23 May 2019

SEAC/M/41/2019 FINAL

Final

Minutes of the 42nd meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

12-15 March 2019

I. Summary Record of the Proceeding

1) Welcome and apologies

Tomas Öberg, Chairman of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants of the 42nd meeting of SEAC. The Chairman also informed SEAC that apologies had been received from three members.

The Chairman informed the participants that the meeting would not be recorded.

The list of attendees is given in Part III of the minutes.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

The Chairman introduced the final draft agenda of SEAC-42. The agenda was adopted with minor modifications (in line with SEAC/A/42/2019 rev1). The final agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex III. The list of all meeting documents is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

The Chairman requested members and their advisors participating in the meeting to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Six members declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions under the Agenda Items 5.2b.1, 5.2b.2 and 5.2b.3. These members did not participate in voting under those Agenda Items, as stated in Article 9(2) of the SEAC Rules of Procedure.

The Chairman declared the absence of conflict of interest for all items of SEAC-42 plenary meeting.

The list with declared conflicts of interest is given in Annex II of these minutes.

4) Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

a) Report on SEAC-41 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

The Chairman informed the participants that all action points of SEAC-41 had been completed or would be followed up during the on-going SEAC-42 meeting.

The Chairman also informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-41 had been adopted by written procedure and had been uploaded to S-CIRCABC as well as on the ECHA website. The Chairman thanked members for providing comments on the draft SEAC-41 minutes.

A representative of the Commission was invited to update the Committee on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in CARACAL.

The Chairman informed the participants about the document prepared for the MB-53 on the functioning of the Committee (meeting document SEAC/42/2019/02) with a view of the increasing workload. In addition, the Chairman informed the Committee about the

changed CoI policy. A note summarising the changes to the CoI policy had been made available to RAC and SEAC, and is also submitted to MB and Forum for their upcoming meetings.

b) Report from the satisfaction survey and Chairman's interviews with members and observers (including discussions in breakout groups)

The Secretariat first presented to the Committee the outcome of 2018 satisfaction survey. The Chairman then presented to the participants a report from his interviews with SEAC members and observers, carried out in 2018. The Committee was then advised to split in four breakout groups to discuss two issues – the efficiency of plenary meetings and the presentations. After the discussions, all four groups were asked to report back to plenary.

All groups stressed the importance of focussing the discussions in plenaries on key issues and suggested that the rapporteurs could highlight them already in the draft opinions, so that it would stimulate also the written commenting by other members. One group proposed to nominate a group of prime commentators, whose task would be to perform detailed scrutiny of all draft opinions. Other members, however, were against this and stressed that commenting on draft opinions should remain voluntary.

As for the presentations, it was noted that the focus should be on key points only, and not on explanation of the case and the process. Slide number, time limit, use of hidden slides were named as measures to make presentations in plenaries more efficient. It was also suggested that the presentations could be shared before the plenary meetings, to facilitate the preparations by members and observers.

It was agreed that the Secretariat will analyse the discussions and come up with possible proposals for improving the efficiency of the Committee and its plenary meetings.

c) Revision to the SEAC Rules of procedure

The Chairman informed the Committee about the need to implement an efficiency measure to handle the length of the plenary meetings through 2019 and 2020 for SEAC members. The revised SEAC Rules of procedure proposes lowering of the quorum for meeting and written procedures, achieved when at least fifty percent (instead of the current 60%) of all members having the right to vote are present at the meeting.

The Committee agreed the revised SEAC rules of procedure (in line with the meeting document SEAC/42/2019/04).

d) Update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)

The Secretariat presented to SEAC an update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list. The Committee agreed with the proposal by the Secretariat in line with the restricted meeting document SEAC/42/2019/05. The Chairman informed SEAC that the Secretariat will publish the updated list on the ECHA website.

5) Restrictions

5.1) General restriction issues

a) Report from Restriction Task Force meeting

The Secretariat presented to the Committee the report from the last Restrictions Task Force (RTF) meeting as well as the issues planned to be tackled in the near future. The Committee welcomed the work of the RTF.

The Committee was informed that the Secretariat had shared the Action points of the last RTF meeting with RAC and SEAC via S-CIRCABC.

b) Update of the opinion development process

The Secretariat presented to SEAC an update to the opinion development procedure for restrictions (meeting document SEAC/42/2019/01), the aim of which is to streamline the process and make it more flexible.

The Committee agreed to use the updated procedure starting from the three dossiers that were submitted in January 2019 (with one small modification introduced at SEAC-42).

5.2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Conformity check and key issues discussion

1) Formaldehyde and formaldehyde releasers

The Chairman welcomed the Dossier Submitter representatives from ECHA and the RAC (co-)rapporteurs. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier had been submitted by ECHA on 11 January 2019.

The representative of the Dossier Submitter provided an introductory presentation on the dossier. The proposed restriction aims to restrict the placing on the market or the use of all articles releasing formaldehyde at concentrations greater than or equal to 0.124 mg/m3 in the air of a test chamber used under the conditions prescribed in EN 717-1. Formaldehyde released from an article may come from formaldehyde and/or other substances that release formaldehyde (formaldehyde releasers) used in the production process of the article. Articles subject to the CMRs in textiles restriction as well as the use of formaldehyde and formaldehyde releasers as biocide are exempted from the proposed restriction because they are already covered by other legislation. Use of formaldehyde in mixtures (> 0.1 %) has already been restricted in 2018 by the Commission with the amendment to Entry 28 to Annex XVII of REACH. Formaldehyde is predominantly used as a chemical intermediate in the production of formaldehyde-based resins and other chemicals. The most common substances manufactured from formaldehyde include urea formaldehyde resins, phenol formaldehyde resins and melamine formaldehyde resins. Such formaldehyde-based resins are the biggest group of formaldehyde releasers, a broader group of substances with the common element that they can release formaldehyde under foreseeable conditions of use. Formaldehyde-based resins are widely used as adhesives and binders in the woodworking, pulp and paper, as

well as the synthetic vitreous fibre industries, in the production of plastics and coatings, and in textile finishing.

The Chairman then informed the Committee that RAC had discussed the conformity of this dossier within RAC-48 last week and that the proposal was considered in conformity from the RAC point of view.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the outcome of the conformity check and the recommendations to the Dossier Submitter and proposed to the Committee that they consider the dossier to be in conformity. The SEAC members asked questions for clarification and commented on the Annex XV restriction dossier focussing on the scope of the restriction proposal and on testing requirements as well as testing methods for the determination of formaldehyde released from articles.

