

11 February 2015

SEAC/M/25/2014

Final

Minutes of the 25th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

25-28 November 2014

I. Summary Record of the Proceeding

1) Welcome and apologies

Tomas Öberg, Chair of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants of the twenty fifth meeting of SEAC.

The Chair informed the Committee that apologies had been received from three members and two stakeholder observers. One invited expert, six advisors to the members, two representatives of the European Commission, observers of five stakeholder organisations and two accompanying experts present at the meeting were introduced. The Chair informed the participants that one member and four members' advisors were to follow the relevant parts of the meeting via WebEx, and that the RAC (co-)rapporteurs, the dossier submitter representatives and the experts following specific agenda items would be presented at the beginning of the relevant discussions.

The Chair also 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 Chair introduced the draft agenda of SEAC-25. The agenda was adopted with one addition under the Agenda Item 6.2 (adoption of the final opinions on DEHP 2c and DBP 2 use 3 applications for authorisation). 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 Chair requested members, their advisors and invited experts participating in the meeting to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Eight members and seven advisors declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions under the Agenda Items 5.2 and 6.2. These members did not participate in voting under the respective 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-24 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

In relation to the action points of the previous SEAC-24 meeting, the Chair informed the Committee that the updated Rules of Procedure will be presented to SEAC in March 2015, due to the fact that the Secretariat had been putting priority on other efficiency measures. All other action points have been completed or will be followed up during the on-going SEAC-25 meeting.

Furthermore, the Chair informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-24 had been adopted by written procedure and had been uploaded to CIRCABC as

well as on the ECHA website. The Chair thanked members and observers for providing comments on the draft SEAC-24 minutes.

The Chair explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA MB, RAC, MSC, the Forum and BPC had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/25/2014/01).

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

b) General SEAC procedures

The Secretariat provided a presentation on the revised working procedure for RAC and SEAC on the appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for AfA, CLH and restrictions, which aim to increase the efficiency as well as harmonize and streamline the approaches in all three processes. AfA was presented as a good example: members apply for rapporteurship, the Committee agrees on the pool of rapporteurs and the Chair selects the rapporteur(s) for each application.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion. Several participants welcomed and supported the simplification of the procedure. One member suggested including a reference to the service contract into the working procedure.

The working procedure, with additional modification introduced during the meeting as outlined in the amended document SEAC/25/2014/02_rev.1, was agreed by SEAC.

5) Restrictions

5.1) General restriction issues

a) Review of the restriction process – update from the Task Force

The Chair invited a representative of the Secretariat to provide an update from the Restrictions Efficiency Task Force (RETF). The RETF was set up to facilitate a discussion among MSs, ECHA's Committees and the Secretariat, and the Commission on the efficiency of the restriction process and to make recommendations for improving the efficiency. The RETF has agreed on recommendations within the following topics: the opinion making procedures in the Committees, the extent of analysis required (dossiers and opinions), the challenges in preparing proposals, the scope and targeting, the proportionality and technicalities (Annex XV format, guidance). ECHA and the Commission intend to hold workshops in 2015 to discuss the implementation of recommendations with the MSs and to monitor the implementation of the recommendations by the relevant parties. It is proposed to report back to the Committees, the Management Board and CARACAL at the end of 2015 on implementation and to monitor resources used for future restriction proposals.

One stakeholder observer questioned how ECHA intends to improve the awareness of public consultations carried out on Annex XV reports. The representative of the Secretariat informed the Committee about its ideas for improving the publicity (e.g. better identification of relevant stakeholders, targeting relevant stakeholders through MSCAs, etc) and confirmed that some of these ideas have already been implemented on the public consultations recently started (e.g. on the Ammonium salts and the BPA restriction dossiers). One member commented on the complexity of the dossiers received and emphasised the importance of having a contact between the Secretariat and the dossier submitter already in the phase of the preparation of a dossier. This member also expressed his view that the rapporteurs

should not be responsible for the Background Document (BD), but this should rather be the responsibility of the Secretariat.

5.2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Opinion development

1) 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) – 1st version of the final opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (NL), who followed the discussion remotely via WebEx. The Chair reminded the Committee that the deadline for the SEAC opinion on this restriction proposal had been postponed by 90 days based on Article 71(3) of REACH. The Chair also informed that the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion had finished on 14 November.

