

26 August 2014

SEAC/M/23/2014 FINAL

Final

Minutes of the 23rd meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

10 – 13 June 2014

I. Summary Record of the Proceeding

1) Welcome and apologies

Tomas Öberg, Chair of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants of the twenty third meeting of SEAC.

The Chair informed the Committee that apologies had been received from three members and three stakeholder observers. Two invited experts, seven members' advisors present at the meeting as well as two representatives of the European Commission and observers of four stakeholder organisations were introduced. The Chair informed the participants that one member, four members' advisors and ten dossier submitter representatives were to follow the relevant parts of the meeting via WebEx.

The Chair also informed 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 Chair introduced the draft Agenda of SEAC-23. The Agenda was adopted with additional modifications under Agenda Items 3, 4, 6.1 and 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 Chair requested members, their advisors and invited experts participating in the meeting to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Five members and five advisors declared potential conflicts of interest, or had this declared for them by the Chair, to the substance-related discussions under the Agenda Items 5.2 and 6.2. 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.

The Chair provided a presentation to the Committee on the results of the on-going activities within the ECHA Conflicts of Interest Advisory Committee (COIAC) and the recommendations in relation to the practice of members declaring a potential conflict of interest when a dossier is submitted by a Member State Competent Authority or executing agency by which the member is employed. The COIAC acknowledged that although RAC and SEAC members were independent, concurrent employment in a MSCA could create a perception of conflict or potential conflict. Therefore, the current practice cannot be viewed as breaching the existing legal or policy framework. In this regard the Chair explained the rules of voting as contained in REACH and the Rules of Procedure. Furthermore, the Chair stressed that it was not the intention to exclude members who had been involved in the preparation of a dossier from participating in the Committees' deliberations during the opinion making process. The only practical implication in this specific situation is that the member cannot vote nor issue a minority opinion, as stipulated in the legal text.

The Chair also informed the participants that the MB had approved at the end of March the revised ECHA Procedure for Prevention and Management of potential Conflicts of Interest and had made adaptations to the Annex to this Procedure, namely the form for annual declaration of interest. This form is also an Annex to the Rules of Procedure of each Committee and the Forum and the form has thus been replaced in the SEAC RoPs.

4) Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

a) Report on SEAC-22 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

The Chair reported that all action points of SEAC-22 had been completed or will be followed up during the on-going SEAC-23 meeting.

The Chair informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-22 had been adopted by written procedure and had been uploaded to CIRCABC as well as on the ECHA website. The Chair thanked members for providing comments on the draft SEAC-22 minutes.

The Chair explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA MB, RAC, MSC, the Forum and the BPC had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/23/2014/01).

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

Finally, the Chair provided a presentation on the results of the teleinterviews conducted with the SEAC members at the end of last year – beginning of this year.

5) Restrictions

5.1) General restriction issues

a) Review of the restriction process – update from the Task Force

The Secretariat provided to the Committee an update on the work of the Restrictions Efficiency Task Force, which was set up in November 2013 with the purpose of making coherent recommendations for improving the efficiency of the overall restriction process. The main issues discussed and agreed by the Task Force at its meeting on 7 May were presented. SEAC was informed that the final results of this work are planned to be presented to CARACAL and to RAC and SEAC in November 2014.

Several participants welcomed the recommendations of the Task Force made so far.

5.2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Opinion Development

1) Nonylphenol – 4th version of the draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representative (Sweden) and the RAC co-rapporteur, who followed the discussion remotely via WebEx.

The RAC co-rapporteur provided to the Committee an update from the RAC discussions on this dossier. RAC had adopted its opinion at RAC-29 by consensus.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the modified 4th version of the SEAC draft opinion. They were especially interested to hear the views of other Committee members whether SEAC agrees with exclusion of NP from the scope, whether SEAC agrees with the proposed wording and the proposed setting of the restriction (limit value and transitional period) as well as with the approach to and decision on proportionality.

Several members expressed the view that the draft opinion is well written and very clear. Several members agreed with the rapporteurs on exclusion of NP from the scope. Some SEAC members and one stakeholder observer questioned the need for exclusion of the

used articles from the scope and pointed out that such a term has not been used in any other entry of the Annex XVII. The rapporteurs explained that originally they had intended to include a derogation for the second-hand market. However, they then realised that also new articles might end up on the second-hand market and therefore decided to use the term "used articles" instead. Several members agreed with the rapporteurs that it is unlikely that the testing costs would be that high, as it is also in the interest of industry to minimize these costs (through contractual agreements) and suggested that some conclusions in the opinion could even be more strongly worded.

SEAC agreed by consensus on the SEAC draft opinion on NP and NPE restriction dossier with modifications introduced within SEAC-23. The rapporteurs were asked to finalise the text of the opinion in accordance with the discussion and to ensure, together with the Secretariat, that the supportive documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion.

2) 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) – 4th version of the draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representative (NL) and the RAC rapporteur, who followed the discussion remotely via WebEx.

The Secretariat provided to the Committee an update from the RAC discussions on this dossier. RAC had adopted its opinion at RAC-29 by consensus.

The rapporteurs then presented the 4th version of the SEAC draft opinion. They were especially interested to hear the views of other Committee members whether SEAC agrees to follow the RAC position, whether there is a need for a derogation for the wire coating sector and how to formulate the opinion with regard to proportionality.

Several members were of the view that from the 4th version of the SEAC draft opinion, it was difficult to follow why this restriction is considered appropriate from the SEAC side. The evolution of this proposal from the original restriction proposed by the dossier submitter was not visible from the opinion. They also suggested that the draft opinion would benefit from better structuring and making the text more clear. The rapporteurs pointed out that the option proposed by RAC is, in addition to be based on REACH processes, easier to implement and less costly compared to the one proposed in the original dossier.

The Chair informed the Committee that ECHA intends to postpone the deadline for the adoption of the SEAC final opinion by 90 days based on Article 71(3) of the REACH Regulation. The Committee will therefore agree on its draft opinion in September and on its final opinion in December 2014. It was agreed that the Secretariat, together with the rapporteurs, will organise an informal consultation with industry stakeholders, in particular with the wire coating sector, in July. The rapporteurs will prepare the 5th version of the SEAC draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-23 discussions as well as the results of the consultation with industry. A written commenting round will be organised on the 5th version prior to the discussion and agreement on the draft opinion at SEAC-24.

3) Cadmium and its compounds in paints – 2nd version of the draft opinion

The Chair opened the agenda item by providing the state of play on the opinion development on the proposed restriction. The request from the Commission addresses a need to slightly modify the existing entry. The SEAC commenting round on the 1st version of the SEAC draft opinion was held in March 2014. The 2nd version of the SEAC draft opinion was submitted to SEAC in May 2014 on which the first plenary discussion is expected to be held at this plenary.

