

**Helsinki,
SEAC/M/06/2010/final**

Draft

Minutes of the 6th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

10 March 2010

Part 1: Summary record of the Proceeding

1) Welcome and apologies and changes in SEAC Composition

Ms Ann Thuvander, Chair of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants of the sixth meeting of SEAC.

The Chair informed that apologies had been received from seven members, three of whom had sent an invited expert as a replacement. Members' advisors present at the meeting as well as observers of the European Commission (COM) and observers of five stakeholder organisations participating to the meeting were introduced.

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

The Chair informed the participants that the meeting would be recorded and the records would be destroyed after the adoption of the minutes.

The Chair covered the changes in the SEAC composition and welcomed three newly appointed members to SEAC: Paolo Variz (PT), Jiri Bendl (CZ) and Luminita Tirchila (RO). The new members briefly introduced themselves.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair introduced the agenda of SEAC-6. The following suggestions for items to discuss under AOB were made by the members:

- Independence of members
- Request for information on the Risk Communication Network
- Discuss request by Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP) for comments on Guidance on Socio-economic aspects

With these modifications the Agenda was adopted. The final Agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex II.

3) Declaration of conflict of interest to the Agenda

None of the participants declared a conflict of interest to the items on the Agenda of SEAC-6.

4) Administrative issues

b) Annual survey

The Secretariat reported on the main results from the annual satisfaction survey (2009). One member asked what the conclusions were from the other committees and how the issues for improvements would be taken up. The Secretariat responded that the results of the survey of the other Committees show a similar level of satisfaction. The Chair informed that an internal action plan is under development on how to take up issues for improvement.

c) Update on remuneration framework

The Secretariat (LYM) provided an update on the current status of the remuneration framework and the arrangement for the transfer of fees. The Secretariat reported that COM in February had given its agreement to the MB decision of 23-24 April concerning the arrangements for the transfer of fees. At its last meeting (3-4 March 2010) the MB received an update on the current situation. The MB decision should appear soon on the ECHA's website and will also be distributed via CIRCA.

At the meeting last week, the MB received an update on the current state of play on the framework contract which has been developed over the past few months.

According to available information ECHA had only received information on formal contact points for these framework contracts from half of the MSs, and only one of the six countries from which rapporteurs have been nominated for the first restriction proposals had submitted information about contact points.

Denmark, UK, and Slovenia had not sent any information. Priority should now be given to finalise at least with these countries the framework contracts in time as specific contracts need to be signed with MSCAs as soon as possible after the dossiers arrive in order to transfer a certain amount of fees to remunerate the rapporteurs.

The first rapporteurs were encouraged to make sure that their MSCA is aware of the situation and take action to get information on contact points submitted to ECHA. Involved members were given the opportunity to contact the Secretariat if difficulties arise in following up on this issue.

The framework contract and a model of the contract to be signed by the rapporteurs would be made available to the members.

One member asked when the letter had been sent and to whom. The Secretariat responded that the letter was formally sent to the permanent representations, and that the MSCAs were in copy of that letter. The Secretariat would provide a copy of the letter to the members of SEAC in order to assist in collecting information on contact points.

The Chair encouraged especially the SEAC members of Slovenia, Denmark and UK to encourage their MSCAs to submit information as soon as possible.

Confidential information

The Chair asked the members to sign the acknowledgement of receipt of the Notice on security provisions regarding access to confidential information uploaded to CIRCA under REACH and CLP during the day

The Chair informed the members that should any problems arise that might prevent them from signing this acknowledgement they could contact the Secretariat to help them find a solution. The Chair stressed that if equally safe methods for handling of

confidential information as those described in the Notice exist in the members' own organisation they can still be used.

The Chair also reminded the members to make requests to access to CIRCA for their advisers by 11 March. Members were asked to submit this information or inform if this information will be submitted at a later stage.

5) Status report of SEAC-5 action points

The Secretariat provided an update of the status report of SEAC-5 action points and main conclusions. The Secretariat reported that most actions were completed in time.

As a follow up from the RMO session at SEAC-5, the Secretariat agreed to upload the Council non-paper concerning the interface of RoHs Directive and REACH. By 10 March the Secretariat had still not received a version of that document that would be suitable for uploading. The Secretariat promised to upload this document as soon as a suitable version would be available. The Secretariat pointed out that the action point concerning authorisation would be covered under the Agenda items concerning authorisation.

