

SEAC/M/11/2011 FINAL

FINAL

Minutes of the 11th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

14-16 June 2011

I. Summary Record of the Proceeding

1) Welcome and apologies

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

The Chair informed that apologies had been received from two members. Members' advisers present at the meeting as well as observers of the European Commission (COM), observers of six stakeholder organisations, RAC (co-)rapporteurs and a dossier submitter representative participating to the meeting were introduced. The Chair informed that additional RAC (co-) rapporteurs and dossier submitter representatives were to follow relevant parts of the meeting via teleconference. The Chair also mentioned that the meeting would be recorded and the records would be destroyed after the adoption of the minutes.

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

2) Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair introduced the draft Agenda of SEAC-11. The following suggestions for additional items to discuss under AOB had been made prior to the meeting:

- Evaluation of SEAC's work with the first Restriction proposals;
- Information on EAERE Conference;
- Information on Network of Experts on benefits and Economic Instruments;
- Update on RAC discussions regarding non-threshold substances.

The items had been included in the revised Agenda apart from the update on RAC discussions regarding non-threshold substances that was to be covered under the agenda point 9 on authorisations.

The Agenda was adopted without any further changes. The Agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

The Chair requested members and their advisors to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Five members and two advisors declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions in the agenda items 7.2.a) (two members, one advisor), 7.2.b) (two members, one advisor) and 7.2.c) (one member,) and 7.2.e) (two members, one advisor).

The list with declared conflicts of interest is given in Annex II.

4) Administrative issues

a) Changes in the SEAC composition

The Chair informed that since the last SEAC meeting, the following members have joined the Committee:

Greece	Angela LADOPOULOU
Bulgaria	Elina Velinova STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA

Poland

Zbigniew Tomasz ŚLEZAK

Moreover, the Chair informed that since the last SEAC meeting, the following member's membership has been renewed:

Greece

Dimosthenis VOIVONTAS

The Chair informed that she would resign as Chair of the Committee but will probably chair the next meeting in September.

b) Outcome of written procedures

The Chair updated the Committee on the recent written procedure for the adoption of the SEAC-10 minutes and informed that the minutes were adopted by consensus.

c) Independence of the Committee

The Chair reminded SEAC that to protect the members' independence they are encouraged to be highly cautious when being approached by industry or other stakeholder organizations on ongoing dossiers. Should members receive such invitations they are asked to immediately contact the ECHA Secretariat and to refer the organization to the ECHA Secretariat. As the names of SEAC members are publically available, the contact cannot be excluded. It was highlighted by several members that valuable information could be retrieved through contact with industry and NGOs. The discussions of specific dossiers between members and stakeholders should not take place without involvement of the ECHA Secretariat to ensure contacts are made in a coordinated and transparent manner respecting the rights of equal treatment.

5) Status report of the action points of SEAC-10

The Secretariat provided an update of the status of the SEAC-10 action points and main conclusions. The Secretariat reported that all actions had been completed on time.

6) Feedback from other bodies and activities

The Chair informed that a room document was distributed with updates from the ECHA Committees and Forum as well as from the Management Board.

7) Restrictions

7.1) General restriction issues

a) Update of the registry of intentions

The Chair informed SEAC that no new intentions have been registered at this point in time.

b) Comments from the Commission related to General restriction issues

A room document (SEAC/11/2011/06) was distributed at the meeting in which the Commission presented a number of preliminary comments on the first opinions of RAC and SEAC. The comments were given, without questioning the independence of the Committee, in order to provide assistance to the Committees in drafting the opinions on restriction proposals and supporting them with sound justifications.

The Commission observers presented the main comments of the Commission on the first four restriction dossiers. These comments touched upon e.g. the need for clarity and consistency of the RAC and SEAC opinions and a strict distinction between the remits of RAC and SEAC.

Among the comments, the Commission furthermore pointed out that the remits of the Committees are to provide scientific advice and the legal text should not be in focus of the Committees' elaborations.

SEAC discussed these comments and asked for clarification on how to deal best with synergies between REACH and other pieces of legislation to which the Commission responded that the best place to refer to other legislation is in the Background Document as the Committees are to focus on REACH restriction proposals in their opinions. Some members argued that the opinion of the Committees is also a good place to refer to other legislation.

