

23 November 2015

SEAC/M/28/2015 FINAL

Final

Minutes of the 28th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

8-11 September 2015

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 twenty eighth meeting of SEAC.

The Chairman briefly introduced three newly appointed Committee members. He then informed the Committee that apologies had been received from six members and one stakeholder observer. Five advisors to the members, two invited experts, two representatives of the European Commission, observers of six stakeholder organisations, four accompanying experts and one observer accompanying European Commission observer present at the meeting were introduced. The Chairman informed the participants that two members, three members' advisors and five representatives of the European Commission were to follow the relevant parts of the meeting via WebEx, and that the RAC rapporteurs, the dossier submitter representatives and the experts following specific agenda items would be presented at the beginning of the relevant discussions.

The Chairman also 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 draft agenda of SEAC-28. The agenda was adopted with minor modifications (under agenda point 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.

The Chairman informed the participants that due to the planned migration to the Secure CIRCABC, the SEAC commenting round on the draft minutes of the SEAC-28 might have to be delayed.

3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

The Chairman requested members, their advisors and invited experts participating in the meeting to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Seven members and three advisors declared potential conflicts of interest 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.

4) Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

a) Report on SEAC-27 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

The Chairman informed the participants that all action points of SEAC-27 had been completed or would be followed up during the on-going SEAC-28 meeting. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-27 had been adopted by written procedure and had been uploaded to CIRCABC as well as on the ECHA website. The Chairman thanked members for providing comments on the draft SEAC-27 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/28/2015/01).

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

b) General SEAC procedures (closed session)

Admission of stakeholder organisations

SEAC discussed and agreed on the annual update of the list of the SEAC accredited stakeholder organisations (ASOs). The update was based on the procedure for the admission to the Committee of accredited stakeholder organisations agreed at SEAC-27.

Under the new approach, seven stakeholder organisations that represent a larger industry group or other general/cross-sectorial/broader interests and who have demonstrated a good attendance record and high level of participation are regarded as 'regular observers'. These will be automatically invited to SEAC plenary meetings by the Secretariat and be granted full access to non-confidential documentation for the respective meetings.

On the other hand, all organisations interested in SEAC who represent sectors with more specific interest are regarded as 'occasional observers'. Occasional observers are also welcome to request the Secretariat to participate in a SEAC meeting for a specific case, substance, agenda item or Committee discussion, following their justified expression of interest in advance of the respective meeting.

The updated list of stakeholders will be published on the ECHA website and be applied with immediate effect following the end of the plenary.

Appointment of co-opted members to RAC and SEAC

The Chairman reminded the Committee that the restricted meeting document (SEAC/28/2015/03) on the appointment of co-opted members to SEAC has been tabled for agreement at this meeting.

In addition, the Secretariat presented the report on the appointment of co-opted members as well as briefly summarized the outcome of the procedure. SEAC agreed on the appointment of the four proposed co-opted members as proposed by the Secretariat. The Secretariat will proceed with the contractual appointment of the new co-opted members.

5) Restrictions

5.1) General restriction issues

a) Common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development for restriction proposals

The Secretariat presented the Framework for RAC and SEAC in checking conformity and developing opinions on restriction proposals (meeting document SEAC/28/2015/04). The document had been updated based on comments received during the RAC/SEAC written commenting rounds. There were some comments raised by the stakeholder organisation representatives to the text of the document in relation to the how the public consultation comments are taken into account. Furthermore, a SEAC member asked for the aim of the document. Following the clarifications provided by the Secretariat, SEAC agreed on the Framework for RAC and SEAC in checking conformity and developing opinions on restriction proposals. The Secretariat will make final editorial changes to the document and publish the agreed Framework to ECHA website and the SEAC CIRCABC IG.

5.2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Opinion development

1) 4,4-Isopropylidenediphenol (bisphenol A) – revised draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter representative (France) and then introduced the state of play regarding the restriction dossier on the placing on the market of thermal paper containing BPA. The Chairman explained that at RAC-33, RAC adopted its opinion by consensus. The SEAC rapporteurs' fifth revised draft opinion was made available to SEAC on 12 August. The written commenting round finished on 26 August with seven comments received from SEAC members. Taking into account the comments received, the SEAC rapporteurs prepared the sixth revised draft opinion which was made available to SEAC on 2 September.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the revised draft opinion. They explained that they had amended the substitution cost estimates and the valuation factors used for monetising disease burden. As a result, the incidence rates that would be necessary in order for the benefits to offset the costs of the restriction had also changed. The rapporteurs considered that the estimates are sufficiently similar so that the reply of RAC can still be informative for SEAC's opinion.

