

**12 May 2016**

**SEAC/M/30/2016 FINAL**

**Final**

**Minutes of the 30<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis**

**8-11 March 2016**

## **I. Summary Record of the Proceeding**

### **1) Welcome and apologies**

Tomas Öberg, Chairman of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants of the thirtieth meeting of SEAC.

Geert Dancet, Executive Director of ECHA, addressed SEAC on the occasion of reaching the thirtieth meeting of the Committee. He thanked members for the work done so far, with 76 opinions adopted to date. He stressed the importance of the co-operation between RAC and SEAC for both restriction and the authorisation processes and noted that the interface and dialogue between these two Committees had increased. The Executive Director also encouraged members, together with the ECHA Secretariat, to continue delivering opinions with high quality and within the legal timeframe. He noted that the long awaited peak of applications for authorisation has now started, and the challenge has been met by ECHA and its Committees with capacity building efforts such as appointment of co-opted members last year as well as increased amount of rapporteurships per member. He also pointed out that despite the recent debate on the application of socio-economic analysis (SEA) under REACH Regulation, notably by the European Parliament, he has full confidence in the work of SEAC and the issue will also be discussed in the ECHA Management Board. He encouraged the Committee to continue focusing on the scientific analysis of the information in dossiers and staying away from policy considerations. Finally, he also thanked the observers from the Commission and the regular stakeholder observers for their valuable contributions to the SEAC plenary discussions.

The Chairman briefly introduced the three newly appointed members. He then informed the Committee that apologies had been received from five members.

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

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

### **2) Adoption of the Agenda**

The Chairman introduced the final draft agenda of SEAC-30. The agenda was adopted with minor modifications (under Agenda Item 7, AOB). The final agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex III. The list of all meeting documents is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

### **3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda**

The Chairman requested members and their advisors participating in the meeting to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Three members and one advisor declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions under the Agenda Item 5.2. 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.

#### **4) Report from other ECHA bodies and activities**

##### **a) Report on SEAC-29 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies**

The Chairman informed the participants that all action points of SEAC-29 had been completed or would be followed up during the on-going SEAC-30 meeting. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-29 had been adopted by written procedure and had been uploaded to S-CIRCABC as well as on the ECHA website. The Chairman thanked members for providing comments on the draft SEAC-29 minutes. The Chairman explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA MB, RAC, MSC, the Forum and BPC had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/30/2016/01).

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

##### **b) Feedback from the Commission on SEAC opinions**

The representative of the Commission provided feedback on SEAC opinions on restriction proposals and on applications for authorisation in order to take stock of experiences so far and to identify areas of improvements where needed. In general, the Commission has been content with the advice given by the Committee and has observed much improvement in terms of the process as well as the structure, analysis and presentation of the opinion. He emphasized to the Committee the need to provide evidence-based advice, to stay factual and within the remit of SEAC. Furthermore, it was noted that the clarity of conclusions and transparency of analysis is important for the decision-makers. The opinions should include sound justifications, well-explained assumptions and description of uncertainties. More specific recommendations were also made.

SEAC members welcomed the feedback received. One SEAC member expressed the view that the quality of opinions also relates to the quality of the dossiers submitted. Furthermore, an industry stakeholder representative agreed with the sentiment embodied by this view and promised that the challenge of producing good quality applications for authorisation is taken seriously by the industry. He also emphasised the importance of consistency between the opinions to ensure a level playing field. One member stressed the importance of elaborating further the terminology related to proportionality as well as noted that SEAC should be careful with its conclusions in the opinions, focussing on evaluating the dossier submitter's proposal rather than changing it. With regard to proportionality, the representative of the Commission referred to the restriction taskforce where the matter was largely discussed. As to the latter matter he responded that they view it in a different way – both the dossier submitter's proposal and the opinions of the two Committees (evaluating the proposal and the comments received in the public consultation), serve as input for the Commission's draft regulation.

##### **c) Use of SEA in the REACH regulation and the European Parliament's resolution on DEHP**

SEAC took note of the presentation prepared by the Secretariat on the use of SEA in the REACH regulation and the associated draft note to the Management Board

and the European Parliament's resolution on DEHP. After the presentation, the Chairman invited SEAC to provide its views on the matter.