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs presented the SEAC final opinion to the Committee. They explained that there were fourteen comments received within the public consultation. Having taken the comments into consideration, their conclusion remained the same as in the SEAC draft opinion. The main issue to be discussed in SEAC is whether to prolong the implementation time of the proposed restriction for the wire coating sector due to cost-effectiveness concerns for some wire coating lines.

Several members supported the prolongation of the implementation time for the wire coating sector, as this would give substantial cost savings. It was agreed to indicate in the final opinion that SEAC considers that for the use in wire coating lines it might be appropriate to allow longer time for the implementation of risk reduction measures.

The Committee adopted its final opinion (with modifications introduced during the meeting) by consensus. The rapporteurs were asked, together with the Secretariat, to do the final editing of the opinion and to ensure that the BD is in line with the adopted SEAC opinion. The Secretariat will forward the adopted opinion and its annexes to the Commission as well as publish on the ECHA website.

2) Cadmium and its compounds in paints – 1st version of the final opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representative (ECHA). The Chair reminded the Committee that this is a technical amendment to an existing restriction at the request of the Commission. The SEAC rapporteurs presented to the Committee the 1st version of the SEAC final opinion. Following the end of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion on 14 November 2014 (with three comments received), the rapporteurs had not made any changes to the opinion.

The Committee adopted the SEAC final opinion by consensus. The rapporteurs were asked, together with the Secretariat, to ensure that the BD is in line with the adopted SEAC opinion. The Secretariat will forward the adopted opinion and its annexes to the Commission as well as publish on the ECHA website.

3) Cadmium and its compounds in artists' paints – revised draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (Sweden) and an industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer. He informed the Committee of the state of play regarding the opinion development on this dossier and about the 666 comments received in the public consultation, many from artists who are mainly against the proposed restriction, but also from industry, Member States and non-governmental organisations.

The Chair then asked the Secretariat to report back from the RAC-31 discussions, where RAC had concluded that the proposed restriction is not justified because in reducing the risks from cadmium in artists' paints alone, this restriction is not considered to be the most appropriate EU wide measure to address the negligible level of risks identified by RAC in terms of its effectiveness. Following the RAC rapporteur's update, the SEAC rapporteurs presented their revised draft opinion. The SEAC rapporteurs restated their view that the proposed restriction is not the most appropriate EU wide measure. The presentation also outlined the release factors of Cd into soil, the use of alternatives, proportionality and the other RMOs.

After the modifications made in the justification text of the opinion at the plenary, the rapporteurs concluded (taking into account the RAC's conclusions) that the proposed restriction is not the most appropriate EU wide measure to address the identified risks in terms of the proportionality of its socio-economic benefits to its socio-economic costs. The Committee agreed by consensus on the SEAC draft opinion, as further modified in the following plenary session. The Chair informed the Committee that the Secretariat will launch the 60 day public consultation on the agreed draft opinion in December 2014. The Committee is expected to adopt its final opinion on this dossier at SEAC-26 in March 2015.

4) Chrysotile – revised draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the RAC rapporteur and an industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer. The Chair informed the Committee of the state of play regarding the opinion development on the amendment of derogation to an existing restriction designed to phase out the last uses (two companies) of chrysotile in the EU. The Chair then asked the RAC rapporteur to report back from the RAC-31 discussions, where RAC had adopted its opinion in support of the restriction proposal by ECHA. Following the RAC rapporteur's update, the SEAC rapporteurs presented to the Committee the revised SEAC draft opinion.

SEAC discussed the need to keep the last paragraph in the wording of the Annex XVII proposal in the opinion regarding the review for the exemption after 2025, to be in line with the adopted RAC opinion. The stakeholder observers expressed their concerns for leaving this in, as well as questioned the need to allow DOW to continue its import of fibres after 2017, as there is already a voluntary agreement with the German authorities to stop the imports of chrysotile (for both fibres and contained in diaphragms). The industry expert re-explained to the Committee that until 2017, Dow will need to ensure the quality of the fibres they have available to make sure that they have the right type of long fibres. Furthermore, the rapporteurs, on request by the stakeholder observer, updated the Committee regarding the outcome of the public consultation. The rapporteurs had not changed the SEAC draft opinion based on approximately 160 comments received.

