19 February 2018

SEAC/M/37/2017 Final

Final

Minutes of the 37th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

27 - 30 November 2017

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-seventh meeting of SEAC. The Chairman informed the participants that three new members have joined the Committee. The Chairman also informed SEAC that apologies have been received from five 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-37 (SEAC/A/37/2017 rev.1 with minor modifications under AOB). The agenda was adopted without modifications. The final agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex III. The list of all meeting documents is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

The Chairman informed about the Committee regarding new improved practice in declarations and the consequent update of SEAC Rules of Procedure. In addition, new practice in meeting invitations and registrations (ELM tool) will be implemented shortly.

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 and 5.1.b. 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-36 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

The Chairman informed the participants that all action points of SEAC-36 had been completed or would be followed up during the on-going SEAC-37 meeting. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-36 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-36 minutes.

In addition, the Chairman informed SEAC that AfA two Final Opinions on 2 uses of Bis(2-methoxyethyl) ether (diglyme) submitted by Acton were adopted by written procedure on 13 November 2017 with 25 members voted in favour. The required quorum was 22 votes.

The Chairman then explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA MB, RAC, MSC, and the Forum had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/37/2017/01). The Chairman informed that this report will no longer be provided in the current format, but instead the Secretariat will be distributing to all ECHA committees the slides on the quarterly report on all ECHA activities, compiled for the ECHA MB.

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

b) REACH Authorisation – Criteria for longer review periods

The Commission informed the Committee about the document endorsed by CARACAL regarding criteria for review periods longer than 12 years. The document is available on S-CIRCABC.

5) Restrictions

5.1) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Conformity check and key issues discussion

1) Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up

The Chairman welcomed the SEAC rapporteurs, representatives of the dossier submitter (from 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 dossier submitter's representative (ECHA) presented the restriction 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. A number of colourants, which do not currently have alternatives or where information is insufficient to demonstrate risk, are exempted. 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 Chairman then informed the Committee that RAC will discuss the conformity of this dossier within RAC-43 later this week, however, the RAC (co-) rapporteurs consider the dossier in conformity from the RAC point of view.

The rapporteurs presented the outcome of the conformity check and the recommendations to the dossier submitter and proposed to the Committee that they consider the dossier to be in conformity. The Committee agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. In addition, the rapporteurs presented their key issues of the restriction proposal. The Commission representative asked SEAC to assess both risk management options proposed and if possible to compare them and to recommend the one of them if the analysis demonstrate that one option is better in terms of its effectiveness, efficiency, practicality and monitorability. The Chairman informed the Committee that if RAC found the dossier in conformity, the public consultation on this restriction proposal will be launched in December 2017.

2) C9-14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitters' representatives from Germany and Sweden. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier had been submitted by Germany and Sweden in October 2017 and proposes to restrict the use, placing on the market and import of C9-C14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances as substances on their own or in a mixture or in an articles 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. Thus, articles and mixtures manufactured in Europe can comply with the proposed threshold. C9-C14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances are mainly unintended by-products occurring during the manufacturing of per- and polyfluorinated substances containing a carbon chain of less than nine carbon atoms, such as perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA, C8-PFCA) based substances and perfluorohexanoic acid (C6-PFCA) based substances.

The representatives of the dossier submitters provided an introductory presentation on the dossier. The Chairman then informed the Committee that RAC will discuss the conformity of this dossier within RAC-43 later this week, however, the RAC (co-) rapporteurs consider the dossier in conformity from the RAC point of view.

The rapporteurs presented the outcome of the conformity check and informed the Committee that they consider the dossier to be in conformity with the requirements of Annex XV of REACH. The rapporteurs noted that this is a thorough report providing an extensive overview of the restriction proposal. The rapporteurs also presented to the Committee the recommendations to the dossier submitters as well as the key issues identified by them in this restriction proposal. The rapporteurs noted that this dossier is in some aspects similar to the previous PFOA restriction (except for derogations).

The Committee agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. The Chairman informed the Committee that the public consultation on this restriction proposal will be launched in December 2017 (provided that also RAC agrees on the conformity of the dossier).

b) Opinion Development

1) Diisocyanates – third draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representatives from Germany, the RAC rapporteur, an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer and an occasional stakeholder observer. He reminded the participants that this restriction proposal (submitted by Germany) limits the use of diisocyanates in industrial and professional applications to those cases where a combination of technical and organisational measures as well as a minimum standardised training package have been implemented. Information on how to get access to this package is communicated throughout the supply chain. Exemptions are defined for cases where the content of diisocyanates in the substance or mixture placed on the market or used would be less than 0.1% by weight, as well as for mixtures containing diisocyanates at higher levels than 0.1% by weight which fulfil criteria that show that the potential risks using such products are very low. The Chairman reminded the Committee that the public consultation on this restriction proposal ended on 22 September 2017 with more than 50 comments received. The third draft opinion was made available to SEAC on 14 November and comments were received from eight members in the subsequent commenting round. The aim of the meeting was for the Committee to agree on its draft opinion on this dossier taking into account the comments received in the public consultation.

