Section A9 Annex Point IIA, IX	Classification and labelling	Official use only
9.1 Current classification according to Directive 67/548/EEC	Burnt dolomitic lime is not currently included in Annex I of Council Directive 67/548/EEC or in Annex VI of Regulation EC/1272/2008 (Classification, Labelling and Packaging Regulation).	
9.2 Proposed classification		
	The Applicant presented the current classification for burnt dolomitic lime in Doc II-A of their submission.	
	Class of Danger: Xi: Irritant	
	Risk Phrases: R38: Irritating to skin	
	R41: Risk of serious damage to eyes	
	R37: Irritating to respiratory system	
		X
	The Applicant also indicated that this classification would trigger the following safety phrases:	
	S2: Keep out of reach of children.	
	S25: Avoid contact with eyes.	
	S26: In case of contact with eyes, rinse immediately with plenty of water and seek medical advice. S37: Wear suitable gloves. S39: Wear eye/face protection.	
	Evaluation by Competent Authorities	

	Evaluation by Competent Authorities
	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted
	EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE
Date	24 <sup>th</sup> February 2010
Conclusion	Section 9.2
	The UK CA agrees with the applicant's proposed classification.
	The UK CA has not considered the safety phrases, and has not included them in the CA report, because they are triggered by the classification and do not need to be discussed specifically.
Acceptability	Acceptable
Remarks	None
	COMMENTS FROM
Date	Give date of comments submitted
Materials and Methods	Discuss additional relevant discrepancies referring to the (sub)heading number and to applicant's summary and conclusion.
	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Results and discussion	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Conclusion	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Reliability	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Acceptability	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
The state of the s	

Burnt lime is not currently included in Annex I of Council Directive 67/548/EEC or in Annex VI of Regulation EC/1272/2008	
(Classification, Labelling and Packaging Regulation).	
The Applicant presented the current classification for burnt lime in Doc II-A of their submission.	
Class of Danger: Xi: Irritant	
Risk Phrases: R38: Irritating to skin	
R41: Risk of serious damage to eyes	
R37: Irritating to respiratory system	
The Applicant also indicated that this classification would trigger the following safety phrases:	X
A STATE OF THE STA	
S25: Avoid contact with eyes.	
S26: In case of contact with eyes, rinse immediately with plenty of water and seek medical advice. S37: Wear suitable gloves. S39: Wear eye/face protection.	
<b>Evaluation by Competent Authorities</b>	
	II-A of their submission.  Class of Danger: Xi: Irritant  Risk Phrases: R38: Irritating to skin R41: Risk of serious damage to eyes R37: Irritating to respiratory system  The Applicant also indicated that this classification would trigger the following safety phrases: S2: Keep out of reach of children. S25: Avoid contact with eyes. S26: In case of contact with eyes, rinse immediately with plenty of water and seek medical advice. S37: Wear suitable gloves. S39: Wear eye/face protection.

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Evaluation by Competent Authorities
	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted
	EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE
Date	24 <sup>th</sup> February 2010
Conclusion	Section 9.2
	The UK CA agrees with the applicant's proposed classification.
	The UK CA has not considered the safety phrases, and has not included them in the CA report, because they are triggered by the classification and do not need to be discussed specifically.
Acceptability	Acceptable
Remarks	None
	COMMENTS FROM
Date	Give date of comments submitted
Materials and Methods	Discuss additional relevant discrepancies referring to the (sub)heading numbers and to applicant's summary and conclusion.  Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Results and discussion	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Conclusion	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Reliability	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Acceptability	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Remarks	

EULA AISBL	H	ydrated Dolomitic Lime	Feb 2010
Section A9 Annex Point IIA, IX	Classification	on and labelling	Official use only
9.1 Current classification according to Directive 67/548/EEC	Directive 67/54	mitic lime is not currently included in Annex I of Council 18/EEC or in Annex VI of Regulation EC/1272/2008 Labelling and Packaging Regulation).	
9.2 Proposed classification		presented the current classification for hydrated in Doc II-A of their submission.	
	Class of Dange	r: Xi: Irritant	
	Risk Phrases:	R38: Irritating to skin R41: Risk of serious damage to eyes R37: Irritating to respiratory system	22
	The Applicant following safet	also indicated that this classification would trigger the y phrases:	X
	S2: Keep out o	freach of children.	
	S25: Avoid con	ntact with eyes.	
	water and seek S37: Wear suit	contact with eyes, rinse immediately with plenty of medical advice. able gloves. face protection.	

