

Final

**Minutes of the 13th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic
Analysis**

14 – 15 December 2011

I. Summary Record of the Proceeding

1) Welcome and apologies

Pilar Rodríguez Iglesias, Acting Chair of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants to the thirteenth meeting of SEAC.

The Chair informed the meeting that apologies had been received from four members, one invited expert, two stakeholder observers and one RAC co-rapporteur. Three invited experts, members' advisers present at the meeting as well as observers of the European Commission (COM), observers of seven stakeholder organisations, an international observer and a dossier submitter representative were introduced. The Chair informed the meeting that a SEAC member, a Forum representative, two advisors, a RAC member and a RAC-rapporteur 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-13. The following suggestions for additional items to discuss under AOB had been made prior to the meeting:

A SEAC Member asked the Secretariat to present information on ECHA's plans in terms of providing help to Authorisation applicants and on how Members contacted in this regard should respond to Authorisations' information requests. The Chair responded that this could be discussed under 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. Two members and one advisor declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions in the agenda items 8.2.

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

4) Administrative issues

a) Changes in the SEAC composition

The Chair informed the meeting that since the last SEAC meeting, the following member has joined the Committee:

Spain RODRIGUEZ DE SANCHO Maria Jesus

b) Outcome of written procedures

The Chair updated the Committee on the recent written procedure for the adoption of the SEAC-12 minutes and informed it that the minutes were adopted by consensus.

c) Report on ECHA Management Board policy on handling conflict of interests

The Chair briefly introduced the ECHA policy on handling conflict of interests which SEAC has already been informed about in the previous meeting. The policy had been adopted by the Management Board of ECHA in September 2011. A detailed presentation outlining the policy was uploaded to CIRCABC, as well as the related guidance on the policy. The

members were asked to become acquainted with the new policy and the guidance, especially with regard to what kind of interests should be declared.

With regard to a question on how to deal with handling conflict of interests with third parties, such as consultancy companies serving both government and industry, SEAC members were encouraged to declare all potential conflict of interests and to contact the Secretariat when in a doubt. If needed, this topic could be further discussed in the upcoming meetings, given the importance of the issue.

d) Update of the form on annual declaration of interest (Annex 2 of the SEAC Rules of Procedure)

SEAC agreed unanimously the proposal by the Secretariat (SEAC713/2011/02) to amend the Rules of Procedure by replacing the form for the Declaration of Interest (Annex II) with the new one adopted by the Management Board. The amendment originates from the guidance of the new policy in handling conflicts of interest. The Secretariat will inform the Management Board of the SEAC decision and provide it with the amended SEAC Rules of Procedure for adoption.

5) Status report of the action points of SEAC-12

The Secretariat provided an update of the status of the SEAC-12 action points and main conclusions. One action point from SEAC-12 remained pending, the ECETOC study will be uploaded to the ECHA website following the launch of the new website.

6) Feedback from other bodies and activities

The Chair informed that a room document (SEAC713/2011/03) had been distributed with updates from the ECHA Management Board, the Risk Assessment Committee as well as from the Member State Committee and the Forum. Additionally, a member of SEAC pointed out that the report was not completely up to date regarding for example the appeal cases on acrylamide (T-268/10 and T-368/11). The Chair took note of the comment and explained that whereas the Secretariat tries to keep the balance between the internal deadlines and providing the report externally to SEAC, some updates might unfortunately not reach the report on time.

7) Review of stakeholders' participation in the work of SEAC

The Chair presented briefly the report on the participation of stakeholder organisations in the work of SEAC which was circulated to SEAC members for information prior to the meeting (SEAC/13/2011/04). The topic was not discussed in a closed session as SEAC was not asked to take any action. As outlined in the report three sector specific organisations had expressed interest in the work of SEAC.

8) Restrictions

8.1) General restriction issues

a) Update on intended restriction dossiers

The Chair reminded the committee that the ECHA Secretariat has launched a call for rapporteurs for the 1,4-dichlorobenzene restriction dossier. The dossier is under preparation by ECHA and is expected to be ready in April 2012. The SEAC members were encouraged to volunteer their candidature for the (co)-rapporteurship.

b) Update on the review of the restriction process including the project on improving the quality of forthcoming restriction reports

The Chair introduced the agenda item with two complementary presentations by the Secretariat.