6) Report back from other ECHA and community bodies

The Chair reported that for SEAC-6 a meeting document had been prepared that covered the feedback of some of the other bodies (RAC, MSC, and Forum). However some oral updates would still be given as they were deemed to be important or were not possible to cover on time in writing

a) Feedback from MB

The Secretariat gave an update on the Management Board (MB) meeting of 3-4 March, covering the following items:

- Multi-Annual Work Program of the ECHA 2011-2013

The MB had reviewed the Multi-Annual Work Program 2011-2013 (MAWP) and agreed to release this document for public consultation. Of special interest for SEAC is one of the annexes containing the current assumptions of the amount of incoming dossiers .

- Status of preparedness for first registration deadlines

The Secretariat informed that the MB had been given an update on the preparedness of ECHA for the first registration deadlines.

- Update on the Biocide directive

The Commission's proposal for a new Biocide Regulation is under scrutiny in the Council and the European Parliament The proposal foresees tasks for ECHA and a new committee for authorisation of biocidal products is proposed to be set up.

- Rules of Procedure

The MB had approved the draft Rules of Procedure for RAC, SEAC and MSC. The issue in this general revision was MSC's need to introduce a provision to allow alternates for their members, which was approved by the MB.

Further discussion in the MB had focused on the proposed change regarding recording of minority positions. The MB proposed to delete one sentence¹ in the RoPs of RAC and SEAC. The Commission representatives in the MB had pointed out that opinions are defined in the legal text as majority opinions. Minority opinions should be recorded and published according to Article 85(9) of REACH but not in the opinion itself. The written minority opinions will not be annexed to the opinion but rather to the minutes from the meeting where the opinion was adopted.

The Secretariat stressed that of key importance is the sentence² in the RoPs concerning the expression of majority views in writing. The Chair stressed that the issue was not the recording as such of minority opinions but rather on where to report them. The Chair asked SEAC to agree to delete the text concerning the recording of the minority opinions.

One member asked for the reason why members should express their minority views in writing and asked whether it was not enough that these are expressed at the meeting orally and therefore recorded in the minutes.

The Secretariat responded that the expressions of minority views have to be justified by scientific and technical facts. The Commission will also have to understand the reason for disagreement.

SEAC agreed on the change of the RoPs.

b) Feedback from Caracal

The Chair of the Member State Committee gave a report from the CARACAL meeting of 2-4 February 2010. The presentation covered the preparatory activities for the REACH committee, substances for which Annex XV dossiers (either restriction or SVHC) are being considered, and RMO analysis including the format that could be used for such analysis.

One member asked whether the voluntary agreement with the EPA and industry to stop the production of Decabromodiphenyl ether in the US was discussed in the CARACAL meeting and whether such agreement might be reached in an EU context. The Chair of the MSC answered that the agreement was mentioned but that there was no discussion on whether a similar kind of voluntary agreement could be established within the EU.

c) Feedback from the 2nd meeting for working group on request for an opinion on possible improvements in risk assessment approaches in view of risk management needs and effective risk communication

¹ SEAC Rules of procedure, article 19.5 “These minority position(s) shall also be indicated in the opinion”

² SEAC Rules of procedure, article 19.5 “Members having minority positions shall provide them to the Committee in writing, stating clearly their grounds”

Mats Forkman gave a presentation on the DG SANCO working group. The Chair of SEAC, and two members (Stavros Georgiou and Mats Forman) attended the 2nd meeting of the working group.

The presentation covered the background of the request, the composition of the working group, its terms of references, scope and objectives, as well as the expected outcome of its work.

Stavros Georgiou gave some additional information on this meeting. For SEAC there is an interest to stay involved as socio-economic analysis, including assessments of impacts, is a focus of the discussions in the working group.

The Chair pointed out that the chairperson of this working group, Peter Carlow, was invited to the SEAC workshop on assessment of impacts on 11 March. The Chair also stressed that the discussion in the SANCO working group was on general risk assessment without addressing a specific legislative context.

7) SEAC work plan 2010-2011

The Secretariat presented the SEAC work plan 2010-2011 in which the different timelines were presented for coming restriction dossiers as well as the planning for the development of procedural documents.

