ANNEX 1
LIST OF CONSULTER ARTHUR AND STATE ARCHIVED TO STATE ARCHIVED THE ARCHIVED TO STATE ARCHIVED THE ARCHIVED TO STATE ARCHIVED THE ARCHIVED TO STATE ARCHIVED THE ARCHIVED THE

ANNEX 1: LIST OF CONSULTEES

A1.1 ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED

The organisations contacted as potential sources of information to support either indicators and/or baselines are listed below. However, a small number were unable to provide information within the timescale for this study.

Government Departments, Agencies and Supported Bodies

- Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science (Cefas)
- Competent Authority
- Competent Authority Enforcement Group
- Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS, formerly BERR
- Department for Business Innovation and Skills, Chemicals Regulatory Forum (BIS CRF)
- Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)
- Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, Chemicals Stakeholder Forum (Defra CSF)
- Department of Environment Northern Ireland (DOE)
- Department of Health (DH)
- Environment Agency (EA)
- Government Chemist at LGC
- Health Protection Agency (HPA)
- Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Enforcement Group
- Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Epidemiology Group
- Health and Safety Executive (HSE), International Chemicals Unit (ICU)
- Home Office Animals In Scientific Procedure Division (Policy)
- National Centre for the Replacement, Refinement and Reduction of Animals in Research (NC3Rs)
- National Centre for Social Research (NATCEN)
- National Health Service, UK Ambulance Services (National Education Network for Ambulance Services (NENAS) and UK Ambulance Trusts: East Midlands, Great Western, Isle of Wight, London, North East, North West, Northern Ireland, Scottish, South East Coast, South Central, South West, Staffordshire, Welsh, West Midlands and Yorkshire)
 - Northern Ireland Environment Agency (NIEA)

Office of National Statistics

- Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)
- Scottish Executive
- Welsh Assembly Government
- WRAP
- WRAP Northern Ireland
- WRAP Scotland
- WRAP Cymru.

Non-Governmental Organisations

- British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV)
- Chem Trust
- Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments (FRAME)
- Greenpeace UK
- Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA).

Academic and Professional Organisations

- Green Chemistry Centre of Excellence, University of York
- Institute of Chemical Engineers (IChemE)
- Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
- Royal Society of Chemistry, Green Chemistry Network (RSC, GCN)
- University of Birmingham, Division of Environmental Health and Risk Management, School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences.

Trade Unions

- UK Trade Union Congress
- UNITE.

Industry Associations

- Aluminium Federation (ALFED)
- British Association for Chemicals Specialities (BACS)
- British Aerosol Manufacturers Association (BAMA)
- British Adhesives and Sealants Association (BASA)
- British Chambers of Commerce (BCC)
- British Coating Federation (BCF)
- British Fragrance Association (BFA)
- British Metal Recycling Association (BMRA)
- British Plastics Federation (BPF)
- British Retail Consortium (BRC)
- British Stainless Steel Association (BASSA)
- Confederation of British Industry (CBI)
- Chemical Industry Association (CIA)
 - Chemical Industry Association, REACHReady
- Chemical Business Association (CBA)
- Federation of Small Businesses (FSB)
- Chemical Hazard Communication Society (CHCS)
- Cosmetic Toiletry and Perfumery Association (CTPA)
- Mineral Products Association (BPA)
- National Federation of Demolition Contractors (NFDC)
- Non-ferrous Alliance (NFA)
- UK Engineering Employers Federation (EEF)
- Environmental Services Association

- UK Cleaning Products Industry Association (UKCPI)
- UK Steel.



ANNEXZ

ANNEXA
OBJECTIVES, SUB-OBJECTIVES AND INDICATORS

A2.1. REDUCE THE NEGATIVE HEALTH IMPACTS ARISING FROM OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE TO CHEMICALS

Table A2.1 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards the REACH and CLP regulations.

Chemicals Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	%	%
mulcutor	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Basenne)	REACH	CLP
Sub-objective: Re	educe the Incidence of Chemical-relat	ted Occupational Dermatitis		4
Change in	HSE Statistics:	Same as for indicator data	. (y , ,
incidence of	Labour Force Survey - Self-reported	set		0
chemically-	Work-related Illness survey (SWI),			•
related	the Health and Occupation			
occupational skin	Reporting network (THOR),		10	
disease (short- to	Voluntary reporting of occupational		57	43
medium-term	diseases by General Practitioners	0		
indicator)	(THOR-gP), Occupational skin	00		
	surveillance (EPI-DERM),			
	Occupational Physicians Reporting			
	Activity (OPRA)			
Change in	Survey of appropriate health	No existing collated		
number of	professionals to gather data on	information.		
prescriptions for	prescribing practice for cases of	CO.		
chemically-	occupational dermatitis. (Drawing	Retrospective survey for	57	43
related	on prescription records of	period pre-REACH	37	43
occupational	occupational physicians and	implementation to establish		
dermatitis (short-	dermatologists relating to cases of	baseline		
term indicator)	occupational dermatitis)			
Change in	Survey of Trade Union members in	No existing baseline but		
incidence of	targeted industry sectors (where	repeated survey to establish		
work-related	workers are considered at risk of	trends might be informative		
chemically-	developing work-related skin		57	43
induced skin	disease that might be attributable to			
disease (short- to	chemical exposure)			
medium-term				
indicator)				
	educe the Incidence of Chemical-relat		Disease	
Change in	HSE Statistics:	Same as for indicator		
incidence of	Labour Force Survey - Self-reported			
chemically-	Work-related Illness survey (SWI),			
related occupational	Surveillance of work-related and		57	42
	occupational respiratory disease		57	43
asthma (short- to	(SWORD), Thor-GP, OPRA, HSE			
medium-term indicator)	Risk Control Indicators, HSE Workplace health and safety			
maicator)	1			
Change in	survey (WHASS) programme HSE Statistics: THOR,	Same as for indicator		
incidence of		Same as for indicator		
	Industrial Injuries Disablement			
chemically- related	Benefit (IIDB) Scheme, HSEs Risk		57	43
	Control Indicators, HSEs Workplace		31	43
occupational chronic	health and safety survey (WHASS)			
	programme			
obstructive		1		

Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	% CLP
pulmonary				
disease (COPD)				
(long-term				
indicator)				
Change in	Survey of health professionals to	No existing collated		
number of	gather data on prescribing practice	information.		
prescriptions for	for cases of occupational asthma.			1
occupational	(Would draw on prescription records	Retrospective survey could	57	43
asthma (short-	of occupational and respiratory	be undertaken for period		λ),
term indicator)	physicians for cases of occupational	pre-REACH implementation		C
CI.	asthma)	to establish baseline)
Change in	Survey of Trade Union members	No existing baseline but		
incidence of	in targeted industry sectors (where	repeated survey to establish	(7)	
work-related	workers are considered at risk of	trends might be informative		
chemically-	developing work-related respiratory	0- 1		
induced	disease that might be attributable to	~~		
respiratory	chemical exposure)	'1,	57	43
disease (time course of		~ "		
indicator				
dependent on		. 0		
conditions under		2		
consideration)		~0		
	l educe the Incidence of Chemical-relat	ad Occupational Cancers		
Change in	HSE Statistics: SWORD and OPRA	Same as for indicator		
incidence of		•		
chemically-				
related	40			
occupational				
respiratory	Sale		57	43
cancers	-6			
	100			
(long-term	No			
indicator)	~ ~~			
Change in	HSE Statistics: EPIDERM	Same as for indicator		
incidence of	7)`			
chemically-				
related				
occupational skin			57	43
cancers				
*0~				
(long-term				
indicator)	lander Indiana (CI)			
	educe the Incidence of Chemical-relat			
Change in the	Health Protection Agency:	Same as for indicator		
number of	Chemicals and Poisons Division			
chemical	(CHaPD) chemical incident		57	42
incidents	surveillance systems.		57	43
involving	Local and Regional Services (LaRS) National Poisons Information			
exposure of				
workers (short- to	Service (NPIS), National Chemical			

Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	% CLP
medium-term	Emergency Centre (NCEC)			
indicator)				
Change in the	Health Protection Agency:	Same as for indicator		
number of the	Chemicals and Poisons Division			
workers affected	(CHaPD) chemical incident			
by chemical	surveillance systems, Local and		57	43
incidents (short-	Regional Services (LaRS), National			1
to medium-term	Poisons Information Service (NPIS),			1
indicator)	National Chemical Emergency			<i>"</i>),
<u>Cl </u>	Centre (NCEC)	G		
Change in rates of	HSE Statistics:	Same as for indicator		
serious worker	RIDDOR reports of chemical-			
injury or death attributable to	related deaths & serious injuries, HSEs Risk Control Indicators,	•	57	43
chemicals (short-	HSEs Workplace health and safety			
term indicator)	survey (WHASS) programme	0.		
Change in	HSE Statistics: IIDB data	Same as for indicator		
numbers claiming	TISE Statistics. HDD tata	Same as for mulcator		
compensation		~ V		
because of				
industrial injuries		. ()	50	50
attributable to		λ		
chemicals (long-		70		
term indicator)				
Sub-objective: Re	duce or Eliminate Exposure to Chem	icals of Concern in the Work	olace	
Change in	Survey of either glove	No existing collated		
industry	manufacturers or purchasers in	information;		
expenditure on	relevant industry sectors of			
protective gloves	numbers/types of glove purchased	retrospective survey could be	50	50
(short-term	70	undertaken for period pre-	30	50
indicator of	-62	REACH implementation to		
improvement in	177	establish baseline		
worker exposure)	No			
Change in	Survey of either equipment	No existing collated		
industry	manufacturers or purchasers in	information;		
expenditure on	relevant industry sectors of	retrospective survey could be		
local and general	numbers/types of equipment	undertaken for period pre-	[50
ventilation	purchased	REACH implementation to	50	50
equipment (short-		establish baseline		
term indicator of				
improvement in				
worker exposure)	C&I Database statistic	No aviating callets 1		
Number of	C&L Database statistic,	No existing collated information		
substances/ mixtures	supplemented by survey data from industry	Intornation		
reclassified with a	maasa y		0	100
'higher'				
classification				
Number of	C&L Database statistic,	No existing collated		
substances/	supplemented by survey data from	information		
mixtures	industry	Intormation	0	100
reclassified with a	industry			100
'lower'				

Table A2.1: Object Chemicals	ctive: Reduce the Negative Health Im	pacts Arising from Occupation	onal Exposur	e to
Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	%	%
			REACH	CLP
classification				

A2.2.REDUCE THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON PUBLIC HEALTH OF EXPOSURE TO CHEMICALS

Table A2.2 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards the REACH and CLP regulations.