Firstly, SEAC was informed on the progress in the project on improving the quality of forthcoming restriction reports. The Secretariat informed SEAC on the results of the first step in collecting experiences and ideas for improving the quality of the restrictions reports. Furthermore, SEAC was also informed about the planned follow-up actions which will be implemented in 2012.

Secondly, SEAC was informed about the review of the restriction process following the experiences on the first dossiers and about the outcome of the comments received from RAC and SEAC. Positive aspects of the procedures considered were, among others, rapporteurs' dialogues, support given by ECHA to rapporteurs, ad-hoc/drafting groups and teleconference meetings with (co-)rapporteurs (including for plenary preparation), as well as RAC and SEAC rapporteurs' collaboration and cross-reporting of RAC-SEAC at plenary meetings. The areas of improvement called for clarification in the roles and responsibilities of different actors, as well as in different issues related to the conformity check, appointment of rapporteurs, and the restriction dossier itself, as well as in opinion-making and the background document.

The Commission provided SEAC with an update regarding the first restriction case on DMFu, which the REACH Committee had unanimously agreed in its last meeting. One member shared his observations from that meeting, noting that the REACH Committee solely dealt with the legal proposal and ignored other elements in the opinions from RAC and SEAC. In response the Commission representative acknowledged this observation and announced that the Commission in future cases will provide a note to the REACH Committee how to deal with other elements in the opinions. Three remaining substances are still under consultation. SEAC will be further informed about their progress in March 2012.

SEAC discussed at a general level how to improve the restriction process, especially with regard to the involvement of RAC in the restrictions process until the SEAC opinion is adopted, and issues related to the Background Document (e.g. who should be responsible for revising it). One member pointed out that the quality of Annex XV dossiers has an impact on the quality of the process as a whole.

The discussions between the SEAC members (together with several RAC members) continued in three separate break-out groups focusing on the following topics: I) conformity check, II) opinion-making process, including RAC-SEAC cooperation and on III) Background Document. SEAC was provided with an oral report from each of the break-out groups. The Secretariat will prepare a separate report of these discussions.

The Secretariat will organise further discussions with a group of both RAC and SEAC members during the first quarter of 2012 (before SEAC-14 meeting) – by teleconference and back-to-back with the plenary in March. The exact organisation depends partly on the size of the group. With this respect, **SEAC members were asked to volunteer to contribute to the review of the restriction process.**

It was concluded by the Chair that the Secretariat will compile both SEAC and RAC suggestions. If needed, the Secretariat will **propose revisions to the current working procedures. These would be discussed by both Committees in the March meetings with a view to their adoption in the June meetings.**

SEAC agreed to continue using the revised conformity check template that was tested in the phthalates restriction dossier for the next restriction dossiers. Depending on the outcome of the ongoing review of the restriction process, the template may be adapted later.

8.2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers – Phthalates

The agenda point was opened by a report from the discussion on the first version of the

RAC opinion from the RAC-19 meeting given by the RAC rapporteur. After that SEAC (co-)rapporteurs briefly presented the initial comments of SEAC members on the dossier, the first Forum advice, and the early comments from the public consultation. In their presentation on the elements of the draft opinion the (co-)rapporteurs highlighted that the operational wording of the scope is still under development. Furthermore, the assessment of the risk by RAC was on-going. The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs then gave a summary of the key elements of the draft opinion, some suggestions as to the possible ways to improve the assessment and specific questions they would like SEAC to consider. Subsequently, the dossier submitter gave a presentation outlining the issues that they would be addressing in preparing the Background Document, as well as the issues found to be challenging.

Given the lack of data in the dossier and limited input so far from the public consultation upon which SEAC could base its opinion, the discussion focused on the priorities for further work. It was concluded that as a minimum, verification of the data in the dossier, further investigation of costs and extending the cost analysis in the dossier would be a way forward. Furthermore, the Background Document should indicate whether benefits are greater than costs. Some participants noted that claims by industry that switching to alternatives is easy may be interpreted as there were only moderate costs associated with the substitution. As regards the baseline, several members found its specification in the dossier ambiguous and suggested it should be clarified.