SEAC members supported the rapporteurs' view that the restriction proposal is unlikely to be proportionate from an economic efficiency perspective, comparing the socio-economic benefits to the socio-economic costs. Furthermore, SEAC members supported the rapporteur's view that other elements to proportionality of the restriction are important, and that it should be reflected in the opinion that there may be favourable distributional and affordability considerations to introducing the proposed restriction. The rapporteurs explained, however, that SEAC does not have any information on societal preferences for different distributional compositions.

SEAC agreed by consensus its draft opinion on the restriction dossier on BPA. The rapporteurs, together with the Secretariat, will make the final editorial changes to the agreed draft opinion and will ensure that the supporting documentation (Background Document (BD) and responses to comments from the public

consultation) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion. The Secretariat will launch the 60-day public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion on 16 September 2015. The Committee is expected to adopt its final opinion in December 2015.

2) DecaBDE –draft final opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitters' representatives (ECHA and Norway), and an industry expert accompanying stakeholder observer to the meeting. He informed the Committee that the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion, agreed at SEAC-27, had been launched on 17 June and finished on 17 August with 14 comments received. The (co-) rapporteurs had provided the draft of the SEAC final opinion and the responses to the public consultation comments on 28 August.

The (co-) rapporteurs were then invited to present to the Committee the results of the public consultation as well as their impact on the SEAC opinion. Based on the comments received the rapporteurs proposed additional derogations for military aviation, road vehicles, and spare parts for machinery, and agricultural and forestry vehicles. The majority of SEAC members supported the (co-)rapporteurs' conclusions. Several members raised concerns in relation to the recycling although agreed with the rapporteurs' conclusions that there was no sufficient evidence to justify a derogation for recycling. It was agreed to reflect the recycling issue more in detail in the justification of the opinion.

Following modifications introduced in the justification text at the plenary, SEAC adopted its opinion on the dossier by consensus. The (co-)rapporteurs were asked, together with the Secretariat, to make final editorial changes to the opinion and to ensure that the BD is 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.

3) PFOA – revised draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitters' representatives (Germany and Norway), the RAC (co-)rapporteurs and an industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer. The Chairman reminded the Committee that this dossier has been submitted by Germany and Norway in October 2014. The dossier submitters propose a restriction on the manufacture, marketing and use of PFOA, its salts and PFOA-related substances, as well as of articles and mixtures containing these substances. Based on the discussions held at SEAC-27 and almost 200 comments received within the public consultation, the (co-)rapporteurs had prepared the revised draft opinion, which was submitted for comments by SEAC, as well as for observations by the Commission and the dossier submitters. Based on the comments received from three SEAC members, the Commission and the dossier submitters, the (co-)rapporteurs updated their revised draft opinion, which was made available to the Committee on 3 September.

The RAC (co-)rapporteurs updated SEAC on the discussions on the dossier held within RAC-34, where RAC adopted its opinion on this restriction proposal by consensus.

In presenting their revised draft opinion to SEAC, the (co-)rapporteurs focussed on the proportionality assessment and on the proposed derogations.

With regard to the proportionality assessment, one member questioned how the (co-)rapporteurs judged proportionality in terms of cost-effectiveness and whether the proposed derogations are taken into account in the proportionality assessment. The (co-)rapporteurs responded that there are derogated uses that were not included in the cost-effectiveness analysis prepared by the dossier submitters. Some of the uses that are proposed to be derogated were included in the (co-) rapporteurs' evaluation but the volumes are not very high. The Commission observer recommended including a footnote in the text of the opinion presenting the cost-effectiveness estimates of other restrictions.

Based on the comments received within the public consultation, the dossier submitters had updated their proposal and now recommended using six concentration limits. The RAC and SEAC (co-)rapporteurs, however, considered such proposal too complex, mainly based on practicality and enforcement issues, and instead proposed two concentration limits in their opinions – 25 ppb for PFOA and its salts, and 1000 ppb for PFOA-related substances. One stakeholder observer expressed the view that the limit value of 1000 ppb for PFOA-related substances is too high and can make the whole restriction meaningless. The dossier submitters' representative also emphasised that such high limit would allow intentional use of PFOA-related substances. The (co-)rapporteurs responded that these issues could be taken into account if the Commission would review this restriction after 5 years from the entry into force. Several members expressed support for the approach of the (co-) rapporteurs.

In relation to the derogations, the (co-)rapporteurs listed the derogations they evaluated as supportable: implantable medical devices, transported isolated intermediates, semiconductor photolithography processes, second hand articles, articles produced from recycled articles and photographic coatings (also agreed by RAC), as well as, latex printing inks, protective professional textiles, non-implantable medical devices, firefighting foams, and spare parts for automobiles. An industry expert emphasised that they strongly support a derogation for the manufacture of C6 alternatives and will come back to this in the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion. In their view, longer transitional periods are not needed. SEAC agreed with the derogations recommended by the (co-) rapporteurs.

