

21 November 2017

SEAC/M/36/2017 DRAFT

Final

Minutes of the 36th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

12 - 14 September 2017

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 thirty-sixth meeting of SEAC. The Chairman informed the participants that three new members have joined the Committee. The Chairman also informed SEAC that apologies have been received from six members.

The Chairman informed the participants that the meeting would be recorded solely for the purpose of writing the minutes and the recordings would be destroyed once no longer needed.

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-36 (SEAC/A/36/2017 rev.1 with minor modifications under AOB). The agenda was adopted without modifications. 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. One member declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions under the Agenda Item 6.1.a. This member did not participate in voting under that Agenda Item, as stated in Article 9(2) of the SEAC Rules of Procedure.

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

4) Capacity Building

Following the discussion at SEAC-35 on capacity building needs, the Secretariat organised for a SEAC capacity building session on scientific scrutiny of restriction and authorisation dossiers. The session started with the Secretariat providing a theoretical background, followed by a practical example by one of the SEAC rapporteurs (Karen Thiele), who focused in her presentation on one restriction and one authorisation dossier. After the presentations, the participants were split into four break-out groups, looking at evaluation of different scientific aspects of restrictions and AfAs (one group discussed what is needed for the scrutiny of costs, another – what is needed for the scrutiny of benefits and two groups discussed what it needed for the scrutiny of the assessment that the proposed restriction is the most appropriate EU wide measure). The outcomes of the break-out group discussions were presented in plenary and many issues were identified as well as items for improvement. The Secretariat will take these suggestions further in the planning for improving the two processes.

5) Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

a) Report on SEAC-35 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

The Chairman informed the participants that all action points of SEAC-35 had been completed or would be followed up during the on-going SEAC-36 meeting. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-35 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-35 minutes.

A stakeholder observer representative informed about a small inaccuracy which occurred when the ECHA Secretariat edited the minutes. It applied part of the comments made to the authorisation opinions ZFL case, while this related to the MOCA case.

The Chairman then explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA MB, RAC, MSC, and the Forum had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/36/2017/01).

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

b) Annual update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)

The Secretariat presented a report on the participation of stakeholder organisations in the work of SEAC since SEAC-32 and a proposal for an update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list. SEAC agreed on the annual update of SEAC stakeholder observers as presented by the Secretariat. The Chairman informed the Committee that the Secretariat will publish the updated list on the ECHA website.

6) Restrictions

6.1) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Opinion Development

1) Diisocyanates – second draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representatives from Germany, the RAC rapporteurs (following via WebEx) and an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer. He reminded the participants that this restriction proposal (submitted by Germany) limits the use of diisocyanates in industrial and professional applications to those cases where a combination of technical and organisational measures as well as a minimum standardised training package have been implemented. Information on how to get access to this package is communicated throughout the supply chain. Exemptions are defined for cases where the content of diisocyanates in the substance or mixture placed on the market or used would be less than 0.1% by weight, as well as for mixtures containing diisocyanates at higher levels than 0.1% by weight which fulfil criteria that show that the potential risks using such products are very low. The rapporteurs had developed the second draft opinion on this dossier, taking into account the discussion held at SEAC-35, which was made available to SEAC on 21

August. The commenting round ended on 1 September with comments received from nine SEAC members. At this SEAC-36 meeting, the Committee was invited to discuss the second draft opinion with the aim of reaching agreement on all the main components of the restriction and enabling the rapporteurs to develop a final version of the opinion or identify where remaining work is needed.

The Secretariat briefly reported to SEAC on the RAC second draft opinion on this dossier that was going for discussion at RAC-42 on the following week. The rapporteurs then presented the second draft opinion, in which they mainly had focused on benefits. In relation to the training effectiveness, the rapporteurs explained that the dossier submitter had considered 50% (low bound) and 70% (high bound) based on the Motor Vehicle Refinish study by UK HSE. In the view of the rapporteurs, however, there is possible effectiveness overestimation and they therefore proposed to add a sensitivity analysis with LO bound 30%. Several members supported the view of the rapporteurs, and the dossier submitter also agreed to this. One member emphasised that the rapporteurs' assessment of effectiveness needs to be elaborated further, in particular the extent to which these studies, on which the effectiveness assessment is based, can be carried over to the current case. He added that the effectiveness can be different across different MSs, as the baseline is different and suggested the rapporteurs to look at these possible differences too.

