

3 September 2018

SEAC/M/39/2018 FINAL

Final

Minutes of the 39th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

12 - 14 June 2018

I. Summary Record of the Proceeding

1) Welcome and apologies

Tomas Öberg, Chairman of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants of the thirty-ninth meeting of SEAC. The Chairman also informed SEAC that apologies had been received from seven members.

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

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

2) Adoption of the Agenda

The Chairman introduced the final draft agenda of SEAC-39 (SEAC/A/39/2018). The agenda was adopted with minor modifications under AOB. The final agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex III. The list of all meeting documents is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

The Chairman requested members and their advisors participating in the meeting to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Four members declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions under the Agenda Items 5.1.a.2, 5.1.a.3. These members did not participate in voting under those Agenda Items, as stated in Article 9(2) of the SEAC Rules of Procedure.

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

4) Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

a) Report on SEAC-38 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

The Chairman informed the participants that all action points of SEAC-38 had been completed or would be followed up during the on-going SEAC-39 meeting. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-38 had been adopted by written procedure and had been uploaded to S-CIRCABC as well as on the ECHA website. The Chairman thanked members for providing comments on the draft SEAC-38 minutes.

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

5) Restrictions

5.1) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Opinion Development

1) Lead and lead compounds in shot – final SEAC opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representatives from ECHA, an industry expert (FACE) accompanying a regular stakeholder observer and a representative from the UNEP-Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA). He reminded the participants that this restriction dossier (submitted by ECHA) proposes a restriction of lead in gunshot for shooting with a shotgun within a wetland or where spent gunshot would land within a wetland with a 36-months transitional period. The Chairman reminded the Committee that the public consultation on the agreed SEAC draft opinion ended on 21 May 2018 with 39 comments received. The (co-)rapporteurs updated the opinion based on the comments received and the draft of the SEAC final opinion was made available to the Committee on 6 June 2018.

The rapporteurs were then invited to present the results of the public consultation and their impact on the SEAC opinion. They reminded the participants about the open issues with specific questions in the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion – on impacts on forestry (whether machinery can be damaged because of steel shot imbedded in trees, and whether there are existing Member State restrictions in the use of steel shot in forestry areas), production of gunshot (cost to industry to increase non-lead gunshot production, and cost of labelling lead shot), and benefits (other benefits than considered in the background document, and further benefits to be quantified in a reliable and robust way). During the public consultation evidence had been provided that there is no significant impact on forestry and veneer industry (in Denmark), and information had been received that existing ban of the use of steel shot in forests has been revoked recently in Finland. Hence, the SEAC rapporteurs concluded that there is no significant impact on forestry to be expected from the restriction.

Regarding production of gunshot, information on additional costs from cartridge producers in the UK had been received about changes to steel shot production. Some remaining questions on the figures had been provided during the public consultation. According to the SEAC rapporteurs it is not possible to estimate costs to EU manufacturers based on the provided information. On the part of the benefits, which were not mentioned in the opinion, some new ideas had been offered during the public consultation, such as reputational value of the restriction, value of wetlands and nature in general etc. Quantitative information also had been provided during the public consultation, such as value of predatory and scavenging birds. Although it is still not clear to what extent they are affected by lead gunshots in wetlands. Information on the impact of lead gunshot on human health also had been submitted to ECHA. However, the SEAC rapporteurs could not conclude on the reliability of the provided estimates.

These clarifications received during the public consultation were added to the opinion by the rapporteurs. However, proposed SEAC's conclusions had not been changed.

The SEAC rapporteurs also informed the Committee that there were specific questions sent to the European authorities to provide data on the enforcement costs. Three of the authorities responded to the questions; none of them shared costs data.