7.2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) DMFu – draft version of final opinion

The rapporteur presented the comments that were received during the public consultation on the draft opinion of SEAC. SEAC agreed with the rapporteurs that, on the basis of the comments, no modifications were needed to prepare the draft version of final opinion of SEAC.

A discussion followed on how best to refer to comments from the public consultation in the final documentation on the restriction proposals. SEAC agreed that the strategy of the Secretariat to include a subchapter in the Background Document in part G “Stakeholder consultation” was a good way forward. However, SEAC also expressed its preference not to refer to the exact outcome of the public consultation in the opinion document as such. SEAC proposed to change the word “views” to “comments” in the sentence referring to the consultation in the draft opinion in the template for restriction opinions.

Members of SEAC asked the Secretariat about the steps after the adoption of the opinion of SEAC. The Secretariat informed SEAC on the documents that are to be sent to COM, the cover letter, the opinion, the BD and the RCOMs. The Secretariat informed SEAC that an explanatory note would be attached to this package to explain the development of the opinion from a process, scientific and technical point of view. Following this information, SEAC expressed the wish that rapporteurs would be consulted on this note prior to sending it to the Commission.

SEAC adopted the opinion on the restriction proposal on DMFu. The Secretariat informed that it would publish the final opinion and the BD and the RCOM on the ECHA website and forward the opinion and its relevant attachments to the Commission.

b) Lead and its compounds in jewellery - final draft opinion

The rapporteur presented the outcome of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion. The rapporteur gave a short overview of the comments received during the public consultation, concentrating on the issues likely to have implications on the SEAC opinion and pointing out the aspects where RAC's views would be desired. The way forward was proposed, including possible derogations for inner parts of watches and enamel jewellery.

The following discussion pointed out the lack of information, in particular information on migration, to justify potential derogation for enamelled jewellery. COM indicated that the involvement of RAC at this stage is formally not possible due to the existing legal framework. COM informed of ongoing internal discussions on this issue. The Chair emphasized the need for informal cooperation with RAC rapporteurs in order to fill in the data gaps when developing the SEAC opinion for this restriction proposal. However, without additional information RAC rapporteurs would not be able to develop the needed advice. Submitters of the comments related to enamelled jewellery and crystals would be contacted by the Secretariat to obtain additional information.

An adviser to a SEAC member pointed out that a comment criticising the lead content derived from the migration data in RAC opinion had implications also on the validity of the SEAC calculation of health impacts. The Chair noted that similarly this issue would need to be addressed via informal contacts to the RAC rapporteurs.

A comment related to the implementation period was considered covered by the paragraph 3 of the restriction proposal supported by the SEAC draft opinion.

An ad-hoc working group convened in the margins of the plenary meeting in order to further develop rapporteurs' proposals and identify additional questions for the submitters of the comments related to enamel jewellery and crystals. The ad-hoc working group expressed their support for the derogation of the inner parts of the watches.

The Chair noted that the first version of the SEAC final opinion, taking into account comments received in the public consultation on the draft opinion, would be developed and submitted by the rapporteurs by 12 August 2011. Following the submission, it would be circulated to SEAC for possible comments with an aim for adoption in the next SEAC meeting.

c) Phenylmercury compounds – 4th version of SEAC draft opinion

The Secretariat briefly presented the conclusions of the webinar that was held on May 20 2011, on keeping the manufacturing of phenylmercury compounds in the scope of the restriction proposal. During the webinar participants concluded a) that the overall enforceability, monitorability and practicality would improve by keeping manufacturing in the scope of the proposal, b) the efficiency of the restriction would also benefit from keeping manufacturing in the scope and c) the benefits of including manufacturing in the scope of the proposal are substantial and alternatives seem to be technically and economically viable.

The Chair announced the change of rapporteurs responsible of the dossier. SEAC agreed on the proposed changes.

The SEAC rapporteur introduced SEAC to the main changes made to the SEAC draft opinion. Comments from the public consultation and SEAC members, responses to these and their implications on the SEAC draft opinion were discussed. SEAC was also informed about the outcome of the discussion at RAC-16, including the arguments made by RAC for keeping manufacturing in the scope of the restriction.