The Committee agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. The Chairman informed the Committee that the public consultation on this restriction proposal will be launched on 20 March 2019.

2) Siloxanes: D4/D5/D6

The Chairman welcomed the Dossier Submitter's representatives from ECHA, one industry expert, accompanying the regular stakeholder observer, as well as the representative of one occasional stakeholder. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier had been submitted in January 2019.

The representative of the Dossier Submitter provided an introductory presentation on the dossier. She explained that the dossier proposes to restrict the placing on the market of D4, D5 and D6 as substances, as constituents of other substances, or in mixtures in a concentration equal to or greater than 0.1% w/w of each substance. These substances are manufactured and used in a variety of sectors in the European Economic Area. They are mainly used as monomers (i.e. intermediates) for the production of silicone polymers (a use which is exempt from restriction) but are also used as substances on their own or in the formulation of various mixtures that are subsequently used by consumers and professionals. D4, D5 and D6 were identified by ECHA's MS Committee as SVHC substances with PBT/vPvB properties. The proposed restriction is a follow-up of the UK Annex XV restriction proposal on D4 and D5 that was evaluated by RAC and SEAC in 2016 and will result in a total emission reduction of D4, D5 and D6 (all sources and compartments) of approximately 90%.

The Chairman then informed the Committee that RAC had discussed the conformity of this dossier within RAC-48 last week and that the proposal was considered in conformity from the RAC point of view.

The (co-)rapporteurs presented the outcome of the conformity check and the recommendations to the Dossier Submitter, and proposed to the Committee that they consider the dossier to be in conformity. The rapporteurs mentioned that in their view the dossier would benefit from additional information on the scope of the proposed restriction (specifically the term 'industrial site') and more detailed conclusions on the analysis of the proposed derogations; on alternatives; on justification that the restriction is the most appropriate EU wide action as well as on the conclusions that the proposed restriction is proportionate. One member was interested in the link between the current proposal and the one for microplastics. The Dossier Submitter's representative

responded that indeed they are currently analysing this link and the possible impact on costs and are preparing a note on this issue that will be shared with the (co-)rapporteurs of both dossiers and published as part of their public consultations. Another member emphasised that the cost-effectiveness of this proposal cannot be directly compared with the cost-effectiveness of the previous UK proposal, as the assumptions used to derive the cost estimates are different between the two proposals.

The Committee agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. In addition, the (co-)rapporteurs presented their key issues of the restriction proposal. The Chairman informed the Committee that the public consultation on this restriction proposal will be launched on 20 March 2019.

3) Microplastics

The Chairman welcomed the RAC rapporteurs, the Dossier Submitter representatives from ECHA, and their experts in person or via webex (Sweden), the RAC co-rapporteur, the occasional stakeholder and the industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer. He informed that the dossier was submitted by ECHA in January 2019. In addition, Sweden (KemI) collaborated with ECHA in the preparation of the dossier.

A representative of the Dossier Submitter made an introductory presentation on the dossier. The proposal aims to restrict intentionally added microplastics in products from which they will inevitably be released to the environment. The term 'microplastic' is not consistently defined, but is typically considered to refer to small, usually microscopic, solid particles made of a synthetic polymer. The Dossier Submitter has estimated that approximately 36 000 tonnes per year of intentionally added microplastics are currently released to the environment per year. These are most likely to accumulate in terrestrial environments, although their presence in the aquatic environment has been under greater focus. The scope of the proposed restriction covers a wide range of uses in consumer and professional products, including detergents, cosmetics, paints and coatings, construction, medical and agricultural. The proposed restriction is estimated to result in an emission reduction of 85-95% from its entry into force at a cost of approximately €9.4 billion (NVP, 20 year analytical period). The average cost-effectiveness of emissions reduction, for sectors where it has been quantified, is estimated to be €23/kg per year ranging from €1/kg to €820/kg for individual sectors (central case).

The Chairman then informed the Committee that RAC had discussed the conformity of this dossier within RAC-48 last week and that the proposal was considered in conformity from RAC's point of view.

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs presented the outcome of the conformity check and the recommendations to the Dossier Submitter, and proposed to the Committee that the dossier is considered in conformity. The rapporteurs mentioned that in their view the dossier would benefit from elaboration of the analysis of RMOs and asked more information on why a separate legislative proposal targeting Microplastics was not considered as a possible RMO. Both the Commission and ECHA Secretariat representatives replied that the Commission has a legislative power and the Commission has requested ECHA to prepare an Annex XV restriction dossier under REACH, and it is not an intention to have a standalone legislation under REACH. Several SEAC members asked for additional clarifications on the scope of the proposed restriction, derogations and definitions (such as polymers within REACH), estimation of loss of product quality,

the link between the microplastics and D4, D5, D6 restriction dossiers and the approach to estimating reformulation costs. A stakeholder observer questioned the four year transition period for use of rinse-off products when alternatives are available. Also, an occasional stakeholder pointed out that the impact on SMEs would merit further exploration via public consultation, as not all of them focus on niche products and highlighted that the reformulation process for leave-on cosmetics is complex and there are no one-to-one substitutes. Furthermore, a Commission observer called for an elaboration on the scope of the proposal, and to use the public consultation to refine it. The (co-)rapporteurs and the Dossier Submitter responded to the questions and informed that specific questions on the scope and on cosmetic products are proposed for the public consultation and that a note on the linkages between the two restrictions dossiers will be published. The Chairman observed that the issues raised are not seen as conformity issues, but they will be considered in the further evaluation of the dossier within the opinion development.