Members raised the following issues:

- Why the first version of the draft opinion on a restriction proposal is not on the Agenda of a SEAC meeting;
- That there might be valuable lessons from these first dossiers and that therefore there might be a need to discuss these lessons in a meeting;
- Change of planning and timelines in case dossiers are found not to be in conformity;
- How the presented scheme reflects the planning of RAC?
- That it would be valuable to be informed about the planning of the meetings of RAC.

The Secretariat responded that the document lists dossier-related topics to be discussed at the SEAC meetings as foreseen by the Committee working procedures. The Chair stated that the document presents formal expectations - but that does not exclude discussions of a dossier at an earlier stage.

The Secretariat explained that in case of non-conformity, the submission dates will be moved by six months unless the dossier is brought into conformity quick enough to be submitted at the next submission dates (in the three months' submission window). The Secretariat pointed out that in cases where the RAC opinion diverges significantly from the original restriction, the discussion of the final opinion of SEAC will be postponed by three months.

With regard to the cooperation with RAC, the rapporteurs are foreseen to be invited to the other Committee's meetings. Joint meetings of the Committees to discuss restriction dossiers are not foreseen as this may cause practical problems.

The Chair informed SEAC that on 15 March a planning meeting will be held between ECHA and the first two sets of rapporteurs of RAC and SEAC. A similar meeting is likely to be held for the June submission dossiers later this year.

The Chair closed the discussion and proposed to keep this document as a living document and to update it should the need for this arise.

8) Agreement on appointment of rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

The Secretariat presented the outcome of the call for expression of interest - the Chair's recommendation for the appointment of a rapporteur and co-rapporteur for the restriction dossier on mercury in measuring devices.

SEAC agreed on the appointment of rapporteur and co-rapporteur for the above mentioned restriction dossier according to the Chair's recommendation presented in the meeting document SEAC/06/2010/01.

9) Update on the upcoming restriction dossiers

The Chair updated SEAC on the latest changes in the ROI. The main change concerned the entry on the phenylmercury dossier. The following modifications had been made:

- Addition of phenylmercury 2-ethylhexanoate to the group of substances covered by the Norwegian dossier.
- Updated scope: "Shall not be manufactured, placed on the market, or used, as substance or in mixtures. Articles containing the substance shall not be placed on the market."

The Chair informed SEAC that during the process the dossier submitter (Norway) had found that the substances were used only in polyurethane elastomers. The scope had been changed in order to prevent the substances to be used in other, unknown uses and emerging uses (effectively banning the substances). This scope is now valid for all of the phenylmercury compounds covered by the Norwegian dossier.

10) Authorisations

a) Overview of ECHA's preparations for authorisation applications

The Secretariat responded to a question on the action points of SEAC -5:

A decision granting an authorisation will be valid until the Commission decides to amend or withdraw it in the framework of a review. Review periods for certain uses can already be set upfront in an Annex XIV entry, there are two types of case-by-case reviews:

First, systematic time-limited review periods will be set in each authorisation decision.

A review report should be sent to the ECHA by a specified deadline (at least 18 months before the time-limited review period expires), and on which basis new opinions will be adopted by RAC and SEAC (same procedure as initial applications) and sent to Commission who may decide to amend or withdraw the original decision. If no review report is submitted by the applicant by the specified deadline, the authorisation will not be valid anymore after the time-limited review period ends.

Second ad hoc reviews can also be initiated by the Commission at any time, under certain circumstances (see Articles 61 (2), (4) and (5) of the REACH Regulation).

Applicants do not have to suggest review periods which would be appropriate for them. However, several aspects of the application for authorisation will be taken into account by RAC/SEAC in forming their opinions, and finally by the Commission in its decision, to suggest/decide on appropriate review periods.

The Secretariat gave a presentation of ECHA's preparations and workplan for handling of authorisation applications. The presentation contained an update on the main issues on which preparations are needed that were briefly introduced at the SEAC-5 meeting in November 2009.

b) Working procedure for appointment of rapporteurs for authorisation applications

The Secretariat gave a presentation on the revised draft working procedure for the appointment of rapporteurs for authorisation applications and the changes that had been incorporated following the written commenting round.