Based on the discussions, SEAC agreed to introduce two public consultation questions on the need to remove the import of fibres after 2017 as well as on the possibility of the review after 2025. The comments received will be taken into account in the final SEAC opinion to be adopted in March 2015.

After the minor modifications made in the justification text of the opinion at the plenary, SEAC agreed on its draft opinion on the chrysotile dossier by simple majority. Two SEAC members expressed dissenting views on the SEAC draft opinion. One of them stated that there are no grounds for a restriction; furthermore the opinion fails to acknowledge that given the control measures in place, the proposed restriction imposes large net welfare costs to society and fails to acknowledge that the proposed restriction's aim to improve clarity, transparency and provide incentives to phase out chrysotile use is undermined by the possibility for DOW to renew the derogation in 2025 as per the proposed restriction. Another member restated his dissenting views as reflected in the SEAC-23 minutes.

The Chair informed the Committee that the Secretariat will launch the 60 day public consultation on the agreed draft opinion in December 2014. The Committee is expected to adopt its final opinion on this dossier at SEAC-26 in March 2015.

5) 4,4-Isopropylidenediphenol (bisphenol A) – first draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (France) and the RAC rapporteurs. He then introduced the state of play regarding the restriction dossier on bisphenol A used in thermal paper. The RAC rapporteurs were asked to summarise the outcome of the discussion on the first draft opinion, which took place in RAC 31. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first draft opinion to SEAC.

On questions from the members the rapporteurs explained that in the current model health benefits are not linked to the total tonnage of BPA and therefore conclusions on proportionality are difficult to make. The rapporteurs proposed to make an approximation to this by evaluating cost and benefits in a single year and assume the resulting cost benefits ratio as representative for all coming years. SEAC agreed to this approximation.

Some members and one stakeholder observer expressed concerns how to compare non-quantifiable and quantifiable benefits with regards to proportionality. It was questioned whether there can be enough certainty on non-quantifiable health impact to conclude on identified benefits.

The discussion further focussed on the likelihood of BPS being used as an alternative. The most likely scenario for transfer of BPA to BPS in between the two extreme scenarios would need to be further clarified.

One member considered that the paper-free alternatives (electronic receipts) should be taken into account, especially since the cost-benefit analysis assumes a time limit which is far in the future. The rapporteurs explained that this was done for analytical reasons as benefits are only realised further in the future.

The rapporteur mentioned that it was also not possible at this stage to conclude on proportionality, as the net alternatives will depend on the alternatives chosen by industry in the end. Furthermore, SEAC is awaiting the conclusion of RAC on the risk assessment.

The Chair concluded that SEAC generally supported the first draft opinion, but that it was too early to conclude on benefits, costs and proportionality analysis, as this is contingent on the RAC's clarifications and conclusions on the risk assessment for cashiers and workers.

The SEAC rapporteurs were asked to take the discussions into account in their revised draft opinion, which is due by end of January 2015. SEAC is expected to agree on its draft opinion on this dossier at SEAC-26 in March 2015.

6) Ammonium salts – first draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (France) and the RAC rapporteurs. He reminded the participants that this restriction dossier had been submitted under Article 129 of the REACH Regulation (safeguard clause). Substances in the scope of the restriction proposal are inorganic ammonium salts that are used as additives in cellulose insulation for their flame retardant properties.

The RAC (co-)rapporteurs were invited to briefly present their first draft opinion and the results of the RAC-31 discussion on this dossier to SEAC. The SEAC (co-) rapporteurs then presented the SEAC first draft opinion to the participants of the meeting. They recommended to the Committee that SEAC would take a "soft" approach with regard to the justification for action on EU wide basis, considering that this restriction proposal has been submitted within Article 129(3) of REACH.

The rapporteurs consider the restriction of emission limit as the most appropriate measure. However, the rapporteurs do not see a sufficient proof for technical feasibility of the proposed limit, therefore RMO1 (restriction on ammonia emissions) and 2 (restriction on ammonium salts content) seem quite similar. In addition, the rapporteurs consider RMO2 to be better enforceable compared to RMO1. The rapporteurs also informed SEAC that the proportionality assessment will need to be updated and that they might prepare a document on the benefits approach of the proposal (internalised costs for industry).

The Secretariat informed that as was agreed at SEAC-24, ECHA had carried out a targeted consultation with industry, which yielded four comments in total; the most important comment (also submitted via the public consultation process) was sent by a flame retarder manufacturer - that provides some information on the potential stabilisation of ammonium blends.

