

**15 February 2017**

**SEAC/A/33/2016 FINAL**

**Final**

**Minutes of the 33<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis**

**29 November to 2 December 2016**

## **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-third meeting of SEAC. The Chairman informed the participants that one new member has joined the Committee. The Chairman also informed SEAC that apologies had been received from four 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-33. The agenda was adopted with minor modifications (under Agenda Item 7, AOB). 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. Three members declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions under the Agenda Item 5.1. These members did not participate in voting under the respective Agenda Items, 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) Report from other ECHA bodies and activities**

#### **a) Report on SEAC-32 action points, written procedures and update other ECHA bodies**

The Chairman informed the participants that all action points of SEAC-32 had been completed or would be followed up during the on-going SEAC-33 meeting. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-32 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-32 minutes.

The Chairman then explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA MB, RAC, MSC, the Forum and BPC had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/33/2016/01).

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

## **5) Restrictions**

### **5.1) Restriction Annex XV dossiers**

#### **a) Conformity check**

##### **1. Diisocyanates – outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues**

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representatives from Germany, the RAC (co-)rapporteurs as well as an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier had been submitted by Germany in October 2016. The conformity check was launched on 7 November and the SEAC commenting round finished on 18 November with comments received by one SEAC member.

The dossier submitter provided an introductory presentation on the dossier. The proposal 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 how to get access to this package is communicated throughout the supply chain. Exemptions are defined for cases where the content of free monomeric diisocyanates in the substance or mixture placed on the market or used is 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 presented the outcome of the conformity check and informed the Committee that they consider the dossier to be in conformity with the requirements of Annex XV of REACH, although they highlighted that the proposed restriction might be unclear to stakeholders and also the evaluation of economic impacts lacks clarity and transparency. Furthermore, they presented to the Committee the recommendations to the dossier submitter as well as the key issues identified by them in this restriction proposal.

Several members supported the views of the rapporteurs. The Committee agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements and also agreed with the recommendations to the dossier submitter as presented by the (co-) rapporteurs.

The Chairman mentioned that RAC will discuss the conformity of this dossier within RAC-39 later during the week and that the dossier submitter will be informed about the outcome of the conformity check.

## **b) Opinion development**

### **1. TDFAs – second draft opinion**

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter representatives from Denmark and an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer. He informed the participants that the SEAC written consultation on the second draft opinion was launched on 11 November and finished on 23 November with one comment received from a SEAC member. The Chairman reminded the participants that the dossier submitter proposes a restriction on the use of (3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,8-tridecafluorooctyl)silanetriol and any of its mono-, di- or tri-O-(alkyl) derivatives in mixtures containing organic solvents placed on the market or used in spray products for consumers (aerosol dispensers, hand pump and trigger sprays and mixtures marketed for spray application). The restriction is targeted at mixtures with organic solvents in spray products for supply to the general public. TDFAs with organic solvent have been shown to cause serious acute lung injury in mice exposed to aerosolised mixtures.

The rapporteurs then presented their second draft opinion. They provided a risk management option (RMO) assessment comparing impacts of different RMOs using qualitative and quantitative and monetised data. The rapporteurs supported the view that action might be required on a union wide basis, subject to final conclusion by RAC on risk.

The industry expert restated that according to their assessment Magic Nano would not be linked to these substances, as to their information, TDFAs had not been identified in any products linked to the poisoning cases and thereby the proposed restriction would not prevent further incidents.

A SEAC member pointed out with regard to the proportionality, that the products are not in the market anymore. Another SEAC member was of the view that uncertainty in substance composition in mixtures and whether it is still on the market is one of the reasons to justify precautionary measure. The dossier submitter representative confirmed that these products had been placed on the market in Sweden between 2012-14 while TDFAs containing products (for professional uses, though) are currently available on the Spanish market.

In general, SEAC members supported the current indicative estimations on reformulation costs as presented by the dossier submitter (in the absence of any more data unless will soon be available via public consultation); and agreed to the revised (downwards) health benefits estimations as made by the SEAC rapporteurs on the initial analysis provided by the dossier submitter. In addition, SEAC members expressed preliminary support on the proportionality of the proposed restriction (after RAC has concluded on the risk, the rapporteurs will make further clarification and restructuring in the draft opinion).

Regarding the enforceability, the rapporteurs reported that the Forum had advised that the restriction would not be enforceable with current wording (although sampling is feasible, the analysis could be problematic). On this issue, the final conclusions by RAC will also be considered.

The Chairman concluded that in general the Committee supports the rapporteurs' views as presented but would still be subject to final RAC conclusion on risks. The Chairman informed SEAC that the public consultation on this proposal finishes on 15 December

2016. The rapporteurs were asked to take the final results of the public consultation as well as SEAC-33 discussion into account in the third draft opinion (which is due by end of January 2017).