SEAC agreed on its draft opinion on the dossier on PFOA, its salts and PFOA-related substances by simple majority (with modifications introduced at the meeting). One member did not support the draft opinion due to the lack of adequate justification of proportionality and some of the derogations. Another member shared some of these concerns. 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 (BD 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 September 2015. The Committee is expected to adopt its final opinion on this dossier at SEAC-29 in December 2015.

4) Methanol – first draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed an expert accompanying the CEFIC stakeholder observer, the Dossier Submitter's representative from Poland, whom followed the meeting remotely via WebEx, and the RAC rapporteurs. The proposed restriction is aimed to prevent misuse of some mixtures containing high concentration of methanol as an ethyl alcohol surrogate. The scope of the restriction proposal is targeted to windscreen washing fluids and denatured alcohol supplied to the general public.

The RAC rapporteur was invited to briefly update SEAC on the discussions on this dossier held within RAC-34. The SEAC rapporteur then presented the first draft opinion.

The Secretariat and the Commission clarified that misuse can be considered in the scope of a REACH restriction. The Chairman informed that this was a legal issue, as was already clarified at the previous meeting, and therefore does not need further discussion. The issue to be discussed in the following meeting would be if REACH was the most appropriate measure to deal with any risk identified. The EU-wide appropriateness of the measure was discussed, and parallels were drawn with the recently agreed SEAC opinion on ammonium salts in cellulose, where only few respiratory irritation cases were involved. SEAC recommended the rapporteurs to further clarify the reasoning for the Union-wide basis by carefully illustrating the extent of the problem and number of countries where cases of methanol poisoning have been recorded in the EU.

SEAC members supported the proposed approach to target the scope of the restriction proposal to windscreen washing fluids (including windshield defrosters) only.

Furthermore, SEAC members supported the (co-)rapporteurs' proposal to use monthly temperature data in EU-countries to improve the simulation of the annual use of methanol in windshield washing fluids in the European Union. In addition, SEAC discussed the rapporteurs' proposal on the cost-benefit calculations to describe potential EU-level benefits via a simulation based on the relative methanol use in windshield washing fluids and fatalities in Finland or Poland. The simulation approach was generally supported, with some members requesting the rapporteurs to strengthen the justification of the assumptions made in the revised draft opinion.

The Chairman informed the participants of the meeting that the (co-)rapporteurs will need to deliver their revised draft opinion on this dossier by end of October 2015 (for agreement at SEAC-29), taking into account the discussion at SEAC-28.

5) D4/D5–first draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter representatives from UK, the RAC (co-) rapporteurs and an industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer. He reminded the participants that the restriction dossier on D4/D5 had been submitted by UK in April 2015 and had been considered in conformity by RAC and SEAC in June plenaries. 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 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 according to the registration CSRs. The Chairman informed the Committee that the (co-)rapporteurs had developed the first draft opinion on this dossier, taking into account the discussion on key issues held at SEAC-27, which was made available to SEAC in mid-August. The RAC (co-)rapporteurs were invited to briefly update SEAC on the discussions on the dossier held within RAC-34.

In presenting their first draft opinion to SEAC, the (co-)rapporteurs asked focus the discussion in SEAC on the costs of the restriction. The (co-) rapporteurs proposed four points for discussion by SEAC: whether the Committee agrees to the conclusion on feasibility of alternatives; whether the Committee agrees with the general approach to the cost calculation; whether it agrees with the (co-

)rapporteurs' assessment of the costs and how should SEAC advise the dossier submitter to update the reformulation costs. For the last question, the (co-)rapporteurs proposed two options – gradually return back to baseline reformulations and if so, what would be an appropriate return rate, or directly back to baseline reformulations after the compliance period.

One member supported the (co-)rapporteurs' approach for assessing the costs. However, he questioned if the uncertainties surrounding the rates of reformulation used should be further considered. The dossier submitter's representative clarified that the rates are based on the review of information that they had received by industry as well as the reformulation rates used in some previous Commission studies. Another member suggested going for the second option proposed by the (co-) rapporteurs relate to their last question, but indicating that the costs might be over-estimated in the view of SEAC. An industry expert explained that there is currently no available analytical method to quantify D4 and D5 in cosmetic products, but that hopefully by 2016 such method would be developed; this will be clarified in their public consultation submission.