One member had proposed a footnote stating that "in certain circumstances previous experience and familiarity concerning regulatory action regarding a specific substance may prejudice the perceived independence of a rapporteur and will require consideration when selecting a rapporteur". In the discussion it became apparent that members were hesitant to have such a footnote in the text as the members' previous experiences is normally seen as an advantage. However, previous involvement by a member in advocacy for or against certain regulatory action regarding a specific substance may be considered as a potential conflict of interest. Some members suggested that the text would be more suitable to be included in the section related to the expression of interest.

Following this discussion it was proposed by the Chair to reformulate the footnote and encourage members to consider all conflicts of interest when expressing their interest to volunteer for rapporteurship. The proposed text would be placed in another, more appropriate, section of the document.

The Commission observers asked for clarification on whether rapporteurs would be selected per application or per substance, whether the working procedures for RAC and SEAC would be the same, how the coherence between the two committees would be ensured and how a consistent approach between applications addressing the same substance would be ensured in SEAC.

The Commission observers furthermore asked when the selection of rapporteurs would actually start. The current text, stating that the appointment process will start after the Commission has initiated the “regulatory procedure with scrutiny” to include substances in Annex XIV, could, according to the Commission representative, be made more specific.

The Chair responded that the procedures at present address individual applications. If numerous applications would be received on the same substance, modifications to the procedure may need to be made e.g. by using a working group. The only difference in the current draft working procedures of RAC and SEAC is the status of the pool of rapporteurs. The Chair agreed that a more precise description might be made of the starting point of the procedure.

One member stated that there would be a need for only one rapporteur per substance and in case of a high workload (a complex application) a working group could be created and the work divided between its members per use, as this is the main focus of the SEA. Cooperation between rapporteurs working with the same substance will be needed to ensure coherence, which in practice means that a working group should be formed.

The Secretariat pointed out that different applications for the same substance could be completely different. Even if the hazard assessment would be the same, other parts (for example uses and analysis of alternatives) could be different. The Secretariat highlighted the need to make an analysis of the contents of the applications that come in and to decide on the correct way forward on the basis of that analysis.

One member raised a question on the issue of voting on the appointment of rapporteurs; in the current text of the working procedure it appears that voting is necessary per default. The Chair proposed to delete that part of the text as voting is indeed foreseen to be exceptional

The Chair concluded that the procedure will be further modified based on the comments received at the SEAC-6 meeting and a written procedure would be initiated to agree on the document.

b) Conformity check questions

The Secretariat gave a presentation on the content of the conformity check, covering the legal basis, the purpose and the scope of the conformity check as well as some examples of conformity check questions.

One member asked for further clarification on the timing of asking the applicant for further information in order to make the dossier conform. If important information is missing and it takes too long before the additional information comes, SEAC could get stuck with an incomplete dossier and have problems in meeting the deadline set for the draft opinion.

The Secretariat responded that according to the REACH Regulation the clock never stops. Because of this it is important to start as early as possible and to run the separate procedures (conformity check and opinion development) in parallel.

The Commission observer asked for further clarification on the outcome of the conformity check. Since there is no legal basis to ask for further information at a later stage (apart from SEAC's request for additional information on alternatives), the Commission observer thought that it might be better not to communicate the outcome of the conformity check to the applicant in case the outcome was deemed positive.

The Secretariat responded that the purpose of the conformity check is to first assess whether the requirements of Article 62 are met and whether the provided information is enough to develop an opinion. The Secretariat furthermore pointed out that there is an issue on legal certainty and legitimate expectations from the applicant's point of view. When an application has been made, applicants can (irrespective of if it has been included or not in the Committee's working procedures) write to the Agency and ask whether the dossier is in conformity. The Agency needs to be able to answer such a question. Conformity is a separate issue from giving an opinion.

One member asked whether conformity was checked for each application or for each use in case of application for multiple uses. The Secretariat responded that there is no answer to this yet. Clear guidance will be given to industry in order to assist them in preparing their dossiers.

It was pointed out by one member that the running of two processes in parallel might lead to resources being spent in vain and that it might be better to start working when all information is available.

The Secretariat responded by stressing the need to start the processes as soon as possible as the clock starts ticking from the moment the fee has been received by ECHA. The Secretariat also remarked that care should be taken not to mix the conformity check and the opinion development. Legal possibilities to ask for additional information as part of the conformity check are limited. On the other hand, the applicant will have an incentive to give further clarifications to the rapporteurs as it wishes to give reasons why the applied authorisation should be granted. Therefore it is important to start the opinion-making procedures simultaneously to identify information gaps not covered by the conformity check.