With regard to the monetisation of benefits, a representative of one stakeholder observer noted that asthma can have other broader implications (e.g. risk for dying while having an asthma attack, shorter life expectancy, etc) – he was wondering if the rapporteurs have considered these in their assessment. He also noted that job loss has an impact on the individual in question, but from the societal perspective it is not important, as someone else will take up the job. The same participant suggested to make it clear what exactly is covered by the definition of asthma. The rapporteurs agreed to look into these issues in more detail.

One SEAC member expressed the view that the way this restriction is currently drafted is rather complex and was interested how the proposed exemptions interfere with OSH. Another member highlighted that in some countries, private companies get some reimbursement from the state for training of employees and suggested to consider this in the evaluation. One SEAC member questioned how much the existing trainings are taken into account. One member suggested to consider the costs involved for the personnel of state organisations who monitor the implementation of the training programmes, in case these costs are covered by the said state organisations. The Commission observer stressed that SEAC should not focus so much on the interface between REACH and OSH, but should assess the proposal as it has been written. He also questioned if the Forum had provided advice on how to improve enforceability and some alternative wording suggestions and why no transitional period has been proposed for this restriction. Taking into account RAC's possible shift towards RMO2 being the more appropriate option, the other Commission observer recommended that SEAC addresses more substantially the difference between RMO1 and RMO2 in terms of their effectiveness and efficiency. The rapporteurs will consider the raised issues in the next version of the draft opinion.

The Chairman informed the Committee that the public consultation on this proposal finishes on 22 September 2017. The rapporteurs should develop the third draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-36 discussion and the public consultation comments, by

early November. SEAC is expected to agree on its draft opinion on this dossier at SEAC-37 in November/December 2017.

2) Lead and lead compounds in PVC – second draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representatives from ECHA, the RAC rapporteurs (following via WebEx), a representative of an occasional stakeholder observer as well as two industry experts accompanying stakeholder observers. He reminded the participants that this restriction dossier (submitted by ECHA) proposes a restriction of lead compounds in PVC articles in concentrations equal to or greater than 0.1% (w/w) with a 15 year derogation for certain building and construction articles produced from recycled PVC (with a higher restriction limit of 1% w/w) and a 10-year derogation for PVC silica separators in lead acid batteries. The rapporteurs had developed the second draft opinion on this dossier, taking into account the discussion held at SEAC-35, which was made available to SEAC on 31 August. The commenting round ended on 7 September with comments received from eight SEAC members. At this SEAC-36 meeting, the Committee was invited to discuss the first draft opinion and to provide feedback sufficient to enable the rapporteurs to formulate a next version of the draft opinion. At this SEAC-36 meeting, the Committee was invited to discuss the second draft opinion with the aim of reaching agreement on all the main components of the restriction and enabling the rapporteurs to develop a final version of the opinion or identify where remaining work is needed.

The Secretariat briefly reported to SEAC on the RAC second draft opinion on this dossier that was going for discussion at RAC-42 on the following week. The rapporteurs then presented the second draft opinion. They were interested to hear the views of other SEAC members whether SEAC agrees with the conclusions of the rapporteurs that action is required on an EU wide basis, on the scope of the restriction (apart from derogations that will be evaluated further), on the costs and benefits assessment and on the proportionality. With regard to the scope of the restriction, one member questioned how is it possible to clarify, if lead has been used as a stabiliser or as a pigment, and how the enforcement will be able to make this difference. Another member was also interested how this restriction is linked with use of lead as pigments, which has been authorised. The dossier submitter responded that it is clear from the Annex XV report that only lead as stabiliser has been assessed and presence of lead as pigments has not been covered at all, as the aim was not to restrict the authorised use – hence, came the need to revise the wording of the restriction to clarify this.

A representative of an occasional stakeholder observer noted that they have recently provided detailed comments within the ongoing public consultation and emphasised that when setting the limit value for recycled PVC, possible variability should be taken into account and they therefore have suggested to set it at higher level than originally proposed. Several SEAC members also asked the rapporteurs to have an in-depth look into the issue of limit values. The rapporteurs responded that at the moment, there does not seem to be enough evidence for raising the limit value to 2%, however, they will have a closer look at the information provided by industry on this issue, and will consider it in the next version of the draft opinion. A Commission observer highlighted that the impacts of the proposed derogations need to be very well assessed for them to be able to decide on their effective inclusion in the entry of Annex XVII and indicated that they

have a preference for exhaustive (or non-exhaustive) lists of product categories to be derogated, rather than non-exhaustive. The rapporteurs promised to consider these suggestions in the next version of the draft opinion.