The Chairman concluded that the Committee supports the (co-)rapporteurs' views and the assessment presented. The (co-)rapporteurs were asked to take the SEAC discussion into account in the second draft opinion.

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

The Secretariat reminded that the pool of SEAC (co-) rapporteurships for the restriction dossiers on Diisobutyl phthalate (DIBP), Dibutyl phthalate (DBP), Benzyl butyl phthalate (BBP), Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) (to be submitted by ECHA) is still open for the volunteers. Furthermore, the Chairman provided an update on the upcoming call for (co-)rapporteurs for the upcoming restriction dossier on BPA in tap water pipes which will be launched in September 2015.

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues

a) Continuing review of SEAC and RAC recommendations

The Secretariat presented to the Committee a set of opinion trees for RAC and SEAC, which would help the Committees to determine additional conditions and monitoring arrangements, as well as the length of the proposed review period. The main aim is to assist RAC and SEAC towards a more structured and consistent way to derive their opinions, as well as to further develop how SEAC takes RAC's recommendations into consideration.

The proposal was developed for non-threshold substances only and in consistency with the RAC/SEAC common approach paper and the review period paper. In addition, the Secretariat clarified that the opinion trees do not address any procedural issues, nor if/how RAC and SEAC would make recommendations not to grant an authorisation, neither situations where Committees are unable to evaluate the application. The Secretariat will consider the SEAC-28 discussion in drafting the note, which will be on the agenda of the next SEAC plenary meeting in December for discussion and agreement.

b) Report from Authorisation Task Force

The Secretariat informed the Committee on the work done so far by the task force, which was established on July 2014. With regard to the low volumes' applications, the EC is preparing a draft implementing act following the finalisation of which the application format for these uses will be completed by the task force.

The Secretariat reminded members of the workshop on the authorisation for process of chemical uses which will be organised on 23 September by Cefic and Eurometaux in Brussels, asking them to express their interest to participate. In addition, members were informed about another workshop that will be organised in November by the EC and ECHA with regard to fit-for-purpose for both upstream and downstream user applications.

c) Working procedure on opinion development

The Secretariat presented a proposal on the revised Working Procedure for RAC and SEAC for developing opinions on Applications for Authorisation. The main changes in the revision concern the steps on the finalisation of the opinion and in particular the part following the possible comments received from the Applicant. Under the current practise following the receipt of comments by the Applicant the rapporteurs assess the comments and propose either modifications, or no changes in the document, which is followed by a RAC and SEAC consultation before finalisation.

The Secretariat has proposed that for the cases where the rapporteurs judge that no changes are necessary to be made in the opinion following the Applicant's comments, then there will be no consultation with the Committee and the Committee will adopt the final opinion either at the next plenary meeting or in a written procedure. In order to balance this proposal, an extra step of transparency has been proposed to the process, and the rapporteurs will be asked to provide a written justification of their assessment following the Applicant's comments, which will be sent to the European Commission, Member States and the Applicant.

During the discussion it was, however, suggested to keep a short consultation round. The Chairman also explained that written procedures will be avoided where possible, and that such a procedure can be terminated where needed. SEAC was not ready to agree on the revised Working Procedure at this meeting and requested the Secretariat to further elaborate the proposal taking into account the SEAC discussion. A new draft will be scheduled for discussion at the next SEAC plenary meeting in December 2015.

d) Update on incoming/future applications for authorisation

The Secretariat updated SEAC members on the forthcoming and expected applications for authorisation, noting an expected peak of about 80 incoming applications in the November 2015 or February 2016 submission windows, which will result to a peak of the workload of the Committee in late spring-summer 2016.

So far the Secretariat has received one new application in the August 2015 submission window and it was submitted in German. The Secretariat explained that in such a case the application would need to be officially translated in English by the European Commission's translation services before being tabled to the Committees. This might take considerable time, however the Secretariat will

inform the committee once there is more information on the expected timeline. Two additional applications for uses of chromium trioxide are expected to be submitted in September/October. If they pass the submission pipeline early enough the Committees will be able to discuss in November/December plenaries the conformity and the key issues.

6.2) Authorisation applications

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

1) 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 SEAC (co-)rapporteurs provided brief information on the application for authorisation and presented the draft outcome of the conformity check. The (co-) rapporteurs also presented their first impression of the application, highlighting some key issues for the attention of the Committee some of which would require further clarification by the applicant.

SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and on the (co-)rapporteurs' proposals with regard to the key issues in the application. The Secretariat will inform the applicant about the outcome of the conformity check and ask them for further clarifications on the issues requested by the Committee.