## **2. 4 phthalates – second draft opinion**

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitters' representatives from ECHA and Denmark, an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer and the RAC rapporteur. He reminded the participants that the dossier had been submitted in April 2016 and had been considered in conformity by RAC and SEAC in June 2016. The dossier proposes a restriction on articles containing the four phthalates (Diisobutyl phthalate (DIBP); Dibutyl phthalate (DBP); Benzyl butyl phthalate (BBP) and Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP)) for: i) indoor use and ii) outdoor use, if in contact with human skin or mucous membranes. The Chairman reminded that the (co-)rapporteurs had developed the second draft opinion on this dossier, which had been made available for the SEAC commenting prior to SEAC-33 and that comments were received from three SEAC members. The Chairman also mentioned that at the SEAC-33 plenary, the Committee is invited to discuss the second draft opinion and that it is planned to organise a drafting group meeting with interested SEAC members in the margins of this plenary in order to assist the (co-)rapporteurs in the further opinion development. The focus at this plenary meeting will be on finalisation of the assessment of costs as well as discussing benefits.

The rapporteurs presented their second draft opinion. With regard to the costs, they noted that they generally agree with the material substitution costs proposed by the dossier submitters, although those costs could be moderately underestimated. In relation to the R&D, reformulation, process and plant modification (RDRPPM) costs, the testing costs, the costs to EU substance manufacturers, the costs to the recycling sector as well as the enforcement costs, the rapporteurs also agreed with the dossier submitters that these costs will remain negligible, but that this conclusion will be revised, if any new information becomes available in the public consultation. Several members supported the approach taken by the rapporteurs. The industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer explained that they had submitted comments within the public consultation and particularly on the costs. He clarified that the costs for replacing the phthalates with safer alternatives are relatively low, but that is only because the major move and investment has already taken place. The industry expert added that it would be good to have this mentioned in the restriction proposal. The Chairman concluded that in general the Committee supports the approach of the (co-)rapporteurs for the cost assessment, pending the final outcome of the public consultation.

The rapporteurs then noted that the dossier submitters have examined a number of other (secondary or distributional) economic impacts in the dossier and found that they were either minimal or positive. The Committee members supported the view of the rapporteurs on other impacts.

The rapporteurs continued their presentation with the description of benefits. They were interested to hear the views of other SEAC members whether they agree to use benefits as calculated by the dossier submitters, with more focus on the 2% discount rate calculations, and whether the Committee agrees with the conclusion of the rapporteurs' uncertainties analysis that benefits have most probably been underestimated. The

discussion on these issues continued in the drafting group meeting, the conclusions of which were presented to the Committee later during the plenary. With regard to the estimation of benefits, the drafting group agreed to present quantitatively the results with both high and low WTP values, to discuss the two main reasons for uncertainties in the estimation of benefits and to describe in uncertainties reasons for underestimation of the monetised benefits. With regard to discounting, the drafting group recommended the Committee to use 2% and 4% for benefits and 4% for costs and to describe qualitatively the impact of declining discount rate on the results. Finally, the drafting group had discussed the approach to proportionality and had agreed to evaluate the following arguments included in the dossier – affordability, cost effectiveness and comparison to previous measure on phthalates in articles, break-even analysis and discussion on the population at risk, as well as benefit-cost comparison, using the quantified benefits as an indication of the magnitude of the impacts of the restriction. Other SEAC members expressed support for the approach proposed by the drafting group.

The Chairman informed that the public consultation will finish on 15 December and the rapporteurs are expected to take the SEAC-33 discussion as well as the outcome from the public consultation into account in the preparation of the next version of the opinion. SEAC is expected to agree on its draft opinion on this dossier at SEAC-34 in March 2017.

## **5.2) Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers**

The Secretariat informed the Committee about the new entries to the Registry of Intentions. In December 2016, ECHA will submit its new restriction proposal on Lead and its compounds in PVC (the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for this dossier was agreed in SEAC-32).

In addition, in May 2017 ECHA will submit its second restriction dossier on Lead and its compounds in lead shots over wetlands. A third ECHA dossier is expected to be submitted in July 2017 proposing a restriction on the placing on the market of certain chemicals in tattoo inks and permanent make-up. The call for expression of interest for these dossiers will be launched in the beginning of next year.

## **6) Authorisations**

### **6.1) General authorisation issues**

#### **a) Update on incoming/future applications**

The Secretariat informed the Committee that during the November 2016 submission window ECHA received two new applications for authorisation on three uses of the chromium (VI) compounds. Conformity and the key issues of the applications for authorisation will be discussed at the next SEAC plenary meeting in March 2017. The applications will be put for the RAC and SEAC consultations, and the public consultations in early February 2017. The Secretariat expects about five to ten more new applications and two review reports to be submitted during 2017.

## **b) Report on AfA Task Force and related activities**

The Secretariat informed the Committee about the AfA Task Force progress in development of the AfA practical guide. There is good progress with the work and it is planned to publish the public version of the guide by the end of 2016.