Table A2.2.	Objective: Reduce the Negative Impa	ects on Public Health of Expo	sure to Chen	nicals
Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	%	%
			REACH	CLP
Sub-objective: Rec	duce the Incidence of Chemical-relate	d Conditions in the General	Public	
Change in the	Health Protection Agency:	Same as for indicator		()
numbers of the	Chemicals and Poisons Division			7
public affected by	(CHaPD) chemical incident			
chemical incidents	surveillance systems, Local and			
(short- to	Regional Services (LaRS), National		57	43
medium-term	Poisons Information Service (NPIS),		10	
indicator)	National Chemical Emergency			
	Centre (NCEC), environment	9		
	agencies	00		
Change in the	Office of National Statistics data	Same as for indicator		
level of congenital	derived from British Isles Network of	• • •		
abnormalities in	Congenital Anomaly Registers			
the UK public that	(BINOCAR)	, 0		
can't be attributed			100	0
to causes other				
than chemicals		lacksquare		
(medium- to long-		7		
term indicator)				
	duce the Level of Public Exposure to C		1	
Change in usage of	Nordic product registers SPIN	Same as for indicator		
chemicals of	database			
concern in			50	50
consumer products	25			
(short- to medium-	.0>			
term indicator)				
Change in the	Health Protection Agency:	Same as for indicator		
number of	Chemicals and Poisons Division			
chemical incidents	(CHaPD) chemical incident			
involving exposure	surveillance systems, Local and			40
of the public	Regional Services (LaRS)		57	43
(short- to medium-	National Poisons Information			
term indicator)	Service (NPIS), National Chemical			
C_{i}	Emergency Centre (NCEC),			
A.C.	environment agencies	C		
Change in tissue	Archive of human breast milk and	Some tissue archives		
levels of chemicals	other tissues (Some depositories	already exist		
of concern in the	exits, e.g. MRC Biobank, and others		100	0
UK population (anticipated EU	might require establishment) with analysis of retained tissue samples		100	U
core reporting	for chemicals of concern			
requirement)	ioi chemicais of concern			
•	omote Withdrawal of Substances of Co	noon from the Market		
Numbers of	HSE –CA	Same as for indicator		
substances	(drawing on ECHA information)	Same as for indicator	50	50
withdrawn from	(Supplemented by survey of reasons		50	30
williawii iioiii	(Supplemented by survey of reasons			

Table A2.2.	Objective: Reduce the Negative Impa	cts on Public Health of Expo	sure to Cher	nicals			
Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	%	%			
			REACH	CLP			
the UK market	for withdrawal; see below)						
because of							
concerns about							
human health.							
imposition of							
restrictions or							
other reasons				() <u>)</u>			
relating to				\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \			
REACH							
Change in	Office of National Statistics:	Same as for indicators					
quantities of	UK manufacture of hazardous		,,	0			
chemicals of	substances (tpa), Proportion of EU						
concern produced	manufacture of hazardous substances		100	0			
or marketed in the	by UK companies (domestic share),		100	U			
UK	UK imports of hazardous substances		.0				
	(imports), UK exports of hazardous						
	substances (exports)	-95					
Change in number	HSE –CA	No existing baseline data.					
of substances of	(drawing on ECHA information):						
very high concern	UK-based notifications of SVHC in						
(SVHC) in articles	articles, UK-based registrations of		100	0			
on UK market	SVHC, UK-based authorisations for	. 0					
	use of SVHC, UK registrations of						
	restricted substances						
	rease Substitution of Substances by L						
Introduction of	New survey or Case Studies	UK industry associations,					
alternative		e.g. Federation of Small					
substances to	.()	Businesses (for SMEs),					
replace chemicals		Environmental Services	100	0			
of concern under		Association & British					
REACH		Plastics Federation (for					
		waste)					
Sub-objective: Implement Emergency Action under Article 129 to Ensure Rapid Safeguarding of Human							
Health in UK	Health in UK						
	HSE Records	Not applicable					
national							
emergency actions							
taken relating to							
human health			100	0			
(under Article							
129) (anticipated							
EU core reporting							
requirement)							

A2.3.REDUCE THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT ARISING FROM CHEMICALS

Table A2.3 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

Table A2.3: Objective	ve: Reduce the Negative Impacts on the l	Environment Arising from (Chemicals	
Indicator	Data Source (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	% CLP
Sub-objective: Incre	ase Populations Levels of Species suscep	tible to Chemical Pollution		
Change in	Biodiversity indicator databases:	Same as for indicator		
population numbers	Joint Nature Conservation committee -		\mathcal{O}	
of species with	biodiversity indicators, Cefas, Chem		100	0
established	Trust, Environment agencies, the		100	0
susceptibility to	Charting Progress initiative (Defra &			
chemical pollution	Devolved Administrations))	
Sub-objective: Redu	ice the Extent of Chemical-induced Effec	ets in Wildlife Species		
Change in	Cefas, Environment Agency Endocrine	Same as for indicator		
population levels of	disrupting chemicals (EDC)	00		
chemical induced	demonstration programme: Population	· V		
non-lethal effect in	monitoring data relating to defined	• • •	100	0
wildlife species	chemical effects (e.g. prevalence of			
	endocrine disruptor changes in marker			
	species)			
	ce the Level of Chemicals of Concern Pr		ntal Media	
Change in levels of	Modification of existing monitoring	Considerable data exists		
selected chemicals in	systems (by Defra, Environment	on environmental		
ambient air samples	Agencies, UK Air Quality Archive,	pollutant levels though		
(anticipated EU core	National Atmospheric Emissions	much will relate to		
reporting	Inventory, UK Pollutant Transfer	chemicals addressed by	100	0
requirement)	Register (UKPTR) or, new monitoring	other legislation (e.g.	100	
	programmes of various types to	Water Framework, IPPC,		
	establish sample archive. Analysis of	POPs). Some sample		
	retained samples for specific chemicals	archives already exist		
	of concern			
Change in levels of	Modification of existing monitoring	Considerable data exists		
selected chemicals in	systems (by Environment Agencies and	on environmental		
water and sediment	water companies) and/or modification	pollutant levels though		
samples (anticipated	of influent water analysis or new	much will relate to		
EU core reporting	monitoring programmes of various	chemicals addressed by	100	0
requirement)	types to establish sample archive.	other legislation (e.g.		
		Water Framework, IPPC,		
	Analysis of retained samples for	POPs).		
100	specific chemicals of concern	Some sample archives		
	No. 1'C	already exist		
Change in levels of	Modification of existing monitoring	Considerable data exists		
selected chemicals in	systems (by Environment Agencies or	on environmental		
soil samples	new monitoring programmes of various	pollutant levels though much will relate to		
(anticipated EU core	types to establish sample archive.		100	
reporting	Analysis of retained samples for	chemicals addressed by	100	0
requirement)	specific chemicals of concern.	other legislation (e.g.		
		IPPC, POPs). Some		
		sample archives already		
]	exist		<u> </u>

Change in levels of selected chemicals in waste sludge samples Modification of existing monitoring systems (by Environment Agencies and water companies) or new monitoring programmes of various types to establish sample archive. Analysis of retained samples for specific chemicals of concern. Evaluation of Environment Agencies pollution monitoring and permit data (Pollution Prevention and Control) Sub-objective: Reduce the Level of Chemicals of Concern Present in Wildlife Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue samples of terrestrial species (anticipated EU core reporting requirement) Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue samples of aquatic species (anticipated EU core reporting requirement) Change in soil Defra monitoring data on bio-indicators Modification of existing monitoring Scheme to max monitoring systems (by Environment Agencies and Control data Construction and Control data Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to chemicals addressed by other legislation. Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to chemicals addressed by other legislation. Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to chemicals addressed by other legislation. Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to chemicals addressed by other legislation. Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to elemicals addressed by other legislation. Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to elemicals addressed by other legislation. Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to elemicals addressed by other legislation. Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to elemicals addressed by other legislation. Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to elem		Data Source (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REAC
Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue samples of terrestrial species (anticipated EU core reporting requirement) Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue samples of (Dredatory terrestrial birds) Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue samples of (anticipated EU core reporting requirement) Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue samples of aquatic species (anticipated EU core reporting requirement) Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue archive (fish-eating birds). Centre for Environment, Fisheries and aquatic species (anticipated EU core reporting requirement) Cetacean Distribution & Relative (Abundance Survey) Change in soil Defra monitoring data on bio-indicators Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to ehemicals addressed by other legislation. Some sample archives already exist	selected chemicals in waste sludge samples	systems (by Environment Agencies and water companies) or new monitoring programmes of various types to establish sample archive. Analysis of retained samples for specific chemicals of concern. Evaluation of Environment Agencies pollution monitoring and permit data (Pollution Prevention and Control)	Pollution Prevention and Control data Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to chemicals addressed by other legislation (e.g. IPPC, POPs).	100
tissue samples of terrestrial species (anticipated EU core reporting requirement) Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue samples of aquatic species (anticipated EU core reporting reporting Centre for Environment, Fisheries and aquatic species (anticipated EU core reporting requirement) Cetacean Distribution & Relative requirement) Change in soil Defra monitoring data on bio-indicators Scheme (PBMS) tissue archive pollutant levels though much will relate to chemicals addressed by other legislation. Considerable data exists on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to chemicals addressed by other legislation. Some sample archives already exist	Change in levels of	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology	Considerable data exists	
selected chemicals in tissue archive (fish-eating birds). Centre for Environment, Fisheries and aquatic species (anticipated EU core reporting requirement) Change in soil tissue archive (fish-eating birds). Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Sciences (CEFAS): Cetacean Distribution & Relative Abundance Survey Abundance Survey Change in soil tissue archive (fish-eating birds). Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Pollutant levels though much will relate to ehemicals addressed by other legislation. Some sample archives already exist	tissue samples of terrestrial species (anticipated EU core reporting requirement)	Scheme (PBMS) tissue archive (predatory terrestrial birds)	pollutant levels though much will relate to chemicals addressed by other legislation. Some sample archives already exist	100
Change in soil Defra monitoring data on bio-indicators	selected chemicals in tissue samples of aquatic species (anticipated EU core reporting	tissue archive (fish-eating birds). Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Sciences (CEFAS): Cetacean Distribution & Relative	on environmental pollutant levels though much will relate to ehemicals addressed by other legislation. Some sample archives	100
	Change in soil biodiversity	Defra monitoring data on bio-indicators for soil	ancady CAIST	100
the Environment in UK	Number of national emergency actions taken relating to environment protection under article 129	HSE-CA &other enforcement agencies (possibly involving detailed case studies)	No natural baseline	100