The Chair announced that a newsgroup will be opened to deal with more detailed questions and comments

c) Working procedure for conformity check

The Secretariat presented the working procedure for the conformity check. The following issues were brought forward in the discussion:

- Timing and planning
- How to proceed with incomplete dossiers
- Submission dates
- Possibilities for appeal

The Secretariat explained that officially the conformity check starts after the fee has been received by ECHA. As the application is likely to be received by ECHA about two months earlier, this two month period can be used for actual work on the application. Concerning deadlines for submitting additional information, the Secretariat responded that for equal treatment it would be good to announce a default time for the applicants to bring their applications in conformity. The length of that period will need to be reflected further.

If the applicant fails to bring his initial application into conformity by the set date, the working procedure proposes that RAC and SEAC shall document without undue delay as their draft opinion that the application has not been made in conformity with the requirements of Article 62 and shall send this draft opinion to the applicant. One member asked whether it was legally possible to recommend submission dates as in the restriction process. The Secretariat responded that this is formally not possible, but other means of staggering the applications could be explored further.

The Commission observers were wondering why the conformity would need to be established in the beginning of the opinion making. As explained by the Secretariat it is logical to check the conformity in the beginning of the process. Furthermore, Article 64(3) states that "each Committee shall first check" the conformity.

A member raised the question whether the handling of a possible appeal would be a responsibility for the rapporteurs. The Secretariat responded that the Committees only give an opinion. The formal decision is taken by the Commission and only that decision can be appealed against.

The Chair proposed to launch a written commenting round on the draft working procedure.

11) Framework for dealing with requests according to Article 77(3)(c) of REACH

The Secretariat presented a revised version of the framework. The revisions had been made following comments from RAC and SEAC that had been received in written commenting rounds.

One member raised the issue when the first request to SEAC can be expected from the ED. The Chair responded that there is no request foreseen at the moment.

The Secretariat explained that the scope of the current framework is kept wide intentionally in order to allow the Secretariat to be able to handle various types of requests. Further specifications were not deemed to be useful as the risk would arise that the framework would not be suitable to handle a very specific request. One member pointed out that the outline seemed workable. However, keeping the framework general has consequences that should not be overlooked e.g. difficulties with planning of time and resources.

SEAC agreed, on a preliminary basis, the revised version of the framework as laid down in document SEAC/06/2010/07. Final agreement is considered to take place after RAC has agreed on the document at its 10th meeting.

12) Environmental benefits transfer

Stavros Georgiou presented a UK project on valuing environmental impacts. The presentation raised a discussion on several issues:

- The possibilities to transfer values and how these transfers work in general.

It was pointed out that one needs to be careful when transferring unit values, i.e. Willingness-to-Pay (WTP) due to cultural differences, spatial scales, differences in ecosystems, purchasing power, etc). The methodology that was presented makes these issues apparent. One of the STO flagged that there is a EC DG Research project that is considering the valuation of DALYs in one of its work packages of which the outcome is expected in the coming months³. However, it was pointed out that DALYs pose a number of conceptual and empirical difficulties, especially in relation to their comparison to costs. However, for certain policy purposes where WTP estimates of health are not available it may be convenient to estimate DALYs .

- Appropriateness and accuracy of value transfer techniques

One of the case studies in the UK project examined differences between the current transfer techniques (e.g. transferring unadjusted/adjusted unit values or using a function). It evaluated the appropriateness and accuracy of the different approaches and recommended when to use which technique - Effort should be proportionate to the issue at hand.

- Meaning of aggregated values

It was pointed out that the unit values from studies that are published are often aggregated. It is, however, important to understand the importance of estimating correctly the population or accounting stance over which unit values are aggregated.

- Context

It was pointed out that it is important to control for the policy context when transferring WTP values from one study to another. Transfer values should be context free to the extent that this is possible i.e. people should give the same value on e.g. WTP to avoid an asthma attack irrespective of how they got it). However, in some circumstances values may need to be adjusted to a specific policy context. It is also important to be aware of the temporal context in the preferences of people and hence their willingness to pay for certain goods.