One member explained that as there is a national measure in France established, it can be assumed that such type of insulation is not produced in France anymore. He pointed out that as there are hardly any cases elsewhere, it is difficult to see justification for the EU wide measure. The rapporteurs, several other members as well as the Commission observer, however, indicated that the fact that there are no reported cases is not a convincing argument, since similar formulations of ammonium based insulation are widely used in the EU. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that they would cause the same type of incidents and health risks. The rapporteurs informed that the Secretariat had received some indications about similar cases from Slovenia (but concerning eye irritation), who had promised to submit this information within the public consultation. The Committee agreed with the rapporteurs that the need for EU wide measure is justified. One SEAC member did not support this view.

One member questioned why the rapporteurs consider that RMO2 is better enforceable than RMO1, as it is easier to measure content than emission. One SEAC stakeholder observer informed that sometimes the costs of testing emission are cheaper than for testing of content and methods based on emission trigger innovation (as they simulate the actual exposure to a chemical than the concentration level). The rapporteurs noted that they plan to consult with the Forum on this aspect. SEAC therefore decided to wait on the choice of RMO for the final results of the public consultation and further advice by the Forum. In addition, SEAC agreed, there was no need to compare CPR to REACH as which is the most appropriate legislative framework to deal with ammonia emissions in cellulose material. In principle, this is an issue for the Commission to decide, so no further analysis is necessary. Furthermore, the rapporteurs agreed with the dossier submitter that labelling and voluntary agreement of industry cannot be considered as sufficient RMOs.

The Chair concluded that SEAC agreed that there is justification for an EU wide measure, but decided to wait with its conclusion on the choice of RMO until the end of the public consultation (finishes on 18 December 2014) and further advice by the Forum. The Chair informed that the rapporteurs should prepare a revised SEAC draft opinion (which will focus on the cost/benefit aspects and the proportionality analysis of the proposed restriction), taking into account the SEAC-25 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the end of January 2015. SEAC is expected to agree on its draft opinion on this dossier at SEAC-26 in March 2015.

7) DecaBDE – key issues document

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (ECHA), the Norwegian representatives as well as the RAC rapporteur to follow the discussions. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier on decaBDE focuses on the hazard and risk of the use of decaBDE as a flame retardant in plastics and textiles. DecaBDE exhibits a widespread occurrence in the environment and in wildlife. In addition to PBT/vPvB concerns, other potential impacts of exposure to decaBDE may result in neurotoxicity in mammals, including humans.

The RAC rapporteurs were asked to summarise the identified key issues, as discussed at RAC-31. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the key issues to SEAC with regard to the scope (whether derogation for recycling is needed), technical and economic feasibility of alternatives (mainly EBP) and proportionality (i.e. emissions factor and cost-effectiveness).

The rapporteurs then answered clarifying questions by the Committee. For the proportionality assessment, one SEAC member highlighted that as decaBDE is being proposed by Norway for POPs and that under REACH, emissions from PBTs are already required to be minimised hence the only issue is to show what is the most cost-effective way to do so.

The Chair concluded that SEAC supported the key issues identified by the rapporteurs. The SEAC rapporteurs were asked to take the discussions into account in their first draft opinion, which is due by end of January 2015.

b) Conformity check

1) PFOA – outcome of the conformity check

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (Germany and Norway) and the RAC (co-)rapporteurs. The Chair reminded the Committee that the dossier on perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) was submitted by Germany jointly with Norway on 17 October 2014. The conformity check process was launched in RAC and SEAC on 30 October and the Committees are expected to reach a conclusion on conformity within the current plenary meetings.

The representative of the dossier submitters provided an introductory presentation on the proposal to restrict PFOA. PFOA is one important representative of the substance group of per- and polyfluorinated substances (PFASs). PFOA is a PBT-substance, which may cause severe and irreversible adverse effects on the environment and human health. Due to its PBT and CMR properties, PFOA and its ammonium salts (APFO) have been identified as substances of very high concern under REACH. The dossier submitters propose a restriction on manufacture, marketing and use of PFOA, its salts and PFOA-related substances, as well as of articles and mixtures containing these substances.