During the discussion some SEAC members and representatives of the European Commission requested to explain as far as possible what the term 'possession' is intended to cover, i.e. during hunting/shooting. The rapporteurs agreed to consider this further in final editing. They also have made a few editorial proposals making the proposed text of the SEAC opinion clearer. One SEAC member noted that the restriction does not restrict only hunting in the wetland areas, but all shooting. The rapporteurs agreed to reflect this in the SEAC opinion. The Committee also discussed the appropriateness of the 36-month transitional period. To the later the SEAC rapporteurs responded that they agree with the original proposal of the DS on the 36-month transitional period. In their opinion it is good balance between the countries, which already have similar restrictions at the national level and the countries, which do not have it.

The representative of FACE confirmed their general support to the restriction on the use of lead in shot in EU wetlands. However, he criticised the use of the Ramsar definition of wetland asking to build up stronger justification why exactly this definition had been chosen for the purpose of the restriction. He pointed out that dry peatlands are also covered by the Ramsar definition, which might affect territories in Ireland, Scotland and the Scandinavian countries. FACE also pointed out that more intensive use of steel gunshot will contribute to plastic littering of wetlands. In addition, he also asked to clarify the term 'possession' proposing, e.g. 'while in the act of hunting/shooting', i.e. possession should contain intent. Finally, he was calling for a longer transitional period, arguing that the proposed 36 months could be too short for the countries where national restriction is not in place, specifically mentioning Ireland and the costs information provided by Irish hunters, as an example.

To these remarks the SEAC rapporteurs responded that the RAC final opinion says that lead shot is ingested by birds in peatland too, and the Ramsar definition of wetlands specifically includes also peatlands. Secondary poisoning can also affect scavenging and predatory birds in peatlands. This formed basis for the proportionality assessment. They agreed with the expert that impact in the countries, which do not have similar national restrictions in place, will be higher. However, the EU-wide restriction proposal has to evaluate impact in EU as a whole. The rapporteurs said that they do not have sufficient data to assess a potential increase of plastic littering in wetlands, if any.

SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus. The rapporteurs were asked, together with the Secretariat, to make final editorial changes to the opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and ORCOM) is in line with the adopted SEAC opinion. The Secretariat will forward the adopted opinion and its supportive documents to the Commission as well as publish them on the ECHA website. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on this dossier.

2) Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up – second draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the SEAC rapporteurs, representatives present in person or via WebEx of the dossier submitter (from Denmark, Norway and ECHA) and dossier submitter experts from Germany. The restriction proposal was submitted by ECHA together with Denmark, Italy and Norway on 6 October 2017. In addition, Germany contributed significantly to the proposal. The proposal aims to restrict the intentional use of certain substances in tattoo inks or to impose concentration limits for selected

substances (impurities). These substances include those with harmonised classifications as carcinogenic, mutagenic, reprotoxic, skin sensitising/corrosive/irritant, eye damaging/irritant as well as other substances prohibited in cosmetic products (under the Cosmetic Products Regulation, (EC) 1223/2009) and selected impurities. Two restriction options (RO1 and RO2) with the same scope are proposed. They differ in terms of the proposed concentration limits and how the links with the Cosmetic Products Regulation annexes are managed. The restriction is expected to provide benefits because of avoided cases of non-infectious inflammatory, systemic, reproductive, developmental, and carcinogenic adverse effects. The report demonstrates that very few avoided cases are necessary (e.g. 320 – 1 050 avoided cases of tattoo removal due to non-infectious inflammatory complications) for the benefits to exceed the costs of the proposed restriction options. The public consultation will end on 20 June 2018. The second version of the draft opinion was provided to the Committee for written consultation on 15 May 2018. Three comments were received from SEAC members.

The Secretariat gave a short update from RAC-45 discussions, where RAC had agreed that substances with CMR, skin sensitisers, irritants/corrosive properties and substances prohibited under Cosmetics Products Regulation (CPR) (Annex II and Annex IV, column g) should not be present in tattoo inks. For the purpose of ensuring the practicality and monitorability of the proposed restriction, sufficiently low concentration limits (CLs) were derived for these substance groups. One member and a stakeholder observer raised concerns regarding justification for risk based restriction and derogations.

