communicated in due time to the SON officers. Generally speaking, we believe that the SON officers should be notified of all decisions in relation to security. In particular, the decisions on security that were taken in the Committees did not seem to us in line with the overall strategy. The SON also lacks of inputs from ECHA such as ECHA's experience on internal auditing results and methodology. We wish that the subjects deliberated at the SON would be more closely coordinated to the communications and decisions made at the CARACAL forum. In relation to the lately issued Terms of Reference, the following text (under 1. Mission) does not seem to us to reflect the reality since up to now the discussion consisted in defining the obligations on the MSCAs whereas the decision relating to the security on the tools were exclusively defined at ECHA's level : "Provide advice to the ECHA Secretariat on any security issue related to the secure exchange of information relating to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 ('the REACH Regulation') and Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 ('the CLP Regulation') between the European Chemicals Agency ('ECHA'), EU and EEA-EFTA Member State authorities and the European Commission. This implies in particular advising the ECHA Secretariat on security issues related to the IT-tools used in the exchange of information process, such as REACH-IT, RIPE and the CIRCA extranet tool" 8. PEG: A general comment is that the communication between the Members States and ECHA is effective, thanks to the quality of the summaries of the discussions provided by ECHA and the possibility to reply to other member's comments. The following comments concern some specific PEG meetings in which the CA has been involved. •PEG on Consumer Exposure Estimation: The Guidance Document forming the basis for the activities of this Partner Expert Group was well developed from the beginning. The timing for the consultation round was feasible, although it was partly in the Christmas period. The meeting organized by ECHA was very welcomed by the participants (regrettably not that many) and presented a good opportunity to fine tune the Guidance Document in an efficient way. Also the effort from the PEG secretariat was highly appreciated as the redaction of all the comments was a very substantial task. However, the deadlines that had to be respected in

the last stages of the consultation were quite tight and did not allow to check the last-minute changes made in the final version. One suggestion for future PEG meetings is that all the deadlines would be attainable as it enhances the overall quality of the process. • PEG on Exposure Scenario Format: Draft guidance for this PEG was not yet well developed in an earlier stage. As a consequence, drawing up an adequate text was a difficult task and that was probably the reason why it took a very long time (more than 6 months) to draw up a properly corrected text. As there was no follow-up meeting and no clear communication from ECHA towards the invited experts on further actions, it is not clear to what extent the current text is backed up by the PEG. A general impression is that the update of this Guidance Document was of minor importance and that the effort made by the various stakeholders was correspondingly limited. • PEG on guidance on the communication of information on the risks and safe use of chemicals: Draft guidance was prepared by a consulting agency in cooperation with the secretariat of the Risk Communication Network. The first commenting round provided a lot of useful comments to improve the guidance and served as the basis for the discussions of first PEG meeting. The comments of the MSCA and the PEG members were made available a few days before the PEG meeting, but due to the RCN meeting which preceded the PEG-meeting; there was little time to review these comments. At the moment a second consultation round is in progress. • PEG on the DNEL/DMEL derivation from human data: Draft guidance was prepared by the ECHA PEG Secretariat. Although the period allowed for the first round of consultation was quite short, many comments were received and the discussions resulting from this meeting were well managed. The resulting document reflected the remarks of participants. 9. Management Board: The work within the MB associated with REACH is quite effective, e.g., well prepared and circumstantial documents are available at least 1 week before the meeting, decisions are taken, follow up of decisions taken, MB members are well kept informed of ECHA's work. 10. FORUM: The time period for the availability of the draft minutes after a FORUM Meeting could be shortened in order to facilitate the work of the public authorities, e.g. the formal brief, checking the personal findings of participants in the draft minutes. The suggested time period for sending these documents is 1 week after the FORUM Meeting. 11. Helpnet (previously RHECORN) If Member States helpdesks would have more human resources, the exchange of information between helpdesks (in particular using the HelpEx - former RHEP) could be improved. However, considering the resources available, one may consider that this committee has now reached a satisfactory level of effectiveness.

Theme 6 - Information on Substance Evaluation Activities

2010 Reporting

Please name the organisations/institutions that are involved in the evaluation process.

Please indicate the number of each type of staff that are involved in substance evaluation.