As for the benefits assessment, some members were of the opinion that the information on the implications for ecosystems as well as on the recycling of PVC was important for the overall assessment of benefits of the restriction proposal. One member suggested that there could be remarkable consequences on the recycled PVC market due to the lack of validated test methods to identify phthalates in materials. This in turn could lead to a precautionary action resulting in a reduction of the demand for recycled PVC. The development would also contradict the EU policies on resource efficiency. The dossier submitter, however, contested the argument by mentioning that the recycled PVC is mainly used for less specialised articles such as cables for outdoor use which are perceived to be outside of the scope of the restriction proposal. Nevertheless, the comment on recycling highlighted there could be a need for further insight into the issue. Information on implications to ecosystems was not considered by rapporteurs as required.

One member pointed out a risk of imposing stricter limit for articles that are exempted under RoHS. The member highlighted a need for further assessment in this respect.

In the context of the analysis of alternatives, the information on the costs of alternative plastics was also suggested to be a rather 'nice-to-know' than 'need-to-know' information.

Several members commented on the different approaches for the operational wording of the scope. A few members pointed out a potential confusion with regard to the concentration limit in the wording of the restriction proposal, namely due to the relation with the "combined effect", reference to different phthalates and due to other legislation on phthalates. One member expressed a preference for improved wording as opposed to explicit lists of either restricted or exempted articles. In the discussion **the operational wording of the scope was found to be not a key priority for the rapporteurs at this stage of the opinion development and it was agreed to be further developed in the drafting group.**

On the suggestion of SEAC, (co-)rapporteurs in cooperation with the Secretariat were to consider the format of and to submit a response to comments of SEAC members on the dossier to the Secretariat for distribution to SEAC members. The dossier submitter noted that they would address the comments of members through the first version of the Background Document.

SEAC members were invited to submit remaining comments on the first version of the draft opinion by December 20, 2011 via CIRCABC Newsgroup.

8.3) Appointment of rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC was informed of the outcome of the call for expression of interest for (co-)rapporteurs for hexavalent Chromium and nonylphenol compounds restriction proposals. SEAC preliminary agreed on the nomination of a rapporteur and a co-rapporteur for the

expected restriction proposal for hexavalent Chromium. As the document (SEAC/13/2011/05) was provided only as a room document, the final agreement will be done via an urgent written procedure as agreed by SEAC.

Furthermore, SEAC agreed to postpone the nomination of (co-)rapporteurs for the expected restriction proposal for nonylphenol compounds until the SEAC-14 meeting in March 2012 and to maintain the rapporteur nominees in a rapporteur pool. Additionally, SEAC was reminded of the ongoing call for rapporteurs for a restriction dossier on 1,4-Dichlorobenzene.

Finally, SEAC agreed to nominate (co-)rapporteurs for the 1,4-Dichlorobenzene and nonylphenol compounds in written procedure if considered appropriate by the Secretariat. The Secretariat will keep the rapporteur pool for the restriction proposal for nonylphenol compounds and will re-launch the call for expression of interest for (co-)rapporteurs in due time.

9) Authorisations

a) Common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development on Applications for Authorisation

The Secretariat presented the meeting document (SEAC/13/2011/01) developed by the Secretariat in consultation with the Commission. The document describes how, during the opinion development on authorisation applications, to deal efficiently with issues identified in earlier discussions. Issues are, for example, how to deal with missing or inadequate information, which endpoints are relevant in case of the adequate control route and which endpoints in case of the SEA route, and what the focus of cooperation between RAC and SEAC should be depending on the line of reasoning with regard to the suitability of alternatives. Main emphasis was given to the general Committees' task to evaluate the assessment – including the methods and the lines of reasoning – carried out in the authorisation application. The applicant, on the other hand, is expected to demonstrate the need for authorisation. It was emphasised that RAC and SEAC have to be prepared to be able to handle over 50 applications at the same time and that each member may have half a dozen applications for reporting. Due to this workload RAC and SEAC need to have a very streamlined and efficient way of giving their opinions.

