

MS REACH Reporting Questionnaire, modified to include Latvia

General Information	
Which Member State are you reporting for?	LV
What reporting period are you reporting on?	2010
Primary contact person's name.	Arnīs Ludboržs (LVĢMC), Anda Stiebre (VIDM)
Please provide an email address for the primary contact person.	arnis.ludborzs@lvgmc.lv; anda.stiebre@vidm.gov.lv

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

One Competent Authority Responsible for REACH	
What is the name of the organisation where the Competent Authority is situated?	Latvijas Vides, ģeoloģijas un meteoroloģijas centrs (LVĢMC)
What is the address of the organisation?	Maskavas iela 165, Rīga, LV-1019, Latvija
What is the email address of the organisation?	lvgmc@lvgmc.lv
What is the telephone number of the organisation?	+371 67032600
What is the fax number of the organisation?	+371 67145154
What part of REACH does this part of the Competent Authority deal with?	All
From what part of Government does this part of the Competent Authority have authority from?	Environment
Are employees in the Competent Authority directly employed by Government (civil servants)?	No
What skills do staff in this part of the Competent Authority have?	Chemistry Toxicology Ecotoxicity CLP
What other chemical legislation are the staff of the REACH CA involved in?	Import/Export Biocides Other
If Other, please list the different legislations here	Uztur ķīmisko vielu un maisījumu datu bāzi saskaņā ar Latvijas Republikas Ķīmisko vielu likumu un Ministru kabineta 2002.gada 22.oktobra noteikumiem Nr.466 "Noteikumi par ķīmisko vielu un ķīmisko produktu uzskaites kārtību un datu bāzi".
Are there any other institutions that the Competent Authority works with in relation to REACH issues?	Yes
Please list the other institutions that the Competent Authority works with.	Politikas līmenī: Vides ministrija (VIDM) Veselības ministrija (VM) Ekonomikas ministrija (EM) Kontroles institūcijas: Veselības inspekcija (VI) Valsts vides dienests (VVD) Valsts darba inspekcija (VDI) Patērētāju tiesību aizsardzības centrs (PTAC)

Does the Competent Authority outsource any of its work?	No
How adequately resourced is the Competent Authority?	3
Space is available below to provide further comments on the resourcing of the Competent Authority.	Finanšu resursi ir ļoti ierobežoti. Tehniskie resursi ir adekvāti. Cilvēkresursi - 1,6 cilv./gadā visu šajā sadaļā minēto pienākumu izpildīšanai.

Theme 2 - Information on Cooperation and Communication with other Member States, the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) and the Commission

How effective is communication between MS for REACH?	7
How could effectiveness of communication between MS be improved?	
How effective is collaboration between MS for REACH?	7
How could effectiveness of collaboration between MS be improved?	
Are there any special projects/cooperation on chemicals that the MS participates in with other MS outside of REACH?	Yes
Please provide further information.	Veselības Inspekcija darbojas Chemical Legislation European Enforcement Network (CLEEN). Pēdējais harmonizētais uzraudzības projekts, kurā Veselības Inspekcija ir piedalījusies ir CLEEN harmonizētais uzraudzības projekts "Eurobiocides". Vides ministrija koordinē jautājumus attiecībā uz Stratēģisku pieeju starptautiskajā ķīmisko vielu pārvaldībā (SAICM), kā arī attiecībā uz Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS). Valsts Darba Inspekcija ir iesaistījusies Senior Labour Inspectors Committee (SLIC).
How effective is MS communication with ECHA?	6
How could effectiveness of communication with ECHA be improved?	
How effective is MS collaboration with ECHA?	6
How could effectiveness of collaboration with ECHA be improved?	
How effective is MS communication with the Commission (specifically Article 133 Committee)?	7
How could effectiveness of communication with the Commission be improved?	
How effective is MS collaboration with the Commission (specifically Article 133 Committee)?	8
How could effectiveness of collaboration with the Commission be improved?	
Has use been made of the safeguard clause of REACH (Art. 129)?	No

Theme 3 - Operation of the National Helpdesk and Provision of Communication to the Public of Information on Risks of Substances