The Chairman informed the Committee that the public consultation on this proposal finishes on 22 September 2017. The rapporteurs should develop the third draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-36 discussion and the public consultation comments, by early November. SEAC is expected to agree on its draft opinion on this dossier at SEAC-37 in November/December 2017.

3) Lead and lead compounds in shot – first draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representatives from ECHA, the RAC co-rapporteur (following via WebEx), experts accompanying the regular stakeholder observer and the UNEP-AEWA observer and accompanying expert. He reminded the participants that this restriction proposal had been submitted by ECHA in April 2017. The dossier proposes a restriction on the use of lead shots in and over wetlands. The harmonisation of the conditions of use of lead in shot in wetlands is a priority at EU level, as national legislation has already been enacted by some Member States (or regions in some Member States) further to international action through the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) under the auspices of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) to which the EU is a Party. The rapporteurs had developed the first draft opinion on this dossier, taking into account the discussion on key issues held at SEAC-35, which was made available to SEAC on 31 August. The commenting round ended on 7 September with nine sets of comments received from eight SEAC members. At this SEAC-36 meeting, the Committee was invited to discuss the first draft opinion and to provide feedback to enable the rapporteurs to formulate a next version of the draft opinion.

Since the RAC plenary meeting will take place a week after the SEAC plenary meeting the Secretariat briefly reported to SEAC on the content of the first version of the RAC draft opinion. The rapporteurs then presented the first draft opinion, in which they mainly had focused on the costs to hunters. The SEAC members discussed the scope of the restriction, as well as the justification for an EU-wide restriction as a measure to address the identified issues, implementation and enforcement costs.

Regarding the discussion on scope, questions were raised on the choice of scope for this dossier, references were made to the Commission mandate. The Commission explained that the choice of scope was motivated by existing commitments of the EU under the AEWA agreement and the existing evidence base on risk. The ECHA Secretariat supported this and explained further that following recommendations of the Restriction Task force the discussion in SEAC should focus on assessing the impacts of the current scope of the restriction.

In the discussion that followed, one SEAC member suggested to introduce the animal welfare argument into the justification for the restriction. One SEAC member expressed his view that the REACH Regulation is not the proper vehicle to impose the proposed restriction. The Committee in its discussion also addressed possible costs of training for hunters. No members disagreed with the main cost calculations but commented on the training/enforcement. A stakeholder observer raised issues about risks from lead also to humans outside wetlands, and the possibility of enforcement costs being limited since hunting already now requires establishment of permitting and licensing. It was agreed

that the rapporteurs will address these issues with the dossier submitter and update the discussion on costs and will develop the benefits part of the opinion in the second SEAC draft opinion in line with comments received at SEAC-36 (as well as possible comments in the ongoing public consultation).

The Chairman informed the Committee that the second draft opinion should be developed by the rapporteurs by beginning of November 2017.

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

The Chairman informed the Committee about the upcoming restriction proposals that have been included in the Registry of Intentions. In April 2018, ECHA is planning to submit its restriction proposal restricting placing on the market of leave on personal care products and other consumer/professional products containing D4/D5 greater than 0,1% in concentration. At the same time, the Netherlands will be submitting a restriction dossier on placing on the market of plastic and rubber granulates containing polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) above a set concentration limit for use on synthetic turf pitches. A second restriction proposal by ECHA is expected to arrive in July 2018, restricting placing on the market of certain chemicals and use of professional and industrial use of the 5 cobalt salts where adequate control cannot be demonstrated. The restriction may also be implemented by imposing operational conditions and risk management measures. The calls for expression of interest for these dossiers will be launched next year.

7) Authorisations

7.1) General authorisation issues

a) Update on incoming/future applications

The Secretariat informed the Committee that one new application for authorisation and two review reports were received during the August 2017 submission window. The received application for authorisation is an upstream application for the two uses of pentazinc chromate octahydroxide. The uses cover formulation of mixtures and the use of the substance in stoved epoxy primer for corrosion protection of aircraft engine components in aerospace and aeroderivative applications. The two received review reports are on the two identical upstream uses of phthalate DEHP: (1) formulation of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in compounds and dry-blends and (2) industrial use of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in polymer processing by calendering, extrusion, compression and injection moulding to produce PVC articles.