The discussion that followed focused on the interaction with the applicant and the need for efficiency during the opinion development. The document describing the common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development raised the issue of members contacting the applicant to e.g. obtain further information. The Secretariat said that the interaction should be limited to that which is envisaged by REACH. Furthermore, contacts between the rapporteurs and the applicants should be channelled via the Secretariat to ensure transparency and equal treatment. One member informed the meeting about their national policy in contacts with industry and pointed at the importance of reporting open and transparent to ECHA, rapporteurs and members about such contacts. Only truly necessary information should be requested by the Committees both in view of efficiency as well as in view of the role of the Committees as evaluators of the applicants' application. Re-assessment of applications by Committees would be considered inappropriate.

The Secretariat also informed the committee of pre-submission sessions with potential applicants that may help predicting the workload, and explained its contingency plans to handle high workload. One NGO stakeholder representative questioned whether ECHA should organise activities for third parties to obtain information on alternatives. The Secretariat invited stakeholders to give suggestions in designing such activities that would make the public consultation phase as meaningful as possible.

Participants raised some additional issues that may need elaboration. These were *inter alia*: tasks of the Committees when alternative technologies are suggested during the process; whether the applicant has made a proportionate (i.e. enough) analysis; how non-economic benefits should be taken into account; how subsequent applications should be treated, etc. A few clarifications to the text of the document were also suggested.

The Secretariat agreed to open a CIRCABC Newsgroup for members' comments on the document (SEAC/13/2011/01) on common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development on applications for authorisation and additional SEAC specific elements. Members were invited to provide comments by 15 January 2012. Consequently, the Secretariat would amend the document with the view to agreeing the document at the SEAC-14 meeting in March 2012.

b) Overview of the capacity building programme

The Secretariat presented the planned programme of capacity building to prepare RAC and SEAC for the authorisation process. First applications for authorisations are expected to be in the second half of 2012. The aim is to be prepared to deliver a large number of opinions to the Commission within a tight legal deadline and of the necessary scientific quality; also taking into account the equal treatment and consistency among the applications. The capacity programme will support RAC's and SEAC's common approach on sharing the same vision on key concepts, address any needs arising during the process preparations and familiarise members with the organisation of the work, as well as continue the capacity building activities when the first dossiers arrive.

SEAC members were asked to post their comments on the presentation and the capacity building programme on preparing SEAC for the process of developing opinions on authorisation via the SEAC CIRCABC newsgroup, (**members to provide comments by 15 January 2012.**) Based on the comments received, the Secretariat will consider them when implementing the capacity building programme. Additionally, a note elaborating the outline of the capacity building programme will be prepared to SEAC and RAC by the Secretariat by mid-January 2012.

c) Demonstration of the use of dissemination portals for databases on chemicals

SEAC was given a presentation on the dissemination databases and type of information that would be available in them. Furthermore, a demonstration on how dissemination portals could be used to find data on substances was also given. The presenter gave indications about future plans for further improving the databases by providing information on the production volume and on the status of the substances in legislative contexts.

d) Economic concepts

One member gave a presentation on the interpretation of the concept of economic feasibility in the context of applications for authorisation. The member explained that the concept is not defined in the REACH Regulation. Having examined the Authorisation Guidance, he clarified that the Guidance suggests focusing on the changes in applicant's costs and revenues including possible pass-through of cost to customers if transferring to an alternative. Using the net present value (NPV) of the alternative was proposed as one possible criterion of economic feasibility in the guidance document. The member, however, found the NPV measure would in most cases be negative, suggesting that it is a redundant measure of economic feasibility. In addition estimation of revenue streams when an alternative is used is difficult, such that SEAC should rather consider the change in costs (baseline versus alternative) only. The member suggested that such an approach would not provide a criterion of economic feasibility, it would nevertheless be consistent with SEAC's need to evaluate how the applicant has demonstrated the (additional) costs associated with alternatives, i.e. avoided costs if the authorisation is granted, and how these compare against the (remaining) risks if the authorisation is granted.

SEAC welcomed the presented way forward as a useful approach when evaluating applications. Some issues were suggested to be clarified in the context of the evaluation

of economic feasibility. One was how to cover the social welfare criterion, namely whether there is a need to look at the costs to the society and costs along the supply chain and not just those of the applicant. Another issue was how to deal with the significant uncertainties around the costs of alternatives as compared to the costs of the use for which an application for authorisation has been made. Again the SEA guidance document has quite a lot of guidance on how to carry out uncertainty analysis. The Secretariat furthermore confirmed that when the Committee evaluates socio-economic benefits and the (remaining) risks this is done on the basis of the assessment carried out by the applicant. The Secretariat noted that the concept of economic feasibility in the context of authorisation should be consistent with the restriction related issues.