The Committee agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. In addition, the (co-)rapporteurs presented their key issues of the restriction proposal. The Chairman informed the Committee that the public consultation on this restriction proposal will be launched on 20 March 2019.

b) Opinion development

1) Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up – draft of final opinion

The Chairman welcomed the SEAC rapporteurs, the Dossier Submitter representatives present in person or via WebEx (from Denmark, Italy, Norway and ECHA) and their experts from Germany. The restriction proposal was submitted by ECHA together with Denmark, Italy and Norway in October 2017. In addition, Germany contributed significantly to the proposal. The proposal aims to restrict the intentional use of certain substances in tattoo inks by imposing concentration limits. These substances include those with harmonised classifications as carcinogenic, mutagenic, reprotoxic, skin sensitising/corrosive/irritant, eye damaging/irritant as well as other substances prohibited in cosmetic products (under the Cosmetic Products Regulation (CPR), (EC) 1223/2009) and selected impurities. SEAC agreed on its draft opinion on this dossier at SEAC-41 in November 2018. The public consultation on the agreed SEAC draft opinion lasted from 12 December 2018 until 11 February 2019 and there were nine comments received. The (co-)rapporteurs updated the opinion based on the comments received and the draft of the SEAC final opinion (together with the ORCOM) was made available to SEAC on 28 March 2019.

The (co-)rapporteurs were then invited to present the results of the public consultation and their impact on the SEAC opinion. SEAC rapporteurs outlined the changes made in the draft of the SEAC final opinion and proposed a two year time-limited derogation for Pigment Blue 15:3 and Pigment Green 7 based on the outcome of the public consultation. SEAC supported the rapporteurs' proposal for amendments, although SEAC noted the uncertainties involved. A stakeholder observer representative stated that these uncertainties should be communicated to the Commission.

In addition, SEAC agreed on a small rewording of the derogation on gaseous substances to reflect that some gaseous substances can be present in dissolved state in tattoo inks and therefore, the concentrations for their respective classifications should apply.

The (co-)rapporteurs received some editorial suggestions for both the proposed entry and the justification part of the opinion.

SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus. The rapporteurs were asked, together with the Secretariat, to make final editorial changes to the opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and ORCOM) is in line with the adopted SEAC opinion. The Secretariat will forward the adopted opinion and its supporting documents to the Commission as well as publish them on the ECHA website. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on this dossier.

2) PAHs in granules and mulches used as infill material – second draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the Dossier Submitter representatives from the Netherlands (present both in person and via WebEx), the RAC co-rapporteur and the industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier had been submitted by the Netherlands on 20 July 2018, in cooperation with ECHA. The restriction dossier focusses on granules and mulches used as infill material in synthetic turf pitches and in loose form on playgrounds and in sport applications. The basis for this dossier is a concern for human health resulting from current concentration limits for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in End-of-Life Tyres (ELT) derived rubber infill granules used in synthetic turf pitches. Recent evaluations by RIVM (2017) and ECHA (2017) concluded that PAH levels found in granules on synthetic turf pitches currently in use are assessed to have a relatively low excess cancer risk. However, the reports highlighted that the current concentration limits permitted in entry 28 of Annex XVII of REACH are insufficient for protecting those who come into contact with the granules and mulches while playing at sports facilities and playgrounds.

The (co-)rapporteurs had developed the second draft opinion on this dossier, made available to SEAC on 8 February 2019, with three comments received from SEAC members. Following the SEAC written consultation round, the (co-)rapporteurs prepared the revised second draft opinion which was made available to SEAC on 8 March 2019. The final Forum advice is expected to be submitted by mid-March 2019. The public consultation on this dossier will finish on 19 March 2019.

The RAC co-rapporteur provided a brief update on the RAC second draft opinion on this dossier, focusing in particular on the justification for the choice of a concentration limit of 20 mg/kg. The dossier was not discussed at RAC-48, but will be tabled for adoption in June 2019.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the second draft opinion. They outlined the updates made in the draft opinion following the SEAC consultation and the SEAC-41 plenary discussions, including updates in the sections on justification for EU wide action, costs, benefits, proportionality, and practicality (incl. enforceability). The rapporteurs concluded that EU wide action is justified and that the proposed restriction is enforceable, although certain factors (e.g. waste status, terminology, testing methodology) may impact enforceability. The rapporteurs also pointed out that societal

concern could not be taken into account as a separate impact category, as it was unclear in what sense these concerns represented impacts in addition to the health/environmental impacts already covered. The (co-)rapporteurs also provided an update on the public consultation comments received to date.

The representative of the Dossier Submitter noted that, based on the public consultation comments received so far, costs might be over-estimated. SEAC members discussed the potential need for re-assessing economic impacts for a limit value of 20 mg/kg, which is the limit value agreed by RAC. The representative of the Dossier Submitter also asked for further justifications for the limit value agreed by RAC. A SEAC member stressed that both costs and benefits have a large degree of uncertainty due to the lack of a standardised test method. The lack of a standardised test method was also pointed out by an expert accompanying a stakeholder observer. One SEAC member called for a more detailed assessment of health impacts, taking into account also possible negative effects resulting from the use of alternatives, in order to be able to conclude on proportionality. Regarding proportionality, a SEAC member advised not to base the assessment on affordability considerations alone, as affordability is not a criterion for proportionality. Further discussions among SEAC members revolved around whether societal concern constitute a separate impact category and whether such concern would not be better addressed through risk communication rather than a restriction.

The Committee in general supported the conclusions of the (co-)rapporteurs as presented. The rapporteurs were requested to prepare the third draft opinion, taking into account the outcome of the public consultation and the discussions in SEAC-42, by beginning of May 2019.

3) *N*,*N*-dimethylformamide – first draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the Dossier Submitter representatives from Italy (present both in person and via WebEx). He informed the participants that the restriction dossier had been submitted by Italy on 5 October 2018. The proposed restriction aims to restrict the uses of the substance on its own or in mixtures in a concentration equal or greater than 0.3 %, unless exposure conditions described as DNEL values for inhalation (3.2 mg/m^3) and dermal (0.79 mg/kg bw/day) exposure of workers are met. DMF is manufactured in the EU, and used in the production of fine chemicals, pharmaceuticals, polymers, textiles, non-metallic products, and perfumes/fragrances. It is also used in the petrochemical industry and as a laboratory reagent. There is no consumer use of DMF included in the current proposal.

The (co-)rapporteurs had developed the first draft opinion on this dossier, which was made available to SEAC on 4 March 2019. There was no written consultation prior to SEAC-42, and there were no comments received from SEAC members on the Annex XV dossier.