2) Sodium chromate 1

Use 1: The use of sodium chromate as an anticorrosion agent of the carbon steel cooling system in absorption refrigerators up to 0.75% by weight (Cr 6+) in the cooling solution.

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs provided brief information on the application for authorisation and presented the draft outcome of the conformity check. The (co-) rapporteurs also presented their first impression of the application, highlighting some key issues for the attention of the Committee.

SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and on the (co-)rapporteurs' proposals with regard to the key issues in the application. The Secretariat will inform the applicant about the outcome of the conformity check.

3) Sodium dichromate 1

Use 1: The use of sodium dichromate in copper/lead separation in concentrators handling complex sulphide ores.

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs provided brief information on the application for authorisation and presented the draft outcome of the conformity check. The (co-) rapporteurs also presented their first impression of the application, highlighting some key issues for the attention of the Committee.

SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and on the (co-)rapporteurs' proposals with regard to the key issues in the application. The Secretariat will inform the applicant about the outcome of the conformity check.

4) EDC 1

Use 1: process and extracting solvent in fine chemical processes

The (co-)rapporteurs provided brief information on the application for authorisation and presented the draft outcome of the conformity check. The (co-)rapporteurs also presented their first impression of the application, highlighting some key issues for the attention of the Committee some of which would require further clarification by the applicant.

SEAC agreed on the conformity of the application and on the (co-)rapporteurs' proposal with regard to the key issues in the application. The Secretariat will inform the applicant about the outcome of the conformity check and ask them for further clarifications on the issues requested by the Committee.

b) Final opinions

1) Trichloroethylene 2a

Use 1: Use of Trichloroethylene in Industrial Parts Cleaning by Vapour Degreasing in Closed Systems where specific requirements (system of use-parameters) exist

The Chairman briefly introduced the case noting that at the last plenary meeting the Committee had agreed on the draft opinion for this use, which was sent to the applicants for their possible comments. The applicants submitted their comments on 6 August 2015.

The (co-)rapporteurs presented to the Committee the applicants' comments on the draft opinion, as well as their assessment. They noted that, following the information provided by the applicant, in their view some modifications would be needed in the opinion, the main issue being the proposed review period which would need to be modified towards 7 years, instead of 4 initially proposed. SEAC agreed with the rapporteurs' assessment and the proposed modifications.

SEAC adopted by consensus the final opinion as presented by the (co-) rapporteurs. The Commission observer placed a reservation on the conditions as formulated due to potential legal implications in introducing these in the decision. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs and the Authorisation team for their work on this application for authorisation.

2) Lead chromate 1

Use 1: Industrial use of lead chromate in manufacture of pyrotechnical delay devices contained into ammunition for naval self-protection

The Chairman briefly introduced the case noting that at the last plenary meeting the Committee had agreed on the draft opinion for this use, which was sent to the

applicants for their possible comments. The applicants submitted their comments on 30 July 2015.

The (co-)rapporteurs presented to the Committee the applicants' comments on the draft opinion, as well as their assessment. They noted that, following the information provided by the applicant, in their view some modifications would be needed in the opinion, namely on the proposed review period which would need to be modified towards 7 years, instead of 4 initially proposed. SEAC agreed with the (co-)rapporteurs' assessment and the proposed modifications.

SEAC adopted by consensus the final opinion as presented by the (co-)rapporteurs. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs and the Authorisation team for their work on this application for authorisation.

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/28/2015/06 rev 1, was agreed by SEAC.

8) AOB

a) Update of the workplan

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

b) SEA tool kit

The expert accompanying the Commission observer provided a report from the Commission project on assessing competitiveness, innovation and SMEs impact in the context of socio-economic analysis under REACH and presented SEAC with a presentation on the SEA toolkit.

c) Information by the Commission on the benefits indicators study

The Commission observer provided a brief presentation on the study initiated by the Commission, the aim of which is to assess the beneficial impact of EU legislation and policies specific to the EU chemical sector related to both the environment and human health, through the definition of a set of indicators. He also advertised to the Committee a brainstorming workshop taking place within this study during the first week of November.