## **c) Harmonisation of AfA opinions**

The Secretariat also reported on the issues that need to have a higher level of harmonisation. It concerned the AfA opinion format, sections 7 and 8 in particular, addressing other endpoints, e.g. environmental impacts, approach to be taken towards the profit losses, breakeven analysis approach taken for the non-adequate control of risks cases, as well as specific cases of setting of the review period.

During the discussion several SEAC members expressed their views on the observations and proposals by the Secretariat. The Secretariat noted the advice, and will continue to work on further development of the opinion format.

## **d) Boundaries of socio-economic analysis in applications for authorisation**

The Secretariat presented the report prepared by the ECHA contractor on the geographical boundaries to socio-economic analysis in applications for authorisation. The Secretariat explained that the report considered issues associated with current definitions of boundaries in SEA undertaken in support of applications for authorisation. It also explored when transboundary impacts should be considered welfare-relevant and when distributional. The report summarised 12 cases of applications for authorisation, which involved relocation scenarios and identified three perspectives: 1) global view (when impacts matter wherever they occur), 2) physical view (when impacts matter only when occurring in EEA), 3) economic view (when impacts matter when occurring to EEA agents).

The Committee discussed the approach to be taken towards the geographical boundaries of SEA, whether it has to be done on a case by case basis or it has to have a unified approach, as well as the next steps to be taken. During the discussion members of SEAC, stakeholders and Commission representatives expressed their views about the approaches identified in the report and what information is most relevant for the decision making process. Whilst no firm conclusion was drawn, the discussion revealed that the Commission prefers an EEA focused SEA with relevant impacts occurring outside the EEA being described qualitatively. Regarding the perspectives of the relocation scenarios the Committee discussed the physical approach as a starting point – but in addition to that also the economic approach could be considered as they provide different information. Thus each of them might be of relevance in a particular case. The Secretariat took note of the discussion and agreed to further work on this item in 2017.

## **6.2) Authorisation applications**

### **a) Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues**

The Secretariat in cooperation with the SEAC rapporteurs provided general information regarding the 20 applications for authorisation listed below. In the presentation of the

cases, the Secretariat outlined the key issues which would need further clarification by the Applicants and asked the Committee for comments and further suggestions.

The Committee discussed these key issues identified by the rapporteurs for these applications, as well as the draft conformity reports for all the 20 applications. SEAC agreed on the conformity of the applications for authorisation which were discussed at this plenary meeting. Where needed, the Secretariat will request the Applicants to provide further clarifications on the issues identified and discussed by the Committee.

1. CT\_Hapoc\_2 (1 use)
2. CT\_Hapoc\_3 (1 use)
3. CT\_Haas (1 use)
4. SD\_Haas (1 use)
5. PD\_Haas (1 use)
6. CT\_Reachlaw (4 uses)
7. CT\_Clariant (1 use)
8. CT\_ZFL (2 uses)
9. SD\_ZFL (1 use)
10. CT\_Cryospace (1 use)
11. SC\_Aviall (2 uses)
12. SD\_Borealis (1 use)
13. SD\_Ormezzano (2 uses)
14. AD\_BAE (2 uses)
15. EDC\_Biotech (1 use)
16. EDC\_ORGAPHARM (2 uses)
17. EDC\_Akzo (1 use)
18. EDC\_Bayer (1 use)
19. EDC\_Olon (2 uses)
20. MOCA\_Reachlaw (1 use)

## **b) Agreement on draft opinions**

1. Diglyme\_Merck (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the Committee discussed the key issues and agreed on the conformity of the application. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion. Members pointed out some editorial modifications which would need to be made in the opinion document.

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



## 2. Diglyme\_Isochem (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the Committee discussed the key issues and agreed on the conformity of the application. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the RAC rapporteur to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The RAC rapporteur briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

The discussion focused on the break-even analysis and calculation of welfare losses, as well as on the submitted analysis of alternatives where further clarifications are needed.

The rapporteurs will clarify these pending issues with the Applicant and the draft opinion will be updated and tabled for discussion and agreement at the March 2017 plenary meeting.

## 3. Diglyme\_Roche (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-31, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion and informed the Committee that the draft opinion had not been agreed at this plenary. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee members asked the rapporteurs for minor editorial corrections.

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

As RAC has not yet agreed on its draft opinion, the SEAC rapporteurs were requested to assess whether there is a need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinion has been agreed by RAC.

## 4. Diglyme\_LifeTech (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-31, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion and informed the Committee that the draft opinion had not been agreed at this plenary. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee discussed some issues related to the substitution plan. Some SEAC members questioned the commitment of the Applicant to implement substitutes and pointed that the time needed

to implement alternatives should be better justified by the Applicant and specified more precisely. Members asked the rapporteurs for some editorial corrections in line with the SEAC document on setting of the review period. One member expressed the view that in his opinion the application qualifies for the normal review period of 7 years.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat.

As RAC has not yet agreed on its draft opinion, the SEAC rapporteurs were requested to assess whether there is a need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinion has been agreed by RAC.