Please provide the name of the organisation responsible for operating the National Helpdesk for REACH.	Latvijas Vides, ģeoloģijas un meteoroloģijas centrs (LVĢMC)
What is the address of the Helpdesk?	Maskavas iela 165, Rīga, LV-1019, Latvija
What is the web page address of the Helpdesk?	http://www.lvģmc.lv/chemical/
What is the email address of the Helpdesk?	REACH@lvģmc.lv
What is the telephone number of the Helpdesk?	+371 67032027
What is the fax number of the Helpdesk?	+371 67145154
Are there any more organisations responsible for operating the National Helpdesk for REACH?	No

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

Toxicologist	0
Ecotoxicologist	0
Chemist	1-5
Risk Assessor	0
Economist	0
Social Scientist	0
Exposure Assessor	0
Other (please list)	0
If you have specified that there are a number of other staff that are involved in the Helpdesk, please list the type of staff here.	
Is the same Helpdesk used to provide help to Industry on CLP?	Yes
Does the Helpdesk receive any non-governmental support?	No
How many enquiries does the Helpdesk receive per year?	101-1000
In what format can enquiries be received by the Helpdesk?	Email Phone Fax Letter
How are the majority of enquiries received?	Email
Do you provide specific advice to SME's?	No
Who are the majority of enquiries from?	No information

What type of enquiries does the Helpdesk receive?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-registration SIEFs Registration REACH-IT Authorisation Downstream user obligations Restriction Obligations regarding articles Safety Data Sheets Enforcement SVHC CLP
---	--

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

Pre-registration (%)	14
Registration (%)	20
Authorisation (%)	1
Restriction (%)	1
Enforcement (%)	9
CLP (%)	8
SIEFs (%)	5
REACH-IT (%)	7
Downstream user obligations (%)	27
Obligations regarding articles (%)	2
Safety Data Sheets (%)	3
SVHC (%)	1

What proportion of enquiries received are deemed to be 1) straight forward, 2) complex, OR No information

Straight forward (%).	80
Complex (%).	20
No information (%).	0

How long, on average, does it take to respond to the following types of questions?

Straight forward questions	1 day
Complex questions	2 weeks
Are any types of enquiry outsourced?	No
Does the Helpdesk seek feedback on its performance?	Yes
Does the Helpdesk review its performance and consider ways to improve its effectiveness?	Yes

What level of cooperation is there between Helpdesks?

What level of cooperation is there between Helpdesks under REHCORN?	4
---	---

What level of cooperation is there between Helpdesks outside REHCORN?	3
How frequently do you use RHEP?	Daily
Has the MS carried out any specific public awareness raising activities?	No
Do you have a REACH webpage/website?	Yes
Do you have a single webpage for REACH or multiple pages?	Multiple webpages
How frequently is the REACH webpage visited (per month)?	No information
Please describe the scope of the number of REACH webpage visits.	Nav informācijas.

Theme 4 - Information on the Promotion of the Development, Evaluation and Use of Alternative Test Methods

Does the MS contribute to EU and/or OECD work on the development and validation of alternative test methods by participating in relevant committees?	No
What has been the overall public funding on research and development of alternative testing in your MS each year?	Euros 0-10,000

Theme 5 - Information on Participation in REACH Committees (FORUM, MS, RAC, SEAC, CARACAL, PEG, RCN, REHCORN)

On a scale of 1-10, how effective do you think the work of the Committees associated with REACH are?	8
How could the effectiveness of the Committees be improved?	

Theme 6 - Information on Substance Evaluation Activities

2010 Reporting

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

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

Toxicologist	
Ecotoxicologist	
Chemist	
Risk Assessor	
Socio-Economic Analyst	
Exposure Assessor	
Other (please list)	
If you have specified that there are a number of other staff that are involved in substance evaluation, please list the type of staff here.	

Please list the names of the substances covered in the dossiers that the MS has commented upon.

Please list the names of the substances covered in the dossiers where a draft decision has been made.

Please list the names of the substances covered in the dossiers that the MS has rapporteured.

Please list the names of the substances covered in the dossiers that the MS has completed.

How long, on average, does evaluation of a dossier take?

How many transitional dossiers has the MS completed?