The RAC rapporteurs then informed the Committee that the dossier was concluded to be in conformity from the RAC point of view. The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs presented their outcome of the conformity check and recommendations to the dossier submitter. In their view, SEAC should also consider the dossier in conformity.

The Commission observer expressed concern about the wide scope of the restriction and whether the Secretariat will manage to ensure that the right parties are targeted with the public consultation. In addition, he was interested whether derogations established under other legislation have been taken into account in the proposal by the dossier submitters. The Secretariat emphasised that the consultations have already been started with the dossier submitters and the RAC and SEAC (co-)rapporteurs on how to tackle the scope issue in the public consultation (in the information note and specific questions addressed). In addition, the discussions are ongoing with the press unit regarding whom to tackle with the public consultation. The Commission observer recommended that the Secretariat would clarify what would be the impact on stocks, what are the uses for which no alternatives are available and whether these should be exempted.

The Committee agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. Two members expressed concerns regarding the wide scope of the restriction. In their view, the Committees have had the dossiers with similar wide scope in past and the processing of these dossiers has been problematic. These members felt that the rapporteurs and the dossier submitters are relying too much on the public consultation. The rapporteurs and other SEAC members did not share these views,

as in their opinion the public consultation is part of the process and it is normal to use it to help getting information from industry in order to clarify the scope.

Finally, the Chair informed the participants that the Secretariat will launch a public consultation on the Annex XV report on 17 December 2014. The rapporteurs are expected to prepare their key issues document by the end of January 2015.

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

The Secretariat presented the proposed (co-)rapporteurs for the restriction dossiers on **Grill lighters fluids and fuels for decorative lamps labelled R65 or H304** (to be submitted by ECHA), **Octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4); Decamethylcyclopentasiloxane (D5)** (to be submitted by United Kingdom) and **Dimethyl formamide** (to be submitted by Italy) as outlined in the meeting document SEAC/25/2014/04 RESTRICTED. SEAC agreed on the appointment of (co-)rapporteurs as proposed in the recommendation. The Secretariat informed that Poland had not resubmitted its dossier on Methanol within 60 days after receiving the reasons for non-conformity. Instead, they will make a new entry in the RoI and submit it as a new dossier in 2015. As it will be a new dossier, SEAC would need to appoint the rapporteurs again. However, it would be reasonable to appoint the same rapporteurs, provided that they are available.

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues (joint RAC/SEAC session)

The Secretariat provided a presentation on the revised working procedure for RAC and SEAC for developing opinions on Applications for Authorisation. The main changes in the revision concern increase of efficiency at the stage of the opinion development. Hence the discussion on the key issues shall follow the Committee's agreement on conformity of the application at its first plenary discussion. The second new item added to the working procedure is a trialogue meeting, which is the meeting between the RAC and SEAC rapporteurs and the applicant (and which has already been carried out for all AfAs received up to now, but had not been included in the current procedure). The third new item in the working procedure is an option to 'A-list' non-controversial draft opinions without plenary debate following the SEAC (and RAC) consultations prior the third plenary meeting. Criteria for 'A-listing' of the draft opinions will be presented by the Secretariat at the next RAC and SEAC plenary meetings in March 2015.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion. In general, members supported the revised working procedure which simplifies and facilitates the opinion development and emphasized the importance of the identification of key issues early in the process. Several members were of the view that the key issues should be identified by the rapporteurs with the help of the Secretariat. They also considered the time provided for preparation of the key issues document insufficient.

Several members emphasised the efficiency of the discussions during the plenary meetings and other members supported reducing the number of the plenary discussions per application. A few members questioned whether the conformity check should be discussed and established in the plenary meeting. The Secretariat responded that this is a requirement set by the REACH Regulation (Article 64).

A few members and stakeholder observers were concerned how the new revision will affect the transparency of the AfA process. The Secretariat responded that the new elements proposed to be added to the working procedure do not affect the transparency. The Secretariat confirmed that the public versions of the documents are published on the ECHA webpage.

The working procedure, with additional modifications introduced during the meeting as outlined in the amended document SEAC/25/2014/05_rev.1, was agreed by RAC and SEAC.

Update from the AfA Task Force

A representative of the Secretariat provided an update on the Application for Authorisation task force. The AfA task force held a meeting on 12 November 2014 in Brussels, with the participation of the Commission, Member States and some RAC and SEAC members, with the aim to guide the development of the streamlined AfA approach for special cases. He also briefly informed SEAC about the forthcoming conference on Lessons Learned on Applications for Authorisation that will take place on 10-11 February 2015 at ECHA in Helsinki.