The Secretariat will open a CIRCABC Newsgroup for SEAC member comments on the presentation on economic feasibility in authorisation. Members were invited to provide comments by 22 January 2012. The Secretariat will continue developing the concept of economic feasibility considering members' comments and submit a discussion paper for the SEAC-14 meeting in March 2012 as a part of the capacity building programme. It was noted that once agreed in SEAC, it would be helpful to make these principles available to applicants. ECHA will consider how to do this.

10) AOB

- Update of the workplan

The Chair referred to the SEAC workplan for the first half of 2012 with regard to the restriction dossiers. The Secretariat would distribute the updated workplan via the SEAC CIRCABC IG so that members could get acquainted with it.

- Nanomaterials

Due to the lack of time, the presentation was moved to the upcoming SEAC-14 meeting.

11) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-13

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-13, 14-15 December 2011 (SEAC-13 meeting)

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/13/2011_rev.2) was adopted.	SEAC Secretariat to upload the revised 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 recorded in the minutes.	
4. Administrative issues	
SEAC was informed about the recent changes in the composition of SEAC.	
SEAC was informed on the outcome of the written procedure on the SEAC-12 minutes, which were tacitly adopted by SEAC.	
SEAC was informed about the MB policy on handling of conflict of interest.	Members to get acquainted with the new policy.
SEAC agreed with the proposal to amend the Rules of Procedure by replacing the form for the Declaration of Interest (Annex II) with the new one adopted by the Management Board.	Secretariat to inform the Management Board of the SEAC decision and provide the MB with the amended RoPs for adoption.
5. Status report of the action points of SEAC-12	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-12. One action point from SEAC-12 remained unresolved (upload of the ECETOC study on ECHA website).	Secretariat to deal with the outstanding action point by the end of 2011 – early 2012.
6. Feedback from other bodies and activities	
SEAC took note of the report from other bodies and activities.	
7. Update of stakeholder participation in the work of SEAC	
SEAC took note of the report on the stakeholder participation in the work of SEAC.	

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
8. Restrictions	
8.1 General restriction issues	
<i>a) Update on intended restriction dossiers</i>	
<p>SEAC was reminded of one new intended restriction dossier (1,4-dichlorobenzene) to be prepared by ECHA.</p>	
<i>b) Update on the review of the restriction process including the Project on improving the quality of the incoming restriction reports</i>	
<p>SEAC was informed on the progress in the Project on improving the quality of the incoming restriction reports and the comments received from RAC and SEAC regarding the review of the restriction procedure.</p> <p>SEAC discussed issues identified for improvement of the restriction procedure in break-out groups.</p> <p>SEAC agreed to continue using the revised conformity check template (that was tested in the phthalates restriction dossier) in the next dossiers until the completion of ongoing review of the restriction process.</p>	<p>SEAC members to volunteer to contribute to the review of the restriction process. Secretariat to organise further discussion with the smaller group of RAC and SEAC members before SEAC-14.</p> <p>Secretariat to consider comments received and to organise the revision of the working procedures with a view of discussion at SEAC-14 and possible adoption at SEAC-15.</p> <p>Secretariat to compile SEAC suggestions regarding the review of the restriction process in a report and to deliver it to SEAC and RAC by SEAC-14.</p>
8.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
<i>Phthalates – First version of draft opinion</i>	
<p>SEAC was given a report on the discussion in the previous RAC meeting and presentations on the 1st version of the SEAC draft opinion and on the recent work on the background document.</p> <p>Given the lack of data in the dossier and limited input so far from the public consultation for SEAC to base its opinion on, SEAC discussed the priorities for further work. At minimum, verification of the data in the dossier, further investigation of costs and extending the cost analysis in the dossier could be a way forward. The operational wording of the scope will also be further developed in the drafting group.</p>	<p>(Co-)rapporteurs in cooperation with the Secretariat to consider the format of and to submit a response to comments of SEAC members on the dossier to the Secretariat for distribution to SEAC members.</p> <p>SEAC members to submit remaining comments on the first version of the draft opinion by December 20 via CIRCABC Newsgroup.</p>
8.3 Appointment of rapporteurs for restriction	