How many substances has the MS added to the Community Rolling Action Plan?

How many of ECHA's draft decisions on dossier evaluation has the MS commented on?

Theme 7 - Annex XV Dossiers

How many of each type of dossier has the MS prepared?

CLP 0

Restriction 0

Identification of SVHC 0

Is the time spent following up your MS dossiers reasonable? 1

Space is available below to provide further comments on how reasonable the time spent following up your MS dossiers was. XV pielikuma dosjē netika sagatavoti.

How many of each type of dossier are rapporteured?

CLP 0

Restriction 0

Identification of SVHC 0

Is the time spent following up rapporteured dossiers reasonable? 1

Space is available below to provide further comments on how reasonable the time spent following up your rapporteured dossiers was. Nav sagatavoti ziņojumi par XV pielikuma dosjē.

How many of each type of dossier are co-rapporteured?

CLP 0

Restriction 0

Identification of SVHC 0

Is the time spent following up co-rapporteured dossiers reasonable?	1
Space is available below to provide further comments on how reasonable the time spent following up your co-rapporteured dossiers was.	Latvija nav bijusi līdzziņotāja kādam no XV pielikuma dosjē.

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

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

What expertise is available for preparing dossiers?	
Chemist	1-3
Toxicologist	1-3
Ecotoxicologist	1-3
Economist	
Enforcement	1-3
Legal	
Policy	1-3
Exposure	
CLP	1-3
Other (please list)	
If you have specified that there is other expertise is available for preparing CLH dossiers, please provide details here.	
Is the MS able to access external specialists?	Yes
What types of external specialists does the MS have access to?	Toksikologs, ekotoksikologs.
Is the MS satisfied with the levels of access to expertise?	3
Has there been any industry involvement in the preparation of MS dossiers?	No

Theme 8 - Information on Enforcement Activities

General Information

Please enter the MAIN enforcing authority for REACH within the Member State.	Veselības ministrijas pārraudzībā esošā Veselības inspekcija - atbildīga par ķīmisko vielu un maisījumu tirgus uzraudzību.
Is there more than one enforcing authority for REACH within the Member State?	Yes
Please provide details on the other enforcing authorities for REACH within the Member State.	Valsts vides dienests Valsts darba Inspekcija Patērētāju tiesību aizsardzības centrs

Enforcement Strategy

Has an overall strategy (or strategies) been devised and implemented for the enforcement of REACH?	No
If No, are there any plans for making an enforcement strategy (or strategies)?	Yes
Comments	Mērķis - nodrošināt REACH regulas prasības "nav datu, nav tirgus" izpildi, veicot valsts uzraudzību un kontroli uzņēmumos, kas ķīmiskās vielas un ķīmiskās vielas maisījumos laiž tirgū un izplata. 2007. - 2009. gadam - prasību drošības datu lapām izpildes uzraudzība, uzņēmumu informēšana par ķīmisko vielu provizorisko reģistrāciju/reģistrāciju. 2009. - 2010. gadi - provizoriskās reģistrācijas/ reģistrācijas prasību izpildes un prasību drošības datu lapām uzraudzība. Uzņēmumi kontrolei tika izvēlēti pēc šādiem kritērijiem: • Latvijā piedāvā tirdzniecībā bīstamas ķīmiskās vielas, kuras tiek ražotas šajā uzņēmumā, un/vai importētas no trešajām valstīm apjomā 1t un vairāk gadā; • Latvijā piedāvā tirdzniecībā bīstamas ķīmiskās vielas maisījumos, maisījumi tiek ražoti un/vai importēti tādos apjomos šajā uzņēmumā, un/vai importēti no trešajām valstīm un vielas apjoms gadā varētu būt 1t un vairāk.

Co-ordination, co-operation and exchange of information

Please outline of the mechanisms put in place to ensure good cooperation, coordination and exchange of information on REACH enforcement between enforcing authorities and the Competent Authority.