6.2) Authorisation applications

a) Authorisation applications – (applications submitted within the November 2013 submission window) report from RAC discussion

- 1) Six uses of lead sulfochromate yellow (C.I. pigment yellow 34) and lead chromate molybdate sulphate red (C.I. pigment red 104) submitted by DCC Maastricht B. V. OR (Lead chromate pigments 2):

Use 1: Distribution and mixing pigment powder in an industrial environment into solvent-based paints for non-consumer use

Use 2: Industrial application of paints on metal surfaces (such as machines vehicles, structures, signs, road furniture, coil coating etc.)

Use 3: Professional, non-consumer application of paints on metal surfaces (such as machines, vehicles, structures, signs, road furniture etc.) or as road marking

Use 4: Distribution and mixing pigment powder in an industrial environment into liquid or solid premix to colour plastic/plasticised articles for non-consumer use

Use 5: Industrial use of solid or liquid colour premixes and pre-compounds containing pigment to colour plastic or plasticised articles for non-consumer use

Use 6: Professional use of solid or liquid colour premixes and pre-compounds containing pigment in the application of hotmelt road marking

The Chair invited the Secretariat to report on the outcome of the discussion on the application for authorisation in the RAC plenary meeting earlier in the week. The Secretariat informed SEAC on the outcome of the discussions and the twelve RAC draft opinions agreed by RAC.

The SEAC rapporteur informed SEAC that considering the RAC draft opinions there is no need to modify the twelve SEAC draft opinions on the application for authorisation. The Committee agreed to this view. The Secretariat was tasked to send the RAC and SEAC draft opinions to the applicants for possible commenting.

b) Authorisation applications – 2nd version of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the February 2013 submission window)

- 1) Two uses of HBCDD submitted by INEOS Styrenics Netherlands B.V., INEOS Styrenics Ribecourt SAS, INEOS Styrenics Wingles SAS, Synthos Dwory 7 spółka z ograniczoną odpowiedzialnością spółka komandytowo-akcyjna, Synthos Kralupy a.s., StyroChem Finland Oy, Monotez SA, RP Compounds GmbH, Synbra Technology bv, Sunpor Kunststoff GmbH, Dunastyr Polystyrene Manufacturing C. Co. Ltd, versalis SpA and Unipol Holland bv (HBCDD 1):

Use 1: Formulation of flame retarded expanded polystyrene (EPS) to solid unexpanded pellets using hexabromocyclododecane as the flame retardant additive (for onward use in building applications)

Use 2: Manufacture of flame retarded expanded polystyrene (EPS) articles for use in building applications

The RAC rapporteurs were invited to update the Committee on the discussions held at RAC-31, informing members that RAC had agreed on its draft opinions for uses 1 and 2. The Chair then invited the SEAC rapporteurs to present the 2nd versions of the draft opinions to SEAC. The rapporteurs asked for the feedback of the Committee with regard to their proposed assessment.

SEAC confirmed that there do not appear to be suitable alternatives in terms of technical and economic feasibility for the applicant at the time that the application was submitted. SEAC also took into account the RAC's assessment on the emissions and the risk, and evaluated the applicant's assessment of (a) the potential socio-economic benefits of the use, (b) the potential adverse effects on the environment of the use and (c) the assessment used to compare the two.

The uncertainties in the socio-economic analysis make it difficult to use cost-effectiveness estimates to draw a firm conclusion. However, when considering this application as a bridging authorisation, the socio-economic benefits of granting the authorisation may outweigh the risks.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus. The Chair asked the rapporteurs, together with the Secretariat, to finalise the draft opinions by (1) adding a reference to the cost-effectiveness figures related to the restriction under REACH of mercury and phenyl mercury and (2) making the editorial checking.

c) Authorisation applications – 1st version of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the May 2014 submission window)

- 1) Two uses of trichloroethylene (Trichloroethylene 5):

Use 1: The use of trichloroethylene as a solvent for the removal and recovery of resin from dyed cloth

Use 2: The use of trichloroethylene as a solvent in a process to recover and purify resin from process water

The Chair informed that RAC has not discussed this application yet, but he invited the RAC rapporteur to address her findings on the exposure to the workers and the men via environment, and on the risk minimisation in the application. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the 1st version of the SEAC draft opinions on both uses of the substance. The Committee briefly discussed the alternatives. The main focus of the discussion was the length of the review period.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus. As RAC has not yet agreed on its draft opinions, the SEAC rapporteurs were requested to assess whether there is a

need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinions have been agreed by RAC.