The RAC rapporteurs provided a brief update from the RAC discussion on this dossier held within RAC-48, where RAC agreed on the derivation of the dermal DNEL from dermal developmental toxicity studies, and agreed the value of dermal DNEL to be 1.1 mg/kg/day. RAC also preliminarily agreed on a systemic long term DNEL of 6 mg/m^3 for the inhalation route (instead of 3.2 mg/m^3 as proposed by the Dossier Submitter). The RAC rapporteurs indicated as well that the exposure assessment was not evaluated and risk characterisation was not concluded yet by the RAC (some impacts are expected

due to the RAC agreed higher DNELs during RAC-48), and that the main concerns remain with the 'uses advised against'.

The SEAC rapporteur presented the first draft opinion outlining the scope of the restriction proposal and concluding that a restriction by harmonisation of DNEL values (RO2) is an appropriate EU wide measure. On costs, the SEAC rapporteur noted that the dossier contains scarce and heterogeneous quantitative information from few sectors only, largely based on industry questionnaires. There is very limited information on risk reduction and not on aggregated level. On the costs of substitution there is similarly very limited information, estimates only cover equipment and are listed as one-off costs. On overall costs the SEAC rapporteur concluded that quantitative estimates available for three sectors are limited; for remaining sectors only qualitative information is available. The enforcement costs are not included. On benefits - the monetised health benefits are substantially overestimated. On the other hand, non-quantified impacts need to be taken more clearly into account. As an overall conclusion the SEAC rapporteur suggested that, with the given information, the Committee cannot now decide on proportionality. However, the use of the DNEL values suggested by RAC would strengthen the proportionality. He underlined the public consultation to be crucial for estimating the expected impacts of the restriction, specifically the industry responses and considerations on later implementation dates for specific sectors (for example the textile coating sector asking for a 10 year transitional period).

During the discussion, two SEAC members referred to a report by IARC, in which it is mentioned that the substance is also used in paint stripping, which is not considered by the DS in the Annex XV restriction dossier. Many SEAC members noted that the outcome of the public consultation will be of high importance to this restriction proposal. They encouraged industrial sectors using DMF to contribute to the public consultation by answering the questions by the two Committees.

In addition, a stakeholder observer representative pointed out difficulties of some of the industrial sectors, *such as the PU Coating and man-made fibre (including carbon fibre) industries, to find an alternative to DMF in order to comply with the requirements of their customers in sectors such as healthcare, aviation and alternative energy.*

The Committee supported the conclusions of the rapporteur as presented. It was agreed that the Secretariat will launch a written commenting round for members to provide remaining comments on the first draft opinion. The rapporteur was requested to prepare the second draft opinion, taking into account the discussions in SEAC-42, by beginning of May 2019.

4) Five cobalt salts – first draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the Dossier Submitter's representatives from ECHA and two industry experts, accompanying the regular stakeholder observers. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier had been submitted in October 2018 and proposes to restrict the placing on the market, manufacture and use of the cobalt salts as substances on their own or in mixtures in a concentration equal to or above 0.01% by weight in industrial and professional applications. The five cobalt salts (cobalt sulphate, cobalt dichloride, cobalt dinitrate, cobalt carbonate and cobalt di(acetate)) are manufactured and used in a variety of sectors within the European Economic Area, including the manufacture of chemicals, catalysts, battery production, surface treatment,

fermentation processes, health applications, feed grade materials, biogas, etc. The cobalt salts are classified as Carc. 1B (inhalation), Muta. 2, Repr. 1B and skin and respiratory sensitisers. The (co-) rapporteurs had developed the first draft opinion on this dossier, which was made available to SEAC on 6 March 2019.

The RAC rapporteur provided a brief update from the RAC discussion on this dossier held within RAC-48. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first draft opinion. They were interested to hear the views of SEAC members on a number of issues, namely the appropriateness of the proposed restriction amongst the RMOs discussed, whether the EU-wide action is justified and whether the cost assessment is sensible. Furthermore, they were interested to hear the first views of members on the benefits assessment, proportionality, specifically on risk equity issues, as well as on the distribution of cancer risk regarded being unjustified by the Dossier Submitter. Several members and an industry expert expressed the concern regarding the proportionality of the proposed restriction, which avoids only one statistical cancer case per year. The rapporteurs responded that indeed it is also raised by RAC that why only these five cobalt salts are targeted, while the exposure to cobalt is much bigger. However, this is the scope of the current dossier and both Committees should evaluate the proposal within the given scope.

The Committee in general supported the conclusions of the (co-)rapporteurs as presented. It was agreed that the Secretariat will launch a written commenting round for members to provide remaining comments on the first draft opinion. The rapporteurs were requested to prepare the second draft opinion, taking into account the discussions in SEAC-42, by the beginning of May 2019.

5.3) Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

The Chairman presented the update on the upcoming restriction dossiers expected to be submitted in April 2019 by ECHA (calcium cyanamide as a fertiliser; lead chromate; and TCEP) and by France in collaboration with Sweden (skin sensitizers and skin irritants). In addition, Norway will be submitting a restriction proposal on perfluorohexane-1-sulphonic acid, its salts and related substances.

The Chairman informed that due to ongoing discussions on the availability of the volunteered (co-)rapporteurs, the SEAC agreement on the pools of (co-)rapporteurs for the upcoming restriction proposals to be submitted in April 2019 will be done via written procedure (if needed via urgent written procedure) end of March or early April 2019.

In September 2019, Germany will also be submitting a restriction proposal on undecafluorohexanoid acid and its salts and related substances. The call for expression of interest for this dossier will be launched in summer 2019.

Finally, the Chairman also reported the Committee that the Working procedure on the appointment of rapporteurs will be updated in spring 2019 to reflect some administrative improvements and simplifications in the process.

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues

a) Update on incoming / future applications

The Secretariat informed the Committee that twelve new applications for authorisation were received during the February 2018 submission window. Three of them are on uses of chromium (VI) substances for surface treatment of steel for high performance transformers, as an anticorrosion agent in a cooling system, and as suppressant of the parasite reactions in electrolytic production of sodium chlorite. Another three are applications for authorisation for the uses of coal tar pitch, high temperature (CTPHT) in formulation of mixtures and production of nozzle throats for civilian and military aerospace launchers. The other six applications for authorisation are for the uses of octylphenol ethoxylates (five applications) and nonylphenol ethoxylates (one application) in the life sciences sector, including production of pharmaceutical active ingredient, formulation of reagents further incorporated in in vitro devices, their production and their use by professionals, such as laboratories, hospitals etc. Key issues in the new applications for authorisation will be discussed at SEAC-43 plenary meeting in June 2019.