The RAC rapporteur explained the justification from RAC to include manufacturing in the scope of the restriction proposal. Following the adoption of the RAC opinion, the SEAC rapporteurs had updated the calculation relevant for keeping manufacturing in the scope of the restriction. SEAC discussed the arguments made in the justification.

The justification for inclusion of manufacturing from a socio-economic point of view was improved during the meeting. An analysis was presented which considered what percentage of non-EU users that would have to substitute to mercury-free alternatives for the costs of the restriction to equal its benefits assuming different patterns of long range transport defining how much of mercury emissions from abroad would come back to EU. The outcome of that analysis strongly depends on the choice of the substitution rate, the unit benefits values for mercury emissions avoided as well as the amount of emissions coming back to the EU.

SEAC considered that, given that the costs calculations do not take into account the indications that exports will cease anyway, costs are probably overestimated. SEAC

furthermore considered that benefits could be underestimated, given that additional factors such as global impacts, occupational health and environmental benefits could not be quantified but are expected to be substantial.

On the basis of the abovementioned analysis and SEAC's considerations concerning the estimation of costs and benefits, SEAC concluded that it seems that the costs of the restriction are not disproportionate to the benefits.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinion for the phenylmercury compounds. It was also agreed that the Secretariat and the rapporteurs would make the necessary changes in the BD to make it in line with the SEAC draft opinion. The Secretariat informed that it would launch the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.

d) Mercury in measuring devices – 4th version of SEAC draft opinion

The rapporteur gave an overview of the process since the SEAC-10 meeting, the remaining points for SEAC consideration and an explanation of the latest changes in the draft opinion proposed for SEAC agreement. The key discussion topics on the draft opinion at SEAC-11 consisted of a) a text addition clarifying that the entry refers to devices for industrial and professional uses, b) possibilities to clarify to which "standards" the proposed derogation for laboratory thermometers refers to and c) a proposal to add a new derogation for the measuring devices which are to be displayed in exhibitions for cultural and historical purposes. The new derogation was proposed following the RAC decision to accommodate comments from public consultation and from RAC on the subject. As the change to the derogation for historical devices was agreed by RAC during its plenary meeting in June there had been no time to consult with the SEAC rapporteurs. Therefore the SEAC draft opinion differs from the RAC opinion on this point.

SEAC members discussed the proposed changes in the draft opinion and proposed minor editorial improvements in the justifications section. They agreed not to use any descriptor to clarify the word "standards" in the proposed derogation. Members also supported the proposal to add the new derogation for devices with cultural and historical value.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinion for the restriction of mercury in measuring devices. It was also agreed that the Secretariat would make the necessary changes in the BD to make it in line with the SEAC draft opinion. The Secretariat informed that it would launch the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.

e) Phthalates

The Secretariat gave a brief overview of the Annex XV dossier proposing a restriction for four phthalates (Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, EC No 204-211-0 CAS No 117-81-7; Benzyl butyl phthalate, EC No 201-622-7, CAS No 85-68-7; Dibutyl phthalate, EC No 201-557-4, CAS No 84-74-2; Diisobutyl phthalate, EC No 201-553-2, CAS No 84-69-5). The proposal was submitted by the Danish authorities in April 2011 and it aims to restrict the placing on the market of articles intended for use indoors and articles that may come into direct contact with the skin or mucous membranes containing the four phthalates in a concentration greater than 0.1% by weight of any plasticised material. The Secretariat also presented an update from the discussions at the RAC-16 meeting and informed that RAC concluded that the dossier had not been in conformity with the requirements of the Annex XV of the REACH Regulation.

The SEAC co-rapporteur presented the final draft outcome of the conformity check and members' comments received during the conformity check. The co-rapporteur reported that although the restriction report was elaborate, there were essential shortcomings due to which

the (co-)rapporteurs concluded that the dossier was not in conformity with the requirements of Annex XV of the REACH Regulation. The co-rapporteur clarified that the dossier was found non-conforming in particular due to deficiencies in a) the description of the scope of the restriction proposal, b) information on uses and exposure, c) assessment of the effectiveness (proportionality), practicality and monitorability of the proposal and d) background information on the scope and conditions of the restriction. The reasons for non-conformity are clarified in the conformity report.

There was general support and appreciation by the members to the conformity check report, the recommendations and the conclusions drawn.

