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Zero tolerance approach to non-compliance

• The CSS includes an action to:

  “propose to entrust the Commission with the duty to carry out audits in Member States, where relevant, to ensure compliance and enforcement of chemicals legislation, in particular REACH“ (Section 2.3.2. A zero tolerance approach to non-compliance)

• The Action Plan laid down in the Annex to the CSS specifies among its measures:

  “Proposal to amend REACH to introduce a European Audit Capacity”
Objective of this action:

• Improving compliance and enforcement of chemical legislation by *strengthening the effectiveness* of national *control systems* throughout the EU

• **Audits** to verify the functioning of MSs official controls *systems*:
  • identifying potential weaknesses
  • their possible causes
  • so that corrective action is taken

  Intended role is mainly ‘control of controller’, i.e.: to verify effectiveness of MSs control systems for the purpose of REACH, not to directly control specific operators

• Standards for uniform assessment
Study by Milieu ongoing

to assist the Commission:

• in identifying possible options for establishing a European Audit Capacity

• in identifying criteria/standards relevant for the effectiveness of Member States control systems that could be evaluated by that Audit Capacity

• The study shall also assess the possible extension of the above actions for the purpose of the CLP, POPs and PIC Regulations.
Consultations

• **Experts from Member States:**
  - FORUM
  - CARACAL, PIC DNAs and POPs competent authorities

• **Experts from the Commission**

• **Public consultation** within the Study for the Impact Assessment **ONGOING**

• In parallel, the Europan Audit Capacity is also part of the follow up discussions (at sherpa level) on the High Level Roundtable’s joint report on enforcement (adopted in Nov 2021)
## Preliminary results of the study

### Options for designing EAC

*This is a modular system and elements in different options can be combined*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Short description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Comprehensive audit capacity system</td>
<td>Combination of general and specific programmed audits and ad-hoc audits; additional activities like fact-finding missions; EC lead; Auditors: EC auditors, with MS experts and ECHA if relevant; Conclusions and actions for follow-up; Audit criteria are laid down in legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: An audit capacity system</td>
<td>Combination of specific programmed audits and ad-hoc audits; EC lead; Auditors: EC auditors; Conclusion and actions for follow-up; Audit criteria are laid down in legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: A minimal control capacity system</td>
<td>Combination of EC ad-hoc controls and MS peer reviews; Controllers from EC for ad-hoc controls, from MSs for peer reviews; Control report; Control criteria are laid down in guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All options</td>
<td>A form of report discussed at Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Milieu presentation to Forum
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What this would mean for ECHA, Forum and MSs?

- Audited MS: MS authorities to cooperate and provide information to auditors (all options)
- Other MS: in some cases, MS to provide experts for audits (option 1) or peer reviews (option 3)
- Audited MS: actions can be taken to address the shortcomings identified during the audit (options 1 and 2 and 3)
- Forum: to provide feedback on audit programme (options 1 and 2), discuss findings of audits (all options)
- ECHA: to provide auditors and technical expertise where necessary (options 1 and 2)
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List of criteria relevant for MSs control systems

Takes into account those existing in other areas of legislation, including Market Surveillance Regulation and guidance from Forum

Criteria concerning:

• the competent authorities (e.g. designation, lack of conflict of interest or coordination)
• organisation of controls (e.g. risk based planning)
• Implementation of controls (e.g. following documented procedures, reporting, follow up)
• evaluation of the control system (e.g. control verification procedures, internal evaluation, horizontal analysis)

Options: to lay down criteria as binding in the legislation or as guidance
Results of the study should inform the Overall Impact Assessment for the Revision of the REACH Regulation
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