A stakeholder observer questioned whether it would be possible to extend minimum requirements for the opinion development to the current conformity check procedure on applications for authorisation. Another stakeholder observer representative reminded that the resolution highlights the importance of the work of SEAC to society and that the resolution was not only about that specific opinion on DEHP but about much wider context. He furthermore concluded that the aim should be to improve the transparency of Committee opinions, by making them more understandable. The industry stakeholder observer representative confirmed that industry will also adopt the lessons learned from this case.

The Secretariat responded that the conformity issue will be tackled by the Authorisation Task Force and some changes have been implemented in the templates to standardise the opinion phrases. Awareness rising activities have been planned to guide the applicants on what information is needed by the Committee for their technical and scientific advice to decision makers.

The Commission observer provided an update on the developments since the adoption of the resolution, informed about the Commission's response to the EP resolution, and confirmed that the dialogue will continue in workshops and further collaborations between all parties concerned.

A member brought up the issue if SEAC could also have considered endocrine properties and referred to an email exchange with the Chairman and the Commission observer. The Commission observer responded that the two issues should not be mixed, since the SEAC opinion in this case was agreed before the endocrine properties had been identified. Therefore, he suggested that this general issue and its practicalities should be discussed at another time.

In conclusion, SEAC welcomed the opportunity to reflect upon the European Parliament's resolution. The Chairman concluded that further improvements in authorisation process are in progress and the issue will be reported back in the June plenary meeting.

## **5) Restrictions**

### **5.1) General restriction issues**

#### **a) Report from the Restrictions workshop held in Brussels on 19-20 January 2016**

SEAC was provided with a brief report from the Workshop on implementation of the recommendations of the restriction task force and discussion on new restriction proposals, organised by the Commission jointly with ECHA and held in Brussels on 19-20 January 2016.

### **5.2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers**

#### **a) Opinion development**

##### **1) Methanol – draft final opinion**

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter representative from Poland and an industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer. He then introduced the

state of play regarding the restriction dossier which is aimed to prevent misuse of some mixtures containing methanol. The scope of the restriction proposal is targeted at windshield washing fluids and denaturated alcohol supplied to the general public. The Chairman explained that the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion ended on 9 February with four comments received. The draft final opinion, taking into account the comments of the public consultation, was made available to SEAC on 23 February.

The (co-)rapporteurs presented the results of the public consultation and explained the revisions made in the draft final opinion. The rapporteurs concluded that public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion did not provide any additional data to support the inclusion of denaturated alcohol in the scope of the restriction. In addition, it was also concluded that although bitterants may be effective against accidental consumption, there is a lack of evidence for action against intentional consumption. The (co-)rapporteurs were also of the view that the additional information on costs and benefits in the public consultation responses did not necessitate a revision of the approach taken in the draft opinion. Lastly the Committee agreed to go back to the original version of the wording and remove 'use' from the scope of the proposal.

SEAC adopted its opinion on the dossier by a simple majority. Five members took minority positions based on reasons included in a separate document which will be published on the ECHA website. The (co-)rapporteurs were asked, together with the Secretariat to make final editorial changes to the opinion and to ensure that the BD and ORCOM are in line with the adopted SEAC opinion. The Secretariat will forward the adopted opinion and its supportive documents to the Commission as well as publish them on the ECHA website. The Chairman thanked the (co-)rapporteurs for their work on this dossier.

## **2) D4/D5 – third draft opinion**

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter representatives from UK, an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer and an occasional stakeholder observer. He reminded the participants that the restriction dossier on D4/D5 had been submitted by UK in April 2015. The dossier proposes that D4 and D5 shall not be placed on the market or used in concentrations equal to or greater than 0.1% by weight of each in personal care products that are washed off in normal use conditions. MSC has recently provided an opinion that both substances are vPvB, and that D4 was a PBT, and the restriction proposal is aimed specifically at reducing emissions to the aquatic environment and is targeted at uses that lead to the greatest waste water emissions. The Committee was informed that the public consultation on the proposal ended on 18 December 2015 with 32 comments received. The third draft opinion was made available on 5 February 2016 and comments were received from one SEAC member in the following written commenting round.

The Secretariat provided a brief update from the RAC discussions on this dossier held within RAC-36. RAC adopted its opinion on the D4/D5 restriction proposal by consensus.

The (co-)rapporteurs then presented to the Committee their third draft opinion. The rapporteurs concluded that the restriction is proportionate and recommended a 2 year compliance period. It was proposed to also ask for further information related to the compliance period in the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.