The Secretariat also informed about high numbers of applications for authorisation expected to be received during May 2019 submission window and in the end of 2019 and the beginning of 2020 amounting to possibly ca. 120 applications for authorisation on more than 200 uses of chromium (VI) substances, octyl- and nonylphenol ethoxylates, coal tar pitch, high temperature, and trichloroethylene and chromium (VI) substances.

b) Update on the approach of evaluation of the upcoming applications for authorisations for environmental endocrine disruptors (octyl-and nonylphenol ethoxylates)

The Secretariat reminded the Committee about the documents “Risk-related considerations in applications for authorisation for endocrine disrupting substances for the environment, specifically OPnEO and NPnEO” agreed by the Committee at the RAC-43 plenary meeting and “SEA-related considerations in applications for authorisation for endocrine disrupting substances for the environment, specifically OPnEO and NPnEO”, which was agreed at SEAC-37 plenary meeting. The documents provide general advice to companies intending to apply for authorisation of uses of OPnEO and NPnEO with regard to environmental risk assessment (the first document) and socio-economic analysis-related considerations (in the second document). However, they do not define any ‘preferred approach’, nor does they give reference values.

During the discussion the SEAC members noted the approach and discussed several of the common issues that are foreseen to arise during the evaluation of the OPnEO and NPnEO applications for authorisation.

c) Approach to opinion drafting

In his introductory note the ECHA Executive Director addressed the Committee by presenting organisational changes of ECHA since January 2019, which is largely related to grouping of the ECHA staff by their competences. He noted that these changes had been introduced in order to increase efficiency of the Agency. Furthermore he emphasised that according to the REACH Regulation the Committees are part of ECHA and that the Committees are also expected to strive for greater efficiency.

The Secretariat presented to the Committee the outline of a new approach to be taken in drafting the Committees opinions on the applications for authorisations in the future. Considering the needs of the European Commission who is drafting the authorisation decision based on the opinions of RAC and SEAC, as well as the fact that number of applications for authorisation are increasing, and the overarching value of efficiency, the Secretariat, together with SEAC members, will draft model opinions, which will be used by the Committees' rapporteurs in drafting the opinions.

The model opinions will be drafted on two of the OPnEO applications for authorisation from the February 2019 submission window. Rapporteurs together with the Secretariat will adjust the model opinions to the applicant-specific cases. If successful this practice will be extended to all the groups of similar applications for authorisation. This approach will also require a more active role of the Secretariat in the early stage of the opinion development process. The idea is that the rapporteurs and ECHA's authorisation team first read the application, discuss what their preliminary conclusions are and only after that start drafting the opinion text. SEAC will also need to follow the progress in RAC and its Working Group on applications for authorisation. The aim is that the opinions will contain harmonised text, e.g. for additional conditions and conclusions.

The Secretariat had set its target to have a five-page long SEAC opinion justification. At the same time evaluation scrutiny of the applications needs to be increased by active participation of the SEAC members in the Committee consultations on the SEAC (draft) opinions. In order to streamline discussions in the Committee, less debating time will be allocated for straightforward applications in the future plenary meetings.

The Secretariat also explained to SEAC the new approach to be taken by RAC. Apart from the measures implemented by SEAC, i.e. use of model opinions and more concise and fit-for-purpose opinions, RAC has introduced an A-listing procedure for agreement on draft opinions with the appropriate level of scrutiny but without a plenary debate. Another measure introduced by RAC is the Working Group on Applications for Authorisation for 2019-2020, which will pre-process all the opinions prior to the plenary discussion and agreement on the draft opinions.

SEAC members discussed the proposal and how it will impact the future work of the Committee. While understanding motivation, one member noted the need for more resources and a higher number of SEAC members, who would actively apply for the rapporteurships. Another member reflected that the increase of efficiency is not only a number of opinions delivered, but also the quality of the SEAC opinions. One of the representatives of the stakeholder observer organisations mentioned some areas of concern which should not be jeopardised for the sake of the increase in numbers of the opinions. He specified transparency of the opinion making and independence of the Committee, as well as uniqueness of every case on the opinion development agenda of SEAC. Another SEAC member advocated attempt of the Secretariat to shorten

Committee's opinions in both Applications for Authorisation and Restriction processes. Some SEAC members expressed concerns about the proactive role of the Secretariat in the opinion drafting process and the perception of the independence of the SEAC members. Some Committee members also saw a possibility to increase the scrutiny and quality of the shortened opinions in the future. Finally, the ECHA Executive Director noted that the discussion was fruitful and was held in a positive and supportive atmosphere. He also sensed good dynamics in taking on the next step towards the increase of efficiency. He acknowledged that a precondition for this new approach to work is that the Committee trusts the Secretariat.

The Committee agreed to try out and evaluate the proposed approach in practice with applications from the February submission window. The Secretariat will organise an early consultation of opinions applying the revised approach and an interim assessment will take place in the June plenary.

d) Commission's feedback on authorisation opinions

A representative of the European Commission presented feedback of DG GROW and DG ENV. Purpose of the presentation was to reflect from the decision-making stage and to identify areas for further improvement. The Commission representative stressed that it is essential that all opinions meet the needs of decision-making. It will ensure quality of presentation in the REACH Committee who takes decisions on authorisations. He recommended SEAC to reduce uncertainties in the opinions to the extent possible. However, remaining uncertainties should be qualified or addressed because uncertainties, as experience demonstrated, have an impact to the conclusions of the REACH Committee. In addition, he recommended the Committee to agree on clear and convincing conclusions, within the remit of SEAC, taking into account any remaining uncertainties. Special attention needs to be given to the conclusions on alternatives. He also noted that further feedback by the Commission on certain matters relevant for opinion-making, based on the Commission analysis of the General Court decisions (Cases T-837/16, T-108/17, T-436/17), as well as based on current policy discussions, including REACH Review follow-up, will be provided at the next SEAC plenary meeting in June 2019.

6.2) Authorisation applications

a) Discussion on key issues

1) Five applications for authorisation from the November 2018 submission window (chromium trioxide)

The Secretariat in cooperation with the SEAC rapporteurs provided general information regarding the new applications for authorisation listed below.

CT_Thyssen

This is an application with a relatively broad scope regarding the following two uses of chromium trioxide.