The SEAC rapporteur then presented the second draft opinion, taking into account the discussions held in SEAC-38 and the additional comments provided during the commenting round organised in March. He outlined the rapporteurs' proposals for benefits and remaining issues on costs and other impacts as well as first views for proportionality. SEAC members asked further clarifications on the labelling requirements and the proposed transitional period. Furthermore, some members felt that derogations will need to be further developed, mentioning that there are other ways to address benefits, and some observations were raised for qualitative vs quantitative approaches.

The Chairman concluded the discussions that there was general support for rapporteurs' proposals and that comments made by members will be taken into account in the next version of the draft opinion. The rapporteurs were requested to prepare the third draft opinion by the beginning of August 2018, taking into account SEAC-39 discussions and the results of the public consultation.

3) C9-C14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances – second draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitters' representatives from Germany and Sweden and the RAC rapporteur (following via WebEx). The Chairman informed the participants that the restriction dossier proposes to restrict the use, placing on the market and import of C9-C14 PFCAs, on their own or in a mixture or in an article or parts therein in a concentration equal to or above 25 ppb for the sum of C9-C14 PFCAs and their salts or 260 ppb for the sum of C9-C14 PFCA related substances. The (co-) rapporteurs had developed the second draft opinion on this dossier, taking into account the discussion held at SEAC-38, which was made available for the written consultation prior to SEAC-39 and two comments were received from SEAC members. The Chairman reminded that at this plenary meeting, the Committee is invited to discuss the second

draft opinion, with the aim of reaching agreement on all the main components of the restriction and enabling the (co-)rapporteurs to develop a final version of the opinion or identify where the remaining work is needed.

The Secretariat provided a brief update from the RAC second draft opinion, as at RAC-46 only the status update on the opinion development was given to the Committee by the rapporteurs. The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs then presented to SEAC the second draft opinion.

The Secretariat reminded that at the previous SEAC meeting, it was agreed that the Secretariat would confirm the legal basis for this restriction. The Secretariat informed that their legal service had been consulted on this issue and had confirmed that this is an acceptable way for the restriction procedure – it is possible to take action with a precautionary approach, without waiting for the actual risk to happen. The rapporteurs added that in the case of the current restriction, it is not only a preventive measure, but the restriction also covers imports. Another member pointed out that the current conclusion on proportionality is not very clear in the draft opinion and needs better construction of the arguments, so that proportionality is shown. One SEAC member also had some suggestions for modifications in the second draft opinion and promised to send them in writing to the rapporteurs after the plenary meeting.

The Chairman concluded that the Committee supported the conclusions of the (co-) rapporteurs as presented and that comments made by members will be taken into account in the next version of the draft opinion. The rapporteurs were asked to prepare the third draft opinion, taking into account SEAC-39 discussion and the results of the public consultation, by the beginning of August 2018.

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

The Secretariat presented and the Committee agreed on the pool of (co-)rapporteurs (in line with the restricted meeting document SEAC/39/2018/01) for two restriction proposals on 5 cobalt salts (expected submission July 2018) and on DMF (expected submission October 2018).

The Chairman informed the Committee regarding the upcoming restriction proposals that had been included in the Registry of Intentions (RoI). In January 2019, ECHA on request of the Commission, will be submitting five restriction proposals on D4/D5/D6; calcium cyanamide as a fertiliser; formaldehyde and formaldehyde releases in mixtures and articles for consumer uses; intentional use of microplastic particles in consumer/professional use products and on oxo-degradable plastics in various products for consumer and professional use. In addition, France together with Sweden will submit a restriction proposal on substances meeting the classification criteria as skin sensitizers and skin irritants (expected submission January 2019).

The Chairman reminded that the calls for expression of interest for new dossiers will be launched late 2018.