Toxicologist
Ecotoxicologist
Chemist
Risk Assessor
Socio-Economic Analyst
Exposure Assessor
Other (please list)
If you have specified that there are a number of other staff that are involved in substance evaluation, please list the type of staff here.
Please list the names of the substances covered in the dossiers that the MS has commented upon.
Please list the names of the substances covered in the dossiers where a draft decision has been made.
Please list the names of the substances covered in the dossiers that the MS has rapporteured.
Please list the names of the substances covered in the dossiers that the MS has completed.
How long, on average, does evaluation of a dossier take?
How many transitional dossiers has the MS completed?
How many substances has the MS added to the Community Rolling Action Plan?
How many of ECHA's draft decisions on dossier evaluation has the MS commented on?

Theme 7 - Annex XV Dossiers

How many of each type of dossier has the MS prepared?	
CLP	0
Restriction	0
Identification of SVHC	1-3
Is the time spent following up your MS dossiers reasonable?	5
Space is available below to provide further comments on how reasonable the time spent following up your MS dossiers was.	As default, we have stated 5. The SVHC Annex XV dossiers are due to be submitted in the first half of 2010; therefore estimating the time spent following up the dossier is not yet relevant.

How many of each type of dossier are rapporteured?	
CLP	0
Restriction	0
Identification of SVHC	0
Is the time spent following up rapporteured dossiers reasonable?	5
Space is available below to provide further comments on how reasonable the time spent following up your rapporteured dossiers was.	As default, we have stated 5. Not relevant.

How many of each type of dossier are co-rapporteured?	
CLP	1-3
Restriction	1-3
Identification of SVHC	0

Is the time spent following up co-rapporteured dossiers reasonable?	5
Space is available below to provide further comments on how reasonable the time spent following up your co-rapporteured dossiers was.	As default, we have stated 5. At this time of the year, it is too early to evaluate the time for the co-rapporteured dossiers as it has just begun.

How many dossiers prepared by other MS has the MS contributed to or commented upon?	
CLP	4-6
Restriction	0
Identification of SVHC	7-9

How many dossiers prepared by ECHA has the MS contributed to or commented upon?	
Restriction	0
Identification of SVHC	1-3

What expertise is available for preparing dossiers?	
Chemist	1-3
Toxicologist	1-3
Ecotoxicologist	1-3
Economist	0
Enforcement	0

Legal	1-3
Policy	1-3
Exposure	1-3
CLP	1-3
Other (please list)	
If you have specified that there is other expertise is available for preparing CLH dossiers, please provide details here.	
Is the MS able to access external specialists?	Yes
What types of external specialists does the MS have access to?	The external specialists are: - PBT experts, - Economists, Toxicologists, - CLP experts.
Is the MS satisfied with the levels of access to expertise?	2
Has there been any industry involvement in the preparation of MS dossiers?	No

Theme 8 - Information on Enforcement Activities

General Information

Please enter the MAIN enforcing authority for REACH within the Member State.	
Is there more than one enforcing authority for REACH within the Member State?	Yes

Please provide details on the other enforcing authorities for REACH within the Member State.	1. The Federal Public Services • Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment; Health and Environment Inspection - they have obligations concerning placing on the market (including import). • Federal Public Service Employment, Labour and Social Dialogue; Labour Inspection – they have obligations concerning manufacture and use focused on worker protection. 2. The Regional Governments • Flemish Government; Environment Inspection Section & Permitting Authorities- they have obligations concerning manufacture and use focused on environment protection. • Brussels Region Institute for Management of the Environment; Environment Inspection Section & Permitting Authority – they have obligations concerning manufacture and use focused on environment protection. • Region of Wallonia, Environment Inspection Section & Permitting Authorities – they have obligations concerning manufacture and use focused on environment protection.

Enforcement Strategy	
Has an overall strategy (or strategies) been devised and implemented for the enforcement of REACH?	No
If No, are there any plans for making an enforcement strategy (or strategies)?	Yes
Comments	In principle the recommendations of ECHA's Forum with regard to harmonized campaigns throughout the EU and EEA countries are followed. Apart from this, one or more inspection services may establish supplementary specific inspection plans and execute them.