A2.4.MAINTAIN THE COMPETITIVE POSITION OF THE UK CHEMICALS SECTOR

Table A2.4 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

Profitability BIS/ Chemical Industries Association data Percentage contribution to GDP Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Overall output of UK chemical industry	Overall output of UK chemical industry Profitability BIS/Chemical Industries Association data Percentage contribution to GDP Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports Value of exports As above Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator Chemicals Value of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator Chemicals Value of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator Sume as indicator 50 Sume as indicator 50 Chemicals Value of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator Chemicals Value of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator Sume as indicator 50 Chemicals Value of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator Sume as indicator 50 Chemicals Value of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator Sume as indicator 50 Chemicals Sume as indicator	Indicator	Data Set (indicator)	Data source (baseline)	% REACH	% C
industry chemicals sector Profitability BIS/ Chemical Industries Same as indicator Association data Percentage contribution to GDP Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - Chemicals Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	rindustry chemicals sector Profitability BIS/ Chemical Industries Same as indicator Association data Percentage contribution to GDP Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator chemicals Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	industry chemicals sector 80 Profitability BIS/ Chemical Industries Same as indicator 67 Association data Same as indicator GDP Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Same as indicator 50 Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50	Sub-objective: Maintain the	Competitive Position of UK Su	bstance Producers and	Downstream	Users
Association data Percentage contribution to ONS PRODCOM data Same as indicator GDP Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator chemicals Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Association data Percentage contribution to ONS PRODCOM data Same as indicator 100 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator chemicals Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Association data Percentage contribution to GDP Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of exports As above Same as indicator Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator chemicals Value of imports As above Same as indicator So Value of imports As above Same as indicator So Value of imports As above Same as indicator So Value of imports As above Same as indicator So Value of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator So Value of imports As above Same as indicator	1		Same as indicator	80	2
GDP Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	GDP Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Export of Chemicals from the UK Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of exports As above Same as indicator Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals into the UK Volume of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50	Profitability		Same as indicator	67	9
Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Same as indicator 50 Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Same as indicator 50 Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Value of exports Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50	_	ONS PRODCOM data	Same as indicator	100	
Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Same as indicator 50 Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Volume of exports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Same as indicator 50 Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Volume of exports Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50	Sub-objective: Maximise the	Ease of Export of Chemicals fr	om the UK	3	
Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Value of exports As above Same as indicator 50 Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Value of exports As above Same as indicator Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50		ONS trade statistics -		50	5
Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator	Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator	Sub-objective: Maximise the Ease of Import of Chemicals into the UK Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of imports As above Same as indicator Same as indicator Same as indicator Some as indicator	Value of exports		Same as indicator	50	4
Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - Same as indicator 50	Volume of imports ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50 Same as indicator 50 ONS trade statistics - chemicals Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50		I .			
Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50	Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50	Value of imports As above Same as indicator 50	Volume of imports	ONS trade statistics -	Same as indicator	50	
value of imports This doore Only the distribution of the control	ABILINAS AICHINAS	The solid line of the solid li	Value of imports	As above	Same as indicator	50	
	No.	cillus,		as archi			
40CUII.	200		30cument	Mas alchi			
90cnii.	900	O The state of the	document	Nas aich			
90chli.	900		document	Nas alchi			
6 AOCIVIL.	300		document	Mas arch			

A2.5.MINIMISE ADVERSE STRUCTURAL CHANGES TO UK INDUSTRY

Table A2.5 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

Indicator	Data Set	Data source (baseline)	% REACH
	e Adverse Structural Changes to UK	Industry (Chemicals Sect	or C20, Dow
	Waste Recycling Sectors)		
Number of companies	ONS industry production statistics – chemicals sectors	Same as indicator	67
Size distribution of compa		Same as indicator	67
Employment	ONS employment statistics	Same as indicator	67
Volume of materials recycled/recovered	ONS Prodcom statistics available for many industry sectors. ONS industry statistics (recycling non-metal and metal only) supplemented by WRAP data	Same as indicator	100
Use of recycled/recovered		Same as indicator	100
			100
	Mas archit		
-es	H Was archiv		
cumer	/industry associations		
9'ochweig	it was archiv		
gocumes	it was alchiv		
docume!	it was alchiv		

A2.6.MINIMISE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON THE PATTERNS OF INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY IN THE UK

Table A2.6 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

Indicator	Data Set	Data source (baseline)	%	% CLP
			REACH	L, V
Sub-objective: Avoid Damagi				
Percentage change in price of	Survey/data collected by	Same as indicator		
chemical inputs (compared to	industry associations		100	0
overall industry inputs)				
	npetition in the Supply of Chem		\sim	
Total number substances	No. substances registered	ONS ABI/2 and		
available on UK market and	(from REACH-IT via HSE -	PRODCOM data;	<i>y</i>	
comparison with EU	CA)	IUCLID IV	67	33
	No. substances registered	No. substances registered	07	33
	(from ECHA via HSE - CA)	(from ECHA via HSE -		
		CA)		
Total no. preparations	ONS ABI/2 and PRODCOM	ONS ABI/2 and		
available on UK market	data	PRODCOM data;	67	33
		IUCLID IV		
Percentage change in number	Case-studies of selected DU	Case-studies prepared for		
of suppliers per DU company	companies from fragrances,	UK IA	100	
	coatings and waste recovery		100	0
	sectors			
Sub-objective: Minimise Cos	ts Associated with Loss of Subst	ances		
Percentage change in DU	Case-studies of selected DU	Case-studies prepared for	67	33
product portfolios	companies including from	UK IA		
	coatings, fragrances and metal			
	finishing sectors			
Number of product	As above	As above	67	33
reformulations carried out	.03			
Number of products removed	As above	As above	100	0
from market due to				
unsupported uses				
Number of process changes	As above	As above	67	33
carried out		113 463 (,	
	hdrawal of Substances for Non 1	Risk-related Reasons	l	<u>I</u>
Risk characteristics of	Eurostat REACH project	Same as indicator		
withdrawn substances	Zarostat REZ terr project	Same as maicator	100	0
Reasons for withdrawal of	Case-studies of selected	Not applicable		
ixeasons for withurawar 01	Case-studies of science	Trot applicable	50	50

A2.7. MAXIMISE THE POTENTIAL FOR INNOVATION

Table A2.7 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

Table A2-2.7: Objective: M	aximise the Potential for Innova	tion		
Indicator	Data Set	Data source (baseline)	% REACH	% CLP
Sub-objective: Maximise In	novation by UK Substance Sup	pliers and Downstream User	S	
REACH/CLP related R&D	Case-studies of selected	Case-studies prepared for		1
expenditure as percentage	substance manufacturers	UK IA.	4	7
turnover for selected sectors		Case-studies of selected	50	50
(manufacturers and DUs)		manufacturing companies	<0	
		 anecdotal data 		
REACH/CLP related R&D	As above	As above		
expenditure as percentage of		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		
total R&D for selected		10	50	50
sectors (manufacturers and				
DUs)		29		
Number of new substances	CA from REACH-IT	NONS data		
registered (UK sites)			100	0
(manufacturers and			100	0
importers)				
Number of PPORD	As above	As above		
exemptions sought with				
reasons (UK sites)	. 0		56	44
(manufacturers and	\	1		
importers)				
Value of REACH/CLP-	Case-studies of selected	n/a		
related services provided to	substance manufacturers			
customers (manufacturers,			50	50
importers and downstream				
users)				
Number of high-risk	Case-studies of selected DU	Case-studies prepared for		
substances substituted (and	companies	UK IA	71	29
cost) by downstream users	N			
Reasons for substitution by	As above	As above	50	50
downstream users			30	30
Number of new products	As above	As above		
developed by downstream			71	20
users using lower risk			/1	29
substances				
Value of new products	As above	As above		
developed by downstream			71	20
users using lower risk			71	29
substances				

A2.8.ENCOURAGING THE DISSEMINATION AND UTILISATION BY STAKEHOLDERS OF INFORMATION SOURCES AND ADVICE RELATING TO CHEMICALS

Table A2.8 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

Sub-objective: Encourage the Dissemination of Information by the UK CA Number of visits to UK CA (not currently recorded) No pre-REACH baseline website Number of guidance items As above As above
Number of visits to UK CA
Number of guidance items As above As above
downloaded from CA website As above 71
Number of subscriptions to CA CA e-Bulletin No pre-REACH baseline 71
Number of CA helpdesk enquiries As above No specific baseline, but data from period before implementation of REACH could provide a quasi-baseline
Number of information events (CA and other government bodies) As above 71
Sub-objective: Encourage the Dissemination of Information by Industry
Number of consumer requests for information regarding SVHC in articles Survey of retailers via British Retail Federation. Cooperation promised Survey of retailers via British Retail Federation. Cooperation promised Survey of retailers via British Retail Federation. Cooperation provided by information from cosmetics companies on no. requests for information made under the Cosmetics Directive 100

A2.9.ENCOURAGING THE PROVISION OF HIGH QUALITY INFORMATION AND ADVICE ABOUT CHEMICALS

Table A2.9 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

Table A2.9: Objective: Ensu Indicator	Data Set (indicator)	Data source (baseline)	%	% CLP
indicator	Data Set (mulcator)	Data source (basenne)	REACH	76 CLI
	ailability of High Quality Inform			
Quality of CA website information	Survey of UK industry associations and/or survey of companies accessing the web site	Recollection of NONs information provided by HSE	74.0	29
Completeness of CA website information	As above	As above	71	29
Relevance of CA website information	As above	As above	71	29
Quality of CA helpdesk responses	Survey of UK industry associations and/or survey of companies using the help desk	No readily-available baseline	71	29
Completeness of CA helpdesk responses	As above	As above	71	29
Relevance of CA helpdesk responses	As above	As above	71	29
Sub-objective: Encourage th	ne Availability of High Quality Ir	formation from Industry		
Number of (e)SDS failing legal requirements	HSE – enforcement records	HSE – enforcement records	100	0
Number of SDS meeting DU requirements	HSE – inspection records	HSE – inspection records.	71	29
Number of substance and mixture labels meeting CLP requirements	As above supplemented by future CHCS surveys	CHCS survey	0	100
Percentage of retailers with knowledge of their customers' right to request information	Survey of companies via British Retail Federation	No direct baseline, but survey could ask about right to request information about cosmetics directive	100	0
	ne Availability of High Quality In			
Percentage of consumers with knowledge of right to request information on SVHCs in articles	Survey of consumers	No natural baseline. Survey could ask about right to request information about cosmetics in order to construct a baseline	100	0

A2.10. PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE (ESPECIALLY NON-VERTEBRATE) TEST METHODS

Table A2.10 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards the REACH and CLP regulations.