Following the introduction, the RAC rapporteur provided a short update from RAC-29 discussions, where RAC had agreed on the main elements proposed by the rapporteurs.

The RAC final opinion will be adopted via written procedure after the end of the public consultation, pending on the nature of the remaining comments to be received.

Furthermore, the SEAC rapporteurs presented the 2nd version of the SEAC draft opinion. As there were no comments received during the SEAC commenting round in March, the SEAC rapporteurs had not made any changes in the 2nd version of the SEAC draft opinion.

A short discussion took place on the nature of the public consultation comments and some further clarifications were provided to SEAC members. Furthermore, a stakeholder representative restated their reservations regarding the legal provisions of this amendment to an existing entry.

The Chair summarised the discussions that SEAC agreed on the main elements presented by the SEAC rapporteurs. Subject to final public consultation comments to be received by 17 June 2014, the Secretariat will launch a written procedure for the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion.

4) Cadmium and its compounds in artists' paints – first plenary discussion on the key issues documents

The Chair opened the agenda topic by giving a brief update on the state of play in the opinion development and the public consultation, where several hundreds of comments have been received so far. Following the new working procedure on the opinion development, the SEAC rapporteurs had prepared a key issues document to the SEAC draft opinion, which had been sent for SEAC commenting round in May 2014 (four members were providing comments). In addition, the draft Forum advice was provided on 3 June 2014. After the introduction, the RAC rapporteurs provided an update from the RAC-29 discussions.

The Chair asked the SEAC rapporteurs to present the key issue document. The long timeframe and the small overall impact of the proposed restriction were questioned by the rapporteurs. On the discussions regarding alternatives, one member considered that based on public comments so far there might not be suitable alternatives for cadmium artist paints; hence market value would not be able to give the correct answer. Furthermore, some questions were raised that need to be further elaborated in the SEAC draft opinion, mainly related to socio-economic analysis of the proposed risk management option and assessment of consumer surplus.

A stakeholder observer representative informed about the public consultation comment submitted by them, where other publications have been provided concluding there is no proven cause-effect relationship between the cadmium intake and an increased incidence of breast cancer. In response to the interventions made the Swedish dossier submitter representative reminded that although the impact is small, the costs of restriction are the same in the order of magnitude.

To sum up, the Chair concluded that many SEAC members share the concerns of the rapporteurs regarding the low impact of the proposed restriction, some issues mentioned in the discussion such as choice of cost estimator need a deeper analysis, and comments from the public consultation need to be scrutinised. The SEAC rapporteurs will take the discussions into account in their first draft opinion, which is due by 1 August 2014.

5) Chrysotile – first plenary discussion on the key issues documents

The Chair opened the agenda topic by introducing the state of play regarding the opinion development on the amendment to an existing derogation in an existing restriction. After the introduction, the RAC rapporteurs were asked to report back from the RAC-29

discussions where RAC had supported the proposed risk management option (i.e. derogation with a fixed end date). As a response to questions from SEAC, the RAC rapporteur confirmed that risk would be quite low to the workers due to automation, but due to asbestos being a non-threshold substance, a risk prevails but in this case it is as minimal as possible.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the key issues document to SEAC. One SEAC member reconfirmed his position for not being in favour of the proposed restriction due to, in his view, severe shortcomings in the dossier (e.g. lack of unbiased information). The member additionally stated that the current technological state of play did not back up the conclusions put forward in the dossier. Another member reminded SEAC about the historical background of the existing restriction. A third member pointed out that on the basis of the SEA (i.e. neutral proportionality), the current status quo would be the best risk management option.

A stakeholder observer representative asked for clarification on why chrysotile-/asbestos was still in use in diaphragms in the EU, but not in the US. He furthermore stated that authorisation would be one of the risk management options. The Chair gave then the floor to an industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer to answer detailed questions addressed to him and to provide SEAC with general information on its procedures and use of alternatives in its operations. Additionally, the industry expert stated that asbestos would not be imported after 2017. In return, SEAC addressed questions to the industry expert regarding the service life of installation, the environmental policy issues and alternatives.

Furthermore, a SEAC member suggested the rapporteurs to elaborate the comparison tables in the next version of the draft opinion. To sum up, the Chair concluded that the SEAC rapporteurs would take the discussions into account in their first draft opinion, which is due by 1 August 2014.

b) Conformity check

1) 4,4-Isopropylidenediphenol (bisphenol A) – Outcome of the conformity check

The Chair welcomed two French dossier submitter representatives, one present at the meeting and the other following the discussion remotely via WebEx. The Chair also welcomed the RAC rapporteur, who followed the discussion remotely via WebEx.

The Chair reported on the state of play of the restriction dossier. The Chair reminded that RAC had agreed on non-conformity in the March plenary meeting. SEAC considered the dossier in conformity in the March plenary meeting. A revised dossier was resubmitted to ECHA by France on 6 May 2014. On 16 May the conformity check process was started in RAC and SEAC. The SEAC commenting round finished on 26 May with no comments received from SEAC members.

The Secretariat informed that RAC had agreed on the conformity of the dossier at their June plenary meeting.

The SEAC rapporteur informed that the outcome of the conformity check remained the same as in the March plenary meeting as no significant changes were made to the parts relevant to SEAC. He considered that the dossier is as a consequence in conformity.

SEAC agreed that the bisphenol A dossier conforms to the requirements of Annex XV. The Chair then informed the participants that the Secretariat would communicate the results of the conformity check and the recommendations to the dossier submitter. As both Committees considered the dossier in conformity, the public consultation on the Annex XV report on bisphenol A will be launched on 18 June 2014.

2) Ammonium salts – outcome of the conformity check

The Chair welcomed two French dossier submitter representatives, one present at the meeting and the other following the discussion remotely via WebEx. The Chair also welcomed the RAC rapporteur, who followed the discussion remotely via WebEx. The Chair informed the participants that the restriction dossier on inorganic ammonium salts had been resubmitted by France on 8 May 2014 following the decisions made by RAC and SEAC in March that the dossier originally submitted by France was not in conformity. The Chair reminded the Committee that this dossier has been submitted within Article 129 of the REACH Regulation (safeguard clause). The conformity check process in RAC and SEAC was launched on 15 May and the rapporteurs' draft conformity check outcome was made available to the Committee on 19 May. The SEAC commenting round finished on 26 May with no comments received from SEAC members.

The representative of the dossier submitter provided a presentation on the main changes introduced in the revised dossier. The Secretariat reported on the outcome of the discussions on this dossier in RAC. According to RAC, issues that had been identified as non-conforming in March, were brought into conformity in the revised dossier. RAC had therefore concluded at RAC-29 that the resubmitted dossier conforms to Annex XV requirements.

The advisor of the SEAC rapporteur then presented the outcome of the SEAC conformity check. According to him, following its improvements on certain aspects (e.g. new emission limit, demonstration of technical feasibility of the proposed limit, a new technical specification with a better description of test conditions, improved justification on costs and benefits, more detailed comparison of RMOs, etc.), the dossier is now in conformity from the SEAC point of view.