Co-ordination, co-operation and exchange of information	
Please outline of the mechanisms put in place to ensure good cooperation, coordination and exchange of information on REACH enforcement between enforcing authorities and the Competent Authority.	Enforcement authorities, including Customs, liaise via a national forum to maximize useful effect of enforcement initiatives while minimizing efforts required from public authorities and from legal persons. A legislative procedure aiming at establishment of a formal cooperation agreement between all relevant public authorities, including the CA, is well underway and should be operational in 2011. Bilateral and multilateral contacts take place on a daily basis in order to facilitate implementation in all its aspects, including concretization of art. 125 REACH.
Describe how these mechanisms have operated in practice during the reporting period (e.g. regular meetings, joint training, joint inspections, co-ordinated projects and so on).	In September 2008, an informal platform ("national Forum") was created for the exchange of enforcement information. All relevant inspection services can participate in its proceedings. Also, other public authorities, such as the CA, are invited to participate if necessary. The scope of this forum is : - enforcement policy, - planning and follow-up of inspection campaigns, detecting enforcement problems, - liaising with the CA, - supporting the ECHA Forum member. The needed meetings within this Forum are organised. The first joint training session has been staged in December 2008 that organised and coordinated Belgium's REACH-EN-Force 1 campaign in 2009. The Chair of the national Forum is the ECHA Forum member for Belgium. He is a permanent member of the Belgian Subgroup Group for REACH Implementation (SGRI) which became operational in 2007. All relevant public authorities – including the CA - are allowed to participate in the proceedings of the SGRI.

2010 Reporting	
Describe the inspection and investigation strategy and methodology.	
Describe the level and extent of monitoring activities.	'Monitoring' in the document "Strategies for enforcement of Regulation (EC) no. 1907/2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of
Describe sanctions available to enforcing authorities.	See Annexe II: Penalties violation

Describe the referrals from ECHA.	There are no referrals.
Describe the referrals from other Member States.	There are no referrals.
Describe any other measures/relevant information.	

2007

Dutyholders	
Provide an estimate of the total number of dutyholders who are likely to have duties imposed on them by REACH.	
Provide an estimate of the above dutyholders who are likely to constitute registrants as defined by REACH.	
What was the total number of inspections and investigations carried out by enforcing authorities in which REACH was discussed and/or enforced for this	0
State the number of manufacturer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of importer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of distributors subject to inspections and investigations.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of downstream users subject to inspections and investigations.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable

Inspections	
State the number of inspections that addressed registration.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed information in the supply chain.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed downstream use.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed authorisation.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed restriction.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed other REACH duties.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	

Investigations	
State the number of investigations prompted by complaints and concerns raised.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by incidents or dangerous occurrences.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by monitoring.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by results of inspection/follow up activities.	0

State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in no areas of non-compliance.	0
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in verbal or written advice.	0
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in formal enforcement short of legal proceedings.	0
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in initiation of legal proceedings.	0
State the number of convictions following legal proceedings.	

Enforcement	
State the number of manufacturers subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of importers subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of distributors subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of downstream users subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable

2008

Dutyholders	
Provide an estimate of the total number of dutyholders who are likely to have duties imposed on them by REACH.	
Provide an estimate of the above dutyholders who are likely to constitute registrants as defined by REACH.	
What was the total number of inspections and investigations carried out by enforcing authorities in which REACH was discussed and/or enforced for this	0
State the number of manufacturer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of importer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of distributors subject to inspections and investigations.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of downstream users subject to inspections and investigations.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable

Inspections	
State the number of inspections that addressed registration.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed information in the supply chain.	0

State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed downstream use.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed authorisation.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed restriction.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed other REACH duties.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	

Investigations	
State the number of investigations prompted by complaints and concerns raised.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by incidents or dangerous occurrences.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by monitoring.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by results of inspection/follow up activities.	0
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in no areas of non-compliance.	0
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in verbal or written advice.	0
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in formal enforcement short of legal proceedings.	0
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in initiation of legal proceedings.	0

State the number of convictions following legal proceedings.	

Enforcement	
State the number of manufacturers subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of importers subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of distributors subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable
State the number of downstream users subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable

2009

Dutyholders	
Provide an estimate of the total number of dutyholders who are likely to have duties imposed on them by REACH.	
Provide an estimate of the above dutyholders who are likely to constitute registrants as defined by REACH.	
What was the total number of inspections and investigations carried out by enforcing authorities in which REACH was discussed and/or enforced for this	58
State the number of manufacturer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	26
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
State the number of importer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	40
Were these mainly:	No information
State the number of distributors subject to inspections and investigations.	5
Were these mainly:	No information
State the number of downstream users subject to inspections and investigations.	45
Were these mainly:	No information

Inspections	
State the number of inspections that addressed registration.	58
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	

State the number of inspections that addressed information in the supply chain.	58
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed downstream use.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed authorisation.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed restriction.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	
State the number of inspections that addressed other REACH duties.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	

Investigations	
State the number of investigations prompted by complaints and concerns raised.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by incidents or dangerous occurrences.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by monitoring.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by results of inspection/follow up activities.	0
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in no areas of non-compliance.	0
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in verbal or written advice.	2
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in formal enforcement short of legal proceedings.	5
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in initiation of legal proceedings.	0
State the number of convictions following legal proceedings.	