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues

a) Update on incoming/future applications

The Secretariat informed the Committee that two new applications for authorisation were received during the May 2018 submission window. One of the received applications for authorisation concerns use of chromium trioxide in functional chrome plating of engine valves for automotive applications. The other application for authorisation concerns industrial formulation of a chromium trioxide solution below 0.1 % w/w concentration for the passivation of copper foil used in the manufacture of Lithium Ion Batteries (LiB) for motorised vehicles. Key issues in both new applications for authorisation will be discussed at SEAC-40 plenary meeting in September 2018. Until the end of the year the Secretariat is expecting to receive six to seven new applications for authorisation on uses of chromium (VI) substances, octyl-/nonylphenol ethoxylates and coal tar pitch, and up to two review reports on the uses of trichloroethylene. The Secretariat also informed the Committee about next wave of the applications for authorisation, which is expected in 2019.

b) Updated AfA opinion format

Following a presentation of the updated AfA opinion format at the SEAC-37 plenary meeting in March 2018 the SEAC consultation had been held in April 2018. Four SEAC members provided their comments on the new format which was updated accordingly. The draft opinion on the application for authorisation Diglyme_Omnichem (agenda point 10.2.b.3) was created in the new format. Many SEAC members and a representative of the European Commission acknowledged that the new format used to develop the draft opinion is logical in its structure, comprehensive and easy to read and follow.

6.2) Authorisation applications

a) Agreement on draft opinions

1. PCO_IP (2 uses)

The Chairman introduced the applications for authorisation. At SEAC-37, the Committee discussed the key issues for this application. At SEAC-38, the SEAC rapporteurs presented a status update concerning preparation of the draft opinions. At this plenary, the SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinions.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinions. Then the SEAC rapporteurs presented the two draft opinions on the application for authorisation.

PCO_IP is a small upstream application on the following two uses of pentazinc chromate octahydroxide: Use 1: Formulation of mixtures, Use 2: Use of pentazinc chromate

octahydroxide in stoved epoxy primer for corrosion protection of aircraft engine components in aerospace and aeroderivative applications.

The rapporteurs proposed conclusions that there are no suitable alternatives available to implement by the sunset date and the benefits of continued use outweigh the risks. SEAC members discussed specific issues, such as requirements for the aeroderivative parts produced by the applicant, scope of the uses and feasibility to substitute the SVHCs, and the length of the review period.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinions as proposed by the rapporteurs by consensus.

2. DBP_AVX (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At this plenary, the SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented a draft opinion. They proposed conclusions that there are no technical and economically feasible alternatives available before the end of the applicable review period of authorisation granted to DEZA (until 21 February 2019) on which the applicant currently relies. The rapporteurs considered the conclusion that benefits outweigh the risks of continued use to be robust.

One SEAC member asked if there would be any contradiction between giving authorisation for use DBP and the restriction on placing on the market articles containing four phthalates including DBP, and what would be the relation between the respective timelines. The ECHA Secretariat clarified that the final products placed on the market (multi-layer ceramic capacitors) do not contain DBP therefore, the restriction does not apply in this case.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs by consensus.

3. Diglyme_Omnichem (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At this plenary, the SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented a draft opinion. They proposed to conclude that there are no suitable alternatives available at the moment and that the benefits of the continued use exceed the health costs.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs by consensus.

4. SD_Olwerke (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-38, the Committee discussed the key issues for this application. At this plenary, the SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion.

The Chairman invited the RAC rapporteur to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinion. Then the SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinion on the application for authorisation.

This is the downstream application for authorisation submitted by two companies on the single use of sodium dichromate as corrosion inhibitor in ammonia absorption deep cooling systems, applied for the dewaxing and deoiling process steps of petroleum raffinate.

The rapporteurs proposed conclusions that currently there are no suitable alternatives available and the benefits of continued use outweigh the risks. SEAC members discussed specific issues, such as availability of alternatives and the length of the review period.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs by consensus.

5. CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use)

6. CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use)

The SEAC members had been informed that the Secretariat suggested to remove the recommendation for a condition specifying the name of the authorisation holder from the text of the draft opinions following an information exchange with the European Commission. However, removing a condition from an agreed opinion text cannot be taken as an editorial issue for the rapporteurs and the Secretariat. The amended draft opinions were therefore brought back to SEAC-39 for agreement. In the amended opinions, the condition in question was removed and a new condition was introduced to limit the scopes of the uses applied for which were clarified by the Applicant during the development of the two opinions.