One of the Members brought forward the work being done in the evaluation of biodiversity and that this could be useful for SEAC.

It was concluded that it is important for SEAC to be aware that there are data availability concerns around benefit transfer methods, but that where available, these

³ Heimtsa project <http://www.heimtsa.eu/>

can provide useful order of magnitude estimates of the value of environmental and health impacts.

A link to the project's website will be inserted into the SEA web portal.

13) AOB

○ Independence of members

One member raised the issue on the Committee members' independence when working for semi-public organisations that may provide services to private companies working in the field of REACH. A representative of the ECHA Legal Affairs unit clarified that the rules of procedures (Articles 9(5) and (6)) provide that members should withdraw from contracts with potential REACH registrants and other concerned companies or interest groups. This does not mean that these organisations should not at all be contacting or contracting with such private companies or interest groups, but just that the Committee member should refrain from being involved in such contracts. Quality Insurance Systems of organisations, that records who is involved in preparing, executing, and supervising contracts, can be used to keep record of the non-involvement of a Committee Member in such contracts. Where relevant, the member concerned will also have to declare any conflict of interest per agenda point at the beginning of Committee meetings.

○ Risk communication network

The Secretariat gave a presentation on the risk communication network, including its aims, purpose and current state of play. SEAC believed that it would be good to collaborate with this initiative given the overlaps with the work of the Committee. The Chair responded that a first step could be to organise a regular reporting back to SEAC and perhaps develop deeper cooperation in the future.

○ POPS convention

One of the members had received a letter from The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants concerning their recently released guidance on SEA in relation to the development of national implementation plans. Parties (MS and EC) were invited to use and give feedback on this guidance by the end of May. ECHA is open to discuss with the Commission if ECHA's assistance is needed when giving feedback to this guidance document.

The guidance document on SEA for POP will be distributed via CIRCA.

14) Action points

The Secretariat presented the action points and main conclusion from SEAC-6. The adopted action points can be found in part 2 of the minutes.

Part 2. Adopted action points

MAIN CONCLUSIONS & ACTION POINTS - SEAC-6, 10 March 2010

(Adopted at the SEAC-6 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
2. Adoption of the agenda	
<p>The revised agenda (SEAC/A/06/2010_rev.2) was adopted with the following additions under AOB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independence of the Committee Members who belong to the organisations that are involved in activities performed for private organisations; • Feedback on the activities of ECHA's Risk Communication Network; • SEA guidance under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. 	<p>SEAC-Secretariat to upload the revised agenda to SEAC CIRCA IG as part of the meeting minutes.</p>
3. Declarations of conflict of interest	
<p>No declarations of conflict of interest were declared.</p>	
4. Administrative issues	
4a. Changes in the SEAC composition/nominations	
<p>SEAC took note of the changes in the composition of SEAC.</p>	
4b. Follow up from satisfaction survey	
<p>SEAC took note of the summary of the results of the satisfaction survey of 2009.</p>	
4c. Update on the remuneration framework contract	
<p>SEAC took note of the update on the remuneration framework contract.</p>	<p>SEAC-Secretariat to provide a link to the MB decision on the transfer of fees to MSs and the framework contract model, when these are available.</p> <p>Members to encourage their CAs to</p>

	<p>take actions necessary to get the remuneration framework contracts finalised (especially from the MSs where the first (co-)rapporteurs come from).</p> <p>SEAC-Secretariat to provide a copy of the letter sent to MS permanent representations in autumn 2009.</p>
5. Status report of SEAC-5 action points	
SEAC took note of the status report concerning the action points of SEAC-5.	
6. Feedback from other bodies	
<p>SEAC took note of the report on the last MB meeting, the CARACAL meeting and the meeting of the DG SANCO working group on improvements in risk assessment approaches.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the change in the RoPs regarding presentation of the minority opinions introduced by the MB.</p> <p>SEAC concluded that it is important to remain involved in the work of the DG SANCO working group.</p>	<p>SEAC-Secretariat to provide the second report on the DG SANCO working group activities in the June SEAC meeting.</p>
7. SEAC Work plan 2010-2011	
SEAC took note of the outline of a work plan for SEAC meetings in 2010 and 2011.	SEAC-Secretariat to keep the work plan updated.
8. Agreement on appointment of rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
<p>SEAC agreed on the appointment of the rapporteur and the co-rapporteur for the restriction dossier on mercury in measuring devices (pending for submission by ECHA) according to the Chair's Recommendation (SEAC/06/2010/01).</p>	
9. Update on upcoming restriction dossiers	
SEAC took note of the latest changes in the ROI.	