Several members stated that they agree with the rapporteurs' conclusion on proportionality and supported that the rapporteurs have put less emphasis on the WTP arguments. With regard to the length of the compliance period, one member highlighted that industry has been aware about this restriction proposal for a long time and should have had a possibility to prepare. A representative of the occasional stakeholder observer pointed out that they had provided a lot of information with regard to the length of the compliance period to ECHA within the public consultation on the Annex XV restriction report. They had explained in their responses the process that industry needs to carry out to move from D4/D5 to alternatives; this can take 5-11 years. Several members supported the rapporteurs' approach with regard to the compliance period and recommended that it should be specified what type of information is expected from industry in the public consultation on the draft opinion. The Chairman concluded that SEAC agrees with the rapporteurs' conclusion on proportionality and with their approach to the compliance period.

SEAC agreed on its draft opinion on the dossier on D4/D5 by consensus (with modifications introduced at the meeting). The (co-)rapporteurs were tasked, together with the Secretariat, to make the final editorial changes to the agreed SEAC draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (Background Document and responses to comments from the public consultation) is in line with the SEAC draft opinion. The Secretariat will launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in March 2016. The Committee is expected to adopt its final opinion on this dossier at SEAC-31 in June 2016.

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

The Chairman informed the Committee about the appointed SEAC (co-)rapporteurships for the restriction proposal on Diisobutyl phthalate (DIBP), Dibutyl phthalate (DBP), Benzyl butyl phthalate (BBP), Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP).

## **6) Authorisations**

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

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

The Secretariat provided an update on the February submission window (8-22 February 2016) where ECHA received 28 new applications for authorisation on 43 uses of the substances of very high concern. There are 13 applications for authorisation for the uses of chromium (VI) compounds, eight applications for authorisation for the uses of 1,2-dichloroethane (EDC), six applications for authorisation for the uses of bis(methoxyethyl) ether (Diglyme) and an application for authorisation for the uses of oligomeric reaction products of formaldehyde with aniline (Technical MDA).

### **6.2) Authorisation applications**

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

- 1) Sodium dichromate-Brenntag (SD\_Brenntag)
- 2) Potassium dichromate-Brenntag (PD\_Brenntag)
- 3) Dichromium tris(chromate)-Henkel (DtC\_Henkel)
- 4) Strontium chromate-Akzo Nobel (SC\_Akzo)
- 5) Potassium hydroxyoctaoxodizincatedichromate-PPG (PH\_PPG)
- 6) Sodium dichromate-Akzo Nobel (SD\_Akzo)
- 7) Sodium dichromate-Solvay (SD\_Solvay)
- 8) Sodium dichromate-Arkema (SD\_Arkema)
- 9) Sodium dichromate-Ercros (SD\_Ercros)
- 10) Sodium dichromate-Electroquimica (SD\_ELECTRQUIMICA)
- 11) Sodium dichromate-Kemira (SD\_Kemira)
- 12) Sodium dichromate-Caffaro Brescia (SD\_Caffaro)
- 13) Chromium trioxide-Federal-Mogul Friedberg (CT\_Friedberg)
- 14) Chromium trioxide-Federal-Mogul Valvetrain (CT\_Valvetrain)
- 15) Chromium trioxide-Federal-Mogul Burscheid (CT\_Burscheid)
- 16) Chromic acid-Bosch (CA\_Bosch)
- 17) Chromium trioxide-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (CT\_Circuit)
- 18) Arsenic acid-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (AsA\_Circuit)
- 19) Chromium trioxide and dichromium tris(chromate)-Nexter Mechanics (CT\_DtC\_Nexter)
- 20) Chromium trioxide-Praxair (CT\_Praxair)
- 21) Potassium dichromate-Sofradir (PD\_Sofradir)
- 22) Sodium dichromate-Lanxess (SD\_Lanxess)
- 23) Ammonium dichromate-Micrometal (AD\_Micrometal)
- 24) Chromium trioxide-Cromomed (CT\_Cromomed)
- 25) Chromium trioxide-Rimex Metals (CT\_Rimex)
- 26) EDC-BASF (EDC\_BASF)
- 27) Diglyme-Novartis (Diglyme\_Novartis)

The rapporteurs provided general information regarding the 27 applications for authorisation as listed above. In their presentations of the cases the rapporteurs outlined issues which would need further clarification by the applicants and asked the Committee for comments and further suggestion.