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
<p>SEAC was informed of the outcome of the call for expression of interest for (co-)rapporteurs for hexavalent Chromium and nonylphenol compounds restriction proposals.</p> <p>SEAC preliminary agreed on the nomination of a rapporteur and a co-rapporteur for the expected restriction proposal for hexavalent Chromium. SEAC agreed to formalise the agreement in an urgent written procedure.</p> <p>SEAC agreed to postpone the nomination of (co-)rapporteurs for the expected restriction proposal for nonylphenol compounds until the SEAC- 14 meeting in March 2012 and to maintain the rapporteur nominees in a rapporteur pool.</p> <p>SEAC was reminded of the ongoing call for rapporteurs for a restriction dossier on 1,4-Dichlorobenzene.</p> <p>SEAC agreed to nominate (co-)rapporteurs for the 1,4-Dichlorobenzene and nonylphenol compounds in written procedure if considered appropriate by the Secretariat.</p>	<p>Secretariat to launch the urgent written procedure to agree on the nomination of (co-)rapporteurs for hexavalent Chromium by 16 December.</p> <p>Secretariat to keep the rapporteur pool for the restriction proposal for nonylphenol compounds and to re-launch the call for expression of interest for (co-)rapporteurs in due time.</p> <p>SEAC members to volunteer for (co-)rapporteurship for the expected restriction proposal for 1,4-Dichlorobenzene (call for rapporteurs is open till 19 December 2011).</p>
9. Authorisations	
<i>a) Common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development on Applications for Authorisation</i>	
<p>Document SEAC/13/2011/01 was presented to SEAC.</p>	<p>Secretariat to open a CIRCABC Newsgroup for members' comments on the document (SEAC/13/2011/01) on common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development on applications on authorisation and additional SEAC specific elements.</p> <p>SEAC Members to provide comments by 15 January 2012.</p> <p>Secretariat to amend the document based on comments received with the view of agreeing the document at the SEAC-14 meeting in March 2012.</p>
<i>b) Overview of the capacity-building programme</i>	
<p>Overview of the capacity building programme was presented to SEAC</p>	<p>Secretariat to open a CIRCABC Newsgroup for members' comments on the capacity building programme on preparing SEAC for the process of developing opinions on authorisation.</p> <p>Members to provide comments by 15 January 2012.</p> <p>Secretariat to consider the comments received</p>

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
	<p>when implementing the capacity building programme.</p> <p>Secretariat to submit a Note elaborating the outline of the capacity building programme (considering members' comments received) by January 2012 to SEAC.</p>
<i>c) Demonstration of the use of dissemination portals for databases on chemicals</i>	
<p>SEAC was introduced on the dissemination portals for databases on chemicals.</p>	
<i>d) Economic concepts</i>	
<p>Presentation was given elaborating on the concept of economic feasibility in REACH, in particular in authorisation.</p> <p>SEAC suggested some issues to be clarified in the context of the evaluation of economic feasibility.</p> <p>It was noted that the paper (to be prepared) on evaluating economic feasibility in the context of authorisation should be consistent with the restriction cases.</p>	<p>Secretariat to open a CIRCABC Newsgroup for SEAC member comments on the concept of economic feasibility in authorisation.</p> <p>Members to provide comments by 22 January 2012.</p> <p>Secretariat to continue developing the concept of economic feasibility considering members' comments and submit a discussion paper for the SEAC-14 meeting in March 2012 as a part of the capacity building programme. Once agreed in SEAC, ECHA to consider how to make these principles available to applicants.</p>
11. Action points and main conclusion SEAC-13	

III. List of Attendees

SEAC Members
BENDL Jiri
BOUSTRAS Georgios
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
CECCARELLI Federica
DALTON Marie
DANTINNE Catheline
FANKHAUSER Simone
FEYAERTS Jean-Pierre
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros
GRANDI Silvia (Via Webex)
KNOFLACH Georg
LADOPOULOU Angela
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
RODRIGUEZ DE SANCHO Maria Jesus
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SKARŽINSKAS Vitalius
ŚLĘZAK Zbigniew Tomasz
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina Velinova
THIELE Karen
THORS Åsa
TIRCHILA Luminita