1. 2006. gadā Vides ministrija izveidoja Ķīmiskās drošības darba grupu (Vides ministrijas 10.07.2006. rīkojums Nr. 357), lai sekmētu Stratēģiskās pieejas starptautiskajā ķīmisko vielu pārvaldībā (SAICM) īstenošanu Latvijā un veicinātu integrētu pieeju ķīmisko vielu jautājumus skarošo starptautisko konvenciju īstenošanā un sinerģiju un sadarbību starp šīm konvencijām atbildīgajām institūcijām, kā arī lai pildītu REACH regulas prasības un izskatītu problēmjautājumus, kas saistīti ar ķīmisko vielu un ķīmisko produktu pārvaldības normatīvo aktu ieviešanu. 2006.gada novembrī pie Ķīmiskās drošības darba grupas tika izveidota Uzraudzības apakšgrupa, lai uzlabotu institucionālo sadarbību un veicinātu REACH regulas prasību izpildes kontroli. Uzraudzības darba grupā ir pārstāvētas visas uzraudzībā iesaistītās iestādes un REACH kompetentā iestāde Latvijā. Darba grupai notiek regulāras sanāksmes, kurā tiek apspriesti aktuāli jautājumi, t.sk. uzraudzības darba plānošana un koordinēšana, informācijas apmaiņa par kontroļu rezultātiem. 2. Veselības inspekcijai ir vienošanās ar Latvijas kompetento iestādi "Latvijas Vides, ģeoloģijas un meteoroloģijas centru" (LVĢMC) par sadarbību. LVĢMC nodrošina pieeju nepieciešamajiem datiem par ķīmisko vielu reģistrāciju, notiek kopīgas sanāksmes, kurās iestādes apmainās ar aktuālo informāciju. 3. Veselības inspekcija izmanto iespēju caur Foruma pārstāvi uzdot jautājumus citām dalībvalstīm vai nodot informāciju par konstatētām neatbilstībām, notiek arī informācijas apmaiņa ar citu dalībvalstu uzraudzības iestādēm izmantojot e-saraksti (Igaunija, Lietuva, Čehija, Polija). 4. Veselības Inspekcija piedalījās ECHA Foruma pirmajā harmonizētajā uzraudzības projektā REACH_EN_FORCE_1.

Describe how these mechanisms have operated in practice during the reporting period (e.g. regular meetings, joint training, joint inspections, co-ordinated projects and so on).

1. Ķīmiskās drošības darba grupa - regulāras sanāksmes;
2. Ķīmiskās drošības grupas Uzraudzības apakšgrupa: a. Regulāras sanāksmes; b. Kopīgas apmācības; c. Kopīgas kontroles- Veselības inspekcija un Valsts darba inspekcija. 3. Sadarbība ar LVĢMC: a. Regulāras sanāksmes; b. LVĢMC ekspertu piedalīšanās kontrolēs (sniedzot eksperta atbalstu inspektoriem un uzņēmumiem); c. Kopīgas apmācības. 4. Ar citām dalībvalstīm: a. ECHA Foruma sanāksmes; b. Sarakste ar citu dalībvalstu uzraudzības iestādēm; c. ECHA Foruma koordinētais uzraudzības projekts REACH_EN_FORCE1 i. Veselības inspekcijas pārstāvis bija projekta nacionālais koordinators; ii. Nacionālais koordinators organizēja apmācības arī citu uzraudzības iestāžu pārstāvjiem un sniedza metodisko atbalstu projekta realizācijas laikā; iii. Veica kontroles uzņēmumos saskaņā ar projekta vadlīnijām; iv. Sagatavoja un iesniedza ziņojumu uzraudzības projekta darba grupai ECHA Forumā.

2010 Reporting

Describe the inspection and investigation strategy and methodology.