#### 5. Diglyme\_Acton (2 uses)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-31, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to discuss the application at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the RAC rapporteurs to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The RAC rapporteurs briefly presented the main points of the discussion and their concerns about this application and a possible conclusion that adequate control of the risk has not been demonstrated. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented their assessment of the application for authorisation and their concerns on missing information necessary to develop an opinion especially for the use 2. The Committee also discussed some issues related to socio-economic analysis of the use 1. The members shared concerns of the rapporteurs in relation to the use 2 and supported the proposal that the Secretariat and the rapporteurs will one more time ask the Applicant to provide this missing information. Depending on the answer by the Applicant the rapporteurs will finalise the draft opinion which will be tabled for agreement at the next plenary.

#### 6. Diglyme\_Bracco (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the Committee discussed the key issues and agreed on the conformity of the application. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion. The discussion focused on the profit losses, as well as on the Applicant's claims about a new synthetic route which is examined in their search for alternatives to the use of Diglyme. Members also pointed out some editorial modifications which could be considered to be made in the opinion document.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) which will be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat.

#### 7. Diglyme\_Maflon (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-31, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the RAC rapporteurs to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The RAC rapporteurs briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee discussed the length of the investment cycle and the rapporteurs' opinion on the Applicant's justification of the requested length of the review period.

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

#### 8. Chromium trioxide\_HAPOC (4 uses) (CT\_HAPOC)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the Committee heard the status update by the SEAC rapporteurs.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteur then presented the progress on the opinion development on the application for authorisation.

The Committee discussion focused on the unique approach of the application: a future use by an applicant who is currently not using the substance but intends to supply downstream users who are currently using the substance. The SEAC rapporteurs will start drafting the opinions on the uses of chromium trioxide for discussion at the next SEAC plenary meeting.

#### 9. EDC\_ELI LILLY S.A. (1 use) (EDC\_Eli\_Lilly)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the Committee discussed the first version of the draft opinion. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the second version of the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion. The discussion focused on some clarifications about the Applicant's services, as well as on the registration vs production of products in the EU market. Members also pointed out some editorial modifications which could be considered to be made in the opinion document. A Commission representative stated that the opinion should reflect the SEAC's assessment, and not the one of the Applicants alone. Members also pointed out some editorial modifications which would need to be made in the opinion document.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) which will be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat.

10. Potassium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (2 uses) (PD\_Gentrochema)
11. Sodium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (3 uses) (SD\_Gentrochema)

The Chairman introduced the applications for authorisation. At the SEAC-31 plenary meeting in June 2016, the Committee discussed the key issues and agreed on the conformity of both of the applications. SEAC noted that Gentrochema BV submitted the same assessment reports (chemical safety report, analysis of alternatives and socio-economic analysis) as those in two applications that were previously submitted by the CCST consortium (lead applicant Brenntag UK Ltd) and that Gentrochema BV had acquired permission to use these assessment reports. The Committee considered the specific information reported by Gentrochema BV. The Committee was of the view that the opinion and the justifications for the opinion on the applications for authorisation by Brenntag UK Ltd are valid for the applications for authorisation submitted by Gentrochema BV. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions. The Committee briefly discussed technical feasibility of the alternatives and content of the socio-economic analysis report.

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

### **c) Adoption of final opinion**

1. Chromium trioxide\_Cromomed (1 use) (CT\_Cromomed)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the SEAC-31 plenary meeting, the rapporteurs had presented and SEAC discussed the second version of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee had agreed on the draft opinion by consensus. The draft opinion was sent to the Applicant, who commented on the draft opinion. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinion based on the comments from the Applicant, as well as from members which were made during the subsequent consultation of the updated draft prior to the plenary meeting.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the draft SEAC final opinion.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the comments made by the Applicant. The final opinion was subsequently adopted by consensus. The opinion will be sent to the Applicant, the European Commission and the Member States.

The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

2. Chromium trioxide\_Burscheid (1 use) (CT\_Burscheid)
3. Chromium trioxide\_Friedberg (1 use) (CT\_Friedberg)
4. Chromium trioxide\_Valvetrain (1 use) (CT\_Valvetrain)

The Chairman introduced the applications for authorisation. At the SEAC-31 plenary meeting in June 2016, the rapporteurs had presented, and SEAC discussed the second version of the SEAC draft opinions. Following this, the Committee had agreed on the draft opinions by consensus. The draft opinions were sent to the Applicants, who commented on them. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinions based on the comments from the Applicants, as well as from members which were made during the subsequent consultation on the updated draft prior to the plenary meeting.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat explained that no RAC-related comments had been submitted by the Applicants and therefore no discussion was needed in RAC-39.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the comments made by the Applicants, and the proposed review periods. The Committee supported the rapporteurs' proposal to extend the lengths of the review periods recommended due to the additional information submitted. The final opinions were subsequently adopted by simple majority. One SEAC member expressed his minority position, which will be published on the ECHA website. The adopted opinions will be sent to the Applicants, the European Commission and the Member States.