After a brief discussion, SEAC agreed that the dossier on inorganic ammonium salts conforms to the requirements of Annex XV. The Chair informed that since both Committees considered the dossier in conformity, the public consultation on the Annex XV report on inorganic ammonium salts will be launched on 18 June 2014.

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

The Secretariat presented the recommendation of the Chair for the appointment of (co-) rapporteurs for the restriction dossiers **Bis(pentabromophenyl) ether (DecaBDE)** (to be submitted by ECHA), **methanol** (to be submitted jointly by Poland and Finland), and **Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)** (to be submitted jointly by Germany and Norway) as outlined in the meeting document SEAC/23/2014/02 RESTRICTED. SEAC agreed on the appointment for (co-)rapporteurs as proposed in the recommendation.

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues

a) Report from the RAC session on common approach to authorisation applications

The Chair informed SEAC that last week RAC-29 was holding the session on the applications for authorisation aimed at discussing issues, which are in common for the number of applications for authorisation, and to reach a common understanding on the approach on how to address these issues during the week of the plenary and beyond.

The discussion in RAC covered a number of items, such as setting of conditions and monitoring arrangements, minimisation of exposures, scope of exposure assessment in the applications for authorisation for PBT/vPvBs.

The Chair invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussions at the RAC plenary and the conclusions drawn. The Secretariat reminded SEAC that similar discussion on the general application for authorisation issues was held in RAC-28 in March, when RAC discussed the scope of uses (waste, intermediates), submission of new information during the opinion making phase in the Committees, combined exposures for different substances, and the level of scrutiny. At RAC-29 the Committee discussed minimisation of exposures and the scope of exposure assessment for PBT and vPvB substances, as well as setting of additional conditions and monitoring arrangements.

During the discussion, a few members noticed the importance of the topics presented for RAC and discussed at the plenary. One SEAC member suggested discussing the issues in depth in the open commenting round. All the SEAC members, who intervened during the discussion, expressed their general support to the proposed way forward.

The Secretariat informed SEAC that the outcome of the RAC discussion will result in the updating of the "Common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development on applications for authorisation" (SEAC/14/2012/05).

b) Discussion on possible scenarios of the SEA route

The Chair informed the participants that a SEAC member had provided to the Committee a discussion note on possible scenarios of the SEA route. Two scenarios are proposed on the way forward with the SEAC opinion formulation, based on a model case assuming that the risks were not adequately controlled and that the remaining risks could not be quantified. It would thus be impossible for SEAC to evaluate the proportionality of the application, as the relevant part of the proportionality assessment was not provided by the applicant (option 1). Alternatively, he proposed that SEAC would prepare its own proportionality assessment of the application based on the benefit estimate of the applicant and the qualitative description of remaining risks by RAC (option 2).

The Chair invited the Committee to have a brief exchange of views. Some SEAC members talked in favour of the option 1, while other members expressed the view that SEAC shall make its decisions on a case-by-case basis. A Commission representative noted that in case of the opinion to recommend the Commission not to grant the authorisation, the justification should clearly specify the reasons, as specified in the Article 60(4)(b) of the REACH Regulation with a reference to the socio-economic implications of refusal to authorise. One member pointed out that although an opinion in practice might be a support of an authorisation, the remit of the Committee according to Article 64(4) of REACH is to carry out an assessment of the socio-economic factors and the availability, suitability and technical feasibility of alternatives, and not to recommend not granting an authorisation.

The Chair summarised the discussion noting that SEAC should focus on evaluating the information submitted by the applicants in their applications. In addition, it is important that equal treatment of all the applicants would be assured. However, case specific issues will arise and some examples will be further discussed already during this meeting.

6.2) Authorisation applications

a) Authorisation applications on phthalates – 2nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the August 2013 submission window)

1) Two uses of DEHP submitted by ARKEMA FRANCE (DEHP 2a)

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendaring, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

Due to their similarities, the uses 1 and 2 of the DEHP2a, b, and c applications were discussed under the same agenda point.

The RAC rapporteur updated the Committee on the RAC-29 plenary discussions. The opinion of RAC will provide SEAC a qualitative description of the human health impacts.

The SEAC rapporteur then presented his view on technical and economic feasibility of alternatives and considered that there seem to be economic impacts for an unknown number of downstream users (DUs). There appear to be suitable alternatives for some DUs, but as a whole no economically feasible alternatives seem to exist. Following discussion on the case, the concept of economic feasibility and the legal provisions in REACH, the Chairman summarised that SEAC was of the opinion that while there appear to be suitable alternatives for some DUs, as a whole there are no economically feasible alternatives.

The Rapporteur presented the monetary valuation of infertility cases and the approach to estimate substitution costs. These were used to calculate the 'break-even point', i.e. the number of avoided infertility cases that in monetary terms would equal the substitution costs for downstream users. Furthermore, the Rapporteur presented an estimate of the annually avoided infertility cases of the non-use scenario. The Chair summarised that the Committee welcomed the human health impact assessment presented by the rapporteur but wished to scrutinise it further before drawing firm conclusions.

In view of RAC's recommendation for the review period, the deficiencies in the analysis of alternatives and in the socio-economic analysis, and additional considerations, the rapporteur made his proposal for the review period. Several members expressed support for this proposal. The Chair summarised that SEAC preliminary agreed on the proposal for the review period.

After discussing the possible impact of the announced closure of Arkema's DEHP production plant to the analysis, the Chair summarised that the majority of members considered this application would be evaluated in a similar manner as the other two DEHP applications for use 1 and 2.

2) Two uses of DEHP submitted by Grupa Azoty Zakłady Azotowe Kędzierzyn Spółka Akcyjna (DEHP 2b):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendaring, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

Due to their similarities, the uses i and ii of the DEHP2b application were discussed under the same agenda point with uses i, and ii of DEHP2a and c. For the description of the discussion see point 6.2) a) 1) of the minutes.

3) Three uses of DEHP submitted by DEZA a.s. (DEHP 2c) (and DBP2 use 3):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendaring, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

Use 3: Use in ceramic sheets and printing pastes for production of capacitors and lambda sensor elements

Uses 1 and 2

Due to their similarities, the uses i and ii of the DEHP2c application were discussed together with the DEHP2a and b uses i and ii applications. For the description of this discussion see point 6.2) a) 1) of the minutes.

Use 3 (including DBP2 use 3)

The Chair opened the discussion and reminded members that due to their extensive similarities, DEHP2c use 3 will be discussed together with DBP2 use 3 of the same applicant, DEZA a.s.

The RAC rapporteur updated the Committee on the RAC-29 plenary discussions. The rapporteurs are of the view that they have sufficient information to perform a reliable exposure and risk assessment for this application.