The Secretariat provided to the Committee a brief update on RAC discussion on this dossier, held within the ongoing RAC-43 plenary meeting, where RAC had not yet adopted its opinion on this restriction proposal, but was going to continue the discussion later during the week. Furthermore, the Secretariat presented the revised conditions of the restriction, developed by the RAC and SEAC rapporteurs, together with the ECHA Secretariat, to present them in a more structured and simplified way (that were made available to the Committee prior to SEAC-37).

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented their third draft opinion focussing on concluding on costs, benefits and proportionality of the proposed restriction. The rapporteurs proposed that SEAC would conclude in its opinion that both restriction (RO1 (restriction option with exemptions from training for low risk products), and also RO2 (restriction option with all workers to be trained)) are proportionate to the risk on the basis of an assessment of its cost and benefit comparison, and affordable to the affected supply chains. The quantified benefits were the same for both ROs while the costs of RO2 was about 50% higher than the cost of RO1. The difference in benefits between the two ROs is non-quantified benefits arising from reduction of skin sensitisation and more safe handling of chemicals in general by workers for which the risks related to use of diisocyanates are considered to be low. . With regard to the practicality and enforceability of the proposal, the rapporteurs informed the Committee that as neither all aspects on implementability nor on enforceability have been fully elaborated, the practicality of the proposed restriction has not been fully justified, although in principle the restriction has a number of merits. This is also in line with the Forum advice on enforceability of the proposal. The rapporteurs also described the comments received within the public consultation, noting that these were generally supportive comments from industry. With regard to trainings, comments were received that the content, length and frequency of the trainings should be adapted to the participants. Industry had

also commented that it is paramount that training taken and qualification of trainers are recognized from one MS to another and the possibility of e-learning was seen extremely important. Furthermore, a transition period of 5-6 years was seen necessary by most. An additional derogation was requested for medical devices, however, no supportive information on costs/benefits was provided.

One SEAC member expressed the view that the revised conditions are much clearer than they were before, however, she still found the proposal very complex and this would influence the practicality as well as implementability of the restriction. Another member also noted that the restriction proposal looks quite complicated in terms of conditions and this might result in high administrative burden for companies, especially SMEs. Furthermore, it was questioned whether e-learning would result in lower effectiveness of the training, to which the rapporteurs responded that they are aware that e-learning is not as effective as a classroom training, however, based on the conditions of the restriction, only a small percentage of workers could use this training option.

The discussion continued in an evening ad-hoc group, organised for the rapporteurs, interested SEAC members and the Secretariat, with the aim to facilitate finalisation of the draft opinion. During the second discussion slot in plenary, a presentation was provided by the Secretariat, describing the issues discussed by the ad-hoc group and how they were agreed to be tackled.

During the third discussion slot, the rapporteurs presented the changes introduced in the third draft opinion as a result of SEAC-37 discussion. The rapporteurs explained that references to OSH legislation were put in perspective and that the RAC recommendation of MS oversight of training material and implementation of training has been addressed. Several clarifications were made in costs, benefits and proportionality sections of the draft opinion. The rapporteurs also proposed that in the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion SEAC would ask specific questions on medical devices (costs and benefits of a derogation), on costs related to the introduction of risk management measures required by this restriction and on possible affordability issues for SMEs. Furthermore, it was agreed to ask a specific question regarding the length of the transitional period.

The Committee agreed on its draft opinion on the restriction proposal on diisocyanates (with modifications agreed at SEAC-37) by simple majority. Three SEAC members expressed the dissenting views. One member voted against the opinion as he considered that the evaluation of practicalities to be unfounded. Furthermore, he found that it is unclear to which extent the revised text of the restriction addresses the concerns raised. Another member took a dissenting view based on the fact that a project with the same aim as that of the proposed restriction and carried out by the Health and Safety Executive of UK under the OSH policy, but combining training with follow-up visits by inspectors – according to the view of this member, this project had a much higher effectiveness than the proposed measure and this member therefore did not agree that the proposed restriction is the most appropriate and effective EU wide measure. The third SEAC member took the minority view as the restriction would in his opinion be extremely difficult to implement and to enforce. He questioned the use of REACH instead of OSH legislation in this case and did not support the proposal. One member expressed reservations over the opinion due to issues related to the process (e.g. too short consultation time).

The rapporteurs were requested, together with the Secretariat, to make the final editorial changes to the agreed SEAC draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (Background Document and Responses to comments from the public

consultation) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion. The Chairman informed that the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion will be launched on 20 December 2017.

2) Lead and lead compounds in PVC – third draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representatives from ECHA, a representative of an occasional stakeholder observer as well as two industry experts accompanying stakeholder observers. He reminded the participants that this restriction dossier (submitted by ECHA) proposes a restriction of lead compounds in PVC articles in concentrations equal to or greater than 0.1% (w/w) with a 15 year derogation for certain building and construction articles produced from recycled PVC (with a higher restriction limit of 1% w/w) and a 10-year derogation for PVC silica separators in lead acid batteries. The Chairman reminded the Committee that the public consultation on this restriction proposal ended on 22 September 2017 with more than 20 comments received. The third draft opinion was made available to SEAC on 14 November and comments were received from four members in the subsequent commenting round. The aim of the meeting was for the Committee to agree on its draft opinion on this dossier taking into account the comments received in the public consultation.