The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the applications.

5. Sodium dichromate\_Akzo (2 uses) (SD\_Akzo)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the SEAC-31 plenary meeting, the rapporteurs had presented and SEAC discussed the second versions of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee had agreed on the draft opinion by consensus. The draft opinions were sent to the Applicant, who commented on the draft opinions. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinions based on the comments from the Applicant, as well as from members which were made during the subsequent consultation of the updated draft prior to the plenary meeting.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the draft SEAC final opinions.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the comments made by the Applicant. The final opinions were subsequently adopted by consensus. The opinions will be sent to the Applicant, the European Commission and the Member States.

The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

6. Sodium dichromate\_Arkema (1 use) (SD\_Arkema)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the SEAC-31 plenary meeting, the rapporteurs had presented and SEAC discussed the second version of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee had agreed on the draft opinion by consensus. The

draft opinion was sent to the Applicant, who commented on the draft opinion. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinion based on the comments from the applicant, as well as from members which were made during the subsequent consultation of the updated draft prior to the plenary meeting.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the draft SEAC final opinion.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the comments made by the Applicant. The final opinion was subsequently adopted by consensus. The opinion will be sent to the Applicant, the European Commission and the Member States.

The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

#### 7. Chromic acid\_Bosch (1 use) (CA\_Bosch)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the SEAC-31 plenary meeting, the rapporteurs had presented and SEAC discussed the second version of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee agreed on the draft opinion by consensus. The draft opinion was sent to the Applicant, who commented on it. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinion based on the comments from the Applicant, as well as from members which were made during the subsequent consultation of the updated draft prior to the plenary meeting.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat explained that no RAC-related comments had been submitted by the Applicant and therefore no discussion was needed in RAC-39.

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

The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

#### 8. Potassium dichromate\_Brenntag (2 uses) (PD\_Brenntag)

#### 9. Sodium dichromate\_Brenntag (3 uses) (SD\_Brenntag)

#### 10. Dichromium tris(chromate)\_Henkel (2 uses) (DtC\_Henkel)

#### 11. Strontium chromate\_Akzo (2 uses) (ST\_Akzo)

#### 12. Potassium hydroxyoctaoxidizincatedichromate\_PPG (2 uses) (PH\_PPG)

The Chairman welcomed the invited expert from the European Aviation Safety Agency following the discussions on WebEx. The Chairman introduced the 5 applications for authorisation which comprise the CCST consortium. At the SEAC-32 plenary meeting in September 2016, the rapporteurs had presented and SEAC discussed the first versions of the SEAC draft opinions. The Committee agreed on the draft opinions by consensus. The draft opinions were sent to the Applicant, who commented on it. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinions based on the comments from the Applicant, as well as from members which were made during the subsequent consultation of the updated drafts prior to the plenary meeting.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat explained that no RAC-related comments had been submitted by the

Applicant and therefore no discussion was needed in RAC-39 for the uses on ETP plating and formulation. Regarding the opinions on surface treatment and on paints and coatings, some edits were made in the RAC opinions in order to clarify aspects in the justifications regarding the limited exposure and emission data from downstream users in the application, as well as the periodicity of measurements for machining operations and biomonitoring in the proposed additional conditions and monitoring arrangements.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the updated drafts of the SEAC final opinions. The discussion focused on the review period, as well as on the proposed conditions.

The final opinions were subsequently adopted by consensus. The opinions will be sent to the Applicant, the European Commission and the Member States.

The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

### **6.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)**

The pool of (co-)rapporteurs, as outlined in the amended restricted room document SEAC/33/2016/03 rev.1, was agreed by SEAC.

## **7) AOB**

### **a) Update of the workplan**

The Secretariat provided an update of the workplan for the future months.

## **8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-33**

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

## II. Main conclusions and action points

### SEAC-33, 29 November-2 December 2016

(Adopted at SEAC-33 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
<b>2. Adoption of the agenda</b>	
The agenda was adopted with minor modifications.	<b>SECR</b> to upload the adopted agenda to SEAC S-CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.
<b>3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda</b>	
Conflicts of interest have been declared and will be taken to the minutes.	
<b>4. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities</b>	
<i>a) Report on SEAC-32 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies</i>	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-32. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/33/2016/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in the CARACAL.	
<b>5. Restrictions</b>	
<b>5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers</b>	
a) Conformity check	
1. Diisocyanates- outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues	
SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements.  SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitter.	<b>SECR</b> to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this to S-CIRCABC IG.  <b>SECR</b> to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.
b) Opinion development	
1) TDFAs – second draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the second draft opinion.	<b>Rapporteurs</b> to prepare the third draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-33 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the end of January 2017.