It was stressed that there is a need for a careful balancing act between assessing the conformity of the dossier and evaluation. It was recognised this was not straightforward, and the new conformity check template and guidance were considered as improvements in this respect. It was reminded that public consultation is a part of the process intended to generate more information and an adviser to a member warned that conformity check could become an obstacle for Member States to prepare restriction proposals.

The conformity report was amended to clarify the reasoning of non-conformity regarding the assessment of the effectiveness of the proposed restriction in particular in relation to the information on health and environmental impacts.

SEAC decided that the Annex XV dossier proposing a restriction for four phthalates is not in conformity with the requirements of Annex XV for the relevant parts for SEAC, in accordance with Article 69(4) of the REACH Regulation. The Secretariat informed that it would communicate the SEAC outcome of the conformity check of the dossier on the four phthalates, together with the RAC one to the dossier submitter by 15 June 2011.

9) Authorisations

a) Outcome from call for expression of interest

The item was postponed to SEAC-12.

b) Formulation of SEAC's opinion on authorisation applications

The Chair of RAC summarised the discussion in RAC-16 on assessment of non-threshold substances. SEAC was informed about the different approaches discussed in RAC and how RAC could present the results of their assessment to SEAC.

One stakeholder observer complemented the report of the Chair of RAC and informed SEAC on the discussions that took place in RAC-16 on the DMEL concept. The observer pointed out that neither RAC nor SEAC should decide on the level of acceptable risk and that this needs to be defined at a political level. The Secretariat pointed out that what is important for SEAC to know is the remaining risk which ultimately has to be compared to societal benefits.

The Secretariat furthermore pointed out that, in comparison to the work on restrictions, the work on authorisation applications should be based on the assessment of the applications as presented by the applicants, the Committee and its rapporteurs are not expected to refine the assessments or produce new calculations.

The Chair proposed to discuss the co-operation between RAC and SEAC concerning applications for authorisations, including methodological issues, in a joint session of RAC and SEAC in the meetings of September 2011.

SEAC raised several issues related to carrying out the assessment of applications of authorisation such as: handling large amounts of dossiers, setting of standards of the Committees' work and the difference between private and social costs. It was noted that such issues need to be addressed during the capacity building exercise that the Secretariat organises.

The Secretariat asked SEAC to consider its needs for handling authorisation applications further and provide ideas/suggestion to the Secretariat. The Secretariat would open a SEAC CIRCA IG newsgroup for members to send in ideas/suggestions for capacity building to the Secretariat.

- **Format of an opinion**

The Secretariat presented the main changes in the note and the format of the opinions of RAC and SEAC on applications for authorisation following the commenting rounds in RAC and SEAC after their meetings in March 2010. Following this presentation SEAC discussed both issues related to assessment of the applications as well as the format of the opinion.

In the discussion on the format of the opinion SEAC concluded that the comments to improve the document were taken into account in the revised format of the opinion. Members discussed the flexibility the format provides for e.g. making additional remarks. The Secretariat stressed the importance of good collaboration with RAC and the harmonisation of e.g. conditions that are set.

SEAC agreed to the format of the opinion on authorisation applications. The Secretariat agreed to upload the agreed format to the SEAC CIRCA IG.

10) AOB

a) Update of the workplan

The Secretariat presented the SEAC workplan for the rest of 2011 with regard to the restriction dossiers. The Secretariat would distribute the updated workplan via the SEAC CIRCA IG so that members could get acquainted with it

b) Collecting experiences on restriction dossiers

The Secretariat informed SEAC about its plans to evaluate the work on restrictions following the processing of the first four restriction dossiers and how SEAC (and RAC) would be involved in this. SEAC discussed how a further evaluation of the restriction work (with e.g. focus on the role and purpose of the conformity check, adjustments in the background document, role of the rapporteurs dialogues, usefulness of templates, further development of SEA methodology, etc) could be set up.