During the discussion a representative of the European Commission acknowledged that the way how the issue is being resolved is good. The SEAC rapporteurs also supported the proposed way forward. The Committee briefly discussed potential enforcement issues in relation to the two applications for authorisation.

SEAC agreed on the two draft opinions by consensus.

6.3 Review reports

a) Agreement on draft opinions

1. RR1_DEHP_VINYLOOP (2 uses)

2. RR1_DEHP_PP (2 uses)

The Chairman introduced the two review reports by VINYLOOP FERRARA S.p.A. and Plastic Planet srl. At SEAC-37, the Committee discussed the key issues for these review reports. At SEAC-38, the SEAC rapporteurs presented a status update concerning preparation of the draft opinions. At this plenary, the SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinions.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinions. Then the SEAC rapporteurs presented the four draft opinions on the review reports.

RR1_DEHP_VINYLOOP and RR1_DEHP_PP are upstream review reports on the following two uses of DEHP-containing PVC recyclate: Use 1: Formulation of recycled soft PVC

containing DEHP in compounds and dry-blends, Use 2: Industrial use of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in polymer processing by calendaring, extrusion, compression and injection moulding to produce the three groups of the PVC articles.

SEAC members agreed with the rapporteurs that there are no suitable alternatives before the end of the review period of the granted authorisation. The subsequent discussion focussed in particular on the length of the new review period in relation to the development and availability of alternatives.

Two representatives of the stakeholder organisations noted that although RAC concluded that the adequate control of risks had been demonstrated by the authorisation holders, the substance is also an endocrine disruptor for which possibly no threshold may be determined. The Secretariat reminded that Annex XIV does not include the endocrine disrupting properties of DEHP and thus Applicants and the Committees only base their conclusions on reprotoxic properties. A representative of the European Commission informed the Committee that the Commission is currently considering the inclusion of the endocrine disrupting properties (Article 57(f)) into the entry for DEHP in Annex XIV to REACH and the Secretariat informed that a public consultation is currently ongoing on ECHA's website on this topic. The rapporteurs mentioned that both RAC and SEAC do note the endocrine disrupting properties of DEHP in their opinions.

A representative of the European Commission said that each application needs to be assessed on its own merits and that it is necessary to clearly convey in the opinion the reasons for SEAC to concur or to deviate from the arguments provided by the Applicant to justify their request for a review period. Also, the representative stressed, regarding one of the two cases, the need to clearly explain the impact of the uncertainties on the conclusions of the analysis of alternatives. Furthermore, a Commission representative emphasised that all relevant socio-economic elements need to be assessed and included in the justification of the opinion regarding the recommended review period as per Article 60(8) and in view of the objectives noted in Article 55.

SEAC agreed on the two draft opinions on the review report RR1_DEHP_VINYLOOP by VINYLOOP FERRARA S.p.A. as proposed by the rapporteurs by consensus. SEAC also agreed on the two draft opinions on the review report RR1_DEHP_PP by Plastic Planet srl as proposed by the rapporteurs by simple majority.

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

The pool of (co-)rapporteurs, as outlined in the restricted room document SEAC/39/2018/03, was agreed by SEAC.

7) Requests under Article 77(3)(c)

a) Request to review a derogation request for the PFOA restriction (entry 68 of Annex XVII to REACH)

The Chairman informed the Committee that the Commission had received a request for re-examination of the existing restriction of PFOA and related substances (entry 68 of Annex XVII to REACH) in view of including a derogation for the use of PFOB for the manufacturing of certain pharmaceutical products using pressurised metered-dose inhalers for the treatment of pulmonary diseases. RAC and SEAC were requested to

prepare an opinion in view of a possible derogation from the existing Annex XVII restriction of PFOA, its salts and the related substances, by 1 December 2018. The ECHA Secretariat had prepared an analysis of the information provided by the company concerned and the ECHA report had been made available to SEAC prior to SEAC-39. The ECHA Secretariat found this derogation request justified.