2) Diisobutyl phthalate (DIBP), Dibutyl phthalate (DBP), Benzyl butyl phthalate (BBP), Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) – second draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the second draft opinion.	<b>Rapporteurs</b> to prepare the third draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-33 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the end of January 2017.
<b>5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers</b>	
SEAC took note of the update on the upcoming restriction dossiers.	
<b>6. Authorisation</b>	
<b>6.1 General authorisation issues</b>	
a) Update on incoming/future applications	
SEAC took note of the update on the incoming/future applications for authorisation.	
b) Report on AfA Task Force and related activities	
SEAC took note of the update on AfA Task Force and related activities.	
3) Harmonisation of AfA opinions	
SEAC took note of the update on harmonisation of AfA opinions and discussed the proposed modifications in the opinion format.	<b>SECR</b> to develop a new opinion format after the peak in applications for authorisation.  <b>SECR</b> to prepare a paper on profit losses (similar to the paper on social cost of unemployment) for SEAC consultation in Q2/2017.
4) Boundaries of socio-economic analysis in applications for authorisation	
SEAC took note of the report by the ECHA contractor on boundaries of socio-economic analysis in applications for authorisations. In addition, SEAC discussed the impacts examined in the report.	
<b>6.2 Authorisation applications</b>	
a) Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues	
21. CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use) 22. CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use)	

<p>23. CT_Haas (1 use)  24. SD_Haas (1 use)  25. PD_Haas (1 use)  26. CT_Reachlaw (4 uses)  27. CT_Clariant (1 use)  28. CT_ZFL (2 uses)  29. SD_ZFL (1 use)  30. CT_Cryospace (1 use)  31. SC_Aviail (2 uses)  32. SD_Borealis (1 use)  33. SD_Ormezzano (2 uses)  34. AD_BAE (2 uses)  35. EDC_Biotech (1 use)  36. EDC_ORGAPHARM (2 uses)  37. EDC_Akzo (1 use)  38. EDC_Bayer (1 use)  39. EDC_Olon (2 uses)  40. MOCA_Reachlaw (1 use)</p>	
<p>SEAC agreed that the applications are in conformity and discussed the key issues identified in these applications.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b> to take the discussions into account in the preparation of the first versions of the draft opinions.</p>
<p>b) Agreement on draft opinions</p>	
<p>1. Diglyme_Merck (1 use)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.  SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion.  <b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>2. Diglyme_Isochem (1 use)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p><b>SEAC</b> to comment on the revised draft opinion during the commenting round prior to SEAC-34.  <b>SECR</b> to table the draft opinion for agreement at the next plenary meeting.</p>
<p>3. Diglyme_Roche (1 use)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.  SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion.  <b>Rapporteurs</b> to revise the draft opinion following the agreement on the draft opinion in RAC (if needed).</p>

	<b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
4. Diglyme_LifeTech (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.  SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	<b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion.  <b>Rapporteurs</b> to revise the draft opinion following the agreement on the draft opinion in RAC (if needed).  <b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
5. Diglyme_Acton (2 uses)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.	<b>SEAC</b> to comment on the revised draft opinions during the commenting round prior to SEAC-34.  <b>SECR</b> to table the draft opinions for agreement at the next plenary meeting.
6. Diglyme_Bracco (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.  SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	<b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion.  <b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
7. Diglyme_Maflon (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.  SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	<b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion.  <b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
8. Chromium trioxide_HAPOC (4 uses) (CT_HAPOC)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented an update on the progress with the opinion development.	<b>Rapporteurs</b> to proceed with the opinion development.
9. EDC_ELI LILLY S.A. (1 use) (EDC_Eli_Lilly)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.  SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	<b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion.  <b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
10. Potassium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (2 uses) (PD_Gentrochema)	

<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>11. Sodium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (3 uses) (SD_Gentrochema)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions for Uses 1, 2 and 3 by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>c) Adoption of final opinion</p>	
<p>1. Chromium trioxide_Cromomed (1 use) (CT_Cromomed)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
<p>2. Chromium trioxide_Burscheid (1 use) (CT_Burscheid)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by simple majority. Minority view will be reflected in the minutes and published on ECHA website.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
<p>3. Chromium trioxide_Friedberg (1 use) (CT_Friedberg)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by simple majority. Minority view will be reflected in the minutes and published on ECHA website.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
<p>4. Chromium trioxide_Valvetrain (1 use) (CT_Valvetrain)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by simple majority. Minority view will be reflected in the minutes and published on ECHA website.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
<p>5. Sodium dichromate_Akzo (2 uses) (SD_Akzo)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final</p>