The Secretariat presented a list of proposals of the conformity check of the 26 applications for authorisation. With regard to the application on Chromium trioxide submitted by the Circuit Foil Luxembourg, SEAC discussed in detail whether the application does conform to the requirements of the REACH Regulation, as the (co-)rapporteurs proposed that it does not.

SEAC agreed on the conformity of all the 27 applications for authorisation. The Committee also discussed the key issues identified by the rapporteurs in the applications. The Secretariat will inform the applicants about the outcome of the conformity checks and will request further clarifications on the issues identified and discussed by the Committee.

### **1) One use of chromium trioxide submitted by Kromatek Oy on behalf of a group of companies (Chromium trioxide - Kromatek):**

Use 1: Use of chromium trioxide in Cr(VI) based functional plating

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. The Secretariat updated the Committee on the RAC-36 deliberations and then the SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee discussed the length of review period, with four members expressing a dissenting view opting for a shorter review period than suggested by the rapporteurs. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus and the Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on this dossier.

### **2) Two uses of chromium trioxide submitted by Grohe AG (Chromium trioxide - Grohe):**

Use 1: The use of chromium trioxide for electroplating of different types of substrates with the purpose of creating a long-lasting, high durability surface with a shiny or matte look (also called 'functional plating with decorative character')

Use 2: The use of Chromium Trioxide for pre-treatment step in the electroplating process

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first version of the SEAC draft opinions. The Committee discussion mainly focused on the alternatives analysed by the applicant, especially the Committee discussed a production plant shutdown as one of the alternatives suggested by the applicant. The Committee in its discussion also addressed the environmental impact issue.

The Committee discussed the length of the review period and one SEAC member expressed his reservation regarding the proposal made by the rapporteurs. He spoke in favour of identical review periods for both uses, noting the interlinkage between them. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus and the Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on this dossier.

### **b) Second version of the draft opinion**

#### **Six uses of chromium trioxide submitted by LLANXESS Deutschland GmbH on behalf of a group of companies (Chromium trioxide 1)**

Use 1: Formulation of mixtures

Use 2: Functional chrome plating

Use 3: Functional chrome plating with decorative character



Use 4: Surface treatment for applications in the aeronautics and aerospace industries, unrelated to Functional chrome plating or Functional plating with decorative character

Use 5: Surface treatment (except ETP) for applications in various industry sectors namely architectural, automotive, metal manufacturing and finishing, and general engineering

Use 6: Passivation of tin-plated steel (ETP)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the Rapporteurs asked SEAC for advice on how to develop the draft opinions on this complex application. The applicant has provided additional information requested by SEAC, which has allowed the rapporteurs to draft the opinions. The rapporteurs presented then the draft opinions for all uses. In connection to this particular application for authorisation, the Committee also briefly discussed the general issue of references to social costs of unemployment included in the socio-economic analysis. The Secretariat will prepare a draft note addressing the issue for the discussion at the next Committee's plenary meeting.

SEAC discussed the draft opinion on Use 6 and the Committee agreed on the draft opinion for this use by consensus.

Furthermore, SEAC discussed and agreed in principle on the draft opinions on Uses 1 and 2 of the application for authorisation. The Committee will readdress the length of the review period in the draft opinions, when the RAC draft opinions on Uses 1 and 2 are available.

In addition, SEAC discussed and supported the approach taken by the rapporteurs regarding the draft opinions on Uses 3, 4 and 5 of the application for authorisation. The Committee will readdress remaining issues in the draft opinions, and will conclude on the content when the RAC draft opinions on the respective uses are available.

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

The pool of (co-)rapporteurs, as outlined in the amended restricted room document SEAC/30/2016/03 rev 1, was agreed by SEAC.

## **7) AOB**

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

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

### **b) Report from the PBT working group**

The Secretariat reported on the state of play of the SEAC working group on PBT evaluation. There were four comments received from the SEAC commenting round on the revised framework in February 2016. One member suggested that further work ought to be undertaken by the working group and volunteered to take a lead in this, while accepting that in the meantime the framework could continue to be used. The Chairman highlighted that the final report is expected for agreement at the plenary meeting in June 2016 and if needed, a new working group with another mandate could be created for continuing this work in the future.

In this context, the Commission representative also informed about the Commission project envisaged to look into PBTs to further build on the approach for socio-economic assessment of these substances. More information will follow in the June plenary.