10. Authorisations	
10a. Overview of ECHA's preparations for authorisation applications	
SEAC took note of the presented overview of ECHA's preparations for authorisation applications.	
10b. Working procedure for the appointment of rapporteurs for authorisation applications	
<p>SEAC took note of the modifications introduced in the revised draft procedure based on the comments received from SEAC Members through the CIRCA newsgroup.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the need to reword the additional footnote in Section 2.2 and move it to another more appropriate section.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the need to clarify in the document when the procedure exactly starts.</p> <p>SEAC took note that RAC will proceed with slightly different procedure for the appointment of rapporteurs for authorisation applications.</p>	<p>SEAC-Secretariat to finalise the document based on the comments received at SEAC-6 and to initiate the written procedure to agree on the revised document.</p>
10c. Conformity check of authorisation applications	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Content of conformity check</u> <p>SEAC took note of the proposed scope and content of the conformity check of authorisation applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Working procedure</u> <p>SEAC took note of the proposed draft procedure for the conformity check of authorisation applications.</p>	<p>SEAC-Secretariat to launch a CIRCA commenting round on the discussion paper on 12 March (open for 2 weeks). SEAC-Secretariat to revise the discussion paper based on received comments and to provide a revised version for SEAC-7.</p> <p>SEAC-Secretariat to launch a CIRCA commenting round on the draft procedure on 12 March (open for 2 weeks). SEAC-Secretariat to revise the draft procedure based on received comments and to provide a revised</p>

	version for SEAC-7.
11. Framework for dealing with requests according to Article 77(3)(c) of REACH	
<p>SEAC took note of the modifications introduced in the revised draft framework based on the comments received from SEAC and RAC Members.</p> <p>SEAC reached preliminary agreement on the framework for dealing with requests according to Article 77(3)(c) of the REACH Regulation. The framework will be considered as finally agreed when RAC has also reached agreement on the document.</p>	
12. Environmental benefits value transfer	
<p>SEAC took note of the presentation on the practical guidelines for the use of value transfer in policy and project appraisal.</p> <p>SEAC concluded that it is useful to be aware of how the value transfer might be done by the dossier submitters.</p>	<p>SEAC-Secretariat to include the link to the value transfer guidelines website on ECHA's SEA webportal or/and SEAC CIRCA IG.</p> <p>SEAC-Secretariat to consider organising a training for SEAC on valuation (including value transfer).</p>
13. AOB	
13a. Independence of the Committee Members who belong to the organisations that are involved in activities performed for private organisations	
<p>SEAC took note of the response given by the Secretariat with regard to the independence of the Committee Members who belong to the organisations that are involved in activities performed for private organisations.</p>	
13b. Feedback on the activities of ECHA's Risk Communication Network	
<p>SEAC took note of the report on the activities of ECHA's Risk Communication Network.</p> <p>SEAC concluded that it is important to have a good co-operation with the Risk Communication Network.</p>	<p>Secretariat to continue reporting on the activities of Risk Communication Network at SEAC meetings.</p>

13c. SEA guidance under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants	
SEAC took note of the response given by the Secretariat with regard to SEA guidance under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.	SEAC-Secretariat to include these guidance documents to SEAC CIRCA IG.
General	
	SEAC-Secretariat to upload all SEAC-6 presentations and the action points to CIRCA IG by 12 March.