<p>the SEAC final opinions.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.</p>	<p>editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinions to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
<p>6. Sodium dichromate_Arkema (1 use) (SD_Arkema)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant</p>
<p>7. Chromic acid_Bosch (1 use) (CA_Bosch)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
<p>8. Potassium dichromate_Brenntag (2 uses) (PD_Brenntag)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinions.</p> <p>SEAC adopted on the final opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinions.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinions to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
<p>9. Sodium dichromate_Brenntag (3 uses) (SD_Brenntag)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinions.</p> <p>SEAC adopted on the final opinions for Uses 1, 2 and 3 by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinions.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinions to the Commission, Member States and the applicants.</p>
<p>10. Dichromium tris(chromate)_Henkel (2 uses) (DtC_Henkel)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinions.</p> <p>SEAC adopted on the final opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinions.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinions to the Commission, Member States and the applicants.</p>
<p>11. Strontium chromate_Akzo (2 uses) (ST_Akzo)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinions.</p> <p>SEAC adopted on the final opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinions.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinions to the Commission, Member States and the applicants.</p>
<p>12. Potassium hydroxyoctaoxidizincatedichromate_PPG (2 uses) (PH_PPG)</p>	

<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinions.</p> <p>SEAC adopted on the final opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b>, together with <b>SECR</b>, to do the final editing of the adopted opinions.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the final opinions to the Commission, Member States and the applicants.</p>
<p><b>6.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)</b></p>	
<p>SEAC agreed on the updated pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (considered as agreement on appointment in line with SEAC/33/2016/03 rev.1 restricted room document).</p>	<p><b>SEAC members</b> to volunteer to the pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to upload the updated document to confidential folder on S-CIRCABC IG.</p>
<p><b>8. Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-33</b></p>	
<p>SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-33.</p>	<p><b>SECR</b> to upload the action points and main conclusions to S-CIRCABC IG.</p>

### III. List of Attendees

#### SEAC-33

<b>SEAC members</b>
ALEXANDRE Joao
ALEXANDROPOULOU Ioanna
BERGS Ivars
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
CASTELLI Stefano
CAVALIERI Luisa
COGEN Simon
CSERGÓ Robert (co-opted)
DELCOURT Benjamin
DOUGHERTY Gary
DRAKE Lars (co-opted)
FANKHAUSER Simone
FIGLIORE Karine
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros
HENNIG Philipp (co-opted)
JONES Derrick (co-opted)
KAJIĆ Silva
KIISKI Johanna
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LOČS Jānis
LÜDEKE Andreas
LUIT Richard
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
MEXA Alexandra
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
MEXA Alexandra
NORING Maria
OLTEANU Maria
RYDLEWSKA-LISZKOWSKA Izabella
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SMILGIUS Tomas
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina
THIELE Karen
THORS Åsa
URBAN Klaus
<b>Commission observers</b>
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)
GALLEGO Matteo (DG ENV)
PIRSELOVA Katarina (DG ENV via Webex)
PROKES Pavel (DG GROW via WebEx)

<b>Advisors, invited experts, observers &amp; dossier submitters (DS)</b>
BERNHEIM Teresa (via WebEx to Hennig Phillip)
BUHARU Irina (via WebEx to Lars Fock)
DOMINIAK Dorota (advisor to I. Rydlewska-L.)
FOCK Lars (DS TDFAs)
GUDRUN Walenzik (DS Diisocyanates)
HELMEDACH Achim (advisor to Karen Thiele)
JONGENEEL Rob (advisor to Richard Luit)
MORO LACOPINI Sabrina (advisor to Stefano Castelli)
READMAN Guy (via WebEx, European Aviation Safety Agency)
REALE Priscilla (advisor to Luisa Cavalieri)
THEODORI Demi (via WebEx to Richard Luit)
<b>RAC (co-)rapporteurs</b>
SCHULTE Agnes
VARNAI Veda
MULLOOLY Yvonne
KAPELARI Sonja
PRONK Marja
HAKKERT Betty
DUNAUSKIENE Lina
TOBIASSEN Lea-Stine
SANTONEN Tiina
VAN DER HAAR Rudolf
KADIKIS Normunds
SOGORB Miguel A.
STASKO Jolanta
HOPLAND Eivind
SCHLUETER Urs
<b>Stakeholder observers &amp; accompanying experts</b>
BUONSANTE Vito (ClientEarth)
HAIDER Sonja (ChemSec)
HOLLAND Mike (EAERE)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
KROESCHE Christoph (EVONIK Industries, accompanying CEFIC for the discussions on TDFAs only)
LUCKE-BRUNK Gudrun (Covestro Deutschland AG, accompanying CEFIC for the discussions on Diisocyanates only)
MUSU Tony (ETUC)


ROMANO Dolores (EEB)
SARGINSON Nigel (ExxonMobil Chemical Europe Inc, accompanying CEFIC for the discussion on Phthalates only)
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)
<b>ECHA staff</b>
BERGES Markus
BALDUYCK Bo
DVORAKOVA Dana
JACQUEMIN Katline
KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia
KIVELÄ Kalle
BROERE William
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
KOULOUMPOS Vasileios
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORZS Arnis
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
LINNA Risto
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
ÖBERG Tomas
PELTOLA Jukka
PILLET Monique
HENRICHSON Sanna
REGIL Pablo
RHEINBERGER Christoph
ROGGEMAN Maarten
SADAM Diana
AJAO Peter
RANTALA Terhi
SIMPSON Peter
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
STOYANOVA Evgenia
UPHOFF Andreas
VAN HAELST Anniek