The Secretariat briefly reported to SEAC on the RAC third draft opinion on this dossier that was going for discussion and adoption at RAC-43 later this week. The rapporteur then presented the third draft opinion. She explained to the Committee that the key issue proposed for discussion at this meeting is the scope of the restriction, namely the remaining open issues regarding the derogations – changes/additions to the wording of the restriction on recycling, lead pigments and PVC silica separators. The rapporteur added that with articles containing recycled PVC, a request has been received from industry for a higher concentration limit of 2% lead and a non-exhaustive list of PVC articles to be exempted. For lead pigments in PVC – a derogation has been proposed by the dossier submitter to clarify that lead pigments are out of the scope of the restriction, and for PVC silica separators in lead acid batteries – a company concerned provided additional information in the public consultation on the feasibility of alternatives and R&D activities.

One SEAC member questioned why the derogation for recycled PVC has no time limit, but for PVC-silica separators in lead acid batteries it is limited to 10 years. The Secretariat responded that it was the company concerned who wished to have this derogation for 10 years, however, if this restriction will be re-assessed in the future, then both derogations could be re-assessed. The rapporteur specified that the derogation for recycled PVC is also time limited to 15 years. The same member was interested what had been the basis for inclusion of two lead pigments under derogations. The Secretariat replied that the intention was to exclude authorised uses from the scope of this restriction. Another member questioned if there are more lead pigments being used in PVC, to which the Secretariat responded that according to their information these two are the only uses. Several SEAC members were interested why the word "stabiliser" was removed from the wording of the proposed restriction. The rapporteur explained that it would have caused problems with recycled PVC (as not possible to trace back the original function of lead) and in addition it would have been problematic for enforcement of the restriction.

During the second discussion slot on the dossier, the rapporteur provided a presentation on the pros and cons of the current and the previous wording of the proposal and

recommended to the Committee to stick to the current proposal, as the current wording has more pros than cons. Several SEAC members asked if the derogation could be broadened to all lead pigments, and not just to the two currently specified. The Secretariat responded that for these two lead pigments, the composition is known and it is therefore straightforward to enforce, which would not be the case with other lead pigments. The Secretariat recommended to ask a question on this issue in the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion. The rapporteur then introduced to the Committee the third draft opinion, updated by the rapporteur, together with the Secretariat, in line with comments by SEAC members made in the written commenting round on the third draft opinion as well as in SEAC-37 discussion.

The Committee agreed on its draft opinion on the restriction proposal on lead in PVC (with modifications agreed at SEAC-37) by consensus. The rapporteurs were requested, together with the Secretariat, to make the final editorial changes to the agreed SEAC draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (Background Document and Responses to comments from the public consultation) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion. The Chairman informed that the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion will be launched on 20 December 2017.

3) Lead and lead compounds in shot – second draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representatives from ECHA, an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer and a representative from the UNEP-Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA), accompanied by an expert. He reminded the participants that this restriction proposal had been submitted by ECHA in April 2017 and had been considered in conformity by SEAC in its June plenary. The dossier proposes a restriction on the use of lead shot in wetlands as well as nearby a wetland where lead shot could subsequently land in a wetland. The harmonisation of the conditions of the use of lead in shot with respect to wetlands is a priority at EU level, as national legislation has already been enacted by some Member States (or regions in some Member States) further to international action through the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) under the auspices of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) to which the EU is a Party.

The rapporteurs presented the second draft opinion highlighting the following parts of the draft opinion: details on scope of the restriction, costs to hunters, including alternative ammunition and effectiveness of alternatives, enforcement costs, benefits, including impact on waterbirds, and proportionality. The Chairman invited the Committee to discuss the second draft opinion with the aim of concluding on all the main components of the restriction and enabling the rapporteurs to develop the third version of the opinion or identify where remaining work is needed.

Concerning the scope of the restriction the SEAC rapporteurs suggested to the Committee to include buffer zones in addition to the sites covered by the Ramsar definition of wetland. They explained that borders or buffer zones around a wetland are not defined yet in the draft opinion because of unclear arguments on both sides speaking in favour and against their establishment (the original restriction dossier does not include buffer zone proposal). The rapporteurs also noted diverging comments received so far in the public consultation on the appropriateness of the proposed transition period. They also noted the importance of complementary enforcement and awareness raising

for the effectiveness of the restriction. This has not been elaborated on by the dossier submitter in the restriction proposal, as enforcement is left to the discretion of the Member States. However, the dossier submitter will compile a brief summary of the available information on experiences from the Member States in the Background Document. SEAC members concurred with the rapporteurs that the scope of the restriction proposal is appropriate in principle.

Regarding costs to hunters the SEAC rapporteurs reminded that the three main components taken into account by the dossier submitter are all operational costs.

Regarding the enforcement costs the rapporteurs noted that the additional cost of enforcing the restriction depends on the existing national legislation and enforcement already implemented in the particular Member State.