Use 1: Use of chromium trioxide for Passivation of tinplated steel (ETP)

Use 2: Use of chromium trioxide for Electrolytic Chromium Coating of Steel (ECCS)

The substance is used on one site in Germany. 95 tonnes of chromic acid (47.5 tonnes chromium trioxide) are used for use 1, and 7-year long review period is requested starting from expected decision in 2020 by the applicant. 200 tonnes of chromic acid (100 tonnes chromium trioxide) are used for use 2, and 7-year long review period until end 2028 is requested by the applicant.

CT_Aloys

This is an application with a narrow, well-defined scope regarding the following single use of chromium trioxide.

Use: Functional chrome plating with decorative character for sanitary applications

The substance is used on one site in Germany. 1-10 tonnes of chromium trioxide are used for the use 1, and 12-year long review period is requested by the applicant.

CT_Ideal

This is an application with a narrow, well-defined scope regarding the following two uses of chromium trioxide.

Use 1: Electroplating of different types of substrates using chromium trioxide to achieve functional surfaces with high durability and a bright or matt silvery appearance for sanitary applications

Use 2: Etching of plastics with chromium trioxide as pre-treatment step for electroplating processes

The substance is used on one site in Germany, one site in Portugal and two sites in Bulgaria. 10-100 tonnes of chromium trioxide are used for use 1, and 12-year long review period is requested by the applicant. However, 1-10 tonnes of chromium trioxide are used for use 2, and 12-year long review period is requested.

CT_Keuco

This is an application with a narrow, well-defined scope regarding the following two uses of chromium trioxide.

Use 1: Electroplating of different types of substrates using chromium trioxide to achieve functional surfaces with high durability and a bright or matt silvery appearance for sanitary applications

Use 2: Etching of plastics with chromium trioxide as pre-treatment step for electroplating processes

The substance is used on one site in Germany. 1-10 tonnes of chromium trioxide are used for use 1, and 12-year long review period is requested by the applicant. However, 1-10 tonnes of chromium trioxide are used for use 2, and 12-year long review period is requested.

CT_Schell

This is an application with a narrow, well-defined scope regarding the following single use of chromium trioxide.

Use: Functional chrome plating with decorative character for sanitary applications

The substance is used on one site in Germany. 1-10 tonnes of chromium trioxide are used for the use 1, and 12-year long review period is requested by the applicant.

In the presentation of these cases, the Secretariat outlined the key issues identified by the Rapporteurs and asked the Committee for comments and further suggestions.

The Committee discussed the key issues. Where needed, SEAC will request further clarifications from the Applicants on the issues identified and discussed by the Committee.

6.3) Review reports

a) Agreement on draft opinion

1) RR1_TCE_Spolana (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the review report on the authorisation of the use of trichloroethylene as an extraction solvent in caprolactam production submitted by Spolana a.s. At this plenary, SEAC members were asked to agree on the SEAC draft opinion. The Chairman invited the ECHA Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinion.

Then the SEAC rapporteurs presented the SEAC draft opinion. The rapporteurs were of the opinion that the analysis of alternatives is sufficiently detailed to conclude on the technical and economic feasibility of the alternatives, and that there is currently no suitable alternative. Further in the draft opinion the SEAC rapporteurs stated that the socio-economic analysis carried out by the authorisation holder thoroughly captures the changes in impacts and allows SEAC to conclude that the benefits of continued use of TCE outweigh the associated risks. They consider none of the uncertainties to be of such magnitude that they could affect this overall conclusion.

The discussion largely focused on the time required for the implementation of an alternative. SEAC also discussed the non-use scenario presented by the authorisation holder.

The Committee agreed the draft opinion by consensus, with some further post-editing to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat.

6.4 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)

The pool of (co-)rapporteurs, as outlined in the restricted room document SEAC/42/2018/03 rev.1, was agreed by SEAC.

7) AOB

a) Update of the work plan

The Secretariat provided an update of the work plan for the future months.

b) Training session on INTERACT Project

The Secretariat provided to SEAC an update on the progress of the ECHA Interact Project, the release of which is scheduled for April 2019.

c) Presentation of ChemSec new report “Lost at SEA”

SEAC took note of the presentation by ChemSec on their recent report “Lost at SEA”. Different views by members were expressed, some technical inaccuracies were noted. It was observed the aim of the document was to spur a political discussion.

d) Presentation about the court case regarding the authorisation for the uses of lead chromates yellow and red

The Secretariat gave an update to the Committee about the judgment of the General Court in Case T-837/16 of 7 March 2019– Sweden v. Commission regarding a decision granting an authorisation for some uses of lead sulfochromate yellow and of lead chromate molybdate sulphate red. The General Court judgment annulled the Commission decision on the basis that the Commission made an error of law in its examination of the absence of alternatives.

During the discussion the SEAC members asked questions of clarifying nature to the Secretariat. The Secretariat informed that there is a possibility for the Commission to appeal the judgment within 2 months and 10 days. Further updates will be given to the Committee at the next SEAC plenary meeting in June 2019.

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-42

A table with the action points and main conclusions is given in Part II below.

II. Main conclusions and action points

SEAC-42, 12 - 15 March 2019
(Adopted at SEAC-42 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	**Action requested after the meeting (by whom / by when)**
2. Adoption of the agenda	
The agenda was adopted with minor modifications (SEAC/A/42/2019_rev.1).	**SECR** to upload the adopted agenda to SEAC S-CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.
3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda	
Conflicts of interest have been declared and will be taken to the minutes.	
4. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities	
a) Report on SEAC-41 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-41. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies, including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee.	
b) Report from the satisfaction survey and Chairman's interviews with members and observers (including discussion in breakout groups)	
SEAC took note of and discussed the results of 2018 satisfaction survey as well as the report from the Chairman's interviews with members and observes.	**SECR** to analyse the discussions and come up with possible proposals for improving the efficiency of the Committee and its plenary meetings.
c) Revision of the SEAC Rules of procedure	
SEAC agreed to the proposed revisions to the SEAC Rules of Procedure (SEAC/42/2019/04).	**SECR** to inform the Management Board on the agreement of SEAC on the proposed revised Rules of Procedure.
d) Update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)	
SEAC agreed on the update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (restricted meeting document SEAC/42/2019/05).	**SECR** to publish the updated list on the ECHA website.
5. Restrictions	