In addition, the Secretariat informed the Committee that in the November 2017 submission window it is expected to receive one new application for authorisation on the downstream use of diglyme, and possibly one review report on the use of lead chromate pigments.

b) Applications for environmental endocrine disruptors

Two SVHC substances with endocrine disrupting properties for the environment (Article 57(f)) were added to Annex XIV of REACH in July 2017 (OPnEO and NPnEO). These are the first two SVHC added to Annex XIV on the basis of these properties.

The Secretariat reported to the Committee about a technical workshop hosted by ECHA in August 2017 (In Brussels) to raise awareness on key issues relevant to the hazard and risk assessment of these substances, specifically the potential role of 'thresholds' and 'dose-response' relationships in applications for authorisation for these substances held in August 2017 in Brussels.

It remains clear there that there are significant uncertainties surrounding the derivation of robust thresholds and dose-response relationships for endocrine disrupting substances. Recognising these uncertainties, RAC are not in a position to derive 'reference values' for these substances. In addition, these uncertainties are, on balance, likely to significantly complicate the evaluation of any justification for authorisation proposed by an applicant for these substances on the bases of adequate control. Given the considerations documented in the recent RAC opinion on a restriction proposal for the use of NP in textiles it will be challenging for applicants to demonstrate that any threshold value derived for these substances is a 'no effect concentration' for endocrine disrupting properties across all relevant taxonomic groups.

Recognising the 'business risk' inherent to demonstrating adequate control for these substances, applicants are interested in how socio-economic analysis could be used as justification for an authorisation. Given that the hazard properties of these substances are different to those that have previously been considered in applications for authorisation, applicant's will benefit from additional support for preparing 'fit-for-purpose' Chemical Safety Assessment and Socio-economic Analysis for these substances.

The most appropriate means to facilitate this support will be considered and implemented in collaboration with ECHA's scientific committees. During the brief discussion one SEAC member noted on similarities between assessment of endocrine disruptors with the assessment of PBT/vPvB properties.

7.2) Authorisation applications

a) Discussion on key issues

- 1. EDC_Microbeads (1 use)**
- 2. CT_ZFF (1 use)**
- 3. SC_Wesco (1 use)**
- 4. DtC_Wesco (1 use)**
- 5. PCO_Aviall (2 uses)**

The Secretariat, in cooperation with the SEAC rapporteurs, provided general information regarding the new applications for authorisation submitted by the applicants during the May 2017 submission window. In the presentation the Secretariat outlined the key issues identified by the rapporteurs, which would need further clarification by the applicant and asked the Committee for comments and further suggestions.

b) Agreement on draft opinions

1. PC_SC_Saes (2 uses)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-35, the Committee discussed the key issues for this application. At this plenary, the SEAC Members were asked to consider the agreement of the SEAC draft opinions.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinions, which will be discussed for agreement at the next RAC plenary meeting in November. The SEAC Rapporteurs presented the draft opinions. The discussion focused mainly on the calculation of human health impacts and the analysis of alternatives.

The draft opinions were subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Rapporteurs were asked to revise the draft opinions following the agreement on the draft opinions in RAC (if needed).

c) Adoption of final opinions

1. SD_Borealis (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-34, the Committee agreed on the draft opinion. The applicant provided comments to this draft opinion on 20 July 2017. At this plenary, the SEAC members were asked to consider the adoption of the SEAC final opinion.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the updated RAC final opinion to be discussed and adopted the next week. The SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft of the final opinion.

The final opinion was subsequently adopted by consensus, and will be sent to the applicant, the European Commission as well as the Member States.

d) Status update

1. CT_Hapoc (4 uses), CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use), CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use), SD_Hapoc (1 use)

The rapporteurs informed SEAC about the opinion development progress on the four applications for authorisation submitted by HAPOC GmbH & Co KG. Recently the applicant submitted extensive responses to the rapporteurs' questions. In case of SD_Hapoc, SEAC had asked a set of questions to bring the application into conformity. The applicant did not answer these questions but got back to ECHA with a request for an extended dead line until the end of 2017. Since this was already the second request for extending the deadline and in light of equal treatment of applicants the ECHA Secretariat did not extend the deadline.

The Committee intend to discuss and, if possible, to agree on the draft opinions on these applications for authorisation at its plenary meeting in November/December 2017.

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

The pool of (co-)rapporteurs, as outlined in the amended restricted room document SEAC/36/2017/03 rev.1, was agreed by SEAC. The Committee also requested the Secretariat to review the process of appointment of (co-) rapporteurs for AfAs.