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-28

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-28, 8-11 September 2015 (Adopted at SEAC-28 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
2. Adoption of the agenda	
The agenda was adopted with minor modifications.	SECR to upload the adopted agenda to SEAC CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.
3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda	
Conflicts of interest have been declared and will be taken to the minutes.	
4. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities	
a) Report on SEAC-27 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-27. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/28/2015/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in CARACAL.	
b) General SEAC procedures (closed session)	
SEAC agreed on the updated list of regular and occasional stakeholder observers (as presented in the restricted meeting document SEAC/28/2015/02). SEAC agreed on the appointment of the co-opted members as proposed by the Secretariat (restricted meeting document SEAC/28/2015/03).	SECR to publish the updated list of SEAC stakeholder observers on ECHA website. SECR to proceed with the contractual appointment of the new co-opted members.
5. Restrictions	
5.1 General restriction issues	
SEAC agreed on the Framework for RAC and SEAC in checking conformity and developing opinions on restriction proposals (meeting document SEAC/28/2015/04).	SECR to do the final editing of the agreed Framework and to publish it to SEAC CIRCABC IG and on ECHA website. SECR to take the comments made at SEAC-28 into account in the next revision of the Framework.
5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Opinion development	

1) Isopropylidenediphenol (Bisphenol A) – revised draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the updated revised SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on Bisphenol A by consensus (with modifications introduced during SEAC-28).</p>	<p>Rapporteurs, together with SECR, 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>SECR to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in September 2015.</p>
2) DecaBDE – draft final opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft of the SEAC final opinion and the results of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted its final opinion on the decaBDE dossier by consensus (with modifications introduced during SEAC-28).</p>	<p>Rapporteurs, together with SECR, to do the final editing of the SEAC opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and ORCOM) is in line with the adopted SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SECR to forward the adopted opinion and its annexes to COM and publish it on the ECHA website.</p>
3) Perfluorooctanic acid (PFOA) - revised draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the updated revised SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on PFOA and its salts dossier by simple majority (with modifications introduced during SEAC-28). The dissenting views will be reflected in the minutes.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs, together with SECR, 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>SECR to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in September 2015.</p>
4) Methanol – first draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the second draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-28 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by end of October.</p>
5) D4/D5 – first draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the second draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-28 discussions, by end of October.</p>
5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
<p>SEAC was provided with an update with regard to upcoming restriction dossiers.</p>	<p>SEAC members to volunteer to the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for the upcoming restriction proposals.</p>
6. Authorisations	

6.1 General authorisation issues	
<p>SEAC discussed the Secretariat's proposal for a revised working procedure on opinion development for applications for authorisation (meeting document SEAC/28/2015/05).</p> <p>SEAC discussed the RAC and SEAC opinion trees for authorisation process compiled by the Secretariat.</p> <p>SEAC took note of the report from Authorisation Task Force and of the update on future applications.</p>	<p>SECR to consider the SEAC discussion and to table the document back to SEAC in upcoming meetings.</p> <p>SECR to organise a written commenting round in SEAC after SEAC-28 and to table an updated document on the RAC and SEAC opinion trees for discussion (and possible agreement) at SEAC-29.</p>
6.2 Authorisation applications	
a) Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of key issues	
<p>1. Six uses of chromium trioxide submitted by LANXESS Deutschland GmbH on behalf of a group of companies (Chromium trioxide 1):</p> <p>SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and discussed the key issues identified in this application.</p>	<p>SECR to inform the applicant about the conformity of the application for authorisation.</p> <p>Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in the preparation of the first version of the draft opinion.</p>
<p>2. One use of sodium chromate submitted by Dometic GMBH and Dometic Htgépgyártó és Kereskedelmi Zrt. (Sodium chromate 1):</p> <p>SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and discussed the key issues identified in this application.</p>	<p>SECR to inform the applicant about the conformity of the application for authorisation.</p> <p>Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in the preparation of the first version of the draft opinion.</p>
<p>3. One use of sodium dichromate submitted by Boliden Mineral AB (Sodium dichromate 1):</p> <p>SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and discussed the key issues identified in this application.</p>	<p>SECR to inform the applicant about the conformity of the application for authorisation.</p> <p>Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in the preparation of the first version of the draft opinion.</p>
<p>4. One use of 1,2-dichloroethane submitted by Laboratoires Expanscience (EDC 1):</p> <p>SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and discussed the key issues identified in this</p>	<p>SECR to inform the applicant about the conformity of the application for authorisation.</p> <p>Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in the preparation of the first version of the draft opinion.</p>

application.	
b) Final opinions	
<p>1. One use of trichloroethylene submitted by DOW Deutschland Anlagengesellschaft mbH (Trichloroethylene 2a):</p> <p>Rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the draft of the SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs, together with SECR, to do the final editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the final opinions to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
<p>2. One use of lead chromate submitted by Etienne LACROIX (Lead chromate 1):</p> <p>Rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the draft of the SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs, together with SECR, to do the final editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the final opinions to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
6.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)	
<p>SEAC agreed on the updated pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (considered as agreement on appointment in line with the restricted room document SEAC/28/2015/06).</p>	<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>
8. Action points and main conclusion of SEAC-28	
<p>SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-28.</p>	<p>SECR to upload the action points and main conclusions to CIRCABC IG.</p>