The Secretariat proposed to prepare a first draft of a plan for further evaluation of the work of the Committees on the processing of restriction dossiers. The Secretariat considered setting up a Newsgroup on this and to collect ideas and first reactions on the first draft of the abovementioned plan. Following this the Secretariat could then present a draft plan at SEAC-12 (in collaboration with RAC) on how an evaluation of the restriction work can be carried out.

c) Information on EAERE conference

This item was not addressed due to timing issues.

d) Network of Experts on Benefits and Economic Instruments (NEBEI)

A stakeholder observer representative presented the background of NEBEI and briefly explained the relevance of NEBEI’s work to the SEAC work and updated SEAC on its activities since SEAC-10. The observer informed SEAC about the responses to a survey concerning the re-launch of the NEBEI. There seemed to be support for the re-launch of the network but it was suggested that at this stage it should limit its scope to air pollution only. NEBEI would continue to organise technical meetings and invited interested parties to contribute to these meetings on an individual basis. The observer would continue to update SEAC on NEBEI’s activities.

11) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-11

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

II. Conclusions and action points

MAIN CONCLUSIONS & ACTION POINTS - SEAC-11, 14-16 June 2011,

Agenda point	
Conclusions/decisions/minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
2. Adoption of the agenda	
The revised agenda (SEAC/A/11/2011_rev.1) was adopted.	SEAC-Secretariat has uploaded the revised agenda to the SEAC CIRCA IG as part of the meeting minutes.
3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda	
Conflicts of interest were declared and were taken to the minutes.	
4. Administrative issues	
5. Status of the action points of SEAC-10	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-10.	
6. Feedback from other bodies	
7. Restrictions	
1)General restriction issues	
a) Principles for changes of (Co-)rapporteurs for ongoing dossiers	
SEAC agreed in principle on the proposal of the Secretariat on how to deal with changes in membership and consecutive changes in rapporteurship but requested more time to consider the proposal.	The Secretariat to upload the document to the SEAC CIRCA IG and to launch a newsgroup and give SEAC three weeks to send in comments.

<p>SEAC was informed about the withdrawal of a rapporteur for the phenylmercury dossier.</p> <p>SEAC agreed to the proposal of the Secretariat to appoint the current co-rapporteur as a rapporteur for the phenylmercury dossier.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the proposal of the Secretariat to appoint the advisor of the former rapporteur, who is now a SEAC member, as a co-rapporteur for the phenylmercury dossier.</p>	
b) Dealing with comments from the public consultation on SEAC's draft opinion	
<p>SEAC was informed of the strategy the Secretariat proposed on how to deal with comments from the public consultation.</p> <p>SEAC pointed out that when the rapporteurs were responding to the comments that should be done as soon as possible and not within one week.</p>	<p>Secretariat to take into account the comments of SEAC when dealing with comments from the public consultation.</p> <p>Secretariat to take into account of the proposed strategy in the revision of the templates and working procedures for the processing of restriction dossiers.</p>
c) Independence of SEAC members	
<p>SEAC discussed the issue of independence of the Committee and its members.</p>	
2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) draft final opinion of SEAC on DMFu	
<p>SEAC expressed the wish that rapporteurs are consulted on the 'Note to the Commission' concerning the processing of the dossier.</p> <p>SEAC agreed to make a change in the template of the opinion, i.e. to change the word 'views' to 'comments' in the sentence concerning the feedback on the consultation on the draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed to delete the reference to the comments from the public consultation in the opinion document.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion on DMFu.</p>	<p>The Secretariat to publish the final opinion of SEAC on DMFu on the ECHA website and to forward it to the Commission.</p>
b) final opinion of SEAC on Lead and its compounds	
<p>SEAC discussed the comments that were</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to deliver first version of the</p>