8) AOB

a) Update of the work plan

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

b) Report on the second Forum pilot project on authorisation and additional Austrian experience in enforcing REACH authorisation decisions

The Forum Secretariat provided a report on the second Forum pilot project on authorisation. SEAC took note of the experience gained and welcomed the update. Due to problems with flights, the second part of the presentation on Austrian experience in enforcing REACH authorisation decisions was postponed. The Secretariat provided also additional information on Forum project on restrictions.

c) EEB report on Restrictions

The Secretariat informed about the EEB's recent report on Restrictions, which was made available to SEAC via S-CIRCABC. The Secretariat provided its feedback on the findings of the report. In addition, SEAC members exchanged views on the report, e.g. highlighting some misunderstands regarding cost-benefit analysis.

9) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-36

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

II. Main conclusions and action points

SEAC-36, 12 - 14 September 2017
(Adopted at SEAC-36 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.	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.	
5. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities	
<i>a) Report on SEAC-35 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies</i>	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-35. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/36/2017/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in the CARACAL.	
b) Annual update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)	
SEAC agreed on the update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list as proposed by the SECR (in line with restricted meeting document SEAC/36/2017/02).	SECR to upload the agreed list of SEAC accredited stakeholder observers to ECHA website.
6. Restrictions	
6.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Opinion development	
1. Diisocyanates - 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-36 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the beginning of November 2017.

2. Lead and lead compounds in PVC – 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-36 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the beginning of November 2017.
3. Lead and lead compounds in shot – first draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.	Rapporteurs to prepare the second draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-36 discussions, by the beginning of November 2017.
6.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
SEAC was informed about the upcoming restriction proposals included in the RoI.	SECR to launch the calls for expression of interest for these dossiers late 2017/early 2018.
7. Authorisation	
7.1 General authorisation issues	
a) Update on incoming/future applications	
SEAC took note of the update on the incoming/future applications.	
b) AfAs for environmental endocrine disruptors	
SEAC took note of the presentation by SECR on AfAs for environmental endocrine disruptors.	SECR to provide further updates to SEAC in the future.
7.2 Authorisation applications	
a) Discussion on key issues	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EDC_Microbeads (1 use) 2. CT_ZFF (1 use) 3. SC_Wesco (1 use) 4. DtC_Wesco (1 use) 5. PCO_Aviall (2 uses) 	
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-36 discussions.

b) Agreement on draft opinions	
1. PC_SC_Saes (2 uses)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions. Rapporteurs to revise the draft opinions following the agreement on the draft opinions in RAC (if needed). SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
c) Adoption of final opinions	
1. SD_Borealis (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the draft of the SEAC final opinion. SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus.	SECR to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.
d) Status update	
1. CT_Hapoc (4 uses), CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use), CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use), SD_Hapoc (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the status update on the opinion development for the applications for authorisation.	Rapporteurs to develop the draft opinions by end of October 2017 (to be tabled for discussion and agreement at SEAC-37).
7.3 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 SEAC/36/2017/03 Rev.1 restricted room document).	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. SECR to review the process of appointment of (co-) rapporteurs for AfAs on request of SEAC.
9. Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-36	
SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-36.	SECR to upload the action points and main conclusions to S-CIRCABC IG.

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-36

SEAC members
ALEXANDRE Joao
ANASTASIOU Christos
BERGS Ivars
BLAHA Karel
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
CASTELLI Stefano
CAVALIERI Luisa
COGEN Simon
CSERGÓ Robert (co-opted)
DELCOURT Benjamin
FANKHAUSER Simone
FIGLIORE Karine
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros
JANSSEN Martien
JONES Derrick (co-opted)
KIISKI Johanna
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LÜDEKE Andreas
LUIT Richard
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
NORING Maria
OLTEANU Maria
RUZGYS Karolis
SCHUCHTAR Endre
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina
THIELE Karen
URBAN Klaus
ZAIKOVA Ilona
ZAMFIR Adrian-Stefan
Commission observers
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)
GALLEGO Matteo (DG ENV)
Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts
GREMSE Carl (BfR), accompanying AEW-UNEP for the discussion on Lead in shot
HAIDER Sonja (ChemSec)
HOLLAND Mike (EAERE)
HRUSKA Zdenek (Plastics Europe), accompanying EUPC for the discussion on Lead in PVC