5.1 General restriction issues	
a) Report from Restrictions Task Force meeting	
SEAC took note of the report from the Restrictions Task Force meeting.	
b) Update of the opinion development process	
SEAC took note of the update to the opinion development procedure for restrictions (in line with the meeting document SEAC/42/2019/01; with the modification made at SEAC-42) and agreed to use it starting from the three January restriction dossiers.	**SECR** to publish the new procedure to S-CIRCABC as well as on the ECHA website.
5.3 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Conformity check and key issues discussion	
1) Formaldehyde and formaldehyde releasers	
SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitter.	**SECR** to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this to S-CIRCABC IG. **SECR** to launch a public consultation on the restriction proposal on 20 March 2019.
2) Siloxanes: D4/D5/D6	
SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitter.	**SECR** to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this to S-CIRCABC IG. **SECR** to launch a public consultation on the restriction proposal on 20 March 2019.
3) Microplastics	
SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitter.	**SECR** to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this to S-CIRCABC IG. **SECR** to launch a public consultation on the restriction proposal on 20 March 2019.
b) Opinion development	

1) Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up – draft of final opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the draft of the SEAC final opinion and the results of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC adopted its final opinion by consensus (with modifications agreed at SEAC-42).	**Rapporteurs** together with **SECR** to do the final editing of the SEAC final opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and ORCOM) is in line with the adopted SEAC final opinion. **SECR** to forward the adopted opinion and its annexes to COM and publish it on the ECHA website.
2) PAHs in granules and mulches used as infill material – second draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the second draft opinion.	**Rapporteurs** to prepare the third draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-42 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the beginning of May 2019.
3) *N,N*-dimethylformamide – first draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.	**SECR** to launch a written commenting round for members to provide remaining comments on the first draft opinion via the S-CIRCABC newsgroup (until 1 April 2019). **Rapporteurs** to prepare the second draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-42 discussions, by the beginning of May 2019.
4) Five cobalt salts – first draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.	**SECR** to launch a written commenting round for members to provide remaining comments on the first draft opinion via the S-CIRCABC newsgroup (until 1 April 2019). **Rapporteurs** to prepare the second draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-42 discussions, by the beginning of May 2019.
5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
SEAC took note of the ongoing discussions on the pools of (co-)rapporteurs for the April 2019 restriction proposals. The agreement on the pools of (co-)rapporteurs will be arranged by written procedure.	**SEAC Members** to volunteer for the pools of (co-)rapporteurs for the restriction dossiers arriving to ECHA in April 2019. **SECR** to launch a written procedure on the appointment of the pools of (co-)rapporteurs for the April 2019 dossiers.

6. Authorisation	
6.1 General authorisation issues	
a) Update on incoming/future applications	
SEAC took note of the update on the incoming/future applications.	
b) Update on the approach of evaluation of the upcoming applications for authorisation for environmental endocrine disruptors (octyl- and nonylphenol ethoxylates)	
SEAC took note of the update on the approach of evaluation of the upcoming applications for authorisation for environmental endocrine disruptors (octyl- and nonylphenol ethoxylates).	
c) Approach to opinion drafting	
SEAC took note of the revised approach to opinion drafting as presented by the SECR. SEAC discussed positive aspects and potential drawbacks of the revised approach. SEAC agreed to try out and evaluate the proposed approach in practice with applications from the February submission window.	**SECR** to organise early consultations of opinions applying the revised approach. **SECR** to organise a dedicated session in the June plenary to evaluate the revised approach.
d) Commission's feedback on authorisation opinions	
SEAC took note of the Commission's feedback on authorisation opinions.	
6.2 Authorisation applications	
a) Discussion on key issues	
1) Five applications for authorisation from the November 2018 submission window (chromium trioxide)	
SEAC discussed the key issues identified in the applications for authorisation.	**Rapporteurs** to prepare the first versions of the draft opinions, taking into account the SEAC-42 discussions.
6.3 Review reports	
a) Agreement on draft opinions	

1. RR1_TCE_Spolana	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC agreed on its draft opinion on this application for authorisation by consensus.	**Rapporteurs** together with **SECR** to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion. **SECR** to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
6.4 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)	
SEAC agreed on the updated pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (considered as agreement on appointment in line with the restricted room document SEAC/42/2018/03).	**SEAC members** to volunteer to the pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation. **SECR** to upload the updated document to confidential folder on S-CIRCABC IG.
7. AOB	
c) Presentation of ChemSec new report "Lost at SEA"	
SEAC took note of the presentation by ChemSec on their new report "Lost at SEA".	
d) Presentation about the court case regarding the authorisation for the uses of lead chromates yellow and red	
SEAC took note of the presentation by SECR about the court case regarding the authorisation of the uses of lead chromates yellow and red.	
8. Conclusions and action points	
SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-42.	**SECR** to upload the action points and main conclusions to S-CIRCABC IG.

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-42

SEAC members
ALEXANDRE Joao
ANASTASIOU Christos
BERGS Ivars
BLAHA Karel
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
CASTELLI Stefano
CAVALIERI Luisa
COGEN Simon
DELCOURT Benjamin
DOMINIAK Dorota
DOUGHERTY Gary
FANKHAUSER Simone
FIORE Karine
FOCK Lars
FORKMAN Mats
GEORGIOU Stavros
JANSSEN Martien
JONES Derrick
JOYCE John
KAJIC Silva
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LEAHY Eimear
LOCS Janis
LUIT Richard
LÜDEKE Andreas
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
RONKAINEN Dora
ROUW Aart
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SHAKHRAMANYAN Nikolinka
THIELE Karen
URBAN Klaus
ZAMFIR Adrian-Stefan
Commission observers
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)
BERTATO Silvia (DG GROW) via Webex
GALLEGO Matteo (DG ENV)
HUALDE-GRASA Patricia (DG GROW) via Webex
SVARD Amie (DG GROW) via Webex
Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts
BERNARD Alice (ClientEarth)
GERMAIN Pierre (CES = Silicones Europe) as accompanying expert to CEFIC for D4/D5/D6