The SEAC rapporteur updated the Committee on the developments on DEHP2c use 3 since the last SEAC plenary. According to the DEHP2c use 3 rapporteur, if RAC concludes that adequate control is demonstrated for this use, it should have reflection on the review period, given quality issues with the analysis of alternatives and the socio-economic analysis provided by the applicant.

The Chair then invited the DBP2 SEAC rapporteur to update the Committee on the developments on DBP2 use 3 since the last SEAC plenary. For scenario 1 concerning lambda sensors the rapporteur fully supported the presentation and conclusions given by the DEHP2c SEAC rapporteur. Concerning the second scenario on capacitors the rapporteur informed that the analysis of alternatives does not adequately describe the technical and economic feasibility of alternatives.

Due to similarities in the opinions of DEHP2c use 3 and DBP2 use 3 SEAC agreed that there was no need to carry out written consultation on the DBP2 use 3 opinion.

4) Three uses of DBP and DEHP submitted by Roxel (UK Rocket Motors) Ltd (DEHP 3):

Use 1: Industrial use of DBP in manufacture of solid propellants and motor charges for rockets and tactical missiles

Use 2: Industrial use of DEHP in manufacture of solid propellants and motor charges for rockets and tactical missiles

Due to the same use of DBP and DEHP in the mixture the use 1 and use 2 were discussed together.

In the presentation the rapporteur reminded that SEAC had concluded in the previous SEAC meeting that technical feasibility of alternatives could only be confirmed with the finalisation of formal testing and the requalification programme for rocket propellant /motor charges. The assessment of the economic feasibility of alternatives was not considered to be very robust but did not affect the opinion. The applicant had estimated that if no problems occur during the requalification, the alternative would be available in 2017.

SEAC agreed by consensus on the two draft opinions. SEAC recommended the Commission to grant the authorisations for a period of four years.

Use 3: Industrial use of DBP within a specialty paint in manufacture of motors for rockets and tactical missiles

In the presentation the rapporteur reminded that SEAC of the same issues as in use 2. The applicant had estimated that one alternative for DBP in the specialty paint application could be available in 2016 if replacement programme is successful.

SEAC agreed by consensus on the draft opinion. SEAC recommends the Commission to grant the authorisation for a period of four years.

The Chair concluded that as both RAC and SEAC had agreed on their draft opinions of all uses for this application, they will be sent to the applicant for its possible comments.

5) The second and the third uses of DBP submitted by DEZA a.s. (DBP 2):

Use 2: Use in propellants

The Chair invited the Secretariat to update the Committee on the RAC-29 plenary discussions on DBP2 use 2. RAC preliminary agreed on the adequate control and decided not to provide any advice on the review period. The draft opinion after further improvements is foreseen for adoption via written procedure before the September plenary.

The rapporteur informed about the alternatives analysed by the applicant. She informed that from the list of potential alternatives in her opinion only two substances seem to be 'generally' good candidates from a technical perspective. The conclusions on the technical feasibility will be based on the need of requalification. The rapporteur proposed as preliminary conclusions that the alternatives are neither technically nor economically feasible.

One member asked why the discussion on the review period was postponed. The rapporteur explained that different rules of requalification in different countries and for different ammunition type require further assessment and therefore, she was not able to propose a review period at this stage of the opinion development.

The Chair concluded that there was support for the preliminary conclusions presented by the rapporteur. Following the request of the rapporteurs and the Secretariat SEAC agreed to shorten the SEAC written consultation to two weeks.

Use 3: Use in ceramic sheets and printing pastes for production of capacitors and lambda sensor elements

Due to similarities with application DEHP2c use 3 and DBP2 use 3 opinions on both uses were discussed together and minutes are recorded under point 6.2) a) 3).

6) Two uses of DEHP submitted by VINYLOOP FERRARA S.p.A., Stena Recycling AB and Plastic Planet srl (DEHP 4):

Use1: Formulation of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in compounds and dryblends

Use 2: Industrial use of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in polymer processing by calendering, extrusion, compression and injection moulding to produce PVC articles

The Chair gave a brief update on the state of play in the opinion development. The Secretariat then briefed SEAC about the discussion on the application in RAC. The Committee was informed that RAC had agreed on no adequate control for workers but adequate control for general population for use 1 and use 2 exposure scenarios (ES1 and ES2). RAC had recommended to SEAC – in case authorisation is granted – to consider risks, which are not demonstrated to be minimised and the general weaknesses of the exposure assessment.

The SEAC rapporteur presented the 2nd version of the SEAC draft opinion. The rapporteur proposed that considering the RAC agreement on the fact that risk for workers in both uses of the substance is not adequately controlled and that the remaining risks cannot be quantified, it is not possible for SEAC to evaluate the proportionality of the application as the relevant part of the proportionality assessment was not provided by the applicant. Alternatively, he proposed that SEAC would prepare its own proportionality assessment of the application based on the benefit estimate of the applicant and the qualitative description of remaining risks by RAC.

Some SEAC members supported the first option proposed by the rapporteur, i.e. that it is not possible for SEAC to conclude on proportionality in its opinion. Other SEAC members supported the point of view of the Secretariat and Commission observers considering the opinion of the Committees as a basis for the Commission decision on granting the authorisation or refusal to grant the authorisation. The Commission would have to consider positive or negative opinions of the Committees; a “non-opinion” by the Committees would not be helpful.

Following the presentation given by the SEAC rapporteur, SEAC agreed in principle on the analysis of alternatives submitted by the applicants. The Committee concluded that the Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are not technically and economically feasible, and that the virgin PVC from the perspective of the applicants is not an alternative.

b) Authorisation applications – first outline SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the November 2013 submission window)

- 1) The use of diarsenic trioxide submitted by Boliden Kokkola Oy (Diarsenic trioxide 1):

Use 1: Use of diarsenic trioxide in the purification of metal impurities from the leaching solution in the zinc electrowinning process

- 2) The use of diarsenic trioxide submitted by Nordenhamer Zinkhütte GmbH (Diarsenic trioxide 2):

Use 1: Industrial use of diarsenic trioxide to produce a copper concentrate in the purification of the leaching solution in a zinc electrowinning process

Due to the similarity of applications submitted by Boliden Kokkola Oy and the Nordenhamer Zinkhütte GmbH both applications and the draft opinions were discussed together.

The Secretariat updated the Committee that RAC-29 plenary discussions were mainly on the appropriateness of the exposure estimates, both for the workers and for the general public via environment.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinions and including the conclusions on technical and economic feasibility of the alternatives as well as the benefits and the risks related to granting the authorisation.

The Chair invited the Committee to agree with the draft opinions with the following addition: "As RAC has not yet agreed upon its draft opinion, the rapporteur is requested to assess if the outcome of the RAC's opinion gives a reason for SEAC to reconsider its agreed draft opinion. Should this be the case, modified proposals for draft opinions will be presented to the Committee for agreement."