**c) Presentation by ChemSec on The Bigger Picture – assessing economic aspects of chemicals substitution**

A stakeholder observer presented a report on The Bigger Picture – assessing economic aspects of chemicals substitution.

**d) ClientEarth's views on conformity check in AfA**

A stakeholder observer presented its views on the role and purpose of the conformity check in Applications for Authorisation process.

**8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-30**

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

## II. Main conclusions and action points

**SEAC-30, 8-11 March 2016**  
(Adopted at SEAC-30 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
<b>2. Adoption of the agenda</b>	
The agenda was adopted with minor modifications.	<b>SECR</b> to upload the adopted agenda to SEAC S-CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.
<b>3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda</b>	
Conflicts of interest have been declared and will be taken to the minutes.	
<b>4. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities</b>	
<i>a) Report on SEAC-29 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies</i>	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-29. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/30/2015/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee.	
<i>b) Feedback from the Commission on SEAC opinions</i>	
SEAC took note of feedback from the Commission on SEAC opinions on applications for authorisation and restriction proposals.	
<i>c) Use of SEA in the REACH regulation and the European Parliament's resolution on DEHP</i>	
SEAC discussed the European Parliament's resolution on DEHP and its implications on SEAC's future work.	<b>SECR</b> to inform SEAC on further developments in June 2016 plenary.
<b>5. Restrictions</b>	
<b>5.1 General restriction issues</b>	
<i>a) Report from the Restrictions workshop held in Brussels on 19-20 January 2016</i>	
SEAC took note of the outcome of the Commission and ECHA Workshop on Restrictions held in Brussels on 19-20 January 2016.	
<b>5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers</b>	
<i>a) Opinion development</i>	
<i>1) Methanol – draft final opinion</i>	
SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft of the SEAC final opinion and the results of the public	<b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the SEAC opinion and to ensure

<p>consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted its final opinion on methanol by majority (with modifications introduced at SEAC-30). Dissenting views will be reflected in the minutes and published on the ECHA website together with the opinion.</p>	<p>that the supporting documentation (BD and ORCOM) is in line with the adopted SEAC final opinion.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to forward the adopted opinion and its annexes to COM and publish it on the ECHA website.</p>
<p>2) D4/D5 – third draft opinion</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the third draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on D4/D5 by consensus (with modifications introduced at SEAC-30).</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in March 2016.</p>
<p><b>5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers</b></p>	
<p>SEAC took note of the update on the incoming restriction dossiers.</p>	
<p><b>6. Authorisation</b></p>	
<p><b>6.1 General authorisation issues</b></p>	
<p>a) Update on incoming/future applications</p>	
<p>SEAC took note of the update on the incoming/future applications for authorisation.</p>	
<p><b>6.2 Authorisation applications</b></p>	
<p>a) Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sodium dichromate-Brenntag (SD_Brenntag)</li> <li>2. Potassium dichromate-Brenntag (PD_Brenntag)</li> <li>3. Dichromium tris(chromate)-Henkel (DtC_Henkel)</li> <li>4. Strontium chromate-Akzo Nobel (SC_Akzo)</li> <li>5. Potassium hydroxyoctaoxodizincatedichromate-PPG (PH_PPG)</li> <li>6. Sodium dichromate-Akzo Nobel (SD_Akzo)</li> <li>7. Sodium dichromate-Solvay (SD_Solvay)</li> <li>8. Sodium dichromate-Arkema (SD_Arkema)</li> <li>9. Sodium dichromate-Ercros (SD_Ercros)</li> <li>10. Sodium dichromate-Electroquimica (SD_ELECTRQUIMICA)</li> <li>11. Sodium dichromate-Kemira (SD_Kemira)</li> <li>12. Sodium dichromate-Caffaro Brescia (SD_Caffaro)</li> </ol>	

13. Chromium trioxide-Federal-Mogul Friedberg (CT\_Friedberg)
14. Chromium trioxide-Federal-Mogul Valvetrain (CT\_Valvetrain)
15. Chromium trioxide-Federal-Mogul Burscheid (CT\_Burscheid)
16. Chromic acid-Bosch (CA\_Bosch)
17. Chromium trioxide-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (CT\_Circuit)
18. Arsenic acid-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (AsA\_Circuit)
19. Chromium trioxide and dichromium tris(chromate)-Nexter Mechanics (CT\_DtC\_Nexter)
20. Chromium trioxide-Praxair (CT\_Praxair)
21. Potassium dichromate-Sofradir (PD\_Sofradir)
22. Sodium dichromate-Lanxess (SD\_Lanxess)
23. Ammonium dichromate-Micrometal (AD\_Micrometal)
24. Chromium trioxide-Cromomed (CT\_Cromomed)
25. Chromium trioxide-Rimex Metals (CT\_Rimex)
26. EDC-BASF (EDC\_BASF)
- 27. Diglyme-Novartis (Diglyme\_Novartis)**

SEAC agreed that the applications are in conformity and discussed the key issues identified in these applications.

