

Workshop on Socio-economic Analysis in Restrictions  
and Applications for Authorisation  
Brussels, 29 June 2016

# Conclusions and next steps

Björn Hansen & Matti Vainio

## Conclusions of the role of SEA

- SEA is important for public acceptance of decisions
  - Helps to avoid outcomes that are arbitrary or considered extreme
- SEA makes the trade-offs between different impacts explicit to see if society is better off
- SEA is a tool that supports and is necessary for decision making – it does not replace it
  - It provides factual basis and analysis for the decision-making, based on which political judgment can be made
  - It's part of the picture, but not the whole picture
  - It is used throughout the whole decision-making process
- SEA tries to integrate all information in a transparent and comprehensible manner
  - Due to information constraints it never does this perfectly

## Methodological conclusions

- Like any analysis SEA requires data, information, assumptions, methodology and synthesis
  - Depending on available information different methodologies can be applied
  - Depending on the case, different levels of SEA are needed
  - Like in any empirical analysis uncertainties exist
- Like any tool, SEA can be used wisely or less so
  - Results need to be interpreted with skill and care
  - Avoid quantification bias
- SEA is no panacea
  - Sensitivity to assumptions and knowledge of uncertainties need more attention
- Links of SEA with Chemical Safety Assessment and Analysis of Alternatives need to be further improved

# Conclusions for applicants and dossier submitters

- Analysis of alternatives needs to be done more thoroughly
  - Relationship with SEA should be further improved
  - In applications the description of use needs to be clear and detailed enough to allow a proper analysis of alternatives
- Applicants and dossier submitters need to improve further
  - They are responsible for preparing the SEA
  - Societal perspective needs to be in the dossiers (the “S” in SEA)
  - Applicants do not always consider that authorisation adds more value (to their clients) than to themselves;
  - Applicants should describe systemic effects, i.e. the impacts of authorisation or non-authorisation to their customers, suppliers and competitors. Such analysis introduces uncertainties, too
- Information requirements need to be realistic
  - Sometimes applicants or dossier submitters consider information requirements to be too onerous

# Conclusions for opinion and decision making

- The Commission and REACH Committee need clear, transparent and reliable information on socio-economic impacts
  - Monetisation of health and in particular environmental impacts is often not possible and also might not be necessary for decision making
  - Not quantifiable impacts should still be evaluated during opinion making
- Proper scrutiny of provided SEA information is needed
- Capacity to carry out and analyse SEAs has increased
  - SEAC's capacity has increased almost to the maximum
  - Understanding between risk assessors & managers and socio-economic analysts should improve

# Conclusions for opinion and decision making

- If the needs of the Commission or the REACH Committee evolve, this would affect how the ECHA's scientific Committees (RAC and SEAC) communicate their opinions
- Communication
  - There are real challenges to communicate SEA analysis and results
  - Need to communicate better what SEA is and is not

## Next steps

- Highlights and conclusions will be reported to CARACAL and ECHA's Management Board
- Summary report of this workshop prepared
- Lessons learnt to be discussed in ECHA's committees
- Workshop is a source of inspiration for capacity building of
  - Member States and ECHA (and their consultants) for preparing SEA in restrictions in a fit-for-purpose manner
  - For applicants (and their consultants) for preparing SEA in applications in a fit-for-purpose manner
- Presentations will be made public