SEAC agreed by consensus on the two draft opinions with this addition mentioned above.

3) Two uses of diarsenic trioxide submitted by Linxens France (Diarsenic trioxide 3):

Use 1: Formulation of diarsenic trioxide into a mixture

Use 2: Industrial use of diarsenic trioxide as processing aid in gold electroplating

The Secretariat updated the Committee that at the RAC-29 plenary discussions on Diarsenic trioxide 3 RAC had some concerns on the exposure estimate for dermal route.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinions, including the conclusions on technical and economic feasibility of the alternatives as well as the benefits and the risks related to granting the authorisation.

The Chair invited the Committee to agree with the draft opinions with the following addition: "As RAC has not yet agreed upon its draft opinion, the rapporteur is requested to assess if the outcome of the RAC's opinion gives a reason for SEAC to reconsider its agreed draft opinion. Should this be the case, modified proposals for draft opinions will be presented to the Committee for agreement."

SEAC agreed by consensus on the draft opinions with the reservation mentioned above.

4) Six uses of lead sulfochromate yellow (C.I. pigment yellow 34) and lead chromate molybdate sulphate red (C.I. pigment red 104) submitted by DCC Maastricht B. V. OR (Lead chromate pigments 2):

Use 1: Distribution and mixing pigment powder in an industrial environment into solvent-based paints for non-consumer use

Use 2: Industrial application of paints on metal surfaces (such as machines vehicles, structures, signs, road furniture, coil coating etc.)

Use 3: Professional, non-consumer application of paints on metal surfaces (such as machines, vehicles, structures, signs, road furniture etc.) or as road marking

Use 4: Distribution and mixing pigment powder in an industrial environment into liquid or solid premix to colour plastic/plasticised articles for non consumer use

Use 5: Industrial use of solid or liquid colour premixes and pre-compounds containing pigment to colour plastic or plasticised articles for non-consumer use

Use 6: Professional use of solid or liquid colour premixes and pre-compounds containing pigment in the application of hotmelt road marking

The RAC rapporteur informed SEAC that RAC had requested the Secretariat to ask the applicant to respond to the questions raised by the RAC members during the plenary discussion and any further questions posed by the rapporteurs and to submit recalculated values for the workers exposure estimates via inhalation and oral routes, using the dose-

response reference values previously agreed by RAC. The SEAC rapporteurs, in their presentation, pointed out a high number of comments received during the public consultation. Regarding the review period SEAC discussed the arguments for recommendation of different length of the review period. The applicant's request for review period was based on the claim that there are no suitable alternatives available. The applicant further claimed in support of the review period that the innovation cycle is considered to be long in the pigments sector. Some of the members discussed the arguments to differentiate the review period for the different uses.

The Chair summarised that SEAC supported the assessment of the analysis of alternatives made by the rapporteurs and their comparison of costs and risk with the reservation that further adjustment may be necessary pending on RAC's decision. The recommendation of the review period was postponed until the next plenary for the further scrutiny by the SEAC rapporteurs. SEAC agreed to request the applicant to modify the socio-economic analysis in the application, considering updated risk assessment calculations according to the request by RAC.

c) Authorisation applications – outcome of the conformity check

- 1) HBCDD 1 submitted by INEOS Styrenics Netherlands B.V., INEOS Styrenics Ribecourt SAS, INEOS Styrenics Wingles SAS, Synthos Dwory 7 spółka z ograniczoną odpowiedzialnością spółka komandytowo-akcyjna, Synthos Kralupy a.s., StyroChem Finland Oy, Monotez SA, RP Compounds GmbH, Synbra Technology bv, Sunpor Kunststoff GmbH, Dunastyr Polystyrene Manufacturing C. Co. Ltd, versalis SpA and Unipol Holland bv

The RAC rapporteur updated the Committee on the outcome of the discussions of the RAC-29 plenary meeting. The rapporteur informed members that RAC had agreed that the application is in conformity.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the outcome of the conformity check to the Committee. They recommended that the application would be considered in conformity from the SEAC point of view.

Members asked for more clarifications on the possible implications of the application for authorisation with the provisions of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. The Secretariat informed members that the Commission had confirmed that any connection to the Stockholm Convention provisions and developments is not an issue for conformity.

SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity.

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

During the plenary meeting the Committee members expressed their interest by applying to the pool of rapporteurs and indicating absence of conflict of interest. The pool of rapporteurs, as outlined in the amended restricted room document SEAC/23/2014/03 rev.1, was agreed by SEAC.

7) AOB

a) Update on the workplan

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

b) Report from the Working group on PBT evaluation

The Chair opened the discussion explaining that the SEAC working group (WG) on PBT evaluation was agreed during and established after SEAC-21 in December 2013. The SEAC WG's mandate is to propose an overall approach for SEAC to evaluate restrictions and applications for authorisation for PBT and vPvB substances, and hence to allow a systematic evaluation of the cases.

The Chair gave the floor to a member of the SEAC working group, in order to report on the progress made since SEAC-22 and to introduce the framework proposed by the WG.

The member informed SEAC that the Secretariat consulted the PBT expert group (EG), and presented the questions and feedback received from the EG members. The EG confirmed that the quantification of impacts or systematic scoring of all PBT's is not currently possible. However, the EG provided positive comments on using qualitative case properties.

In collaboration with the members of the WG, the Secretariat has prepared an outline of the framework. The proposed framework is based on a cost-effectiveness analysis approach. The starting point is that a unit of emission of any PBT/vPvB substance is considered the same in terms of potential damage to health or the environment. However, qualitative case properties describing the damage potential would be considered case-by-case.

The WG was not yet in a position to present a proposal for the continuation of the work. Issues for future work identified by the WG include development of benchmarks, further work on the qualitative case properties, as well as development of a more systematic way to consider qualitative properties.

The Chair closed the session stating that there will be a possibility for written comments on the document during the summer, and the framework will be discussed at the SEAC-24 plenary meeting. In addition, the WG will come back to SEAC with a recommendation for the Committee on this continuation of the work to improve the framework.

c) Report from the authorisation workshop in the Netherlands

The Secretariat provided to the Committee a report from the workshop on applications for authorisation held on 2 June 2014 in the Netherlands. The topics discussed in that workshop included e.g. the need to improve communication to clarify how the process works and to avoid (further) misunderstandings, use of Article 58(2) of REACH, how to ensure applications that are proportionate to the use (volume), "fit-for-purpose" authorisation application and the procedure, roles of RAC and SEAC in relation to predictability of the process, etc. Possible follow-up actions were proposed, including creating a task force on fit-for-purpose application procedure to establish what is needed at decision making, opinion making and application stages, as well as fit-for-purpose documentation (opinion template, procedure and applications).