Advisors, invited experts, observers & dossier submitters (DS)
ANDERSSON Wiktor (as advisor to Maria NORING via WebEx)
AVERBECK Frauke (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
BERNHEIM Theresa (advisor to Karen THIELE)
De BLAEIJ Arianne (Advisor to Martien JANSSEN via WebEx)
DOMINIAK Dorota (as invited expert)
DROSSARD Claudia (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
GUDRUN Walendzik (DS for Diisocyanates)
GUHE Christine (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
HELLER-HUTORAN Svetlana (DS for Diisocyanates)
HELMEDACH Achim (Advisor to Karen THIELE via WebEx)
LERCHE Dorte (advisor to Lars Fock)
PLOG Matthias (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
REALE Priscilla (Advisor to Luisa CAVALIERI via WebEx)
ROTHER Dag (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
ROUW Aart (DS for Diisocyanates)
RAC (co-)rapporteurs
KADIKIS Normunds (via WebEx)
KAPLARI Sonja (via WebEx)
LEINONEN Riitta (via WebEx)
LUND Bert-Ove (via WebEx)
NEUMANN Michael (via WebEx)
VARNAI Veda (via WebEx)

Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts (cont.)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
LUCKE-BRUNK Gudrun (Covestro Deutschland AG), accompanying CEFIC for the discussions on Diisocyanates
MIKANDER Nina (AEWA - UNEP), for the discussion on Lead in shot
ROGER Apolline (ClientEarth)
TILLIEUX Geoffroy (EUPC = European Plastics Converters), for the discussion on Diisocyanates and Lead and its compounds in PVC
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)

ECHA STAFF
BLAINEY Mark
BERGES Markus
FESIL Mushtaq
HENRICHSON Sanna (via WebEx)
HOLLINS Stephen (via WebEx)
JACQUEMIN Katline
KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
KOULOUMPOS Vasileios
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORZS Arnis
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MAZZOLINI Anna
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
PELTOLA Jukka
PILLET Monique (via WebEx)
REGIL Pablo
RHEINBERGER Christoph
RODRIGUEZ-IGLESIAS Pilar (via WebEx)
SADAM Diana
SIMPSON Peter
SJOBERG Thomas
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
TLOCZEK Magdalena
ÖBERG Tomas

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	<i>SEAC/A/36/2017 (For adoption)</i>
Report on SEAC-35 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies	<i>SEAC/36/2017/01 (For information)</i>
Annual update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list	<i>SEAC/36/2017/02 (Restricted room document For agreement)</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (closed session)	<i>SEAC/36/2017/03 (restricted room document For agreement)</i>

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):

<u>Name of participant</u>	<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Interest declared</u>
LUDEKE Andreas	6.1a-1 Diisocyanates	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier

8 September 2017
SEAC/A/36/2017

Final Draft Agenda

36th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

12 – 14 September 2017

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

12 September starts at 14.00

14 September ends at 14.00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/36/2017
For adoption

Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

Item 4 – Capacity building

Item 5 – Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

- a) Report on SEAC-35 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

SEAC/36/2017/01
For information

- b) Annual update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)

SEAC/36/2017/02
(restricted)
For agreement

Item 6 – Restrictions

6.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) Opinion development
 - 1) Diisocyanates – second draft opinion
 - 2) Lead and lead compounds in PVC – second draft opinion
 - 3) Lead and lead compounds in shot – first draft opinion

For discussion

6.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

For information

Item 7 – Authorisation

7.1 General authorisation issues

- a) Update on incoming/future applications
- b) AfAs for environmental endocrine disruptors

For information

7.2 Authorisation applications

- e) Discussion on key issues
 - 1. EDC_Microbeads (1 use)
 - 2. CT_ZFF (1 use)
 - 3. SC_Wesco (1 use)
 - 4. DtC_Wesco (1 use)
 - 5. PCO_Aviall (2 uses)

For discussion

- f) Agreement on draft opinions
 - 1. PC_SC_Saes (2 uses)

For discussion and agreement

- g) Adoption of final opinions
 - 1. SD_Borealis (1 use)

For discussion and adoption

- h) Status update
 - 1. CT_Hapoc (4 uses), CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use), CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use), SD_Hapoc (1 use)

For information

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

**SEAC/36/2017/03
(restricted room document)
For agreement**

Item 8 – AOB

- a) Update of the work plan
- b) Report on the second Forum pilot project on authorisation and additional Austrian experience in enforcing REACH authorisation decisions
- c) EEB report on Restrictions

For information

Item 9 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-36

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-36

For adoption