Enforcement	
State the number of manufacturers subject to formal enforcement.	1
Were these mainly:	Small
State the number of importers subject to formal enforcement.	5
Were these mainly:	Small
State the number of distributors subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable

State the number of downstream users subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Not applicable

Theme 9 - Information on the Effectiveness of REACH on the Protection of Human Health and the Environment, and the Promotion of Alternative Methods, and Innovation and Competition	
Do you think that the effects of REACH would be better evaluated at a Member State (MS) or EU level?	EU
What parameters are available at MS level that could be used to assess the effectiveness of REACH in a baseline study?	As a result of the Belgian policy ; - Environmental monitoring (air and water) is carried out at the regional level, but it is quite unrealistic to monitor all substances covered by Reach, - Human biomonitoring is carried out at the federal level and the FASFC (The Belgian Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain) contributes to the analysis contaminants found in the food chain.

Theme 10 - Other Issues/Recommendations/Ideas	
Please provide any further information on the implementation of REACH that the MS considers relevant.	1. Information Within the Theme 3, concerning the question regarding the proportion of enquiries deemed to be (1) straight forward, (2) complex, we replied "100% No information" because we received no data from the National Helpdesk. 2. Recommendations - Access to external specialists: Due to budget restrictions, the access to external specialists is quite limited. Difficulties are also encountered in identifying and contacting the Belgian expert networks (e.g. economists). It seems that ECHA is in a better position to identify the experts available in the different fields of REACH and therefore to develop such expert networks. - Data for nanomaterials: Currently, the MSs have no access to the data provided by industry on nanomaterials within the registration framework. An overview of the type of data on nanomaterials provided by industry is needed by the MSs in order to obtain information on, e.g., the possible adaptations made to the proposed tests, the eventual specific characterization of the nanomaterials, the availability of a review containing information on (eco)toxicity of the nanomaterial, etc. In order to examine the sufficiency of information on nanomaterials provided by industry through REACH, BE requested ECHA for access to the IUCLID information on a substance having nanoforms. According to ECHA however, this information can only be made available through the substance evaluation framework. BE is currently investigating the legal basis of ECHA's position. 3. Issue - The 0.1% limit trigger for information on SVHC in articles: REACH in its art. 7 and 33 introduces information

	obligations for producers, importers and suppliers of articles that contain substances of very high concern (SVHC).We consider that a uniform application of the triggering SVHC limit would be essential for the proper functioning of the Internal Market. However, it has not yet been possible to find a common understanding on how to interpret and apply this limit for complex articles. This situation creates uncertainty for companies manufacturing or importing articles – and for enforcement authorities as well. The current interpretation in the guidance on requirement for substances in articles leads to gaps in the flow of information. In many cases the SVHC information will not follow the article through the supply chains. For some types of articles it seems that the loss of information on SVHC is quite substantial. The problems described above can largely be avoided with an interpretation that strictly refers to the REACH article definition when applying the threshold in cases of complex articles. This would be more workable for existing information routines for industry, more enforceable for authorities and it would improve the generation of SVHC information. It should be clearly stated in the guidance that the 0.1% trigger is to be applied on the average concentration of a SVHC in any object that complies with the definition of an article in REACH Art. 3 (3). This interpretation would lead to a largest flow of information on SVHC's in the supply chain and would be to the benefit of human health and environment (REACH art.1 (1)).
Do you wish to upload documents in support of this submission	Yes

Please provide a brief description of the documents that you are uploading. Note: You may upload more than one document.	1. Annexe I: Activities of the Belgian Helpdesk REACH The document refers to the “Theme3 - Operation of the National Helpdesk and Provision of Communication to the Public of Information on Risks of Substances”. It aims to illustrate the proportion of the enquiries received at the National Helpdesk. Two graphics are represented: - The first graphic indicates the “Number of inquiries by quarter” for the period 2005-2010, - The second graphic indicates the “Number of inquiries by fields” for the period 2007-2010. 2. Annexe II: Penalties for Violations The document refers to the “Theme 8- Information on Enforcement Activities”. It describes the sanctions available for the Belgian enforcement authorities. Two tables illustrate the penalties: - at the Federal level, - at the Regional level.

Meta Informations	
Creation date	31-05-2010
Last update date	
User name	ReachBE
Case Number	223501153231615110
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N