2) Diarsenic trioxide 4:

Use 1: The use of diarsenic trioxide as a processing aid for the removal of carbon dioxide in synthesis gas formed in the production of ammonia

The Chair informed that RAC has not yet discussed the application and then invited the RAC rapporteur to briefly describe her concerns and her views on this application.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented to the Committee the 1st version of the SEAC draft opinion for this bridging application. An alternative has been identified and substitution arrangements are made for the transition. Most of the discussion centred on the review period.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus. As RAC has not yet agreed on its draft opinion, the SEAC rapporteurs were requested to assess whether there is a need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinion has been agreed by RAC.

d) Authorisation applications – outcomes of the conformity check and presentation of key issues

1) Trichloroethylene 1:

Use 1: Trichloroethylene used as degreasing solvent in the manufacture of polyethylene separators for lead-acid batteries

2) Trichloroethylene 2a:

Use 1: Use of Trichloroethylene in industrial parts cleaning by vapour degreasing in closed systems where specific requirements (system of use-parameters) exist

Use 2: Industrial use as process chemical (enclosed systems) in Alcantara material production

Use 3: Use of trichloroethylene in packaging

Use 4: Use of trichloroethylene in formulation

Use 5: Use of trichloroethylene as extraction solvent for bitumen in asphalt analysis

3) Trichloroethylene 2b:

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene in formulation

Use 2: Use of trichloroethylene in packaging

4) Trichloroethylene 3:

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene as a processing aid in the biotransformation of starch to obtain betacyclodextrin

5) Trichloroethylene 4:

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene (TCE) as a process solvent for the manufacturing of modules containing hollow fibre gas separation membranes

6) Trichloroethylene 6:

Use 1: Trichloroethylene as an extraction solvent for removal of process oil and formation of the porous structure in polyethylene based separators used in lead-acid batteries

7) Trichloroethylene 7:

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene-containing vulcanising and bonding agents for endless connections and repair of chloroprene rubber transportation belts in underground hard coal mining

8) Trichloroethylene 8:

Use 1: Industrial use as an extraction solvent for the purification of caprolactam from caprolactam oil

9) Trichloroethylene 9:

Use 1: Industrial use as a process chemical in caprolactam purification

10) Trichloroethylene 10:

Use 1: Use as an extraction solvent in caprolactam production

11) Trichloroethylene 11:

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene as solvent in the synthesis of vulcanization accelerating agents for fluoroelastomers

12) Trichloroethylene 12:

Use 1: Industrial use of trichloroethylene as a solvent as a degreasing agent in closed systems

The SEAC rapporteurs on the applications for authorisation provided brief information on their respective applications and presented the draft outcome of the conformity check. For all the twelve applications for authorisation the rapporteurs presented their first impressions on the applications, highlighting the key issues to the attention of the Committee. One SEAC member expressed a conflict of interest for the application for authorisation Trichloroethylene 12.

SEAC agreed that the applications for authorisation are in conformity and the Secretariat will inform the applicants accordingly. The Chair informed the Committee that for the twelve applications for authorisation the first version of the draft opinions should be received from the rapporteurs by 11 February 2015.

e) Authorisation applications – adoption of the SEAC final opinions

1) Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP 2c) :

Use 3: Use in ceramic sheets and printing pastes for production of capacitors and lambda sensor elements

2) Dibutyl phthalate (DBP 2):

Use 3: Industrial use of DBP in ceramic sheets and printing pastes for production of capacitors and lambda sensor elements

The rapporteur presented to the Committee the applicant's comments on the draft opinions. SEAC agreed with the rapporteur's assessment, with the comments from the applicant being acknowledged in the SEAC part of the opinions.

SEAC adopted its final opinions by consensus. The Secretariat will send the final opinions to the Commission, MSs and the applicant.

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

The pool of rapporteurs, as outlined in the amended restricted room document SEAC/25/2014/06_rev.1, was agreed by SEAC.