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-28

SEAC members
ALEXANDRE Joao
ALEXANDROPOULOU Ioanna
BENDL Jiri
BERGS Ivars
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
COGEN Simon (via WEBEX)
CSEGRŐ Robert
D'AMICO Flaviano
DANTINNE Catheline
DOUGHERTY Gary
FANKHAUSER Simone
FIORE Karine (also DS representative for BPA restriction dossier)
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIU Stavros (also DS representative for D4/D5 restriction dossier)
GRANDI Silvia (via WEBEX)
KAJIĆ Silva
KIISKI Johanna
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LOČS Jānis
LUIT Richard
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
LÜDEKE Andreas
MEXA Alexandra
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
OLTEANU Maria
RYDLEWSKA-LISZKOWSKA Izabela
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SLETTEN Thea Marcelia
SIMON Franz-Georg
SMILGIUS Tomas
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina Velinova
THIELE Karen (also DS representative for

Advisors, invited experts, observers & dossier submitters (DS)
BERNHEIM Theresa (advisor to K. Thiele, via WEBEX)
CASTELLI Stefano (advisor to F. D'Amico)
CORRELL MYHRE Ingunn [Norway] and VIERKE Lena (DS representatives for PFOA restriction dossier)
DELCOURT Benjamin (advisor to C. Dantine)
DOMINIAK Dorota (advisor to I. Rydlewska-L.)
FEYAERTS Jean-Pierre (invited expert, FR)
GIANNOTTI Francesca (invited expert, IT)
GODALA Mariusz (DS representative for Methanol restriction dossier, via WEBEX)
KOPANGEN Marit [Norway], and STAUDE Claudia and BIEGEL-ENGLER Annegret [Germany] (DS representatives for PFOA restriction dossier, via WEBEX)
HENNIG Philipp (advisor to K.Thiele)
KOPANGEN Marit, FOTLAND Tor Øystein, KJUUS Berit Eyde and TOLFSEN Christina Charlotte (Norwegian Environment Agency, via WEBEX – as experts for decaBDE restriction dossier)
LUKOSEVICIUTE Lina (PwC, accompanying Commission DG GROW observer) – AOB, SEA tool kit
MARTIN Sara (DS representative for D4/D5 restriction dossier, via WEBEX)
MARTINUSSEN SNEVE Marie (advisor to T.M. Sletten)
VERHOEVEN Julia and JONGENEEL Rob (via WEBEX) (advisors to C. Luttikhuisen, via WEBEX)

RAC (co-)rapporteurs

DUNauskiENE Lina
DUNGEY Stephen (also DS representative for D4/D5 restriction dossier)
LUND Bert-Ove
NEUMANN Michael
RUCKI Marian
STASKO Jolanta
SANTONEN Tiina
VARNAI Veda

Stakeholder observers & accompanying

PFOA restriction dossier)
THORS Åsa
Commission observers
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)
GALLEGO Mateo (DG ENV)
BERTATO Valentina (DG GROW, via WEBEX)
FERNANDES DE BARROS Mariana (DG GROW, via WEBEX)
LUVARA` Giuseppina (DG GROW, via WEBEX)
PROKES Pavel (DG GROW, via WEBEX)
ROZWADOWSKI Jacek (DG GROW, via WEBEX)

experts
BUONSANTE Vito (ClientEarth)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
MUSU Tony (ETUC)
SANTOS OTERO Tatiana (EEB)
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)
BOCK Ronald (Chemours (DuPont), FluoroCouncil representative), accompanying CEFIC observer – PFOA restriction dossier
ERLER Steffen (Saudi Arabian Industries Corporation (SABIC), accompanying CEFIC observer – Methanol restriction dossier
MICHAUX Michel (Brominated Compounds Consortium), accompanying CEFIC observer – DecaBDE restriction dossier
VERBIESE Nicole (Reconsile), accompanying CEFIC observer – D4/D5 restriction dossier
LYONS Fiona (European Semiconductor Industry Association (EECA-ESIA)) – PFOA restriction dossier

ECHA staff
BERGES Markus
BLAINEY Mark
HENRICHSON Sanna
JACQUEMIN Katline
KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia
KIOKIAS Sotirios
KIVELÄ Kalle
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
LEGZDIŃA Ilze
LIOPA Elīna
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORŽS Arnis
MAROSVOLGYI Nikoletta
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MAZZOLINI Anna
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
MOTTET Denis
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
ÖBERG Tomas
PELTOLA Jukka
PILLET Monique
RHEINBERGER Christoph
RODRIGUEZ IGLESIAS Pilar
ROGGEMAN Maarten
SADAM Diana
SHUQOM Natasha
SIMPSON Peter
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
VAINIO Matti
VAN HAELST Aniek