Indicator	Data source	Data source	% DT1.GYY	%
~	(Indicator)	(Baseline)	REACH	CLP
•	te the development, evaluation a	nd validation of alterna	tive methods	for
chemical testing				~0
UK Government	Relevant departmental and	Same as indicator		
contribution to EU	agency resource utilisation			
and OECD work on	records relating to support for		***	
alternative testing	relevant ECHA, ECVAM and		100	0
methods and guidance	OECD committees		, ,	
(anticipated EU core	[as € or man hours/y]		h	
reporting)				
UK Government	Relevant agencies	Same as indicator	"	
contribution to the	and departmental records on			
development of	funding of research into		100	_
alternative test	alternative test method	, 0	100	0
methods (UK focus	development			
only) (anticipated EU	[as €/y]			
core reporting)		10		
UK Government's	Relevant agencies	Same as indicator		
alternative testing	and departmental records of			
awareness raising	expenditure on public &/or		100	0
activities (anticipated	scientists awareness raising			
EU core reporting)	activities [as € or man hours/y]			
Number of alternative	European Centre for Validation	Same as Indicator		
(non-vertebrate) test	of Alternative Methods			
methods subject to	(ECVAM) tracking system for		100	0
validation at European	test methods review, validation		100	O
level	and approval in EU regulation			
	on chemicals (TSAR)			
Number of ECVAM	As above	As above		
validated alternative			100	0
(non-vertebrate) test			100	O
methods				
Number of alternative	Home Office (based on	Same as indicator		
tests adopted by EU	information from European		100	0
	Commission)			
Number of alternative	Home Office (based on	Same as indicator		
(non-vertebrate) test	information from OECD)			
methods subject to			100	0
validation at OECD				
level				
Number of OECD	OECD published information	Same as indicator		
validated alternative			100	0
(non-vertebrate) test			100	U
methods		1		

A2.11. PROMOTE THE USE OF ALTERNATIVE (ESPECIALLY NON-VERTEBRATE) TEST METHODS

Table A2.11 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards the REACH and CLP regulations.

Indicator	Data source	Data source	%	%
	(Indicator)	(Baseline)	REACH	CLP
	te the Replacement of Existing Ver			
Number of withdrawn	Home Office (based on	Same as indicator		
EU test methods that	information from European		100	• 6()
involved use of	Commission)		100	
vertebrate animals				
Number of withdrawn	OECD published information	Same as indicator	. 0	•
OECD test methods			100	0
involving use of			105	Ü
vertebrate animals			h	
Number of project	Home Office departmental records	Same as indicator	\cup	
licenses withdrawn in			P	
UK because of		~ `	100	0
availability of			100	U
alternative test		. 0		
methods				
Sub-objective: Encour	rage the Use of Non-Animal Appro	oaches in REACH Ris	k Assessment	ts
Number of REACH	CA from REACH-IT	Not applicable		
dossiers involving UK				
companies that				
include use of read-	C) '		100	0
across as alternative to	40			
proposing vertebrate				
testing	.0.			
Number of REACH	As above	Not applicable		
dossiers involving UK				
companies including	10			
use of computational			100	0
test methods as	X		100	0
alternative to				
proposing vertebrate				
testing)			
Number of REACH	As above	Not applicable		
dossiers involving UK				
companies including				
use of non-vertebrate			100	^
test methods as			100	0
alternative to				
proposing vertebrate				
testing				
Number of REACH	As above	Not applicable		
dossiers involving UK		or application		
companies for which				
(exposure-based)			100	0
waiving is allowed as				Ü
		i	1	
opposed to vertebrate				

A2.12. MINIMISE THE USE OF VERTEBRATES IN THE TESTING OF CHEMICALS THAT FALL WITHIN THE SCOPE OF REACH

Table A2.12 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards the REACH and CLP regulations.

Table A2.12: Objective: Minimise the use of vertebrates in the testing of chemicals that fall within the	scope
of REACH	

of REACH	T	.		
Indicator	Data Set	Data Source	%	%
	(Indicator)	(Baseline)	REACH	CLP
	omote Minimisation Of Use Of Vertebra		nicals For RI	EACH
Number (by	Home Office Animal usage records	Same as indicator	,	0.
species) of	relating to 'Protection of man, animals			
vertebrate used	or environment' (as surrogate for			
for testing of	REACH-related usage). Possible		100	0
chemicals in UK	targeted survey of licensees to provide			
	additional information		D	
		-95		
Change in	European Commission Animal usage	Same as indicator		
proportion of total	records for Member States collected			
EU usage of	under Directive 86/609/EEC. (Latest		100	0
animals	available published data relates to			
conducted by UK	2005)			
Relative	Home Office departmental database	Same as indicator		
proportion of				
traditional to				
more refined test			100	0
methods using				
vertebrate	,C)			
animals in the UK				
Numbers of	CA from REACH-IT	No real baseline		
REACH dossiers	Co			
including				
vertebrate test	10		100	0
proposals	N		100	O O
involving one or	* 3			
more UK				
companies				
Proportion of	As above	As above		
vertebrate test				
proposals agreed				_
to by ECHA			100	0
involving one or				
more UK				
companies				
Estimated savings	CA from REACH-IT	As above		
of animal	Case studies of UK manufacturers			
numbers for				
ECHA approved				
tests due to			100	0
operation of				
SIEFs /Joint				
registrations				
involving one or				
more UK				

	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	% CLP
companies	(marcaror)	(Dusenne)	TREATORY	CLI
Number of UK	CA from REACH-IT	As above		
stakeholder	Case studies of UK manufacturers			
submissions in				
favour and against			100	0.0
acceptance of				
vertebrate testing				_\ '
involving UK companies				3
companies				}
90cnu	ent was	wed on 28	20.	

A2.13. SUPPORT THE EFFICIENT OPERATION OF THE REACH AND CLP PROCESS BY UK GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

Table A2.13 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

	porting the Efficient Operation	of the REACH and CLP Pro	ocess by UK	
Government and Government		Data Carray (Danalian)	0/	A CI D
Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	% CLP
Sub-objective: Efficient Parti	icipation in REACH and CLP Ir	nplementation Process by U		ent
Person days of REACH and CLP activity at EU level by type (CA and other government bodies) (e.g. ECHA committees, Enforcement Forum, negotiation with COM etc.)	Relevant departmental and agency resource utilisation records relating to different activities [as € or man hours/y]	Person days of activity in relation to NONS/ESR	50	50
Person days of REACH and CLP activity at UK level by type (CA and other government bodies) (e.g. coordination negotiation and enforcement)	As above	As above	50	50
Numbers and nature of REACH and CLP enforcement actions	CA and enforcement bodies records	A baseline may be constructed relating to NONs	50	50
Person days of CA helpdesk activity	CA resource utilisation records	No real baseline	50	50
Person days of REACH and CLP website development (CA and other government bodies)	Relevant departmental and agency resource utilisation records	No real baseline	50	50
Person days for REACH and CLP awareness/ promotion events (CA and other government bodies)	As above	No real baseline	50	50
Number of proposals for harmonised classification (from UK government with reason)	CA and enforcement bodies records	No real baseline	50	50
Number of emergency health responses by emergency response bodies regarding mixtures (CLP Article 45)	NPIS records (or similar records from other body if not NPIS)	As indicator	0	100
Cost saving from having a common CA and enforcement for REACH and CLP	CA resource utilisation records	No real baseline	50	50
Cost of training of enforcement officers	CA and enforcement bodies records	As indicator	50	50
Cost of training of emergency service staff	Emergency services records	As indicator	0	100
Cost to emergency response	HPA resource utilisation	No real baseline	0	100

CLP Article 45 As above As indicator O 10	emergency response guidance in the light of CLP (CLP Article 45) Format of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	emergency response guidance in the light of CLP (CLP Article 45) Format of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	emergency response guidance in the light of CLP (CLP Article 45) Format of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared O 10 As above As indicator O 10 O	Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	% CI
emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	emergency response guidance in the light of CLP (CLP				
emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	emergency response bodies	As above	As indicator	0	10
Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	emergency response bodies	As above	As indicator	0	10
Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies	As above	As indicator		10
Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10	Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10	Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10	Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45) As above As indicator 0 10	Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response	As above	As indicator	0	10
bodies (CLP Article 45)	bodies (CLP Article 45)	bodies (CLP Article 45)	bodies (CLP Article 45)	Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared			0	10
	cent.	cument	3 document.		St.cy.			
3 document	3			document	Nas archi			

A2.14. ENSURE THE ADEQUACY OF THE UK GOVERNMENT RESOURCE BASE TO MEET REACH AND CLP OBLIGATIONS

Table A2.14 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

Indicator	Data Set (indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH
Sub-objective: Ensure Adequ	ate Resourcing by UK governm	ent	
Cost of REACH and CLP activity at EU level by type (CA and other government bodies) (e.g ECHA committees, Enforcement Forum, negotiation with COM)	Relevant departmental, local authority and agency records	No real baseline	50
Cost of REACH and CLP activity at UK level by type (CA and other government bodies) (Eg. coordination, enforcement and enforcement)	As above	No real baseline	50
Cost of CA helpdesk	CA budgets	No real baseline	50
Cost of CA website	CA - costs as person days and budget	No real baseline	50
Cost of REACH and CLP awareness/ promotion events supported by CA	CA - costs as person days and budget	No real baseline	50
Budget for REACH and CLP work (CA and other government bodies)	Relevant departmental, local authority and agency records	No real baseline	50
Numbers of staff assigned to REACH and CLP activities (CA and other government bodies)	As above	No real baseline	50
Adequacy of skill sets of staff assigned to REACH and CLP activities (CA and other government bodies)	Interviews with departmental managers	No real baseline	50