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-23

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

II. Main conclusions and action points

MAIN CONCLUSIONS & ACTION POINTS SEAC-23, 10-13 June 2014

(adopted at SEAC-23 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
2. Adoption of the agenda	
<p>The agenda was adopted with additional modifications under Agenda Items 3, 4, 6.1 and AOB.</p>	<p>SECR to upload the adopted agenda to SEAC CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.</p>
3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda	
<p>Conflicts of interest have been declared and will be taken to the minutes.</p> <p>SEAC took note of the update on the on-going activities within the ECHA Conflicts of Interest Advisory Committee.</p> <p>SEAC also took note of the revised form for annual declarations of interest which has been replaced in the SEAC Rules of Procedure.</p>	
4. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities	
<i>a) Report on SEAC-22 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies</i>	
<p>SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-22. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/23/2014/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the CARACAL.</p> <p>SEAC took note of the results from the teleinterviews conducted with the SEAC members.</p>	
5. Restrictions	
5.1 General restriction issues	
<i>a) Review of the restriction process – update from the Task Force</i>	
<p>SEAC took note of the update from the Restrictions Efficiency Task Force.</p>	
5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
<i>a) 1) Nonylphenol – 4th version of the draft opinion</i>	

<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented the modified 4th version of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC discussed the main changes made to the draft opinion of SEAC.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on NP/NPE by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs and SECR to make editorial changes to the opinion in accordance with the discussion.</p> <p>Rapporteurs and SECR to ensure that the supportive documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion on 18 June 2014.</p>
<p>a) 2) 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) – 4th version of the draft opinion</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented the 4th version of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC discussed the main changes made to the draft opinion of SEAC.</p> <p>SEAC was informed about ECHA's decision to postpone the deadline for the SEAC opinion based on Art 71(3).</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the 5th version of the SEAC draft opinion by the mid-August, taking into account the SEAC-23 discussions and informal consultation with industry stakeholders.</p> <p>SECR to organise a written commenting round in SEAC on the 5th version of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC to agree on its draft opinion in September and to adopt its final opinion in November 2014 based on Art 71(3).</p>
<p>a) 3) Cadmium and its compounds in paints – 2nd version of the draft opinion</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the second version of the SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs and SECR to make editorial changes to the opinion in accordance with the discussion.</p> <p>SECR to launch a written procedure on the agreement of the SEAC draft opinion after the end of the public consultation (17 June 2014).</p>
<p>a) 4) Cadmium and its compounds in artists' paints – first plenary discussion on the key issues document</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the key issues document for the SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to take the discussions into account into the 1st version of the SEAC draft opinion (due by 1 August 2014).</p>
<p>a) 5) Chrysotile - first plenary discussion on the key issues document</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the key issues document for the SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to take the discussions into account into the 1st version of the SEAC draft opinion (due by 1 August 2014).</p>
<p>b) 1) 4,4-Isopropylidenediphenol (bisphenol A) – outcome of the conformity check</p>	

<p>SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements.</p> <p>SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitter.</p>	<p>SECR to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this to CIRCABC IG.</p> <p>SECR to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.</p> <p>SECR to launch the public consultation on 18 June 2014.</p>
<p>b) 2) Ammonium salts – outcome of the conformity check</p>	
<p>SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements.</p> <p>SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitter.</p>	<p>SECR to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this to CIRCABC IG.</p> <p>SECR to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.</p> <p>SECR to launch the public consultation on 18 June 2014.</p>
<p>5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers</p>	
<p>SEAC appointed the (co-) rapporteurs for the restriction dossiers methanol, DecaBDE and PFOA which will be submitted to ECHA in autumn 2014 (as presented in the restricted meeting document SEAC/23/2014/02).</p>	
<p>6. Authorisations</p>	
<p>6.1 General authorisation issues</p>	
<p><i>a) Report from the RAC session on common approach to authorisation applications</i></p>	
<p>SEAC took note of the update from RAC-29 discussions on setting of monitoring arrangements, minimisation of exposure and scope of exposure assessment in AfA for PBT/vPvBs.</p>	<p>SECR to integrate the information into a document and to organise a consultation with RAC and SEAC members.</p>
<p><i>b) Discussion on possible scenarios of the SEA route</i></p>	
<p>SEAC discussed the possible scenarios when RAC concludes on non-adequate control and the application does not contain a socio-economic analysis.</p>	
<p>6.2 Authorisation applications</p>	
<p><i>a) Authorisation application on phthalates – 2nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the August 2013 submission window)</i></p>	
<p>1) Two uses of DEHP submitted by <i>ARKEMA FRANCE</i> (DEHP 2a)</p>	

SEAC supported in principle the approach taken by the rapporteur in the 2 nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions.	Rapporteur to consider the plenary discussion and to prepare the third versions of the SEAC draft opinions for uses 1 and 2 by 20 August.
2) Two uses of DEHP submitted by <i>Grupa Azoty Zakłady Azotowe Kędzierzyn Spółka Akcyjna</i> (DEHP 2b)	
SEAC supported in principle the approach taken by the rapporteur in the 2 nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions.	Rapporteur to consider plenary discussion and to prepare the third versions of the SEAC draft opinions for uses 1 and 2 by 20 August.
3) Three uses of DEHP submitted by <i>DEZA a.s.</i> (DEHP 2c):	
SEAC supported in principle the approach taken by the rapporteur in the 2 nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions.	Rapporteur to consider the plenary discussion and to prepare the third versions of the SEAC draft opinions by 20 August.
4) Three uses of DBP and DEHP submitted by <i>Roxel (UK Rocket Motors) Ltd</i> (DEHP 3)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented the 2 nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.	<u>Uses 1, 2 and 3:</u> Rapporteurs together with the Secretariat to do the final editing of the draft opinions and to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
5) The second and the third uses of DBP submitted by <i>DEZA a.s.</i> (DBP 2):	
<u>Use 2</u> SEAC rapporteur presented the second outline of the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC supported preliminary conclusions on alternatives. <u>Use 3</u> SEAC rapporteur presented the second outline of the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC supported preliminary conclusions.	<u>Use 2</u> Rapporteur to prepare the first version of the SEAC draft opinion by the end of June. SECR to launch a SEAC consultation by 15 August. <u>Use 3</u> Rapporteur to prepare the first version of the SEAC draft opinion to be discussed at the September plenary.
6) Two uses of DEHP submitted by <i>VINYLOOP FERRARA S.p.A., Stena Recycling AB and Plastic Planet srl</i> (DEHP 4):	
SEAC rapporteur presented the second versions of the SEAC draft opinions.	Rapporteur to consider the plenary discussion and to prepare the third versions of the SEAC draft opinions by 20 August.
b) Authorisation applications – first outline SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the November 2013 submission window)	