Part 3. List of Attendees

SEAC Members:	Advisors to the SEAC Members:
BENDL, Jiri	BEEKMAN, Martijn (advisor to LUTTIKHUIZEN, C.)
BRIGNON, Jean Marc	DOMINIAK, Dorota (advisor to RYDLEWSKA, I.)
BROKAITE, Kristina	GULBRANDSEN, Magnus Utne (advisor to LANGTVET, E.)
DALTON, Marie *	KIISKI, Johanna (advisor to SALONEN, H.)
DANTINNE, Catheline	
ECONOMIDES, Aristedemos	Representatives of the Commission:
FAHERTY, Mark	GIL, Sebastian (DG ENV)
FANKHAUSER, Simone	KUBICKI, Michal (DG ENTR)
FEYAERTS, Jean-Pierre	
FOCK, Lars	ECHA staff:
FORKMAN, Mats	DE BRUIJN, Jack
FURLAN, Janez	HAUTAMÄKI, Anne
GEORGIOU, Stavros	KARHU, Elina
GUSTAFSSON, Lars	KIVELÄ, Kalle
GRANDI, Silvia**	LANKOSKI, Jussi
KOZAK, Kristof	LEFEVRE, Remi
LANGTVET, Espen	LOGTMEIJER, Christiaan
LUTTIKHUIZEN, Cees	NAUR, Liina
MANNIK, Leelo***	PELTOLA, Jukka
RYDLEWSKA-LISZKOWSKA, Izabela	SADAM, Diana
SALONEN, Heikki	STOYANOVA, Evgenia
SCHUCHTAR, Endre	SUNDQUIST, Anna-Liisa
SIMON, Franz-Georg	TARAZONA, Jose
SUSNIK, Marko	THUVANDER, Ann
THEOHARI, Maria	VAINIO, Matti
THIELE, Karen	YLÄ-MONONEN, Leena
TIRCHILA, Luminita	DEMI, Rosella
VARIZ, Paolo	VAINIO, Matti
	YLÄ-MONONEN, Leena
	DEMI, Rosella
	Stakeholder organisations:
* replacing McGUINNESS, Sharon	BROUWER, Roy (EAERE)
** replacing RECHIAA Luca Maria	HOLLAND, Michael (EEB)
*** replacing TELLING, Aive	GUEARDIA, Jaume (UEAPME)
	LEENAERS, Joeri (Eurometaux)
	MÄKELÄ, Kari (EMCEF).

List of annexes

- | Annex I List of documents submitted to the [M](#)embers of the Committee for Socio-economic analysis

- Annex II Final Agenda

Annex I

Documents submitted to the Members of the Committee for Socio-economic analysis.

Revised draft agenda	SEAC/A/06/2010_rev.2
Feedback from annual survey	SEAC/06/2010/02
Feedback from other bodies	SEAC/06/2010/08
SEAC Work plan 2010-2011	SEAC/06/2010/03
Recommendation for rapporteurs for restriction dossier HG in measuring devices	SEAC/06/2010/01
Annex to SEAC/06/2010/01: Overview of candidates qualifications	
Procedure for appointment of rapporteurs for authorisation	SEAC/06/2010/04
RCOM SEAC	
Discussion paper on Conformity check for authorisation applications	SEAC/06/2010/05
Procedure for Conformity Check fro authorisation applications	SEAC/06/2010/06
Framework for requests according to Art 77(3)(c)	SEAC/06/2010/07

Revised Draft Agenda
Sixth meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

10 March 2010
ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)
09:00 – 18:00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/06/2010_rev.2
For adoption

Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

Item 4 – Administrative issues

- a) Changes in the SEAC composition/nominations

For information

- b) Follow up from satisfaction survey

SEAC/06/2010/02
For information

- c) Update on the remuneration framework contract

For information

Item 5 – Status report of the action points of SEAC-5

For information

Item 6 – Feedback from other bodies

SEAC/06/2010/08

For information

Report from DG SANCO WG

For information

Item 7 – SEAC Work plan 2010-2011

SEAC/06/2010/03

For discussion

Item 8 – Agreement on appointment of rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC/06/2010/01

For agreement

Item 9 – Update from RoI

For information

Item 10 – Authorisations

a) Brief overview of ECHA's preparations for authorisation applications

For information

b) Working procedure for the Appointment of rapporteurs for authorisation applications

SEAC/06/2010/04

For discussion and possible agreement

c) Conformity check of authorisation applications

- Content of conformity check

SEAC/06/2010/05

For discussion

- Working procedure

SEAC/06/2010/06

For discussion

Item 11 – Framework for dealing with requests according to Art 77(3)(c) of REACH

SEAC/06/2010/07

For agreement

Item 12 – Environmental benefits value transfer

For information

Item 13 – AOB

Item 14 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-6

Table with Action points and decisions from SEAC-6

For adoption