The Rapporteur then presented to the Committee this request, the ECHA analysis as well as the timelines proposed for the opinion development. One member was interested in what is the process for these kind of revisions to the existing restrictions and also pointed out that the current case shows that it is not always possible to rely on the public consultation to reach all possible affected parties. One stakeholder observer representative noted that they are concerned that this special case can set a precedent for how companies could ask for derogations even after the restriction process has been finalised by the Committees. She also questioned whether the company asking for this derogation justified why they reacted so late. The Secretariat responded that this company did not apply on time, as they were not aware that PFOA is present in PFOB as impurity and that for this particular small case, the Commission found it proportionate to launch a process under Article 77(3)(c) of REACH. However, the Secretariat emphasised that this is clearly an exceptional case and is not recommended to be used by stakeholders in the future.

The Chairman informed that the public consultation on this proposal will be launched on 20 June and will last until 20 August 2018. The Rapporteur was tasked to develop a draft opinion for discussion and agreement at SEAC-40 plenary meeting.

8) AOB

a) Update of the work plan

The Secretariat provided an update of the work plan for the future months.

b) Coaching on presentation skills

As a capacity building for the Committee members, SEAC was provided with a coaching session on presentation skills and effective nonverbals.

c) Health and environment costs of recycling policies

A SEAC member presented the results of the project financed by the French Ministry of Ecology, outlining potential conflict between circular economy and risks of chemical additives of materials. The participants welcomed the French efforts in this area and recommended that the findings could be used, for example, by the policy makers.

d) Approach for evaluation of PBTs subject to authorisation and restriction procedures in context of socio-economic analysis

A representative of the Commission provided a presentation on the results of their project on the approach for evaluation of PBTs subject to authorisation and restriction procedures in the context of socio-economic analysis. The Committee appreciated very

much the work done within this project and the Chairman concluded that it will be evaluated how this work could add to SEAC's approach to PBTs.

e) Efficiency in SEAC consultations

It was agreed to cover this agenda point in the next SEAC-40 plenary meeting due to time constraints.

f) Outcome of the SETAC session on Informed Substitution of Hazardous Chemicals for Circular Economy

A SEAC stakeholder observer provided a brief summary of the outcome of the SETAC-Europe Rome May 2018 session on Informed Substitution of Hazardous Chemicals for Circular Economy.

9) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-39

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

II. Main conclusions and action points

SEAC-39, 12 - 14 June 2018
(Adopted at SEAC-39 meeting)

Agenda point	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	
2. Adoption of the agenda	
The agenda was adopted with minor modifications (under AOB).	SECR to upload the adopted agenda to SEAC S-CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.
3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda	
Conflicts of interest have been declared and will be taken to the minutes.	
4. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities	
<i>a) Report on SEAC-38 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies</i>	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-38. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies, including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in the CARACAL.	
5. Restrictions	
5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Opinion development	
1. Lead and lead compounds in shot – final SEAC opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the draft of the SEAC final opinion and the results of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC adopted its final opinion on Lead in shot dossier by consensus (with editorial modifications agreed at SEAC-39).	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC final opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and ORCOM) is in line with the adopted SEAC final opinion. SECR to forward the adopted opinion and its annexes to COM and publish on the ECHA website.
2. Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up – second draft opinion	

SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the second draft opinion.	Rapporteurs to prepare the third draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-39 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the beginning of August 2018.
3. C9-C14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances – second draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the second draft opinion.	Rapporteurs to prepare the third draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-39 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the beginning of August 2018.
5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
SEAC agreed on the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for the restriction proposal on 5 cobalt salts as well as on N,N-dimethylformamide (in line with the restricted meeting document SEAC/2018/39/01).	
6. Authorisation	
6.1 General authorisation issues	
a) Update on incoming/future applications	
SEAC took note of the update on the incoming/future applications.	
b) Updated AfA opinion templates	
SEAC took note of an updated AfA opinion template (SEAC/39/2018/02).	
6.2 Authorisation applications	
a) Agreement on draft opinions	
a) PCO_IP (2 uses) b) DBP_AVX (1 use) c) Diglyme_Omnichem (1 use) d) SD_Olwerke (1 use) e) CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use) f) CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions. <u>PCO_IP (uses 1 and 2):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions. SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicants for commenting.