1) The use of diarsenic trioxide submitted by <i>Boliden Kokkola Oy</i> (Diarsenic trioxide 1)	
SEAC agreed the draft opinion by consensus.	<p>Rapporteurs to finalise the draft opinion.</p> <p>Rapporteurs and SECR to consider the need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinion has been agreed by RAC.</p>
2) The use of diarsenic trioxide submitted by <i>Nordenhamer Zinkhütte GmbH</i> (Diarsenic trioxide 2)	
SEAC agreed the draft opinion by consensus.	<p>Rapporteurs to finalise the draft opinion.</p> <p>Rapporteurs and SECR to consider the need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinion has been agreed by RAC.</p>
3) Two uses of diarsenic trioxide submitted by <i>Linxens France</i> (Diarsenic trioxide 3)	
SEAC agreed the draft opinions (with modifications discussed in the meeting) for uses 1 and 2 by consensus.	<p><u>Uses 1 and 2:</u></p> <p>Rapporteurs to finalise the draft opinions.</p> <p>Rapporteurs and SECR to consider the need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinions have been agreed by RAC.</p>
4) Six uses of lead sulfochromate yellow (C.I. pigment yellow 34) and lead chromate molybdate sulphate red (C.I. pigment red 104) submitted by <i>DCC Maastricht B. V. OR</i> (Lead chromate pigments 2)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented the first outlines of the SEAC draft opinions.	<p>Rapporteurs to consider plenary discussion and to prepare the first versions of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to launch a written consultation on the first versions of the SEAC draft opinions.</p>
c) Authorisation applications – outcome of the conformity check (HBCDD 1)	
SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity.	<p>SECR to upload the conformity report to CIRCABC IG.</p> <p>SECR to inform the applicant about the conformity of the application for authorisation.</p> <p>Rapporteurs to prepare the first outline of the draft opinion by 20 August.</p>
6.3 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/23/2014/03 RESTRICTED room document) and was informed of the (co-)rapporteurs for the authorisation applications submitted to ECHA.	<p>SEAC members to volunteer to the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for applications for authorisation.</p> <p>SECR to upload the updated document to confidential folder on CIRCABC IG.</p>

7. AOB	
b) Report from the Working group on PBT evaluation	
SEAC took note of the report from the Working group on PBT evaluation.	<p>SECR to launch the written consultation on the proposed framework.</p> <p>The Working group to update the framework based on comments received.</p> <p>SECR to table the framework for agreement at SEAC-24</p>
c) Report from the authorisation workshop in the Netherlands	
SEAC took note of the report from the authorisation workshop held in the Netherlands in June 2014.	
8. Action points and main conclusion of SEAC-23	
SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-23.	SECR to upload the action points and main conclusions to CIRCABC IG.

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-23

SEAC members
ALEXANDRE João
ALEXANDROPOULOU Ionna
BENDL Jiri
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
COGEN Simon
CSERGÓ Robert
DANTINNE Catheline
D'AMICO Flaviano
FANKHAUSER Simone
FIORE-TARDIEU Karine
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros
GRANDI Silvia (via WEBEX)
KIISKI Johanna
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
MEXA Alexandra
PALOTAI Zoltán
RODRIGUEZ DE SANCHO Maria Jesus
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SIMON Franz Georg
SLETTEN Thea Marcelia
SMILGIUS Tomas
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina Velinova
THIELE Karen
THORS Åsa

Advisors, invited experts & dossier submitters (DS)
BEEKMAN Martijn (DS representative for NMP, via WEBEX)
BERNHEIM Theresa (advisor to K. Thiele)
CARFÌ Francesca and CASTELLI Stefano (advisor to F. D'Amico)
CARLSSON Mattias (advisor to Å. Thors and DS representative for Cadmium in artists' paints)
CAVALIERI Luisa (advisor to K. Fiore and DS representative for Inorganic ammonium salts)
CEDERBERG Inger, IVARSSON Jenny, VIRDARSON Jenny, PARKMAN Helena, WARHOLM Margareta (DS representatives for Cadmium in artists' paints, via WEBEX)
FAYAERTS Jean-Pierre (advisor to S. Cogen, via WEBEX)
GIANNOTTI Francesca, invited expert (IT)
JONGENEEL Rob (advisor to C. Luttikhuisen)
LE COQ Pierre (DS representative for Inorganic ammonium salts, via WEBEX)
LESTANDER Dag (advisor to Å. Thors and DS representative for Nonylphenol, via WEBEX)
NICOLAIDES Leandros, invited expert (CY)
NIEMELÄ Helena (advisor to J. Kiiski)
TERENDIJ Carline (DS representative for Bisphenol A, via WEBEX)
VASS Anne-Marie (DS representative for Nonylphenol, via WEBEX)
VERHOEVEN Julia and LUIT Richard (advisors to C. Luttikhuisen, via WEBEX)

RAC (co-)rapporteurs
BJØRGE Christine (via WEBEX)
DUBAUSKIENE Lina
HAKKERT Betty (via WEBEX)
JENSEN Frank (via WEBEX)
KORATI Safia (via WEBEX)
LUND Bert-Ove (via WEBEX)
SCHLÜTER Urs (via WEBEX)
SCHULTE Agnes (via WEBEX)
STOLZENBERG Hans-Christian (via WEBEX)
VAN DER HAGEN Marianne via WEBEX)

Representative of the European Commission
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG ENTR)
GALLEGO Mateo (DG ENV)

Stakeholder observers
BUONASANTE Vito (CLIENT EARTH/EEB)
CANOO Christian (ZINC, expert accompanying the EUROMETAUX observer - Cadmium restriction dossiers)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
NETTERSHEIM Rolf (Dow, expert accompanying the CEFIC observer - Chrysotile restriction dossier)
VANDER STRAETEN Michel (EUROMETAUX)

ECHA staff
BERGES Markus
BLAINEY Mark
GIORDANO Serena
HENNIG Philipp
JACQUEMIN Katline
KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia
KIOKIAS Sotirios
KIVELA Kalle
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
KOULOUMPOS Vasileios
LOGTEMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORŽS Arnis
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
MOTTET Denis
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
ÖBERG Tomas
PELTOLA Jukka
RODRIGUEZ IGLESIAS Pilar
ROGGEMANN Maarten
SADAM Diana
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
STOYANOVA Evgenia
VAINIO Matti
VAN HAELEST 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 Agenda

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

Final Draft Agenda	<i>SEAC/A/23/2014</i>
Report on SEAC-22 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies (AP 4.a)	<i>SEAC/23/2014/01</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers (AP 05.3)	<i>SEAC/23/2014/02</i> <i>RESTRICTED</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (AP 6.3)	<i>SEAC/23/2013/03</i> <i>RESTRICTED</i>
Report from the Working group on PBT evaluation (AP 07b)	<i>SEAC/21/2013/04</i>

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST TO THE RESPECTIVE AGENDA ITEMS