Sākotnējais mērķis - kontrolēt kā ķīmisko vielu ražotāji un importētāji izpilda prasības esošo vielu provizorisksai reģistrācijai/reģistrācijai, kā arī to, kā tiek izpildītas prasības drošības datu lapām. Ņemot vērā Veselības inspekcijas pieejamos resursus, prioritāri tika izvēlēti uzņēmumi pēc šādiem kritērijiem: • Latvijā piedāvā tirdzniecībā ķīmiskās vielas, kuras tiek ražotas šajā uzņēmumā, un/vai importētas no trešajām valstīm apjomā 1t un vairāk gadā; • Veikta vismaz 5 ķīmisko vielu provizorisksā reģistrācija. Plānošanas procesā tika izmantoti šādi informācijas avoti: • Saraksts ar uzņēmumiem, kas provizoriski reģistrējuši ķīmiskās vielas ECHA līdz 2008. gada 1. decembrim, • Valsts ieņēmumu dienesta Muitas noliktavas datu bāze par uzņēmumiem, kas veikuši ķīmisko vielu importu laika periodā no 2007. - 2009. gadam; • Pieejamā informācija Internetā par konkrētā uzņēmuma ķīmisko vielu tirdzniecību. Veselības inspekcija informēja uzņēmumus par plānotajām kontrolēm REACH-EN-FORCE 1 ietvaros un par to, kādiem dokumentiem jābūt pieejamiem inspektoriem kontroles laikā. Kontroles laikā tika pārbaudīts vai uzņēmumā esošā informācija sakrīt ar ECHA pieejamo informāciju par ķīmiskajām vielām, piecām vielām un/vai maisījumiem tika kontrolētas drošības datu lapas (vai ir drošības datu lapas, vai tās ir latviešu valodā un vai drošības datu lapām ir visas noteiktās sadaļas). Jāatzīmē, ka drošības datu lapu prasības tika kontrolētas arī kontrolēs ārpus REACH-EN-FORCE 1 projekta (GOS saturošo produktu uzraudzības programmas ietvaros - kontrolētiat mazgāšanas līdzekļus

	<p>programmas ietvaros, kontrolējot mazgasātas uzskaites, biocīdus u.c.). Veselības inspekcija kontroles veic uzņēmumos, izņēmums ir uzdoto korektīvo darbību izpildes kontrole, kad dokumenti tiek izskatīti Veselības inspekcijas telpās.</p>
Describe the level and extent of monitoring activities.	-
Describe sanctions available to enforcing authorities.	Tiesības uzdot (rakstiskā veidā) veikt korektīvas darbības. Tiesības administratīvi sodīt (naudas sods). Tiesības nodot lietu tiesai - kriminālais sods (naudas sods un brīvības atņemšana (ja nodarīts būtisks kaitējums cilvēkam, videi vai mantai)). Produkta izņemšana (withdrawal) no tirgus. Produkta tirdzniecības apturēšana uz laiku līdz pārkāpumi tiek novērsti. Tiesības uzdot atsaukt produktu no tirgus.
Describe the referrals from ECHA.	-
Describe the referrals from other Member States.	Igaunija un Lietuva par ierobežojumu vielām maisījumos neievērošanu.
Describe any other measures/relevant information.	

2007

Dutyholders

Provide an estimate of the total number of dutyholders who are likely to have duties imposed on them by REACH.	1068
Provide an estimate of the above dutyholders who are likely to constitute registrants as defined by REACH.	0
What was the total number of inspections and investigations carried out by enforcing authorities in which REACH was discussed and/or enforced for this year?	371
State the number of manufacturer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	0
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
State the number of importer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	143
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
State the number of distributors subject to inspections and investigations.	45

Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
State the number of downstream users subject to inspections and investigations.	19
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium

Inspections	
State the number of inspections that addressed registration.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed information in the supply chain.	207
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	61
State the number of inspections that addressed downstream use.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed authorisation.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed restriction.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed other REACH duties.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0

Investigations	
State the number of investigations prompted by complaints and concerns raised.	3
State the number of investigations prompted by incidents or dangerous occurrences.	1
State the number of investigations prompted by monitoring.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by results of inspection/follow up activities.	145
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in no areas of non-compliance.	248
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in verbal or written advice.	124
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in formal enforcement short of legal proceedings.	77
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in initiation of legal proceedings.	0

State the number of convictions following legal proceedings.	0
--	---

Enforcement

State the number of manufacturers subject to formal enforcement.	0
--	---

Were these mainly:	Small
--------------------	-------

State the number of importers subject to formal enforcement.	66
--	----

Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
--------------------	--------------

State the number of distributors subject to formal enforcement.	8
---	---

Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
--------------------	--------------

State the number of downstream users subject to formal enforcement.	8
---	---

Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
--------------------	--------------