Regarding benefits the rapporteurs presented both quantified and non-quantified benefits. The quantified benefits relate to avoided mortality in waterbirds. Based on recent studies, the dossier submitter assumes that the restriction would avoid the premature death of 400 000 to 1 500 000 individuals from 33 species. The monetised benefits relate to the avoidance of the premature death of 700 000 individuals from 16 waterbird species per year, the opportunity gain of which is estimated to be at least €105 million. In addition, the restriction is estimated to reduce lead emission into the environment by 1 500 to 7 800 tonnes of lead per year. As further, non-quantified benefits the SEAC rapporteurs presented avoided mortality of predators and scavengers, beneficial impacts on leisure activities such as birdwatching, avoided human health impacts (through the consumption of contaminated game meat and/or potential consumption of contaminated (ground) water), protection of wildlife and ecosystems, and protection of rare bird species. The SEAC rapporteurs also mentioned that avoided impacts from arsenic (natural satellite of lead) were not included in the benefits analysis.

The SEAC rapporteurs agreed with the dossier submitter's estimate of the total annual cost to hunters in EU of €76.2 million, and the total societal costs of €35 to 61 million as well as with the dossier submitter's estimate the total societal benefit (disregarding any non-quantified benefits as mentioned above) of at least €105 million per year.

SEAC members who took part in the discussion spoke generally in favour of the draft opinion as prepared by the rapporteurs. Some of the SEAC members highlighted that the quantified costs under the worst case scenario presented by the dossier submitter might not support the proportionality conclusion. They urged the rapporteurs to elaborate in the draft opinion on the non-quantified costs, which are believed to exceed quantified costs even under worst-case assumptions.

The expert accompanying the UNEP AEWA Representative noted that in terms of ballistic properties, steel shot in its performance is comparable with the one of lead used over a shooting distance of 35-40 meters. A representative of the European Commission urged the rapporteurs to analyse the concept of 'possession' within a restriction on the 'use' of lead shot over wetlands. He also requested the rapporteurs to investigate and address in the opinion if there is or is not risk to hunters from explosion of the guns, which are using steel shot. In addition, the dossier submitter provided few examples of the existing national restrictions on the lead shot. They also mentioned that approximately 70% of the existing Natura 2000 protected natural sites are covered by the Ramsar definition of 'wetland'.

The Chairman summarised that the SEAC agreed on costs of the restriction proposal as well as on the benefits and the overall proportionality of the restriction proposal, as

reflected in the draft opinion. The rapporteurs should consider the plenary discussion in their drafting of the third draft opinion, which should be developed by the rapporteurs by early February 2018.

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

The Chairman informed the Committee regarding the upcoming restriction proposal that has been included in the Registry of Intentions (RoI). In October 2018, Italy will be submitting a restriction proposal on N,N-dimethylformamide, aiming at risk reduction for the general worker population.

The Chairman reminded that the calls for expression of interest for new dossiers to be submitted in 2018 will be launched early 2018.

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues

a) Update on incoming / future applications

The Secretariat informed the Committee that three new applications for authorisation were submitted during the November 2017 submission window. One of the received applications for authorisation concerns the downstream use of dibutyl phthalate (DBP) in the production of ceramic sheets for multi-layer ceramic capacitors. DBP is not present in the articles. The other application for authorisation concerns the downstream use of sodium dichromate as corrosion inhibitor in ammonia absorption deep cooling systems, applied for the dewaxing and deoiling process steps of petroleum raffinate. And the third new application for authorisation concerns the downstream use of bis(2-methoxyethyl) ether (diglyme) as a solvent for the synthesis of an anti-HIV active pharmaceutical ingredient.

b) Report from the Applications Stock-taking Conference

The Secretariat informed the Committee about the Authorisation Stock-taking Conference, which took place on 13-14 November 2017. About 120 participants from ECHA, the European Commission, applicants, alternative suppliers, consultants, NGOs, the Member States, the RAC and SEAC members participated in the Conference.

The participants of the Conference concluded that overall aim of the authorisation system has been achieved: substitution has taken place and risks have been reduced at every stage of the authorisation process, including a candidate list, an authorisation list and applications for authorisation. Applicants have demonstrated improvement in the description of the risks of continued use. This might have been achieved, e.g. due to the publication of the RAC and SEAC checklists. However, the main challenge is still how upstream applicants describe the uses also from the point of view of alternatives.

ECHA, the Commission and the AfA Task Force will further work to improve the authorisation system specifically on the following: 1) matching use description and analysis of alternatives; better and earlier input from alternative providers, 2) improving

the cost-effectiveness of applications, 3) enhancing supply-chain communication, and 4) further actions may possibly be identified from the Commission REACH Review.

c) Lines to take for environmental EDs

The Secretariat informed the Committee about the document describing one possible approach for the applicant to prepare a SEA for the environmental endocrine disrupting substances included in Annex XIV of the REACH Regulation. The document had been produced in order to address the industry's concerns on how to assess environmental EDs in applications for authorisation. The Secretariat informed that RAC has worked on questions and answers for these substances, and the Committee concluded that setting a threshold does not seem to be possible with sufficient certainty, and that RAC will evaluate the applications on the same basis as PBT/vPvB substances with a focus on releases of the substances. The room document SEAC/37/2017/03 summarises the Secretariat's and the European Commission's view on SEA aspects.