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/28/2015</i>
Report on SEAC-27 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies (AP 4a)	<i>SEAC/28/2015/01</i>
General SEAC procedures: Admission of stakeholder organisations (AP 4b)	<i>SEAC/28/2015/02</i> <i>RESTRICTED</i>
General SEAC procedures: Co-opted members (AP 4b)	<i>SEAC/28/2015/03</i> <i>RESTRICTED</i>
General restriction issues: Framework for RAC and SEAC in checking conformity and developing opinions on restriction proposals (AP 5.1)	<i>SEAC/28/2015/04</i>
General authorisation issues: Working procedure on opinion development (AP 6.1c)	<i>SEAC/28/2015/05</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (AP 6.3)	<i>SEAC/28/2015/06</i> <i>RESTRICTED ROOM DOCUMENT</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):

Name of participant	Agenda item	Interest declared
BERNHEIM Teresa	5.2a-3 PFOA	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
BRIGNON Jean-Marc	5.2a-1 Bisphenol A	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
DOMINIAC Dorota	5.2a-4 Methanol	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
DOUGHERTY Gary	5.2a-5 D4/D5	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
IORE-TARDIEU Karine	5.2a-1 Bisphenol A	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
GEORGIU Stavros	5.2a-5 D4/D5	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
KIISKI Johanna	5.2a-4 Methanol	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
MARTINUSSEN SNEVE Marie	5.2a-2 DecaBDE	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
	5.2a-3 PFOA	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
SLETTEN Thea Marcelia	5.2a-2 DecaBDE	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
	5.2a-3 PFOA	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
THIELE Karen	5.2a-3 PFOA	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier

Final Agenda

28th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

8-11 September 2015

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

8 September: starts at 14:00

11 September: ends at 13:30

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/28/2015
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-27 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

SEAC/28/2015/01
For information

- b) General SEAC procedures (closed session)

- Admission of stakeholder organisations

SEAC/28/2015/02 (restricted)
For discussion and agreement

- Co-opted members

SEAC/28/2015/03 (restricted)
For discussion and agreement

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 General restriction issues

- a) Framework for RAC and SEAC in checking conformity and developing opinions on restriction proposals

SEAC/28/2015/04
For discussion and agreement

5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) Opinion development
 - 1) Isopropylidenediphenol (Bisphenol A) – revised draft opinion
For agreement
 - 2) DecaBDE - draft final opinion
For adoption
 - 3) Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) - revised draft opinion
For agreement
 - 4) Methanol – first draft opinion
For discussion
 - 5) D4/D5 - first draft opinion
For discussion

5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

For information

Item 6 – Authorisations

6.1 General authorisation issues

- a) Continuing review of SEAC and RAC recommendations
For discussion
- b) Report from Authorisation Task Force
For information
- c) Working Procedure on opinion development
SEAC/28/2015/05
For discussion and agreement
- d) Update on incoming/future applications for authorisation
For information

6.2 Authorisation applications

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

2. One use of sodium chromate submitted by *Dometic GMBH and Dometic Htgépgyártó és Kereskedelmi Zrt.* (**Sodium chromate 1**):

Use 1: The use of sodium chromate as an anticorrosion agent of the carbon steel cooling system in absorption refrigerators up to 0.75% by weight (Cr 6+) in the cooling solution.

3. One use of sodium dichromate submitted by *Boliden Mineral AB* (**Sodium dichromate 1**):

Use 1: The use of sodium dichromate in copper/lead separation in concentrators handling complex sulphide ores.

4. One use of 1,2-dichloroethane submitted by *Laboratoires Expanscience* (**EDC 1**):

Use 1: process and extracting solvent in fine chemical processes

For discussion/agreement

b) Final opinions

1. One use of trichloroethylene submitted by *DOW Deutschland Anlagengesellschaft mbH* (**Trichloroethylene 2a**):

Use 1: Use of Trichloroethylene in Industrial Parts Cleaning by Vapour Degreasing in Closed Systems where specific requirements (system of use-parameters) exist

2. One use of lead chromate submitted by *Etienne LACROIX* (**Lead chromate 1**):

Use 1: Industrial use of lead chromate in manufacture of pyrotechnical delay devices contained into ammunition for naval self-protection

For adoption

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

SEAC/28/2015/06

(restricted room document)

For agreement

Item 7 – AOB

- a) Update of the work plan
- b) SEA tool kit

- c) Information by the Commission on the benefits indicators study
- d) Information on NL project: Costs of ED related health effects

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-28

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-28

For adoption