A2.15. ENCOURAGE THE EFFICIENT OPERATION OF THE REACH PROCESS BY UK INDUSTRY

Table A2.15 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

Table A2.15: Objective: Enc Industry	ourage the Efficient Operation	of the REACH and CLP Pro	ocesses by U	K
Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	% CLP
Sub-objective: Encourage Pa	rticipation of UK industry in	REACH and CLP processes		
Number of manufacturers and importers (UK based)	REACH-IT (via CA)	No real baseline	63	38
Number of authorisation applications (UK based)	As above	No real baseline	100	0
Number of phase-in registrations by each deadline (UK based) by manufacturers and importers	As above	No real baseline	100	0
Number of notifications of SVHCs in articles by UK based companies	As above	No real baseline	100	0
Number of notifications of classification and labelling under CLP by UK based companies	As above	No real baseline	0	100
Number of proposals for harmonised classification (from industry with reason)	As above	No real baseline	50	50
	Regulatory Burden and Maxi		1	
Actual expenditure on REACH registration	Survey of UK companies registering (via industry associations including waste recovery)	Predicted costs from impact assessments	100	0
Actual expenditure on authorisation	Survey of UK companies registering (via industry associations)	Predicted costs from impact assessments; actual costs incurred under ESR	100	0
Actual expenditure by industry on updating and/or replacement of IT systems	As above	Predicted costs from impact assessments	50	50
Actual expenditure by industry on relabelling (set- up and ongoing)	As above	As above	0	100
Actual expenditure by industry on repackaging (set- up and ongoing)	As above	As above	0	100
Actual expenditure by industry informing customers of changes due to REACH and CLP	As above	As above	50	50
Actual expenditure on by industry on staff training due to REACH and CLP	As above	As above	50	50
Actual cost of stock disposal	As above	As above	0	100

Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	% CLP
due to CLP changes				
Actual expenditure on reclassification of substances	As above	As above	0	100
due to introduction of CLP				
Actual expenditure on	As above	As above		
reclassification of mixtures			0	100
due to introduction of CLP				
Number of joint registrations	Data from REACH IT via HSE	Predicted proportion of		1
versus individual registrations		joint registrations from	100	0
		impact assessments		
Number of substances (and	As above. May need to be	Predicted proportions	1)	
mixtures) reclassified using	supplemented by industry	from impact assessments	0	100
Annex VII alone	survey data			100
Problems encountered with	Survey of UK companies	Predicted problems of	7	
SIEFs	registering (with industry	SIEFs from impact	100	0
~ ~~~ 5	associations)	assessments	100	
Number of SMEs taking	Data from REACH IT via CA	Calculated savings		1
advantage of reduced	Data Holli KLACII II via CA	compared to full fees	100	0
registration fees		compared to full fees	100	
Number of SMEs reducing	Survey of SME	Questions on baseline will		
	manufacturers/importers (with	need to be included in	100	0
manufacture/import to below			100	U
1t/y to avoid registration costs	small business associations)	survey		
Savings in data costs due to	As above	Predicted savings of	62	20
SIEFs		SIEFs from impact	63	38
NY 1 C1 ' 1, 1	D. C. DEACHTE CA	assessments		
Number of dossiers updated	Data from REACH IT via CA	Impact assessment	50	50
for classification changes	<i>4</i> 0°	predictions and data	50	50
(with reason for change)		trends		
Cost savings from using	Case studies of UK companies	No real baseline		
REACH registration data for	registering (with industry		0	100
reclassification of substances	associations)			
and mixtures	\'O'			
Cost of changes to obligations	Case studies of UK companies	No real baseline		1
under downstream legislation	(with industry associations)		_	
triggered by CLP (particularly			0	100
REACH, BPD, PPPD, and				1
Seveso II)				ļ
Cost of reclassification of	Case studies of UK companies	No real baseline		
substances and mixtures due	(with industry associations)		0	100
to introduction of CLP				
Costs of updating SDS due to	Survey of SME manufacturers	Questions on baseline will		1
REACH and CLP	/importers and DUs (with small	need to be included in	50	50
\sim	business associations)	survey		
Time taken by consumers to	Survey of consumers via	No real baseline but UK		
familiarise themselves with	National Centre for Social	RIA estimations	0	100
CLP	Research			1
Level of consumer	Survey of consumers via	No real baseline but UK		
understanding of hazard	National Centre for Social	RIA estimations		
labels under CLP as	Research		0	100
compared to hazard labels			Ĭ	

Consumer confidence in chemicals industry Number of separate lists of prohibited substances prepared by retailers Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations)	Chemicals industry	chemicals industry consumer survey company) Number of separate lists of prohibited substances prepared by retailers Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations)	Indicator	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	%
Number of separate lists of prohibited substances prepared by retailers Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations)	Number of separate lists of prohibited substances prepared by retailers Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health Costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations)	Number of separate lists of prohibited substances prepared by retailers Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health Costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations)			Previous surveys	50	
Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) 50 Sources of DU companies (with industry associations)	Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information Survey of DU companies (with industry associations)	Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health Costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50 150 150 150 150 150 150 150	Number of separate lists of prohibited substances		information on existing	83	
Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50 Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	Sub-objective: Establish Economic Benefits from Improvements to Human and Environmental Health Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information Survey of DU companies (with estimates of costs of poor information) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50 Survey of DU companies (with estimates of costs of poor information) 50 Survey of DU companies (with estimates of costs of poor information)	Survey of DU companies (with management costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with management costs due to better information on chemicals used) Survey of DU companies (with management costs due to better information on chemicals used) Survey of DU companies (with management costs due to better information on chemicals used) Survey of DU companies (with management estimates of costs of poor information) Survey of DU companies (with management estimates of costs of poor information) Survey of DU companies (with management estimates of costs of poor information) 50 50	Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on	Contact NGO and trade unions	*	50	
Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) 50 50 50 50	Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50 50 50		conomic Benefits from Improvem	unts to Human and Enviror	nmental Hea	ith
health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with estimates of costs of poor information) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with estimates of costs of poor information) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) 50 50	health costs due to better information on chemicals used Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Survey of DU companies (with estimates of costs of poor information) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50 150 150 150 150 150 150 150				.0	
Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50	Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50	Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used Survey of DU companies (with industry associations) Impact assessment estimates of costs of poor information 50	health costs due to better information on chemicals		estimates of costs of poor	50	
management costs due to better information on chemicals used industry associations) estimates of costs of poor information 50	management costs due to better information on chemicals used industry associations) estimates of costs of poor information 50	management costs due to better information on chemicals used industry associations) estimates of costs of poor information 50		Survey of DU companies (with	Impact assessment	<u>O- '</u>	
archivedon	archivedon	archivedon	management costs due to better information on		estimates of costs of poor	50	
	90CMUU	Sacural		archive			

A2.16. ENCOURAGE THE PROVISION OF AN ADEQUATE RESOURCE BASE BY UK INDUSTRY WITH WHICH TO MEET REACH AND CLP Obligations

Table A2.16 shows the data sources for each indicator and baseline and the relative specificity of that indicator towards REACH and CLP.

	Data Set (Indicator)	Data Source (Baseline)	% REACH	% (
	Provision of Adequate Scientific a	nd Technical Resource Bas		lustry
which to meet REACH Obl		C :- 1:		
Numbers of toxicologists/ ecotoxicologist and risk	Defra (Toxicology/ Ecotoxicology capacity survey)	Same as indicator	83	1
assessors based in the UK	Survey of companies		O 63	1
Adequacy of scientific and	Discussion with CA; Case	Same as indicator		
technical resource base	studies of manufacturers and	Same as maleatory		
available to industry (FTEs,	DUs Station of Manufacturers and	0.9	83	
skill set and reasons)				
Capacity of UK contract	Defra (Toxicology/	Same as indicator		
laboratories and extent of	Ecotoxicology capacity survey)			
involvement in REACH	Survey of UK contract	7	83	
support activities (FTEs, skill				
set and reasons)	.0			
	125			
	. 1 0			
×	N			
cent	N			
neni	N			
inen	N			
cument	N			
CUMENT				
Aochmen				
40cument				
40cument	wasarchive			
document				
document				
document				

ANNEX 3. ON 28 January 2015.

RESULTS OF INDICATOR SCORENGE OR REACH EVALUATION

THIS document was a chief the second of the sec

This document was archived on 28 January 2015. A3.1.REDUCE THE NEGATIVE HEALTH IMPACTS ARISING FROM

Table A3.1: Indicators for Objective 'Reduce the Negative Health In	npacts Arising fron	1 Occupational	Exposure to Ch	emicals'	\cap	$\overline{\mathcal{O}}$		
	Scor	es for individu	al criteria		Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option			
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confoundin g Factors	Cont	System A	System B	System C	System D
Number of substances/mixtures reclassified with a 'higher' classification	0	4	5	3	0	0	0	0
Number of substances/mixtures reclassified with a 'lower' classification	0	4	5	3	0	0	0	0
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational asthma	4	5	901	5	67	75	86	79
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)	4	5	1	5	67	75	86	79
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational respiratory cancers	4	5	1	5	67	75	86	79
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational skin cancers	4	5	1	5	67	75	86	79
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational skin disease	4	5	1	5	67	75	86	79
Change in rates of serious worker injury or death attributable to chemicals	4	5	1	2	67	60	81	41
Change in the number of chemical incidents involving exposure of workers	4	5	1	3	67	65	83	54
Change in the number of the workers affected by chemical incidents	4	5	1	3	67	65	83	54
Change in number of prescriptions for chemically-related occupational dermatitis	4	3	2	3	60	60	67	56
Change in number of prescriptions for occupational asthma	4	3	2	3	60	60	67	56
Change in industry expenditure on local and general ventilation equipment	4	2	2	3	53	55	59	55
Change in industry expenditure on protective gloves	4	2	2	3	53	55	59	55
Change in incidence of work-related chemically-induced respiratory disease	4	2	1	3	47	50	57	50
Change in incidence of work-related chemically-induced skin disease	4	2	1	3	47	50	57	50
Change in numbers claiming compensation because of industrial injuries attributable to chemicals	1	5	1	5	47	60	60	75

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40) Page A3-2

Page A3-3

A3.2. REDUCE THE NEGATIVE HEALTH IMPACTS ON PUBLIC HEALTH OF EXPOSURE TO CHEMICALS

Table A3.2: Indicators for Objective 'Reduce the Negative Health In	npacts on Public H	lealth of Exposu	re to Chemicals	•	\cap	$\overline{\mathcal{Y}}$		
		res for individu					as % of m specified	
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Clost	System A	System B	System C	System D
Number of emergency actions taken relating to human health under article 129 of REACH	5	5	9 5	5	100	100	100	100
Change in number of substances of very high concern (SVHC) in articles on UK market	5	5	3	4	87	85	96	78
Change in quantities of chemicals of concern produced or marketed in the UK	4	5	3	5	80	85	89	89
Change in the numbers of the public affected by chemical incidents	4	(1	4	67	70	84	66
Change in the number of chemical incidents involving exposure of the public	4	5	1	3	67	65	83	54
Change in the level of congenital abnormalities in the UK public that can't be attributed to causes other than chemicals	3	4	1	4	53	60	67	64
Change in usage of chemicals of concern in consumer products	3	5	3	3	73	70	77	63
Numbers of substances withdrawn from the UK market because of concerns regarding human health	5	3	3	3	73	70	77	63
Change in tissue levels of chemicals of concern in the UK population	5	4	2	1	73	60	81	34
Introduction of alternative substances to replace chemicals of concern under REACH	4	2	3	2	60	55	59	48
Change in public opinion of adequacy of controls on chemicals	2	3	1	2	40	40	47	36