<p>received in the public consultation as well as the proposals of the rapporteurs on how to deal with these comments.</p> <p>Rapporteurs indicated that some of the senders of comments concerning enamelled jewellery and crystals will be contacted to obtain further information.</p>	<p>final opinion by 12th August.</p> <p>SEAC final opinion is to be adopted at SEAC-12.</p>
<p>c) fourth version of the SEAC draft opinion on Phenylmercury</p>	
<p>SEAC was given a presentation on the outcomes of the webinar that took place on 20 May 2011.</p> <p>SEAC discussed the changes made in the final draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on phenylmercury.</p>	<p>Secretariat to launch a public consultation on the draft opinion.</p>
<p>d) fourth version of the SEAC draft opinion on Mercury in measuring devices</p>	
<p>SEAC discussed the main changes made to the draft opinion of SEAC.</p> <p>SEAC agreed to the draft opinion on mercury in measuring devices.</p>	<p>Secretariat to launch a public consultation on the draft opinion.</p>
<p>e) Phthalates – outcome of conformity check</p>	
<p>SEAC decided that the Annex XV dossier proposing a restriction for four phthalates is not in conformity with the requirements of Annex XV for the relevant parts for SEAC, in accordance with Article 69(4) of the REACH Regulation. The dossier was found not in conformity in particular due to shortcomings in the definition of the scope of the proposal for the restriction, and due to gaps in the information on use and exposure. These shortcomings cause problems in assessing the effectiveness, practicality and monitorability of the restriction proposal.</p> <p>SEAC agreed to the draft conformity report with the changes proposed by SEAC.</p>	<p>Secretariat to communicate to the dossier submitter the SEAC outcome of the conformity check of the dossier on the four phthalates, together with the outcome in RAC by 15 June 2011.</p>
<p>9. Authorisations</p>	
<p>b) formulation of SEAC's opinion on authorisation applications</p>	
<p>The Chair of RAC summarised the</p>	<p>SEAC to consider their needs for</p>

discussion on non-threshold substances and the issues related to non-threshold substances. It was decided to have a joint session of RAC and SEAC discussing this issue in September 2011.	information from RAC for handling authorisation applications further and provide ideas/suggestion to the Secretariat.
Format of an opinion	
<p>There was some discussion about the principles about how to formulate the opinion. It was noted that such issues need to be addressed during the capacity building exercise.</p> <p>SEAC agreed to the format of the Committees' opinions on authorisation applications.</p>	<p>Secretariat to upload the agreed format to the SEAC CIRCA IG.</p> <p>Secretariat to open a SEAC CIRCA IG Newsgroup for members to send in ideas/suggestions for capacity building to the Secretariat.</p>
10. AOB	
Collecting experiences on restriction cases	
<p>SEAC was informed about the Secretariat's plans to evaluate the work with the first restriction dossiers.</p> <p>SEAC discussed how a further evaluation of the Committee's work on the restriction dossiers (with e.g. focus on conformity check and other elements) could be set-up (as earlier agreed upon in SEAC-7).</p>	<p>Secretariat to present a draft plan at SEAC-12 (in collaboration with RAC) on how an evaluation of the restriction work could be carried out.</p> <p>Secretariat to consider setting up a SEAC CIRCA IG Newsgroup to collect ideas and first reactions on the first draft of the abovementioned plan.</p>
11. Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-11	
SEAC agreed on the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-11.	Secretariat to upload the action points and main conclusions to the SEAC CIRCA IG.

III. List of Attendees

SEAC Members
BENDL Jiri
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
CECCARELLI Federica
DALTON Marie
DANTINNE Catheline
FANKHAUSER Simone
FEYAERTS Jean-Pierre
IORE-TARDIEU Karine
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros
GRANDI Silvia
KIISKI Johanna
LADOPOULOU Angela
LANGTVET Espen
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SIMON Franz-Georg
SKARŽINSKAS Vitalius
ŚLEZAK Zbigniew Tomasz
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina Velinova
THIELE Karen
THORS Åsa
VARIZ Paulo
VOIVONTAS Dimosthenis

RAC (co)-Rapporteurs
JENSEN Frank (Also advisor to L. Fock)
LARSEN Poul Bo (Via Webex)
LE CURIEUX-BELFOND Olivier
LUND Bert-Ove (Via Webex)
SCHULTE Agnes (Via Webex)
PRONK Marja (Via Webex)
VAN MALDEREN Karen (Via Webex)

Invited Experts
FORKMAN Mats (SEAC co-rapporteur)
KNOFLACH Georg

European Commission
KUBICKI Michal
VLANDAS Penelope

Advisors, Dossier Submitters (DS) & Observers
ALEXANDRE João (Advisor to P. Variz)
BEEKMAN Martijn (Advisor to C. Luttkhuizen)
CAUCHI Jonathan (Observer)
CAVALIERI Luisa (Advisor to K. Fiore-Tardieu)
D'AMICO Flaviano (Advisor to S. Grandi)
HENNIG Philipp (Advisor to K. Thiele)
IRSFELD Brigitte (Advisor to F-G. Simon)
KOPANGEN Marit (Phenylmercury DS representative, via Webex)
MONFORT Donatienne (Advisor to C. Dantine)
MORKA Heidi (Phenylmercury DS representative)
PAPPONEN Hinni (Advisor to J. Kiiski)
SALONEN Heikki (Advisor to J. Kiiski)
VAN DEN HAGEN Marianne (Phenylmercury DS representative, via Webex)
VERHOEVEN Julia (Advisor to C. Luttkhuizen)