2008

Dutyholders

Provide an estimate of the total number of dutyholders who are likely to have duties imposed on them by REACH.	1125
--	------

Provide an estimate of the above dutyholders who are likely to constitute registrants as defined by REACH.	0
--	---

What was the total number of inspections and investigations carried out by enforcing authorities in which REACH was discussed and/or enforced for this year?	244
--	-----

State the number of manufacturer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	1
---	---

Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
--------------------	--------------

State the number of importer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	101
---	-----

Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
--------------------	--------------

State the number of distributors subject to inspections and investigations.	1
---	---

Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
--------------------	--------------

State the number of downstream users subject to inspections and investigations.	26
---	----

Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
--------------------	--------------

Inspections

State the number of inspections that addressed registration.	5
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed information in the supply chain.	131
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	68
State the number of inspections that addressed downstream use.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed authorisation.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed restriction.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed other REACH duties.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0

Investigations	
State the number of investigations prompted by complaints and concerns raised.	1
State the number of investigations prompted by incidents or dangerous occurrences.	1
State the number of investigations prompted by monitoring.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by results of inspection/follow up activities.	180
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in no areas of non-compliance.	138
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in verbal or written advice.	109
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in formal enforcement short of legal proceedings.	47
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in initiation of legal proceedings.	0
State the number of convictions following legal proceedings.	0

Enforcement	
State the number of manufacturers subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium

State the number of importers subject to formal enforcement.	38
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
State the number of distributors subject to formal enforcement.	1
Were these mainly:	Medium
State the number of downstream users subject to formal enforcement.	6
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium

2009

Dutyholders	
Provide an estimate of the total number of dutyholders who are likely to have duties imposed on them by REACH.	1111
Provide an estimate of the above dutyholders who are likely to constitute registrants as defined by REACH.	0
What was the total number of inspections and investigations carried out by enforcing authorities in which REACH was discussed and/or enforced for this year?	235
State the number of manufacturer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	1
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
State the number of importer dutyholders subject to inspections and investigations.	67
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
State the number of distributors subject to inspections and investigations.	50
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
State the number of downstream users subject to inspections and investigations.	15
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium

Inspections	
State the number of inspections that addressed registration.	14
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed information in the supply chain.	137
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	57

State the number of inspections that addressed downstream use.	3
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed authorisation.	0
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0
State the number of inspections that addressed restriction.	4
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	1
State the number of inspections that addressed other REACH duties.	3
State the number these cases which were non-compliant.	0

Investigations	
State the number of investigations prompted by complaints and concerns raised.	12
State the number of investigations prompted by incidents or dangerous occurrences.	1
State the number of investigations prompted by monitoring.	0
State the number of investigations prompted by results of inspection/follow up activities.	183
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in no areas of non-compliance.	158
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in verbal or written advice.	127
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in formal enforcement short of legal proceedings.	33
State the number of inspections and investigations resulting in initiation of legal proceedings.	0
State the number of convictions following legal proceedings.	0

Enforcement	
State the number of manufacturers subject to formal enforcement.	0
Were these mainly:	No information
State the number of importers subject to formal enforcement.	18
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium
State the number of distributors subject to formal enforcement.	14
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium

State the number of downstream users subject to formal enforcement.	1
Were these mainly:	Small-Medium

Theme 9 - Information on the Effectiveness of REACH on the Protection of Human Health and the Environment, and the Promotion of Alternative Methods, and Innovation and Competition

Do you think that the effects of REACH would be better evaluated at a Member State (MS) or EU level?	EU
What parameters are available at MS level that could be used to assess the effectiveness of REACH in a baseline study?	Reģistrācijas prasību izpilde (% no uzņēmumiem, kam vajadzēja veikt reģistrāciju); Informācijas nodrošināšana izplatīšanas ķēdē (% no kontrolētajiem uzņēmumiem, % no kontrolētajām vielām/maisījumiem).

Theme 10 - Other Issues/Recommendations/Ideas

Please provide any further information on the implementation of REACH that the MS considers relevant.	
Do you wish to upload documents in support of this submission	No

Meta Informations

Creation date	31-05-2010
Last update date	
User name	ReachLV
Case Number	7928236503515110
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N