SEAC agreed to use this document as a temporary guidance for applicants. The Secretariat will update the document considering the discussion and inform future applicants about the approach.

6.2) Authorisation applications

a) Discussion on key issues

1. PCO_IP (2 uses)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At this plenary meeting the Secretariat presented the identified key issues in the application for authorisation.

The Secretariat in cooperation with the SEAC rapporteurs provided general information regarding this new application. In the presentation of the case, the Secretariat outlined the key issues identified by the rapporteurs and asked the Committee for comments and further suggestions.

The Committee noted those key issues. SEAC will request further clarifications from the applicant on the issues identified and discussed by the rapporteurs and the Secretariat. The SEAC rapporteurs will draft the opinions on the application for authorisation for discussion and agreement at the next SEAC plenary meeting in March 2018.

b) Agreement on draft opinions

1. CT_Hapoc (3 uses)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. Use 1 (Use of chromium trioxide in dissolved and solid form to produce aqueous solutions of any composition for industrial application) will be dealt with by SEAC at the next plenary meeting in March 2018. At this plenary meeting the SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinions for the agreement on the Uses 2, 3 and 4.

The applicant asked for additional time to answer the rapporteurs' questions following the trialogue in spring of this year. By 31 July 2017, as agreed with ECHA, the applicant

had provided additional information. Over 80% of Hapoc's members carry out functional (hard) chrome plating and this gives the application a clearer focus for SEAC to consider.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinions, which was discussed at the RAC plenary meeting. The SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinions. The discussion focused mainly on the analysis of alternatives and the socio-economic analysis. During the discussion the SEAC members supported the approach taken by the SEAC rapporteurs in drafting the opinions. The Committee members discussed additional conditions in the draft opinions for the authorisation and the review reports and a length of the review period. The Commission representative noted the unconventional approach taken by the applicant when submitting the application for authorisation and requested a clarification regarding the conclusion on the analysis of alternatives. Two representatives of the Stakeholder Organisations issued concerns about the general broadness of the scope of the application for authorisation.

The draft opinions on the Uses 3 and 4 were subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The draft opinion on the Use 2 was agreed by simple majority. One Member voted against the draft opinion on use 2 mainly because he did not find that the applicant had sufficiently demonstrated that suitable alternatives for the downstream users do not exist. The rapporteurs were asked to revise the draft opinions following the agreement on the draft opinions in RAC (if needed).

2. CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At this plenary meeting the SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinion for the agreement.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinion, which was discussed at the RAC plenary meeting. The SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinions. The discussion focused mainly on the analysis of alternatives and the socio-economic analysis. During the discussion on the draft opinion the Committee focused on a length of the review period.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The rapporteurs were asked to revise the draft opinions following the agreement on the draft opinions in RAC (if needed).

3. CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At this plenary meeting the SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinions for the agreement.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinion, which was discussed at the RAC plenary meeting. The SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinions. The discussion focused mainly on the analysis of alternatives and the socio-economic analysis. During the discussion the Committee discussed that the opinion should be conditionally limited to the production of a single type of medical devices done by the only downstream user.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The rapporteurs were asked to revise the draft opinions following the agreement on the draft opinions in RAC (if needed).

4. SD_Hapoc (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At this plenary meeting the SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinion for the agreement.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinion, which was discussed at the RAC plenary meeting. SEAC members were informed that the applicant did not address RAC and SEAC rapporteurs' questions by the given deadline of 31 August 2017. Instead, the applicant asked for a second extension of the deadline, which ECHA did not grant. Since a number of the RAC rapporteurs' questions addressed conformity issues, and these gaps in the application had not been addressed by the applicant, the RAC rapporteurs proposed that the Committee is not in the position to evaluate the risks to human health, arising from the use of the substance, as required under Article 64(a) of the REACH Regulation. In consequence, SEAC could not evaluate the socio-economic factors (e.g. whether the benefits outweigh the risks to human health) as stipulated by Article 64(4)(b) of the REACH Regulation.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The rapporteurs were asked to revise the draft opinions following the agreement on the draft opinions in RAC (if needed).

5. EDC_Microbeads (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-36, the Committee discussed the key issues for this application. At this plenary, the SEAC Members were asked to consider the agreement of the SEAC draft opinion.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinions. Then the SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft opinions. This is a narrow scope downstream user application for the single industrial use of EDC as a swelling agent during the sulfonation reaction of crosslinked polystyrene beads in the manufacture of ion exchange resins for purification of radioactive waste. 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.

The draft opinion was agreed by consensus as proposed by the rapporteurs.

6. CT_ZFF (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-36, the Committee discussed the key issues for this application. At this plenary, the SEAC members were asked to agree on the SEAC draft opinion.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinion. The rapporteurs presented the SEAC draft opinion. The discussion focused mainly on the review period, as well as the effect of the recommended additional

conditions on the expected risk level. The Secretariat clarified that the risk is expected to remain on the same level since the additional conditions recommended by RAC do not include any new measures that would change the current processes followed by the Applicant.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat.