**SECR** to inform the applicants about the conformity of the applications for authorisation.

**Rapporteurs** to take the discussions into account in the preparation of the first versions of the draft opinions.

SEAC briefly discussed the values of statistical life (VSL) that were derived in ECHA study. It was concluded that new VSL on mortality (€3.5m or €5m) and the value of morbidity due to cancer (€0.4m) would be used as the point of departure for SEAC's assessment. SEAC would continue to recognise also the older VSL on mortality of the SEA guidance document during a transitional period, which takes into account the preparation time of authorisation applications or restriction dossiers.

It was agreed that these and other pertinent values (e.g. value of fertility) in the ECHA study need to be communicated clearly.

**SECR** to prepare a note for **SEAC's** consideration on WTP values to be used by the Committee in assessing the health impacts provided by the applicant or dossier submitter.

b) First version of the draft opinion

**1. Chromium trioxide-Kromatek**

*Use 1: Use of chromium trioxide in Cr(VI) based functional plating*

**Rapporteurs** together with **SECR** to do the final editing of the draft opinion.

<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first version of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus. The dissenting views with regard to the agreed length of the review period will be reflected in the minutes.</p>	<p><b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p><b>2. Chromium trioxide-Grohe</b></p> <p><i>Use 1: The use of chromium trioxide for electroplating of different types of substrates with the purpose of creating a long-lasting, high durability surface with a shiny or matte look (also called 'functional plating with decorative character')</i></p> <p><i>Use 2: The use of Chromium Trioxide for pre-treatment step in the electroplating process</i></p> <p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first versions of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the draft opinions.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>c) Second version of the draft opinion</p>	
<p><b>1. Six uses of chromium trioxide submitted by LANXESS Deutschland GmbH on behalf of a group of companies (Chromium trioxide 1):</b></p> <p><i>Use 1: Formulation of mixtures</i></p> <p><i>Use 2: Functional chrome plating</i></p> <p><i>Use 3: Functional chrome plating with decorative character</i></p> <p><i>Use 4: Surface treatment for applications in the aeronautics and aerospace industries, unrelated to Functional chrome plating or Functional plating with decorative character</i></p> <p><i>Use 5: Surface treatment (except ETP) for applications in various industry sectors namely architectural, automotive, metal manufacturing and finishing, and general engineering</i></p> <p><i>Use 6: Passivation of tin-plated steel (ETP)</i></p> <p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the second versions of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on Use 6 by consensus.</p> <p>SEAC agreed in principle on the draft opinions on Uses 1 and 2, except for the recommended review periods to be discussed further at SEAC-31.</p> <p>SEAC discussed and supported the approach taken by Rapporteurs in the draft opinions on Uses 3, 4 and 5.</p>	<p><b>Rapporteurs</b> together with <b>SECR</b> to do the final editing of the agreed draft opinion on Use 6.</p> <p><b>Rapporteurs</b> to revise the draft opinions on Uses 1 to 5 following the agreement on the draft opinions in RAC.</p>

<b>6.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)</b>	
SEAC agreed on the updated pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (considered as agreement on appointment in line with SEAC/30/2016/03 RESTRICTED room document).	<p><b>SEAC members</b> to volunteer to the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for applications for authorisation.</p> <p><b>SECR</b> to upload the updated document to confidential folder on S-CIRCABC IG.</p>
<b>8. Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-30</b>	
SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-30.	<b>SECR</b> to upload the action points and main conclusions to S-CIRCABC IG.