<p><u>DBP AVX (use 1):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p> <p><u>Diglyme Omnichem (use 1):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p> <p><u>SD Olwerke (use 1):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p> <p><u>CT Hapoc 2 (use1):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p> <p><u>CT Hapoc 3 (use 1):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p>	
<p>6.3 Review reports</p>	
<p>a) Agreement on draft opinions</p>	
<p>1. RR1_DEHP_VINYLOOP (2 uses)</p> <p>2. RR1_DEHP_PP (2 uses)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions on RR1_DEHP_VINYLOOP by consensus.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions on RR1_DEHP_PP by simple majority. The minority views will be reflected in the minutes.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicants for commenting.</p>
<p>6.4 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)</p>	
<p>SEAC agreed on the updated pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (considered as agreement on appointment in line with the restricted room document SEAC/39/2018/03).</p>	<p>SEAC members to volunteer to the pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation.</p> <p>SECR to upload the updated document to confidential folder on S-CIRCABC IG.</p>
<p>7. Requests under Article 77(3)(c)</p>	
<p>a) the PFOA restriction</p>	<p>Request to review a derogation request for</p>
<p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC took note of the new request and the proposed timelines.</p>	<p>SECR to launch a public consultation on the proposal in June 2018.</p> <p>Rapporteur to develop a draft opinion for discussion and agreement at SEAC-40 plenary meeting.</p>
<p>9. Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-39</p>	

<p>SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-39.</p>	<p>SECR to upload the action points and main conclusions to S-CIRCABC IG.</p>
--	--

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-39

SEAC members
ALEXANDRE Joao
ANASTASIOU Christos
BERGS Ivars
BLAHA Karel
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
CASTELLI Stefano
CAVALIERI Luisa
CSERGŐ Robert (co-opted)
DELCOURT Benjamin
FANKHAUSER Simone
FIORE Karine
FOCK Lars
GEORGIOU Stavros
JANSSEN Martien
JONES Derrick (co-opted)
KIISKI Johanna
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LÜDEKE Andreas
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
NORING Maria
OLTEANU Maria
RUZGYS Karolis
SCHUCHTAR Endre
THIELE Karen
URBAN Klaus
ZAIKOVA Ilona
ZAMFIR Adrian-Stefan
Commission observers
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)
GALLEGO Matteo (DG ENV)
Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts
ALLEN Lisa (International Lead Association – expert accompanying EUROMETAUX for discussion on Lead in shot restriction)
HAIDER Sonja (CHEMSEC)
JÁNOSI Amaya (CEFIC)

Advisors, invited experts, observers & dossier submitters (DS)
ANDERSSON Wiktor as advisor to Maria NORING via WebEx
BERNHEIM Teresa as advisor to Karen THIELE
BIEGEL-ENGLER Annegret as DS for PFCAs via WebEx
BLOM Cecile as DS for tattoo inks via WebEx
BORG Daniel as DS for PFCAs via WebEx
GABBERT Silke (Wageningen University & Research) as expert accompanying the Commission observers
HELMEDACH Achim as advisor to Karen THIELE
JANS Jenny as advisor to Maria NORING
LAMARCA Victoire as advisor to Karine FIORE via WebEx
LANGTVET Espen as DS for tattoo inks via WebEx
LERCHE Dorte as advisor to Lars FOCK
LINDQVIST Martin as DS for PFCAs via WebEx
STAUDE Claudia as DS for PFCAs via WebEx
TRUBIROHA Achim as expert accompanying DS for tattoo inks via WebEx
VERHOEVEN Julia as advisor to Martien JANSSEN via WebEx

Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts (cont.)
MIKANDER Nina (AEWA – UNEP representative for discussion on Lead in shot restriction)
ROGER Apolline (ClientEarth)
OTERO SANTOS Tatiana (EEB)
SCALLAN David (FACE – expert accompanying CEFIC for discussion on Lead in shot restriction)
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)
RAC rapporteurs
CHIURTU Elena (via WebEx)
DUNAUŠKIENE Lina
KADIKIS Normunds (via WebEx)

ECHA STAFF
BLAINEY Mark
FRANKE Greta
HAZANFARI Sara
HOLLINS Stephen
KIVELA Kalle
JACQUEMIN Katline
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
KOULOUMPOS Vasileios
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORZS Arnis
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MAZZOLINI Anna
MOTTET Denis
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
OTTATI Maria
PILLET Monique
REGIL Pablo
RHEINBERGER Christoph
RODRIGUEZ-IGLESIAS Pilar (via WebEx)
ROGEMAN Maarten
SADAM Diana
SIMPSON Peter
SJOBORG Thomas
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
STOYANOVA Evgenia
ÖBERG Tomas

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 Draft Agenda

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

Document	Number
Final Draft Agenda	SEAC/A/39/2018
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	SEAC/39/2018/01 (restricted)
Updated AfA opinion templates	SEAC/39/2018/02
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications	SEAC/38/2018/03 (restricted room document)

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST TO THE RESPECTIVE AGENDA ITEMS

The following participants declared conflicts of interests with the agenda items below (according to Article 9(2) of the SEAC Rules of Procedure):

<u>Name of participant</u>	<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Interest declared</u>
LUDEKE Andreas	5.1a-2 Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up 5.1a-3 C9-14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances 5.1a-1 Diisocyanates	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossiers
FOCK Lars	5.1a-2 Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
NORING Maria	5.1a-3 C9-14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
THIELE Karen	5.1a-3 C9-14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier

Final Draft Agenda

39th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

12-14 June 2018

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

12 June starts at 13.00

14 June ends at 14.00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/39/2018
For adoption

Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

Item 4 – Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

- a) Report on SEAC-38 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

For information

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) Opinion development

- 1) Lead and lead compounds in shot – final SEAC opinion

For adoption

- 2) Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up – second draft opinion
- 3) C9-C14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances – second draft opinion

For discussion

5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC/39/2018/01

(restricted meeting document)

For agreement

Item 6 – Authorisation

6.1 General authorisation issues

- a) Update on incoming/future applications
- b) Updated AfA opinion templates

SEAC/39/2018/02

For information

6.2 Authorisation applications

- a) Agreement on draft opinions
 1. PCO_IP (2 uses)
 2. DBP_AVX (1 use)
 3. Diglyme_Omnichem (1 use)
 4. SD_Olwerke (1 use)
 5. CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use)
 6. CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use)

For discussion and agreement

6.3 Review reports

- b) Agreement on draft opinions
 3. RR1_DEHP_VINYLOOP (2 uses)
 4. RR1_DEHP_PP (2 uses)

For discussion and agreement

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

SEAC/39/2018/03

(restricted room document)

For agreement

Item 7 – Requests under Article 77(3)(c)

- a) Request to review a derogation request for the PFOA restriction (entry 68 of Annex XVII to REACH)

For information

Item 8 – AOB

- a) Update of the work plan
- b) Coaching on presentation skills
- c) Health and environment costs of recycling policies
- d) Approach for evaluation of PBTs subject to authorisation and restriction procedures in context of socio-economic analysis

For information

- e) Efficiency in SEAC consultations

For discussion

- f) Outcome of the SETAC session on Informed Substitution of Hazardous Chemicals for Circular Economy

For information

Item 9 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-39

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-39

For adoption