7. **SC_Wesco (1 use)**
8. **DtC_Wesco (1 use)**
9. **PCO_Aviall (2 uses)**

The Chairman introduced the applications for authorisation. At this plenary meeting the SEAC rapporteurs presented a status update concerning preparation of the draft opinions.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the status of the RAC draft opinions, which were discussed at the RAC plenary meeting. The SEAC rapporteurs updated the Committee members about the opinions development progress in light of the recent trialogues, which took place in November 2017. During the discussion the Committee discussed availability of alternatives and socio-economic analysis, as well as a length of the review period.

The rapporteurs were asked to draft the opinions on these applications for authorisation for the discussion and agreement at the next SEAC plenary meeting in March 2018.

c) Adoption of final opinions

1. **MOCA_Reachlaw (1 use)**

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the SEAC-35 plenary meeting the Committee had agreed on the draft opinion. The draft opinion was sent to the applicant, who commented on the draft opinion. The rapporteurs proposed not to update the draft opinions based on the comments from the applicant.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the draft SEAC final opinion. The Committee briefly discussed availability of alternatives and non-use scenarios in the application for authorisation. The Commission representative requested that the opinion explains why qualification of the use applied for was not practically possible vis-à-vis the conclusion of the analysis of alternatives.

Members supported the proposal made by the rapporteurs. The final opinion was subsequently adopted by consensus. The opinions will be sent to the applicant, the European Commission and the Member States.

The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

2. **SC_Aviall (2 uses)**
3. **CT_Haas (1 use)**
4. **SD_Haas (1 use)**
5. **PD_Haas (1 use)**

The Chairman introduced these applications for authorisation. At the SEAC-35 plenary meeting the Committee had agreed on the draft opinions. The draft opinions were sent to the applicant, who commented on the draft opinions. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinions based on the comments from the applicant. The SEAC rapporteurs presented the draft SEAC final opinions.

Members supported the changes made by the rapporteurs. The final opinions were subsequently adopted by consensus. The opinions will be sent to the applicant, the European Commission and the Member States. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the applications.

6.3 Review reports

a) Discussion on key issues

1. **RR1_DEHP_VINYLOOP (2 uses)**
2. **RR1_DEHP_PP (2 uses)**

The Chairman introduced the review reports. At this plenary meeting the SEAC rapporteurs presented the identified key issues in the review reports.

The rapporteurs provided general information regarding these new review reports. In the presentation of the case, they outlined the key issues identified by the rapporteurs and asked the Committee for comments and further suggestions.

The Committee noted those key issues. SEAC will request further clarifications from the authorisation holders on the issues identified and discussed by the rapporteurs and the Secretariat. The SEAC rapporteurs will draft the opinions on the review reports for discussion and agreement at the next SEAC plenary meeting in March 2018.

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

The pool of (co-)rapporteurs, as outlined in the amended restricted room document SEAC/37/2017/02 rev.1, was agreed by SEAC. The Committee also requested the Secretariat to review the process of appointment of (co-) rapporteurs for AfAs.

7) AOB

a) Update of the work plan

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

b) Report from the Impact Assessment Scoping Group meeting

The Secretariat provided a brief report from the RAC/SEAC Impact Assessment Scoping Group meeting, held on 17 October 2017.

c) Coaching on presentation skills

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

d) Update on ECHA new building project

The Secretariat provided a short update on ECHA new building project.

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-37

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

II. Main conclusions and action points

SEAC-37, 27 - 30 November 2017
(Adopted at SEAC-37 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	**Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)**
2. Adoption of the agenda	
The agenda was adopted with no modifications.	**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	
a) Report on SEAC-36 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-36. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/37/2017/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in the CARACAL.	
b) REACH Authorisation – Criteria for longer review period	
SEAC took note of the room document on Criteria for longer review period (SEAC/37/2017/04).	
5. Restrictions	
5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Conformity check and key issues discussion	
1) Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up	
SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitters.	**SECR** to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this S-CIRCABC IG. **SECR** to inform the dossier submitters on the

	outcome of the conformity check.
2) C9-14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances	
SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitters.	**SECR** to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this S-CIRCABC IG. **SECR** to inform the dossier submitters on the outcome of the conformity check.
b) **Opinion development**	
1. Diisocyanates - third draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the third draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on Diisocyanates dossier by simple majority (with modifications agreed at SEAC-37). The dissenting views will be reflected in the minutes.	**Rapporteurs** together with **SECR** to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion. **SECR** to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in December 2017.
2. Lead and lead compounds in PVC – third draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the third draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on Lead in PVC dossier by consensus (with modifications agreed at SEAC-37).	**Rapporteurs** together with **SECR** to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion. **SECR** to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in December 2017.
3. Lead and lead compounds in shot – second draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the second draft opinion.	**SEAC members** to provide comments on the second draft opinion until 6 December 2017. **Rapporteurs** to prepare the third draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-37 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the beginning of February 2018.
5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
SEAC was informed about the upcoming restriction proposals included in the RoI.	**SECR** to launch the calls for expression of interest for these dossiers early 2018.
6. Authorisation	
6.1 General authorisation issues	