### III. List of Attendees

#### SEAC-30

<b>SEAC members</b>
ALEXANDRE Joao
ALEXANDROPOULOU Ioanna
BERGS Ivars
BOUSTRAS Georgiou
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
CASTELLI Stefano
COGEN Simon
CSERGÓ Robert (co-opted)
DOUGHERTY Gary
DRAKE Lars (co-opted)
FANKHAUSER Simone
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros (DS representative for D4/D5 restriction dossier)
GRANDI Silvia (via WEBEX)
HEKRLE Marek
HENNIG Philipp (co-opted)
JONES Derrick (co-opted)
KAJIĆ Silva
KIISKI Johanna
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LOČS Jānis
LUIT Richard
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
LÜDEKE Andreas
MEXA Alexandra
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
NORING Maria
OLTEANU Maria
RYDLEWSKA-LISZKOWSKA Izabela
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SLETTEN Thea Marcelia
SMILGIUS Tomas
THORS Åsa
<b>Commission observers</b>
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)
GALLEGO Mateo (DG ENV)

<b>Advisors, invited experts, observers &amp; dossier submitters (DS)</b>
BERNHEIM Theresa (advisor to K. Thiele, via WEBEX)
DELCOURT Benjamin (invited expert, replacing SEAC member C. Dantine)
DOMINIAK Dorota (advisor to I. Rydlewska-L.)
MARTIN Sara (DS representative for D4/D5 restriction dossier, via WEBEX)
JENSEN Louise Baad (advisor to L. Fock, via WEBEX)
JONGENEEL Rob (advisor to R. Luit, via WEBEX)
MARTINUSSEN SNEVE Marie (advisor to T.M. Sletten)
RAMOS Sergio (advisor to A. Narros)
VERHOEVEN Julia (advisor to R. Luit, via WEBEX)
<b>RAC (co-)rapporteurs</b>
BJØRGE Christine
CHIURTU Elena (via WEBEX)
DUNAUŠKIENE Lina
JANKOWSKA Elzbieta (via WEBEX)
KADIKIS Normunds
MOELLER Ruth
MULLOOLY Yvonne
NEUMANN Michael
PASQUIER Elodie
PRONK Marja
SCHLUTER Urs
STAŠKO Jolanta
SOGORB Miguel
VIEGAS Susana (via WEBEX)
<b>Stakeholder observers &amp; accompanying experts</b>
BUONSANTE Vito (ClientEarth)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
HAIDER Sonja (ChemSec)
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)
ARASTO Sini (KEMIRA OY) – accompanying CEFIC for the Methanol restriction dossier
BLOOR Pamela (Unilever), nominated by occasional STO EFCI – D4/D5 restriction dossier
STRASSBERGER Walter (WACKER SILICONES) – accompanying CEFIC for the D4/D5 restriction dossier
<b>ECHA staff</b>
BERGES Markus
BLAINEY Mark
DVORAKOVA Dana
HENRICHSON Sanna
JACQUEMIN Katline



KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia
KIVELÄ Kalle
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
KOULOUMPOS Vasileios
LIINA Risto
LOUKOU Christina
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORZS Arnis
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MAZZOLINI Anna
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
MOTTET Denis
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
ÖBERG Tomas
PELTOLA Jukka
PILLET Monique
REGIL Pablo
RHEINBERGER Christoph
ROGGEMAN Maarten
SADAM Diana
SHUQOM Natasha
SIHVONEN Kirsi
SIMPSON Peter
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
STOYANOVA Evgenia
VAINIO Matti

#### **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**

<b>Document</b>	<b>Number</b>
Final Draft Agenda	<i>SEAC/A/30/2016</i>
Report on SEAC-29 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies	<i>SEAC/30/2016/01</i>
Use of SEA in the REACH regulation and the European Parliament's resolution on DEHP	<i>SEAC/30/2016/02</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)	<i>SEAC/30/2016/03</i>
Report from the PBT working group	<i>SEAC/30/2016/04</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 Article 9(2) of the SEAC Rules of Procedure):

<b>Name of participant</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Interest declared</b>
DOMINIAK Dorota	5.2a-1 Methanol	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
DOUGHERTY Gary	5.2a-2 D4/D5	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
GEORGIU Stavros	5.2a-2 D4/D5	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
KIISKI Johanna	5.2a-1 Methanol	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier

## **Final Agenda**

### **30<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis**

**8 - 11 March 2016**

**ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)**

**8 March starts at 9.00  
11 March ends at 13.30**

**Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies**

**Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda**

***SEAC/A/30/2016  
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-29 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

***SEAC/30/2016/01  
For information***

- b) Feedback from the Commission on SEAC opinions

***For information and discussion***

- c) Use of SEA in the REACH regulation and the European Parliament's resolution on DEHP