Stakeholder Observers
BROUWER Roy (EAERE)
HOLLAND Mike (EEB)
KÜHN Ingolf (Business Europe)
MÄKELÄ Kari (EMCEF)
MUSU Tony (ETUC)
VYBOLDINA Elena (CEFIC)

ECHA staff
ANFALT Lisa
KIVELA Kalle
LIPKOVA Adriana
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LOGHIN Sorina
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
MOSSINK Jos
MULLER Birgit
PARADA SUAREZ Diana
PELTOLA Jukka
RODRIGUEZ-IGLESIAS Pilar
SIHVONEN Kirsi
STOYANOVA Evgenia
SAEZ Monica
SHUQOM Natasha
TARAZONA Jose
THUVANDER Ann
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

ANNEX I

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

Revised draft agenda SEAC-11	<i>SEAC/A/11/2011</i>
Feedback from other bodies and activities	<i>SEAC/11/2011/01(room document)</i>
Principles for changes of (Co-)rapporteurs for ongoing dossiers	<i>SEAC/11/2011/02 (room document)</i>
Dealing with comments coming from the public consultation on SEAC's draft opinion.	<i>SEAC/11/2011/03 (room document)</i>
Outcome from Call for expressions of interest	<i>SEAC/11/2011/04 (room document)</i>
The opinions of RAC and SEAC on Applications for Authorisation	<i>SEAC/11/2011/05</i>
Comments from the Commission related to general restriction issues	<i>SEAC/10/2011/06 (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 Art 9(2) of the SEAC Rules of Procedure):

<u>Name of participant</u>	<u>Agenda item</u>
BRIGNON Jean-Marc	7.2.a DMFu 7.2.b Lead and its compounds
CAVALIERI Luisa	7.2.a DMFu 7.2.b Lead and its compounds
FIORE-TARDIEU Karine	7.2.a DMFu 7.2.b Lead and its compounds
FOCK Lars	7.2.e Phthalates
JENSEN Frank	7.2.e Phthalates
LANGTVET Espen	7.2.c Phenylmercury compounds
ŚLEZAK Zbigniew Tomasz	7.2.e Phthalates

13 June 2011
SEAC/A/11/2011

Final Agenda
11th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

14-16 June 2011
ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)
14 June: starts at 14:00
16 June: ends at 18:00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/11/2011
For adoption

Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

Item 4 – Administrative issues

- a) Changes in the SEAC composition
- b) Outcome of written procedures
- c) Independence of the Committee

For information

Item 5 – Status report of the action points of SEAC-10

For information

Item 6 – Feedback from other bodies and activities

SEAC/11/2011/01

Item 7 – Restrictions

7.1 General restriction issues

- a) Update on intended restriction dossiers
- b) Principles for changes of (Co-)rapporteurs for ongoing dossiers

SEAC/11/2011/02

For agreement

- c) Dealing with comments coming from the public consultation on SEAC's draft opinion
SEAC/11/2011/03
For information

- d) Comments from Commission related to general restriction issues

SEAC/11/2011/06
For information

7.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) DMFu – final draft opinion

For adoption

- b) Lead and its compounds in jewellery - final draft opinion

For discussion

- c) Phenyl mercury compounds – fourth version of SEAC draft opinion

For agreement

- d) Mercury in measuring devices – fourth version of SEAC draft opinion

For agreement

- e) Phthalates – outcome of the conformity check

For agreement

Item 9 – Authorisations

- a) Outcome from Call for expression of interest

SEAC/11/2011/04
For information

- b) Formulation of SEAC opinion on authorisation applications
- Format of an opinion

SEAC/11/2011/05
For agreement

Item 10 – AOB

- a) Update of the work-plan
b) Evaluation of SEAC's work with the first Restriction proposals
c) Information on EAERE Conference
d) Information on Network of Experts on benefits and Economic Instruments

Item 11 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-11

Table with Action points and conclusions from SEAC-11

For adoption