	Evaluation by Competent Authorities
	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted
	EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE
Date	24 <sup>th</sup> February 2010
Conclusion	Section 9.2
	The UK CA agrees with the applicant's proposed classification.
	The UK CA has not considered the safety phrases, and has not included them in the CA report, because they are triggered by the classification and do not need to be discussed specifically.
Acceptability	Acceptable
Remarks	None
	COMMENTS FROM
Date	Give date of comments submitted
Materials and Methods	Discuss additional relevant discrepancies referring to the (sub)heading number and to applicant's summary and conclusion.
	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Results and discussion	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Conclusion	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Reliability	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Acceptability	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
The state of the s	

Section A9	Classification	and labelling	Official use only
Annex Point IIA, IX			
9.1 Current classification according to Directive 67/548/EEC	67/548/EEC or in	ot currently included in Annex I of Council Directive Annex VI of Regulation EC/1272/2008 belling and Packaging Regulation).	9/
9.2 Proposed classification			
	The Applicant pred Doc II-A of their s	sented the current classification for hydrated lime in aubmission.	
	Class of Danger: Y	Ki: Irritant	
	Risk Phrases: R	338: Irritating to skin	
	F	R41: Risk of serious damage to eyes	
	F	37: Irritating to respiratory system	
	The Applicant also following safety p	o indicated that this classification would trigger the hrases:	X
	S2: Keep out of re	ach of children.	
	S25: Avoid contac	t with eyes.	
	S26: In case of cor water and seek me S37: Wear suitable S39: Wear eye/fac	gloves.	
		Competent Authorities	
	Use separate "eva	luation boxes" to provide transparency as to the	

	Evaluation by Competent Authorities
	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted
	EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE
Date	24 <sup>th</sup> February 2010
Conclusion	Section 9.2
	The UK CA agrees with the applicant's proposed classification.
	The UK CA has not considered the safety phrases, and has not included them in the CA report, because they are triggered by the classification and do not need to be discussed specifically.
Acceptability	Acceptable
Remarks	None
	COMMENTS FROM
Date	Give date of comments submitted
Materials and Methods	Discuss additional relevant discrepancies referring to the (sub)heading number and to applicant's summary and conclusion.  Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Results and discussion	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Results and discussion Conclusion	
	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state
Conclusion	Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state  Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state

EULA AISBL Burnt Dolomitic Lime Feb 2010

Section 10	(Sub)heading (specify where appropriate)	
Annex Point IIA, X	SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF SECTIONS 2 TO 9	
	JUSTIFICATION FOR NON-SUBMISSION OF DATA	Official use only
	As outlined in the TNsG on data requirements, the applicant must always be able to justify the suggested exemptions from the data requirements. The justifications are to be included in the respective location (section) of the dossier.  If one of the following reasons is marked, detailed justification has to be given below. General arguments are not acceptable	
Other existing data [ ]	Technically not feasible [ ] Scientifically unjustified [ ]	
Limited exposure [ ]	Other justification [X]	
Detailed justification:	Refer to Document IIA for a summary and evaluation of the data	
	presented in Sections 2 to 9.	
Undertaking of intended data submission [ ]	Give date on which the data will be handed in later (Only acceptable if test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)	
	Evaluation by Competent Authorities	
	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted	
	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the	
Date	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted	
Date  Evaluation of applicant's justification	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE	
Evaluation of applicant's	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE	
Evaluation of applicant's justification	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010	
Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010	
Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010  Acceptable	
Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion Remarks	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE 24/02/2010  Acceptable  COMMENTS FROM OTHER MEMBER STATE (specify)	
Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion Remarks  Date Evaluation of applicant's	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010  Acceptable  COMMENTS FROM OTHER MEMBER STATE (specify)  Give date of comments submitted	