International Observer
BRAATHEN Nils Axel (OECD)

Invited Experts
ALEXANDRE João
ÖBERG Tomas
PAPPONEN Hinni

European Commission
BENGYUZOV Manol
KUBICKI Michal
VLANDAS Penelope

RAC (co)-Rapporteurs
PRONK Marja (Via Webex)

RAC Member
BORGES Maria Teresa (via Webex)

Forum Representative
ATTIAS Leonello (Via Webex)

Advisors, Dossier Submitters (DS), Forum representatives & Observers
BEEKMAN Martijn (Advisor to C. Luttikhuizen, Via Webex)
JENSEN Frank (Advisor to L. Fock, Phthalates DS representative and RAC Member)
VERHOEVEN Julia (Advisor to C. Luttikhuizen, via Webex)

Stakeholder Observers
MÄKELÄ Kari (EMCEF)
GUARDIA JAUME (UEAPME)
HOLLAND Mike (EEB)
JÀNOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
KÜHN Ingolf (Business Europe)
MUSU Tony (ETUC)
WATERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)

ECHA staff
ANFALT Lisa
BRENNAN Eoin
CSAK Viktoria
KIVELA Kalle
LEFEBVRE Alain
LEFEVRE Remi
LIPKOVA Adriana
MOSSINK Jos
ORISPÄÄ Katja
PARADA SUAREZ Diana Carolina
PELTOLA Jukka
ROGGEMAN Maarten
RODRIGUEZ IGLESIAS Pilar
SIHVONEN Kirsi
SHUQOM Natasha
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
VAINIO Matti
VASILEVA Katja

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-13	<i>SEAC/A/13/2011_rev.2</i>
Outlined Final Draft Agenda SEAC-13	<i>SEAC/A/13/2011_rev.2_outlined</i>
Common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development on Applications for Authorisation	<i>SEAC/13/2011/01</i>
Update of the form on annual declarations of interests (Annex 2 to the SEAC Rules of Procedure)	<i>SEAC/13/2011/02</i>
Feedback from other bodies and activities	<i>SEAC/13/2011/03(room document)</i>
Update of stakeholder participation in the work of SEAC	<i>SEAC/13/2011/04</i>
Agreement on appointment of rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	<i>SEAC/13/2011/05</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>
FOCK Lars	8.2 Phthalates
JENSEN Frank	8.2 Phthalates
ŚLĘZAK Zbigniew Tomasz	8.2 Phthalates

8 December 2011
SEAC/A/13/2011_rev.2

Final Draft Agenda
13th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

14-15 December 2011
ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)
14 December: starts at 10:00
15 December: ends at 13:00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/13/2011_rev.2
For adoption

Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

Item 4 – Administrative issues

- a) Changes in the SEAC composition/nominations
- b) Outcome of written procedures
- c) Report on MB policy of handling of conflict of interest

For information

- d) Update of the form on annual declaration of interest (Annex 2 of the SEAC Rules of Procedure)

SEAC/13/2011/02
For agreement

Item 5 – Status report of the action points of SEAC-12

For information

Item 6 – Feedback from other bodies and activities

SEAC/13/2011/03
For information

Item 7 - Update of stakeholder participation in the work of SEAC

SEAC/13/2011/04
For information

Item 8 – Restrictions

8.1 General restriction issues

- a) Update on intended restriction dossiers

For information

- b) Update on the review of the restriction process including the Project on improving the quality of the incoming restriction reports

For information

8.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- Phthalates – First version of draft opinion

For discussion

8.3 Appointment of rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC/13/2011/05
For agreement

Item 9 – Authorisations

- a) Common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development on Applications for Authorisation

SEAC/13/2011/01
For discussion

- b) Overview of the capacity building programme
c) Demonstration of the use of dissemination portals for databases on chemicals
d) Economic concepts

For discussion

Item 10 – Any other business

- Update of the work-plan
- Nanomaterials

Item 11 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-13

Table with conclusions and Action points from SEAC-13

For adoption