#### **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**

<b>Document</b>	<b>Number</b>
Final Draft Agenda	<i>SEAC/A/33/2016</i>
Report on SEAC-32 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies	<i>SEAC/33/2016/01</i>
Boundaries of socio-economic analysis in applications for authorisation	<i>SEAC/33/2016/02</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (closed session)	<i>SEAC/33/2016/03</i> <i>(restricted room document)</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):

<b><u>Name of participant</u></b>	<b><u>Agenda item</u></b>	<b><u>Interest declared</u></b>
LUDEKE Andreas	5.1a-1 Diisocyanates	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
HENNIG Philipp	5.1a-1 Diisocyanates	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
FOCK Lars	5.1b-1 TDFAs	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
FOCK Lars	5.1b-2. Phthalates	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier

18 November 2016  
SEAC/A/33/2016

**Final Draft Agenda**

**33<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis**

**29 November – 2 December 2016**  
**ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)**

**29 November starts at 9.00**  
**2 December ends at 13.30**

**Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies**

**Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda**

***SEAC/A/33/2016***  
***For adoption***

**Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda**

***For information***

**Item 4 – Report from other ECHA bodies and activities**

- a) Report on SEAC-32 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

***SEAC/33/2016/01***  
***For information***

**Item 5 – Restrictions**

**5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers**

- a) Conformity check

- 1) Diisocyanates – outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues

***For agreement***

b) Opinion development

- 1) TDFAs – second draft opinion
- 2) 4 phthalates – second draft opinion

***For discussion***

## **5.2 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) Report on AfA Task Force and related activities

***For information***

- c) Harmonisation of AfA opinions

***For discussion***

- d) Boundaries of socio-economic analysis in applications for authorisation

***SEAC/33/2016/02***

***For discussion***

#### **6.2 Authorisation applications**

- a) Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues

1. CT\_Hapoc\_2 (1 use)
2. CT\_Hapoc\_3 (1 use)
3. CT\_Haas (1 use)
4. SD\_Haas (1 use)
5. PD\_Haas (1 use)
6. CT\_Reachlaw (4 uses)
7. CT\_Clariant (1 use)
8. CT\_ZFL (2 uses)
9. SD\_ZFL (1 use)
10. CT\_Cryospace (1 use)
11. SC\_Aviail (2 uses)
12. SD\_Borealis (1 use)
13. SD\_Ormezzano (2 uses)
14. AD\_BAE (2 uses)
15. EDC\_Biotech (1 use)
16. EDC\_ORGAPHARM (2 uses)
17. EDC\_Akzo (1 use)
18. EDC\_Bayer (1 use)
19. EDC\_Olon (2 uses)
20. MOCA\_Reachlaw (1 use)

***For agreement***

b) Agreement on draft opinions

1. Diglyme\_Merck (1 use)
2. Diglyme\_Isochem (1 use)
3. Diglyme\_Roche (1 use)
4. Diglyme\_LifeTech (1 use)
5. Diglyme\_Acton (2 uses)
6. Diglyme\_Bracco (1 use)
7. Diglyme\_Maflon (1 use)
8. Chromium trioxide\_HAPOC (4 uses) (CT\_HAPOC)
9. EDC\_ELI LILLY S.A. (1 use) (EDC\_Eli\_Lilly)
10. Potassium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (2 uses) (PD\_Gentrochema)
11. Sodium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (3 uses) (SD\_Gentrochema)

***For discussion and agreement***

c) Adoption of final opinions

1. Chromium trioxide\_Cromomed (1 use) (CT\_Cromomed)
2. Chromium trioxide\_Burscheid (1 use) (CT\_Burscheid)
3. Chromium trioxide\_Friedberg (1 use) (CT\_Friedberg)
4. Chromium trioxide\_Valvetrain (1 use) (CT\_Valvetrain)
5. Sodium dichromate\_Akzo (2 uses) (SD\_Akzo)
6. Sodium dichromate\_Arkema (1 use) (SD\_Arkema)
7. Chromic acid\_Bosch (1 use) (CA\_Bosch)
8. Potassium dichromate\_Brenntag (2 uses) (PD\_Brenntag)
9. Sodium dichromate\_Brenntag (3 uses) (SD\_Brenntag)
10. Dichromium tris(chromate)\_Henkel (2 uses) (DtC\_Henkel)
11. Strontium chromate\_Akzo (2 uses) (ST\_Akzo)
12. Potassium hydroxyoctaoxidizincatedichromate\_PPG (2 uses) (PH\_PPG)

***For discussion and adoption***

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

***SEAC/33/2016/03  
(restricted room document)  
For agreement***

**Item 7 – AOB**

a) Update of the work plan

***For information***

**Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-33**

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-33

***For adoption***