***SEAC/30/2016/02  
(room document)  
For information and discussion***

**Item 5 – Restrictions**

## **5.1 General restriction issues**

- a) Report from the Restrictions workshop held in Brussels on 19-20 January 2016

***For information***

## **5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers**

- a) Opinion development
  - 1) Methanol – draft final opinion
  - 2) D4/D5 – third draft opinion

***For adoption***

***For agreement***

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

***For information***

## **Item 6 – Authorisation**

### **6.1 General authorisation issues**

- a) Update on incoming/future applications

***For information***

### **6.2 Authorisation applications**

- a) Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues
  - 1. Sodium dichromate-Brenntag (SD\_Brenntag)
  - 2. Potassium dichromate-Brenntag (PD\_Brenntag)
  - 3. Dichromium tris(chromate)-Henkel (DtC\_Henkel)
  - 4. Strontium chromate-Akzo Nobel (SC\_Akzo)
  - 5. Potassium hydroxyoctaoxodizincatedichromate-PPG (PH\_PPG)
  - 6. Sodium dichromate-Akzo Nobel (SD\_Akzo)
  - 7. Sodium dichromate-Solvay (SD\_Solvay)
  - 8. Sodium dichromate-Arkema (SD\_Arkema)
  - 9. Sodium dichromate-Ercros (SD\_Ercros)
  - 10. Sodium dichromate-Electroquimica (SD\_ELECTRQUIMICA)
  - 11. Sodium dichromate-Kemira (SD\_Kemira)
  - 12. Sodium dichromate-Caffaro Brescia (SD\_Caffaro)
  - 13. Chromium trioxide-Federal-Mogul Friedberg (CT\_Friedberg)
  - 14. Chromium trioxide-Federal-Mogul Valvetrain (CT\_Valvetrain)
  - 15. Chromium trioxide-Federal-Mogul Burscheid (CT\_Burscheid)
  - 16. Chromic acid-Bosch (CA\_Bosch)
  - 17. Chromium trioxide-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (CT\_Circuit)
  - 18. Arsenic acid-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (AsA\_Circuit)
  - 19. Chromium trioxide and dichromium tris(chromate)-Nexter Mechanics (CT\_DtC\_Nexter)
  - 20. Chromium trioxide-Praxair (CT\_Praxair)
  - 21. Potassium dichromate-Sofradir (PD\_Sofradir)
  - 22. Sodium dichromate-Lanxess (SD\_Lanxess)

- 23. Ammonium dichromate-Micrometal (AD\_Micrometal)
- 24. Chromium trioxide-Cromomed (CT\_Cromomed)
- 25. Chromium trioxide-Rimex Metals (CT\_Rimex)
- 26. EDC-BASF (EDC\_BASF)
- 27. Diglyme-Novartis (Diglyme\_Novartis)

***For discussion and agreement***

b) First version of the draft opinion:

- 1. Chromium trioxide-Kromatek  
Use 1: Use of chromium trioxide in Cr(VI) based functional plating
- 2. Chromium trioxide-Grohe  
Use 1: The use of chromium trioxide for electroplating of different types of substrates with the purpose of creating a long-lasting, high durability surface with a shiny or matte look (also called 'functional plating with decorative character')  
Use 2: The use of Chromium Trioxide for pre-treatment step in the electroplating process

***For discussion and agreement***

c) Second version of the draft opinion:

- 1. Six uses of chromium trioxide submitted by *LANXESS Deutschland GmbH* on behalf of a group of companies (**Chromium trioxide 1**):  
Use 1: Formulation of mixtures  
Use 2: Functional chrome plating  
Use 3: Functional chrome plating with decorative character  
Use 4: Surface treatment for applications in the aeronautics and aerospace industries, unrelated to Functional chrome plating or Functional plating with decorative character  
Use 5: Surface treatment (except ETP) for applications in various industry sectors namely architectural, automotive, metal manufacturing and finishing, and general engineering  
Use 6: Passivation of tin-plated steel (ETP)

***For discussion and agreement***

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

***SEAC/30/2016/03  
(restricted room document)  
For agreement***

<b>Item 7 – AOB</b>
---------------------

- a) Update of the work plan
- b) Report from the PBT working group

***For information***

***SEAC/30/2016/04  
For discussion***

c) Presentation on The Bigger Picture – assessing economic aspects of chemicals substitution

***For information***

d) ClientEarth's views on conformity check in AfA

***For information***

**Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-30**

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-30

***For adoption***