Section 10	(Sub)heading (specify where appropriate)	
Annex Point IIA, X	SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF SECTIONS 2 TO 9	
	JUSTIFICATION FOR NON-SUBMISSION OF DATA	Official use only
	As outlined in the TNsG on data requirements, the applicant must always be able to justify the suggested exemptions from the data requirements. The justifications are to be included in the respective location (section) of the dossier.  If one of the following reasons is marked, detailed justification has to be given below. General arguments are not acceptable	
Other existing data [ ]	Technically not feasible [ ] Scientifically unjustified [ ]	
Limited exposure [ ]	Other justification [X]	
Detailed justification:	Refer to Document IIA for a summary and evaluation of the data	
	presented in Sections 2 to 9.	
Undertaking of intended	Give date on which the data will be handed in later (Only acceptable if	
data submission [ ]	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)	
	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has	
	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)	
	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the	
	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted	
data submission []	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE	
Date Evaluation of applicant's	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010  Acceptable	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion Remarks	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010  Acceptable  COMMENTS FROM OTHER MEMBER STATE (specify)	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion Remarks  Date Evaluation of applicant's	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010  Acceptable  COMMENTS FROM OTHER MEMBER STATE (specify)  Give date of comments submitted	

Section 10	(Sub)heading (specify where appropriate)	
Annex Point IIA, X	SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF SECTIONS 2 TO 9	
	JUSTIFICATION FOR NON-SUBMISSION OF DATA	Official use only
	As outlined in the TNsG on data requirements, the applicant must always be able to justify the suggested exemptions from the data requirements. The justifications are to be included in the respective location (section) of the dossier.  If one of the following reasons is marked, detailed justification has to be given below. General arguments are not acceptable	
Other existing data [ ]	Technically not feasible [ ] Scientifically unjustified [ ]	
Limited exposure [ ]	Other justification [X ]	
Detailed justification:	Refer to Document IIA for a summary and evaluation of the data	
	presented in Sections 2 to 9.	
Undertaking of intended	Give date on which the data will be handed in later (Only acceptable if	
data submission [ ]	test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has agreed on the delayed data submission.)	
data submission [ ]		
data submission [ ]	agreed on the delayed data submission.)	
data submission [ ]	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the	
	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted	
Date Evaluation of applicant's	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE 24/02/2010	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE 24/02/2010	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion Remarks	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010  Acceptable	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE 24/02/2010  Acceptable  COMMENTS FROM OTHER MEMBER STATE (specify)	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion Remarks Date Evaluation of applicant's	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE 24/02/2010  Acceptable  COMMENTS FROM OTHER MEMBER STATE (specify)  Give date of comments submitted	

EULA AISBL Hydrated Lime Feb 2010

Section 10	(Sub)heading (specify where appropriate)	
Annex Point IIA, X	SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF SECTIONS 2 TO 9	
	JUSTIFICATION FOR NON-SUBMISSION OF DATA	Official use only
	As outlined in the TNsG on data requirements, the applicant must always be able to justify the suggested exemptions from the data requirements. The justifications are to be included in the respective location (section) of the dossier.  If one of the following reasons is marked, detailed justification has to be given below. General arguments are not acceptable	
Other existing data [ ]	Technically not feasible [ ] Scientifically unjustified [ ]	
Limited exposure [ ]	Other justification [X]	
Detailed justification:	Refer to Document IIA for a summary and evaluation of the data	
	presented in Sections 2 to 9.	
Undertaking of intended data submission	Give date on which the data will be handed in later (Only acceptable if test or study is already being conducted and the responsible CA has	
necessary at the	agreed on the delayed data submission.)	
3£ 4	agreed on the delayed data submission.)  Evaluation by Competent Authorities	
	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the	
Date	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted	
	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE	
Date Evaluation of applicant's	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE  24/02/2010  Acceptable	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion Remarks	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE 24/02/2010  Acceptable  COMMENTS FROM OTHER MEMBER STATE (specify)	
Date Evaluation of applicant's justification Conclusion Remarks  Date Evaluation of applicant's	Evaluation by Competent Authorities  Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted  EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE 24/02/2010  Acceptable  COMMENTS FROM OTHER MEMBER STATE (specify)  Give date of comments submitted	