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

Page A3-4 System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

This document was archived on 28 January 2015. A3.3. REDUCE THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT FROM **CHEMICALS**

Table A3.3: Indicators for Objective 'Reduce the Negative Impacts	on the Environm	ent from Chemica	ıls'			<u> </u>		,
	So	cores for individua	al criteria		<u> </u>	ted scores a ossible for		
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D
Number of emergency actions taken relating to environment protection under article 129 of REACH	5	5	95 ⁵	5	100	100	100	100
Change in soil biodiversity	3	5		5	87	70	77	48
Change in levels of selected chemicals in ambient air samples	5	5	3	1	73	70	91	55
Change in levels of selected chemicals in soil samples	5	5	3	1	73	70	91	55
Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue samples of aquatic species	5	5	3	1	73	70	91	55
Change in levels of selected chemicals in tissue samples of terrestrial species	5	5	3	1	73	70	91	55
Change in levels of selected chemicals in waste sludge samples	5	5	3	1	73	70	91	55
Change in levels of selected chemicals in water and sediment samples	5	5	3	1	73	70	91	55
Change in population levels of chemical induced non-lethal effect in wildlife species	5	3	1	3	73	60	74	38
Change in population numbers of species with established susceptibility to chemical pollution	5	3	1	3	73	60	74	38

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System D: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10) System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40) Page A3-6

A3.4.MAINTAIN **COMPETITIVE POSITION** UK **THE OF CHEMICALS SECTOR**

Table A3.4: Indicators for 'Maintain the Competitive Position of th	e UK Chemicals	Sector')			
	So	cores for individua	al criteria			Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*			
Indicator	Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D	
Overall output of UK chemical industry	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84	
Percentage contribution to GDP	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84	
Profitability	4	3	2	4	60	65	69	69	
Value of exports	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84	
Value of imports	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84	
Volume of exports	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84	
Volume of imports	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84	

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A3.5.MINIMISE ADVERSE STRUCTURAL CHANGES TO UK INDUSTRY

Table A3.5: Indicators for Objective 'Minimise Adverse Stru	uctural Changes to UK	Industry'				•		
	s	Scores for individua	al criteria			ted scores a ossible for		
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	tso	System A	System B	System	System D
Employment (various sectors)	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84
Number of companies (various sectors)	4	5	9 -2	5	73	80	87	84
Size distribution of companies (various sectors)	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84
Use of recycled /recovered materials in new products	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84
Volume of materials recycled /recovered	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A3.6. MINIMISE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON THE PATTERNS OF INDUSTRIAL **ACTIVITY IN THE UK**

Table A3.6: Indicators for Objective 'Minimise Adverse Effects on t	he Patterns of In	dustrial Activity i	n the UK'		\ \				
	S	cores for individua	al criteria		Weighted scores as % of m score possible for specified				
Indicator	REACH	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D	
Number of process changes carried out	4	3	3	3	67	65	69	61	
Number product reformulations carried out	4	3	3	3	67	65	69	61	
Number products removed from market due to unsupported uses	5	3	3	3	73	70	77	63	
Percentage change in DU product portfolios	4	3	3	3	67	65	69	61	
Percentage change in number of suppliers per DU company	4	3	3	3	67	65	69	61	
Percentage change in price of chemical inputs (compared to overall industry inputs)	4	2	2	3	53	55	59	55	
Reasons for withdrawal of substances	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68	
Risk characteristics of withdrawn substances	2	5	3	5	67	75	71	86	
Total number of substances available on UK market	4	5	2	4	73	75	86	71	
Total number preparations/mixtures available on UK market	4	5	2	3	73	70	84	59	

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A3.7. MAXIMISE THE POTENTIAL FOR INNOVATION

Table A3.7: Indicators for 'Maximise the Potential for Innovation'					1			
	So	cores for individua	al criteria			ted scores a ossible for		
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D
Number of high-risk substances substituted (and cost) by downstream users	5	3	182	3	67	65	76	58
Number of new products developed using lower risk substances by downstream users	5	3	2	3	67	65	76	58
Number of new substances registered (UK sites) (manufacturers and importers)	5	.0	2	4	80	80	94	73
Number of PPORD exemptions sought with reasons (UK sites) (manufacturers and importers)	5	O 5	2	4	80	80	94	73
REACH/CLP related R&D expenditure as a percentage of total R&D for selected sectors (manufacturers and DUs)	5	3	2	3	67	65	76	58
REACH/CLP related R&D expenditure as percentage turnover for selected sectors (manufacturers and DUs)	5	3	2	3	67	65	76	58
Reasons for substitution by downstream users	5	3	2	3	67	65	76	58
Value of new products developed by downstream users using lower risk substances	5	3	2	3	67	65	76	58
Value of REACH/CLP-related services provided to customers (manufacturers, importers and downstream users)	5	3	3	3	73	70	77	63

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

.dicator 25. A3.8.ENCOURAGE THE DISSEMINATION AND UTILISATION BY STAKEHOLDERS OF INFORMATION SOURCES AND ADVICE

Table A3.8: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage the Dissemination and Utilisation by Stakeholders of Information Sources and Advice Relating to Chemicals'										
	Se	cores for individu	Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*							
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D		
Number of consumer requests for information regarding SVHCs in articles	5	2	4	3	73	70	70	66		
Number of CA helpdesk enquiries	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Number of guidance items downloaded from CA website	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Number of information events (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Number of subscriptions to CA e-Bulletin	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Number of visits to CA website	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A3.9. ENCOURAGE THE PROVISION OF HIGH QUALITY INFORMATION AND ADVICE ABOUT CHEMICALS

Table A3.9: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage the Provision of High Quality Information and Advice about Chemicals'										
	Sc	ores for individua	Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*							
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D		
Completeness of CA website information	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Quality of CA website information	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Relevance of CA website information	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Completeness of CA helpdesk responses	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Quality of CA helpdesk responses	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Relevance of CA helpdesk responses	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Percentage of retailers with knowledge of their customers' right to request information	5	2	2	2	60	55	66	44		
Number of SDS meeting DU requirements	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68		
Number of (e)SDS failing legal requirements	5	5	4	5	93	95	99	95		
Percentage of consumers with knowledge of right to request information on SVHCs in articles	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

Page A3-19

A3.10. PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE (ESPECIALLY NON-VERTEBRATE) TEST METHODS

Table A3.10: Indicators for Objective 'Promote the De	evelopment o	f Alternativ	e (especially	Non-vertebra			7	-				
Scores for individual criteria						Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*						
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D				
UK Government contribution to the development of alternative test methods	5	5	4	5	93	95	99	95				
UK Government's alternative testing awareness raising activities	5	5	4	5	93	95	99	95				
Number of alternative (non-vertebrate) test methods subject to validation at European level	3	5	5	5	87	90	83	98				
Number of ECVAM validated alternative (non-vertebrate) test methods	3	5	5	5	87	90	83	98				
UK Government contribution to EU and OECD work on alternative testing methods and guidance	4	5	140	5	87	90	90	94				
Number of alternative (non-vertebrate) test methods subject to validation at OECD level	3	5	4	5	80	85	81	93				
Number of alternative tests adopted by EU	3	50	4	5	80	85	81	93				
Number of OECD validated alternative (non-vertebrate) test methods	3	()	4	5	80	85	81	93				

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

Page A3-20 System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A3.11. PROMOTE THE USE OF ALTERNATIVE (ESPECIALLY NON-**VERTEBRATE) TEST METHODS**

Table A3.11: Indicators for Objective 'Promote the Use of Alternative (especially Non-vertebrate) Test Methods'										
	Sc	ores for ind	ividual criteri	a	Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*					
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	SystemA	System B	System C	System D		
Number of project licenses withdrawn in UK because of availability of alternative test methods	5	5	4	30	93	95	99	95		
Numbers of REACH dossiers for which (exposure-based) waiving is allowed as opposed to vertebrate testing involving one or more UK companies	5	5	4	b 4	93	90	97	83		
Numbers of REACH dossiers including use of computational test methods as alternative to proposing vertebrate testing involving one or more UK companies	5	5	014	4	93	90	97	83		
Numbers of REACH dossiers including use of non-vertebrate test methods as alternative to proposing vertebrate testing involving one or more UK companies	5	60	4	4	93	90	97	83		
Numbers of REACH dossiers that include use of read-across as alternative to proposing vertebrate testing involving one or more UK companies	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83		
Numbers of REACH dossiers including vertebrate test proposals involving one or more UK companies	(£)	5	3	4	87	85	96	78		
Proportion of vertebrate test proposals agreed to by ECHA involving one or more UK companies	5	5	3	4	87	85	96	78		
Number of withdrawn EU test methods that involved use of vertebrate animals	3	5	4	5	80	85	81	93		
Number of withdrawn OECD test methods involving use of vertebrate animals	3	5	4	5	80	85	81	93		

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

This document was archived on 28 January 2015. A3.12. MINIMISE THE USE OF VERTEBRATES IN THE TESTING OF CHEMICALS THAT FALL WITHIN THE SCOPE OF REACH OR

Table A3.12: Indicators for Objective 'Minimise the Use of Vertebrates in the Testing of Chemicals that Fall within the Scope of REACH or CLP'										
	Se	cores for individua	Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*							
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D		
Number of UK stakeholder submissions in favour and against acceptance of vertebrate testing involving UK companies	5	5	18	4	100	95	99	88		
Number (by species) of vertebrate used for testing of chemicals in UK	5	5	4	5	93	95	99	95		
Relative proportion of traditional to more refined test methods using vertebrate animals in the UK	5	5	4	5	93	95	99	95		
Change in proportion of total EU usage of animals conducted by UK	5	5	3	5	87	90	97	90		
Estimated savings of animal numbers for ECHA approved tests due to operation of SIEFs/Joint registrations involving one or more UK companies	5		2	3	67	65	76	58		

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

This document was archived on 28 January 2015. A3.13. SUPPORT THE EFFICIENT OPERATION OF THE REACH AND CLP PROCESS BY UK GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNMENT

Table A3.4: Indicators for Objective 'Support the Efficient Operation	on of the REACH	and CLP Process	s by UK Gover	nment aı	nd Govern	nent Orga	nisations'	
	Sc	ores for individua	Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*					
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D
Cost of training of enforcement officers	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83
Cost saving from having a common CA and enforcement for REACH and CLP	5	5	18	4	100	95	99	88
Number of proposals for harmonised classification (from UK government with reason)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100
Numbers and nature of REACH and CLP enforcement actions	5	5	5	4	100	95	99	88
Person days for REACH and CLP awareness/ promotion events (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100
Person days of CA helpdesk activity	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100
Person days of REACH and CLP website development (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83
Person days of REACH and CLP activity at EU level by type (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	4	100	95	99	88
Person days of REACH and CLP activity at UK level by type (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	4	100	95	99	88

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10) System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A3.14. ENSURE THE ADEQUACY OF THE UK GOVERNMENT RESOURCE BASE TO MEET REACH AND CLP OBLIGATIONS

Table A3.14: Indicators for Objective 'Maintain the Competitive Position of the UK Chemicals Sector'										
	Sco	ores for individua	al criteria	0	_		as % of max specified O			
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D		
Adequacy of skill sets of staff assigned to REACH and CLP activities (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Budget for REACH and CLP work (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Cost of CA helpdesk	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Cost of CA website	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Cost of REACH and CLP activity at EU level by type (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Cost of REACH and CLP activity at UK level by type (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Cost of REACH and CLP awareness/ promotion events supported by CA	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		
Numbers of staff assigned to REACH and CLP activities (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100		

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A3.15. ENCOURAGE THE EFFICIENT OPERATION OF THE REACH AND CLP PROCESS BY UK INDUSTRY

Table A3.15: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage The Efficient Ope	eration of the RE	ACH Process by U	JK Industry'	•	A			
	S	cores for individu	al criteria	NO	0	ted scores a		
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D
Number of authorisation applications (UK based)	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83
Number of phase-in registrations by each deadline (UK based) by manufacturers and importers	5	, 0	4	4	93	90	97	83
Number of manufacturers and importers (UK based)	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83
Number of notifications of SVHCs in articles by UK based companies	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83
Number of proposals for harmonised classification (from industry with reason)	5	3	5	5	87	90	83	98
Actual expenditure by industry informing customers of changes due to REACH and CLP	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68
Actual expenditure by industry on updating and/or replacement of IT systems due to REACH and CLP	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68
Actual expenditure on by industry on staff training due to REACH and CLP	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68
Actual expenditure on REACH authorisation	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73
Actual expenditure on REACH registration	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73
Consumer confidence in chemicals industry	4	3	2	2	60	55	66	44
Costs of updating SDS due to REACH and CLP	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73
Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use	5	5	4	3	93	85	96	70
Number of joint registrations versus individual registrations	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73
Number of REACH dossiers updated for classification changes (with reason for change)	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73
Number of separate lists of prohibited substances prepared by retailers	5	3	2	2	67	60	74	45
Number of SMEs reducing manufacture import to below 1t/y to avoid	5	3	3	3	73	70	77	63

Table A3.15: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage The Efficient Operation of the REACH Process by UK Industry'											
	S	cores for individu	al criteria	S		ted scores a					
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Eactors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D			
registration costs											
Number of SMEs taking advantage of reduced registration fees	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73			
Problems encountered with SIEFs	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73			
Savings in data costs due to SIEFs	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73			
Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used	2	3	3	3	53	55	51	59			
Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used	2	3	3	3	53	55	51	59			
Cost of environmental damage attributable to chemicals	4	2	1	3	47	50	57	50			
Costs associated with burden to UK of ill-health of population attributable to chemicals	(4)	4	1	3	60	60	74	53			
Costs associated with burden to UK of work-related ill-health attributable to chemicals	4	4	1	4	60	65	76	65			

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

This document was archived on 28 January 2015. A3.16. ENCOURAGE THE PROVISION OF AN ADEQUATE RESOURCE BASE BY UK INDUSTRY WITH WHICH TO MEET REACH

Page A3-33

Table A3.16: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage The Provision of	an Adequate Res	ource Base by Ul	X Industry with	which to	meet REA	CH Oblig	ations'	
	So	cores for individu	al criteria	. ??			as % of max r specified O	
Indicator	REACH Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D
Adequacy of scientific and technical resource base available to industry for demands of REACH and CLP	5	3	2	3	67	65	76	58
Capacity of UK contract laboratories and extent of involvement in REACH support activities	5	40	2	3	73	70	84	59
Numbers of toxicologists/ ecotoxicologist and risk assessors based in the UK	5	O4	2	3	73	70	84	59

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

Annexa Scoring

ANNEXA

RESULTS OF INDICATOR SCORING FOR CLP EVALUATION

THIS document was

This document was archived on 28 January 2015. REDUCE THE NEGATIVE HEALTH IMPACTS ARISING FROM A4.1. OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE TO CHEMICALS

Table A4.1: Indicators for Objective 'Reduce the Negative Health In	Table A4.1: Indicators for Objective 'Reduce the Negative Health Impacts Arising from Occupational Exposure to Chemicals'												
	5	Scores for individ	ual criteria		0		as % of m specified						
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D					
Number of substances/mixtures reclassified with a 'higher' classification	5	4	5	3	93	85	89	74					
Number of substances/mixtures reclassified with a 'lower' classification	5	4	5	3	93	85	89	74					
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational asthma	3	5	1	5	60	70	77	78					
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)	3	5	1	5	60	70	77	78					
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational respiratory cancers	3	5	1	5	60	70	77	78					
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational skin cancers	3	5	1	5	60	70	77	78					
Change in incidence of chemically-related occupational skin disease	3	5	1	5	60	70	77	78					
Change in rates of serious worker injury or death attributable to chemicals	3	5	1	2	60	55	73	40					
Change in the number of chemical incidents involving exposure of workers	3	5	1	3	60	60	74	53					
Change in the number of the workers affected by chemical incidents	3	5	1	3	60	60	74	53					
Change in number of prescriptions for chemically-related occupational dermatitis	3	3	2	3	53	55	59	55					
Change in number of prescriptions for occupational asthma	3	3	2	3	53	55	59	55					
Change in industry expenditure on local and general ventilation equipment	4	2	2	3	53	55	59	55					
Change in industry expenditure on protective gloves	4	2	2	3	53	55	59	55					
Change in incidence of work-related chemically-induced respiratory disease	3	2	1	3	40	45	49	49					
Change in incidence of work-related chemically-induced skin disease	3	2	1	3	40	45	49	49					
Change in numbers claiming compensation because of industrial injuries attributable to chemicals	1	5	1	5	47	60	60	75					

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A4.2. REDUCE THE NEGATIVE HEALTH IMPACTS ON PUBLIC HEALTH OF EXPOSURE TO CHEMICALS

Inis document was archived on 28 January 2015.

Table A4.2: Indicators for Objective 'Reduce the Negative Health In	npacts on Public	Health of Exposu	re to Chemic	als'		, V			
	Se	cores for individua	al criteria		O	Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option'			
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D	
Change in the numbers of the public affected by chemical incidents	3	5	1	4	60	65	76	65	
Change in the number of chemical incidents involving exposure of the public	3	5	1	3	60	60	74	53	
Change in usage of chemicals of concern in consumer products	3	5	3,	3	73	70	77	63	
Numbers of substances withdrawn from the UK market because of concerns regarding human health	5	3	3	3	73	70	77	63	
Change in public opinion of adequacy of controls on chemicals	2	3	1	2	40	40	47	36	

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A4.3. REDUCE THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT FROM CHEMICALS

This objective was not considered of direct relevance to the aims of the CLP regulation and so no indicators of the environmental effects of chemicals were proposed for inclusion in the CLP evaluation programme.

A4.4. MAINTAIN THE COMPETITIVE POSITION OF THE UK CHEMICALS SECTOR

Table A4.3 shows, for this objective, the results of the scoring exercise for those indicators considered to be of some relevance to the CLP regulation. Three other identified indicators (Overall output of UK chemical industry, Percentage contribution to GDP and Profitability) were considered to only be relevant to REACH, and have therefore been omitted from this table.

A4.5. MINIMISE ADVERSE STRUCTURAL CHANGES TO UK INDUSTRY

This objective was not considered of direct refevance to the aims of the CLP regulation and so no indicators were proposed for inclusion in the CLP evaluation programme.

Table A4.3: Indicators for Objective 'Maintain the Competitive Pos	ition of the UK C	Chemicals Sector'									
	Sc	ores for individua	al criteria		_		scores as % of maximum ble for specified Option*				
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D			
Value of exports	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84			
Value of imports	4	5	200	5	73	80	87	84			
Volume of exports	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84			
Volume of imports	4	5	2	5	73	80	87	84			

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A4.6. MINIMISE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON THE PATTERNS OF INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY IN THE UK

Table A4.4 shows, for this objective, the results of the scoring exercise for those indicators considered to be of some relevance to the CLP regulation. Three other identified withdra ... arefore be January ... January ... A language of the state indicators (Number products removed from market due to unsupported uses, Percentage change in number of suppliers per DU company and Risk characteristics of withdrawn substances) were considered to only be relevant to REACH, and have therefore been

Table A4.4: Indicators for Objective 'Minimise Adverse Effects on t	he Patterns of In	dustrial Activity	in the UK'							
	Sc	ores for individua	al criteria			Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*				
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D		
Number of process changes carried out	2	3	3	3	53	55	51	59		
Number product reformulations carried out	2	3	3	3	53	55	51	59		
Percentage change in DU product portfolios	2	3	3	3	53	55	51	59		
Percentage change in price of chemical inputs (compared to overall industry inputs)	4	2	2	3	53	55	59	55		
Reasons for withdrawal of substances	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68		
Total number of substances available on UK market	2	5	2	4	60	65	69	69		
Total number preparations/mixtures available on UK market	2	5	2	3	60	60	67	56		

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A4.7. MAXIMISE THE POTENTIAL FOR INNOVATION