Advisors, invited experts, observers & dossier submitters (DS)
ANDERSSON Wiktor as advisor to Jenny JANS via WebEx
DE BLAEIJ Arianne as DS for Plastic and rubber granulates via WebEx
HELMEDACH Achim as advisor to Karen THIELE
JOHANSSON Olaf as expert to DS for Microplastics via WebEx
JONGENEEL Rob as advisor to Richard LUIT via WebEx
LERCHE Dorte as advisor to Lars FOCK
OYSTEIN FOTLAND Tor as DS for tattoo inks via WebEx
PETERS Oliver as advisor to Karen THIELE via WebEx
REALE Priscilla as advisor to Luisa Cavalieri via WebEx
SAETTLER Daniel as advisor to Karen THIELE via WebEx
VAN DER HAGEN Marianne as DS for Tattoo inks via WebEx
VERHOEVEN Julia as DS for Plastic and rubber granulates via WebEx

Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts (cont.)
HOLLAND Mike (EAERE = European Association for Environmental and Resource Economists)
HÖK Frida (Chemsec)
JÁNOSI Amaya (CEFIC = European Chemical Industry Council)
MACAUDIERE Sylvie (ARKEMA) as accompanying expert to CEFIC for Microplastics
Mc CARTHY (ALBEMARLE) as accompanying expert to CEFIC for Cobalt salts restriction
MISTRY Rohit (EFTEC = Economics for the Environment) as accompanying expert to EUROMETAUX for Cobalt salts restriction
MUSU Tony (ETUC = European Trade Union Confederation)
SANTOS Tatiana (EEB = European Environmental Bureau)
VAN GELDEREN Alex (ETRMA = European Tyre & Rubber Manufacturers' Association) as accompanying expert to CEFIC for Plastic and rubber granulates restriction
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)
WATSON Diane (Cosmetics Europe) as Occasional stakeholder for Microplastics and D4/D5/D6 Restrictions
WIJNENDAELE Kris (European Panel Federation) as accompanying expert to CEFIC for Formaldehyde restriction
RAC rapporteurs
DUNAUSKIENE Lina
PARIS Pietro
KAPELARI Sonja
MOELLER Ruth
SANTONEN Tiina
SCHULTE Agnes

ECHA STAFF
BLAINEY Mark
DI BASTIANO Augusto
DVORAKA Dana
FIGUIERE Romain
GMEINDER Michael
HEINONEN Arsi
HENRICHSON Sanna
HOLLINS Stephen
JACQUEMIN Katline
KIVELA Kalle
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
LEFEVRE-BREVART Sandrine
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORZS Arnis
MAZZOLINI Anna
MOTTET Denis
MUSHTAQ Fesil
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
OTTATI Maria
PELTOLA Jukka
PILLET Monique
REGIL Pablo
RHEINBERGER Christoph
ROGGEMAN Maarten
SADAM Diana
SIMPSON Peter
SJOBERG Thomas
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
STOYANOVA Evgenia
ÖBERG Tomas
VAINIO Matti
VAN HAELST Anniek
VESENTINI Damiano

IV. List of Annexes

ANNEX I. List of documents submitted to the members of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

ANNEX II. Declared conflicts of interest

ANNEX III. Final Draft Agenda

ANNEX I

Documents submitted to the members of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

Document	Number
Final Draft Agenda	SEAC/A/42/2019
Update of the opinion development process	SEAC/42/2019/01
Report on SEAC-41 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies	SEAC/42/2019/02 (restricted room document)
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)	SEAC/42/2019/03 (restricted room document)
Revision to the SEAC Rules of procedure	SEAC/42/2019/04
Update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)	SEAC/42/2019/05 (restricted room document)

ANNEX II

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST TO THE RESPECTIVE AGENDA ITEMS

The following participants declared conflicts of interests with the agenda items below (according to Article 9(2) of the SEAC Rules of Procedure):

Name of participant	**Agenda item**	**Interest declared**
LUDEKE Andreas	5.2b.1 Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossiers
FOCK Lars	5.2b.1 Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
LUIT Richard	5.2b.2 Plastic and rubber granulates containing PAHs	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
JANSSEN Martien	5.2b.2 Plastic and rubber granulates containing PAHs	Working for the MSCA submitting the dossier
CAVALIERI Luisa	5.2b.1 Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up 5.2b.3 -*N*,*N*-dimethylformamide (DMF)	Contract with the MSCA submitting the dossier
CASTELLI Stefano	5.2b.1 Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up 5.2b.3 -*N*,*N*-dimethylformamide (DMF)	Working for the MSCA submitting the dossier

ANNEX III

4 March 2019
SEAC/A/42/2019

Final Draft Agenda

42nd meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

12 – 15 March 2019
ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

12 March starts at 14.00
15 March ends at 12.30

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/42/2019
For adoption

Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

Item 4 – Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

a) Report on SEAC-41 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

For information

b) Report from the satisfaction survey and Chairman's interviews with members and observers (including discussions in breakout groups)

For discussion

c) Revision to the SEAC Rules of procedure

SEAC/42/2019/04
For agreement

d) Update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)

SEAC/42/2019/05

(restricted meeting document)
For agreement

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 General restriction issues

a) Report from Restrictions Task Force meeting

For information

b) Update of the opinion development process

SEAC/42/2019/01
For information

5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

b) Conformity check and key issues discussion

1) Formaldehyde and formaldehyde releasers
2) Siloxanes: D4/D5/D6
3) Microplastics

For discussion and agreement

c) Opinion development

1) Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up – draft of final opinion

For discussion and adoption

2) PAHs in granules and mulches used as infill material – second draft opinion

3) *N,N*-dimethylformamide – first draft opinion

4) Five cobalt salts – first draft opinion

For discussion

5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

For information

Item 6 – Authorisation

6.1 General authorisation issues

a) Update on incoming/future applications

For information

b) Update on the approach of evaluation of the upcoming applications for authorisation for environmental endocrine disruptors (octyl- and nonylphenol ethoxylates)

For information/discussion

c) Approach to opinion drafting

For discussion

d) Commission's feedback on authorisation opinions

For information / discussion

6.2 Authorisation applications

b) Discussion on key issues

1. Five applications for authorisation from the November 2018 submission window (chromium trioxide)

For discussion

6.3 Review reports

a) Agreement on draft opinion

1) RR1_TCE_Spolana (1 use)

For discussion and agreement

6.4 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)

SEAC / 42 / 2019 / 03
(restricted room document)
For agreement

Item 7 – AOB

a) Update of the work plan

b) Training session on INTERACT project

c) Presentation of ChemSec new report "Lost at SEA"

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-42

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-42

For adoption