a) Update on incoming/future applications b) Report from the Authorisation Stock-taking conference	
SEAC took note of the update on the incoming/future applications as well as of the report from the Authorisation Stock-taking conference.	
c) Lines to take for environmental EDs	
SEAC took note of the room document (SEAC/37/2017/03) on lines to take for environmental EDs and agreed to use this document as a temporary guidance for applicants.	**SECR** to update the document considering the SEAC-37 discussion.
6.2 Authorisation applications	
a) Discussion on key issues	
1. PCO_IP (2 uses)	
SEAC discussed the key issues identified in the application for authorisation.	**Rapporteurs** to prepare the first versions of the draft opinions, taking into account the SEAC-37 discussions.
b) Agreement on draft opinions	
1. CT_Hapoc (uses 2, 3 and 4) 2. CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use) 3. CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use) 4. SD_Hapoc (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions. <u>CT_Hapoc (use 2):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by simple majority. The minority view will be reflected in the minutes. <u>CT_Hapoc (uses 3 and 4):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus. <u>CT_Hapoc 2 (use 1):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus. <u>CT_Hapoc_3 (use 1):</u> SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	**Rapporteurs** together with **SECR** to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions. **Rapporteurs** to revise the draft opinions following the agreement on the draft opinions in RAC (if needed). **SECR** to send the draft opinions to the applicants for commenting.

SD_Hapoc (use 1): SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	
5. EDC_Microbeads (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	**Rapporteurs** together with **SECR** to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion. **SECR** to send the draft opinion to the applicants for commenting.
6. CT_ZFF (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	**Rapporteurs** together with **SECR** to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion. **SECR** to send the draft opinion to the applicants for commenting.
7. SC_Wesco (1 use) 8. DtC_Wesco (1 use) 9. PCO_Aviall (2 uses)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the status update on the opinion development for the applications for authorisation.	**Rapporteurs** to develop the draft opinions by February 2018 (to be tabled for discussion and agreement at SEAC-38).
c) Adoption of final opinions	
1. MOCA_Reachlaw (1 use) 2. SC_Aviall (2 uses) 3. CT_Haas (1 use) 4. SD_Haas (1 use) 5. PD_Haas (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the drafts of the SEAC final opinions. SEAC adopted the final opinions by consensus.	**SECR** to send the final opinions to the Commission, the Member States and the applicants.
6.3 Review reports	

a) Discussion on key issues 1. RR1_DEHP_VINYLOOP (2 uses) 2. RR1_DEHP_PP (2 uses)	
SEAC discussed the key issues identified in the review reports.	**Rapporteurs** to prepare the first versions of the draft opinions, taking into account the SEAC-37 discussions.
6.4 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)	
SEAC agreed on the updated pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (considered as agreement on appointment in line with SEAC/37/2017/02 Rev.1 restricted room document).	**SEAC members** to volunteer to the pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation. **SECR** to upload the updated document to confidential folder on S-CIRCABC IG. **SECR** to review the process of appointment of (co-) rapporteurs for AfAs on request of SEAC.
8. Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-37	
SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-37.	**SECR** to upload the action points and main conclusions to S-CIRCABC IG.

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-37

SEAC members
ALEXANDRE Joao
ANASTASIOU Christos
BERGS Ivars
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
CASTELLI Stefano
CAVALIERI Luisa
COGEN Simon
CSERGŐ Robert (co-opted)
DELCOURT Benjamin
DOUGHERTY Gary
FANKHAUSER Simone
FIORE Karine
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros
JANSSEN Martien
JONES Derrick (co-opted)
KIISKI Johanna
KRAJNC Karmen
LOCS Janis
LÜDEKE Andreas
LUIT Richard
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
NORING Maria
OLTEANU Maria
RUZGYS Karolis
SCHUCHTAR Endre
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina
THIELE Karen
URBAN Klaus
ZAIKOVA Ilona
ZAMFIR Adrian-Stefan
Commission observers
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)
GALLEGO Matteo (DG ENV)
Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts
BINKS Steve (International Lead Association - expert accompanying Mr Hugo WAETERSCHOOT for the discussion on Lead in shot and Lead and its compounds in PVC)
CAVALLERO Alain (ESPA = European Stabiliser Producer Association, accompanying CEFIC for the discussion on Lead and its compounds in PVC)