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

<u>Name of participant</u>	<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Interest declared</u>
BRIGNON Jean-Marc	5.2b-1 Bisphenol A 5.2b-2 Ammonium salts	Participation in the preparation of both restriction dossiers
CARLSSON Mattias	5.2a-1 Nonylphenol 5.2a-4 Cadmium in artists' paints	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers
CAVALIERI Luisa	5.2b-1 Bisphenol A 5.2b-2 Ammonium salts	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers
DANTINNE Catheline	5.2a-5 Chrysotile	Strong position as MSCA representative against the dossier
IORE Karine	5.2b-1 Bisphenol A 5.2b-2 Ammonium salts	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers
LESTANDER Dag	5.2a-1 Nonylphenol 5.2a-4 Cadmium in artists' paints	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers
JONGENEEL Rob	5.2a-2 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Working for the organisation preparing the restriction dossier
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees	5.2a-2 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
NIEMELÄ Helena	6.2b 1-3 Applications for Authorisation on Diarsenic trioxide	Previous employment in the consultancy
THORS Åsa	5.2a-1 Nonylphenol 5.2a-4 Cadmium in artists' paints	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers

Final Draft Agenda

23rd meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

10-13 June 2014

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

10 June: starts at 10:00

13 June: ends at 13:00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/23/2014
For adoption

Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

Item 4 – Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

- a) Report on SEAC-22 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies
SEAC/23/2014/01
For information

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 General restriction issues

- a) Review of the restriction process – update from the Task Force
For information

5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) Opinion development
- 1) Nonylphenol – 4th version of the draft opinion
For agreement
 - 2) 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) – 4th version of the draft opinion

For agreement

- 3) Cadmium and its compounds in paints – 2nd version of the draft opinion

For discussion

- 4) Cadmium and its compounds in artists' paints – first plenary discussion on the key issues document

For discussion

- 5) Chrysotile - first plenary discussion on the key issues document

For discussion

b) Conformity check

- 1) 4,4-Isopropylidenediphenol (bisphenol A) – outcome of the conformity check

For agreement

- 2) Ammonium salts – outcome of the conformity check

For agreement

5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC/23/2014/02 (restricted document)

For information and agreement

Item 6 – Authorisations

6.1 General authorisation issues

- c) Report from the RAC session on common approach to authorisation applications

For information

- d) Discussion on possible scenarios of the SEA route

For discussion

6.2 Authorisation applications

- d) Authorisation applications on phthalates – 2nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the August 2013 submission window)

- 1) Two uses of DEHP submitted by *ARKEMA FRANCE* (DEHP 2a):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendering, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

For discussion

- 2) Two uses of DEHP submitted by *Grupa Azoty Zakłady Azotowe Kędzierzyn Spółka Akcyjna* (DEHP 2b):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendaring, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

For discussion

- 3) Three uses of DEHP submitted by *DEZA a.s.* (DEHP 2c):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendaring, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

Use 3: Use in ceramic sheets and printing pastes for production of capacitors and lambda sensor elements

For discussion

- 4) Three uses of DBP and DEHP submitted by *Roxel (UK Rocket Motors) Ltd* (DEHP 3):

Use 1: Industrial use of DBP in manufacture of solid propellants and motor charges for rockets and tactical missiles

Use 2: Industrial use of DEHP in manufacture of solid propellants and motor charges for rockets and tactical missiles

Use 3: Industrial use of DBP within a specialty paint in manufacture of motors for rockets and tactical missiles

For discussion/agreement

- 5) The second and the third uses of DBP submitted by *DEZA a.s.* (DBP 2):

Use 2: Use in propellants

Use 3: Use in ceramic sheets and printing pastes for production of capacitors and lambda sensor elements

For discussion

- 6) Two uses of DEHP submitted by *VINYLOOP FERRARA S.p.A., Stena Recycling AB* and *Plastic Planet srl* (DEHP 4):

Use1: Formulation of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in compounds and dryblends

Use 2: Industrial use of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in polymer processing by calendaring, extrusion, compression and injection moulding to produce PVC articles

For discussion/agreement

- e) Authorisation applications – first outline SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the November 2013 submission window)

- 1) The use of diarsenic trioxide submitted by *Boliden Kokkola Oy* (Diarsenic trioxide 1):

Use 1: Use of diarsenic trioxide in the purification of metal impurities from the leaching solution in the zinc electrowinning process

For discussion/agreement

- 2) The use of diarsenic trioxide submitted by *Nordenhamer Zinkhütte GmbH* (Diarsenic trioxide 2):

Use 1: Industrial use of diarsenic trioxide to produce a copper concentrate in the purification of the leaching solution in a zinc electrowinning process

For discussion/agreement

- 3) Two uses of diarsenic trioxide submitted by *Linxens France* (Diarsenic trioxide 3):

Use 1: Formulation of diarsenic trioxide into a mixture

Use 2: Industrial use of diarsenic trioxide as processing aid in gold electroplating

For discussion/agreement

- 4) Six uses of lead sulphochromate yellow (C.I. pigment yellow 34) and lead chromate molybdate sulphate red (C.I. pigment red 104) submitted by *DCC Maastricht B. V. OR* (Lead chromate pigments 2):

Use 1: Distribution and mixing pigment powder in an industrial environment into solvent-based paints for non-consumer use

Use 2: Industrial application of paints on metal surfaces (such as machines vehicles, structures, signs, road furniture, coil coating etc.)

Use 3: Professional, non-consumer application of paints on metal surfaces (such as machines, vehicles, structures, signs, road furniture etc.) or as road marking

Use 4: Distribution and mixing pigment powder in an industrial environment into liquid or solid premix to colour plastic/plasticised articles for non consumer use

Use 5: Industrial use of solid or liquid colour premixes and pre-compounds containing pigment to colour plastic or plasticised articles for non-consumer use

Use 6: Professional use of solid or liquid colour premixes and pre-compounds containing pigment in the application of hotmelt road marking

For discussion

- f) Authorisation applications – outcome of the conformity check

- 1) HBCDD 1 submitted by *INEOS Styrenics Netherlands B.V., INEOS Styrenics Ribecourt SAS, INEOS Styrenics Wingles SAS, Synthos Dwory 7 spółka z ograniczoną odpowiedzialnością spółka komandytowo-akcyjna, Synthos Kralupy a.s., StyroChem Finland Oy, Monotez SA, RP Compounds GmbH, Synbra Technology bv, Sunpor Kunststoff GmbH, Dunastyr Polystyrene Manufacturing C. Co. Ltd, versalis SpA and Unipol Holland bv*

For agreement

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

SEAC/23/2014/03 (restricted room document)
For agreement

Item 7 – AOB

a) Update of the work plan

For information

b) Report from the Working group on PBT evaluation

SEAC/23/2014/04
(room document)
For discussion

c) Report from the authorisation workshop in the Netherlands

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-23

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-23

For adoption