Table A4.5: Indicators for Objective 'Maximise the Potential for Ind	able A4.5: Indicators for Objective 'Maximise the Potential for Innovation'									
	Se	cores for individu	ıal criteria		// 9	ed scores a ossible for				
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors		System A	System B	System C	System D		
Number of high-risk substances substituted (and cost) by downstream users	2	3	2	3	47	50	50	54		
Number of new products developed using lower risk substances by downstream users	2	3	2	3	47	50	50	54		
Number of PPORD exemptions sought with reasons (UK sites) (manufacturers and importers)	4	5	2	4	73	75	86	71		
REACH/CLP related R&D expenditure as a percentage of total R&D for selected sectors (manufacturers and DUs)	5	30	2	3	67	65	76	58		
REACH/CLP related R&D expenditure as percentage turnover for selected sectors (manufacturers and DUs)	5	3	2	3	67	65	76	58		
Reasons for substitution by downstream users	5	3	2	3	67	65	76	58		
Value of new products developed by downstream users using lower risk substances	2	3	2	3	47	50	50	54		
Value of REACH/CLP-related services provided to customers (manufacturers, importers and downstream users)	25	3	3	3	73	70	77	63		

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A4.8. ENCOURAGE THE DISSEMINATION AND UTILISATION BY STAKEHOLDERS OF INFORMATION SOURCES AND ADVICE RELATING TO CHEMICALS

and the second of the second o Table A4.6 shows, for this objective, the results of the scoring exercise for each indicator in relation to the CLP regulation. One indicator under this objective (Number of

Table A4.6: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage the Dissemination	n and Utilisation b	y Stakeholders of	Information So	ources and	l Advice R	elating to	Chemicals	;'
	S	cores for individu	al criteria			ed scores a ossible for		
Indicator	CLP	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	No.	System A	System B	System C	System D
Number of CA helpdesk enquiries	2	5	5	5	80	85	74	96
Number of guidance items downloaded from CA website	2	5	5	5	80	85	74	96
Number of information events (CA and other government bodies)	2	5	5	5	80	85	74	96
Number of subscriptions to CA e-Bulletin	2	5	5	5	80	85	74	96
Number of visits to CA website	2	5	5	5	80	85	74	96

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A4.9. ENCOURAGE THE PROVISION OF HIGH QUALITY INFORMATION AND ADVICE ABOUT CHEMICALS

This document was archived on 28 January Table A4.7 shows, for this objective, the results of the scoring exercise for each indicator in relation to the CLP regulation. Two indicators under this objective (Number of (e)SDS

Table A4.7: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage the Provision of High Quality Information and Advice about Chemicals'											
	S	cores for individu	ıal criteria		// /~	ted scores as possible for s					
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	30	System A	System B	System C	System D			
Completeness of CA website information	2	3	5	3	67	65	54	69			
Quality of CA website information	2	3	5	3	67	65	54	69			
Relevance of CA website information	2	3	5	3	67	65	54	69			
Completeness of CA helpdesk responses	2	3	5	3	67	65	54	69			
Quality of CA helpdesk responses	2	3	5	3	67	65	54	69			
Relevance of CA helpdesk responses	2	3	5	3	67	65	54	69			
Number of substance and mixture labels meeting CLP requirements	3	5	5	4	87	85	81	85			
Percentage of retailers with knowledge of their customers' right to request information	2	:170	2	2	40	40	40	40			
Number of SDS meeting DU requirements	2	3	4	3	60	60	53	64			

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

A4.10. PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE (ESPECIALLY NON-VERTEBRATE) TEST METHODS

This objective was not considered of relevance to the aims of the CLP regulation and so no indicators were proposed for inclusion in the CLP evaluation programme.

A4.11. PROMOTE THE USE OF ALTERNATIVE (ESPECIALLY NON-VERTEBRATE) TEST METHODS

This objective was not considered of relevance to the aims of the CLP regulation and so no indicators were proposed for inclusion in the CLP evaluation programme

A4.12. MINIMISE THE USE OF VERTEBRATES IN THE TESTING OF CHEMICALS THAT FALL WITHIN THE SCOPE OF REACH

This objective was not considered of relevance to the aims of the CLP regulation and so no indicators were proposed for inclusion in the CLP evaluation programme.

A4.13. SUPPORT THE EFFICIENT OPERATION OF THE REACH AND CLP PROCESS BY UK GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

Table A4.8 shows, for this objective, the results of the scoring exercise for each indicator in relation to the CLP regulation.

Table A4.8: Indicators for Objective 'Support the Efficient Operation of the REACH and CLP Process by UK Government and Government Organisations'											
•		cores for individ	*		Weight	ted scores	as % of ma specified C				
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D			
Cost of training of emergency service staff	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83			
Cost of training of enforcement officers	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83			
Cost saving from having a common CA and enforcement for REACH and CLP	5	5	5	4	100	95	99	88			
Cost to emergency response bodies from adapting emergency response guidance in the light of CLP (CLP Article 45)	5	5	O ₃	4	87	85	96	78			
Number of emergency health responses by emergency response bodies regarding mixtures (CLP Article 45)	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83			
Format of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	5	* 5	4	4	93	90	97	83			
Nature of data held by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83			
Number of requests for statistical analysis submitted to emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83			
Number of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83			
Nature of preventative or corrective measures prepared by emergency response bodies (CLP Article 45)	S	5	4	4	93	90	97	83			
Number of proposals for harmonised classification (from UK government with reason)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100			
Numbers and nature of REACH and CLP enforcement actions	5	5	5	4	100	95	99	88			
Person days for REACH and CLP awareness/ promotion events (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100			
Person days of CA helpdesk activity	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100			
Person days of REACH and CLP website development (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	4	4	93	90	97	83			
Person days of REACH and CLP activity at EU level by type (CA and	5	5	5	4	100	95	99	88			

Table A4.8: Indicators for Objective 'Support the Efficient Operation of the REACH and CLP Process by UK Government and Government Organisations'										
	So	cores for individ		Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*						
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	System A	System B	System C	System D			
other government bodies)			0,0							
Person days of REACH and CLP activity at UK level by type (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5 4	100	95	99	88			

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

Page A4-19

A4.14. ENSURE THE ADEQUACY OF THE UK GOVERNMENT RESOURCE BASE TO MEET REACH & CLP OBLIGATIONS

Table A4.9: Indicators for Objective 'Ensure The Adequacy of the UK Government Resource Base to Meet REACH & CLP Obligations									
	Scores for individual criteria				Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*				
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	\$	System A	System B	System C	System D	
Adequacy of skill sets of staff assigned to REACH and CLP activities (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100	
Budget for REACH and CLP work (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	-5	5	100	100	100	100	
Cost of CA helpdesk	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100	
Cost of CA website	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100	
Cost of REACH and CLP activity at EU level by type (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100	
Cost of REACH and CLP activity at UK level by type (CA and other government bodies)	5	1,5	5	5	100	100	100	100	
Cost of REACH and CLP awareness/ promotion events supported by CA	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100	
Numbers of staff assigned to REACH and CLP activities (CA and other government bodies)	5	5	5	5	100	100	100	100	

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)

ENCOURAGE THE EFFICIENT OPERATION OF THE REACH A4.15. &CLP PROCESSES BY UK INDUSTRY

Inis document was archived on 28 January 2015.

Table A4.10: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage The Efficient Ope	eration of the RE	ACH & CLP Prod	cesses by UK I	ndustry'		7				
	So	Scores for individual criteria				Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*				
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D		
Number of manufacturers and importers (UK based)	3	5	4	4	80	80	80	80		
Number of notifications of classification and labelling under CLP by UK based companies	5	5	5	4	100	95	99	88		
Number of proposals for harmonised classification (from industry with reason)	5	3	5	5	87	90	83	98		
Actual cost of stock disposal due to CLP changes	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68		
Actual expenditure by industry informing customers of changes due to REACH and CLP	5		4	3	80	75	79	68		
Actual expenditure by industry on relabelling due to CLP (set-up and ongoing)	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68		
Actual expenditure by industry on repackaging due to CLP (set-up and ongoing);	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68		
Actual expenditure by industry on updating and/or replacement of IT systems due to REACH and CLP	S	3	4	3	80	75	79	68		
Actual expenditure on by industry on staff training due to REACH and CLP	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68		
Actual expenditure on reclassification of mixtures due to introduction of CLP	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Actual expenditure on reclassification of substances due to introduction of CLP	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Consumer confidence in chemicals industry	4	3	2	2	60	55	66	44		
Cost of changes to obligations under downstream legislation triggered by CLP (particularly REACH, BPD, PPPD and Seveso II)	5	3	4	3	80	75	79	68		
Cost savings from using REACH registration data for reclassification of substances	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		

Table A4.10: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage The Efficient Operation of the REACH & CLP Processes by UK Industry'										
Scores for individual criteria					Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*					
Indicator	CLP	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D		
Costs of updating SDS due to REACH and CLP	5	3	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Level of consumer understanding of hazard labels under CLP as compared to hazard labels under CHIP	5	3	S	3	67	65	76	58		
Number of campaigns by NGOs and trade unions on chemicals use	5	5	4	3	93	85	96	70		
Number of REACH dossiers updated for classification changes (with reason for change)	5	3 0	5	3	87	80	80	73		
Number of separate lists of prohibited substances prepared by retailers	1	3	2	2	40	40	40	40		
Number of substances (and mixtures) reclassified using Annex VII alone	5	2	5	3	80	75	71	71		
Savings in data costs due to SIEFs	3	3	5	3	73	70	63	70		
Savings in environmental management costs due to better information on chemicals used	2	3	3	3	53	55	51	59		
Savings in occupational health costs due to better information on chemicals used	C3	3	3	3	53	55	51	59		
Time taken by consumers to familiarise themselves with CLP	5	3	5	2	87	75	79	60		

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)
System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40) System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

This document was archived on 28 January 2015. A4.16. ENCOURAGE THE PROVISION OF AN ADEQUATE RESOURCE BASE BY UK INDUSTRY WITH WHICH TO MEET REACH &

Table A4.11: Indicators for Objective 'Encourage The Provision of a	an Adequate Res	ource Base by U	U K Industry wi	th which to	meet REAC	H & CLP	Obligations	s'
	Se	Weighted scores as % of maximum score possible for specified Option*						
Indicator	CLP Specificity	Quality of Information	Confounding Factors	Cost	System A	System B	System C	System D
Adequacy of scientific and technical resource base available to industry for demands of REACH and CLP	1	3	2	3	40	45	41	53
Capacity of UK contract laboratories and extent of involvement in REACH support activities	1	4	2	3	47	50	50	54
Numbers of toxicologists/ ecotoxicologist and risk assessors based in the UK	1	4		3	47	50	50	54

^{*} System A: Unweighted scores excluding costs

System B: Unweighted scores including costs

System C: Weighted – Specificity (60), Quality of information (60), Cost (10) and Confounding (10)

System D: Weighted - Specificity (10), Quality of information (10), Cost (100) and Confounding (40)