Advisors, invited experts, observers & dossier submitters (DS)
ANDERSSON Wiktor (as advisor to Maria NORING via WebEx)
AVERBECK Frauke (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
BERNHEIM Theresa (advisor to Karen THIELE)
BLOM Cecile (as DS for tattoo inks via WebEx)
BLUME Annegret (as expert accompanying DS for tattoo inks)
BIEGEL-ENGLER Annegret (DS for PFCAs)
BORG Daniel (DS for PFCAs via Webex)
De BLAEIJ Arianne (advisor to Martien JANSSEN via WebEx)
DROSSARD Claudia (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
GUDRUN Walendzik (DS for Diisocyanates)
GUHE Christine (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
HELLER-HUTORAN Svetlana (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
HELMEDACH Achim (advisor to Karen THIELE via WebEx)
JONGENEEL Rob (advisor to Richard LUIT)
LERCHE Dorte (advisor to Lars FOCK via Webex)
LINDQVIST Martin (acting as advisor to Maria Noring and as a DS for PFCAs)
LUEDEKE Andreas (DS for Diisocyanates)
NIEDERSTRASSE Bernd (DS for PFCAs via WebEx)
REALE Priscilla (advisor to Luisa CAVALIERI via WebEx)
ROTHER Dag (DS for Diisocyanates via WebEx)
ROUW Aart (DS for Diisocyanates)
STAUDE Claudia (DS for PFCAs via WebEx)
VAN DER HAGEN Marianne (DS for tattoo inks via WebEx)
WALENDZIK Gudrun (DS for Diiscocyanates)

Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts (cont.)
HAIDER Sonja (ChemSec)
HOLLAND Mike (EAERE)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
LUCKE-BRUNK Gudrun (Covestro Deutschland AG), accompanying CEFIC for the discussions on Diisocyanates
MIKANDER Nina (AEWA – UNEP international observer for the discussion on Lead in shot)
ROGER Apolline (ClientEarth)
SWIFT John (AEWA – UNEP expert accompanying Ms Mikander for the discussion on Lead in shot)
TILLIEUX Geoffroy (EUPC = European Plastics Converters), for the discussion on Diisocyanates and Lead and its compounds in PVC
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)
RAC RAPPORTEURS
DUNAUSKIENE Lina
KADIKIS Normunds
KAPELARI Sonja
SOGORB Miguel

ECHA STAFF
BLAINEY Mark
BERGES Markus
FESIL Mushtaq
HENRICHSON Sanna (via WebEx)
JACQUEMIN Katline
KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia (via Webex)
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
KOULOUMPOS Vasileios
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORZS Arnis
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MAZZOLINI Anna
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
PELTOLA Jukka
REGIL Pablo
RHEINBERGER Christoph
RODRIGUEZ-IGLESIAS Pilar (via WebEx)
SADAM Diana
SIMPSON Peter
SJOBERG Thomas
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
ÖBERG Tomas

IV. List of Annexes

ANNEX I

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

Document	Number
Final Draft Agenda	*SEAC/A/37/2017_rev.1*
Report on SEAC-36 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies	*SEAC/37/2017/01*
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)	*SEAC/37/2017/02 (restricted room documen)*
Lines to take for environmental EDs	*SEAC/37/2017/03 (room document)*
REACH Authorisation - Criteria for longer review periods	*SEAC/37/2017/04 (room document)*

ANNEX II

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST TO THE RESPECTIVE AGENDA ITEMS

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

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

ANNEX III

21 November 2017

SEAC/A/37/2017_rev.1

Final Draft Agenda

37th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

27 -30 November 2017
ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

27 November starts at 14.00
30 November ends at 13.00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/37/2017
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-36 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

SEAC/37/2017/01
For information

b) REACH Authorisation - Criteria for longer review periods

SEAC/37/2017/04
(room document)
For information

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Conformity check and key issues discussion

1) Substances used in tattoo inks and permanent make-up
2) C9-14 PFCAs, their salts and related substances

For agreement

b) Opinion development

1) Diisocyanates – third draft opinion
2) Lead and lead compounds in PVC – third draft opinion

For agreement

3) Lead and lead compounds in shot – second draft opinion

For discussion

5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

For information

Item 6 – Authorisation

6.1 General authorisation issues

a) Update on incoming/future applications
b) Report from the AfA Stock-taking Conference
c) Lines to take for environmental EDs

SEAC/37/2017/03
(room document)
For information

6.2 Authorisation applications

a) Discussion on key issues

1. PCO_IP (2 uses)

For discussion

b) Agreement on draft opinions

1. CT_Hapoc (3 uses)
2. CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use)
3. CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use)
4. SD_Hapoc (1 use)
5. EDC_Microbeads (1 use)
6. CT_ZFF (1 use)

For discussion and agreement

7. SC_Wesco (1 use)
8. DtC_Wesco (1 use)
9. PCO_Aviall (2 uses)

For discussion

c) Adoption of final opinions

1. MOCA_Reachlaw (1 use)
2. SC_Aviall (2 uses)
3. CT_Haas (1 use)
4. SD_Haas (1 use)
5. PD_Haas (1 use)

For discussion and adoption

6.3 Review reports

b) Discussion on key issues

3. RR1_DEHP_VINYLOOP (2 uses)
4. RR1_DEHP_PP (2 uses)

For discussion

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

SEAC/37/2017/02
(restricted room document)
For agreement

Item 7 – AOB

a) Update of the work plan

b) Report from the Impact Assessment Scoping Group meeting

c) Coaching on presentation skills

d) Update on ECHA new building project

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-37

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-37

For adoption