7) AOB

a) Update of the workplan

The Secretariat provided an update of the workplan for the future months.

b) Report from NeRSAP meeting

The representative of the Network of REACH SEA and Analysis of Alternatives practitioners (NeRSAP) provided SEAC with an update regarding the NeRSAP meeting held at ECHA on 23-24 October 2014. He shortly presented the results of the ECHA study on willingness to pay (WTP) to prevent chemicals-related illnesses. He encouraged the audience to try out the questionnaire of the study. He also mentioned the new CircaBC site for NeRSAP members which will be fully functional by January 2015.

c) Presentation on project for work on PBTs

The Chair invited an advisor to the Dutch SEAC member to present the status of the Dutch project "Development of a benchmark applicable for the SEAC approach to evaluate restriction proposals and authorisation applications for PBT/vPvB substances". The project is linked to the work of the SEAC WG on PBT evaluation. After the presentation on the objectives, approach, and expected outcome of the project, SEAC members were invited to comment on the project.

In general, the Dutch work on the issue was appreciated by the Committee members. The discussion focussed on the selection of the substances and the data availability. It was suggested to include in the assessment also the substances that are currently ongoing in the opinion forming process in the Committees, i.e.

decaBDE and PFOA. It was also suggested to record the available cost information in a form that can be later on updated when new cost data becomes available.

One SEAC member mentioned that for the derivation of the possible benchmark the collection and reporting on the cost data should focus on the ex-ante costs, as these costs reflect decisions made by policy makers. However, it was mentioned that the ex-post data could be interesting for the project as well. Another member suggested looking also into non-PBT substances with environmental concern to better understand what the potential negative effects in the environment are.

The Chair concluded that progress and results of the Dutch project will be followed closely by the SEAC WG on PBT evaluation in their advisory role within the project. An update of the progress of the project is scheduled in the next plenary meetings.

d) Report from the third preparatory seminar on Chromates

The observer from Eurometaux provided SEAC with a brief presentation on the outcome of the third workshop on chromates. The aim of the workshop was to ensure a successful preparation for the submission process of chromates applications for authorisation. These can be considered as the first "large scale" AfAs, with involvement of many countries along with large and very small companies. The observer expressed hope that such seminars help applicants to improve the quality of the submissions.

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-25

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

II. Main conclusions and action points

MAIN CONCLUSIONS & ACTION POINTS SEAC-25, 25-28 November 2014 (adopted at SEAC-25 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 one addition under Agenda Item 6 (adoption of the final opinions on DEHP 2c and DBP 2 use 3 AfAs).	SECR to upload the adopted agenda to SEAC CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.
3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda	
Conflicts of interest have been declared and will be taken to the minutes.	
4. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities	
<i>a) Report on SEAC-24 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies</i>	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-24. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/25/2014/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in CARACAL.	SECR to present the proposal for updated RoPs in the March 2015 meeting.
<i>b) General SEAC procedures</i>	
SEAC agreed on the new Working Procedure for appointment of rapporteurs for Restrictions, AfA and CLH processes (with additional modification introduced during the meeting).	SECR to upload the agreed Working Procedure to CIRCABC.
5. Restrictions	
5.2 General restriction issues	
a) Review of the restriction process – update from the Task Force	
SEAC took note of the presentation on the key outcomes of the Restrictions Efficiency Task Force.	
5.3 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Opinion development	
1) 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) – 1 st version of the final opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the 1 st version of the SEAC final opinion and the results of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.	Rapporteurs and SECR to do the final editing of the opinion and to ensure that the BD is in line with the SEAC opinion. SECR to forward the adopted opinion and its

SEAC adopted its final opinion on the NMP dossier by consensus (with modifications made during the meeting).	annexes to COM and publish it on the ECHA website.
2) Cadmium and its compounds in paints – 1 st version of the final opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the 1 st version of the SEAC final opinion and the results of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC adopted its final opinion on the Cadmium in paints dossier by consensus.	Rapporteurs and SECR to ensure that the BD is in line with the SEAC opinion. SECR to forward the adopted opinion and its annexes to COM and publish it on the ECHA website.
3) Cadmium and its compounds in artist paints – revised draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the revised SEAC draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on Cadmium and its compounds in paints dossier by consensus (with modifications introduced during SEAC-25 discussion).	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinion. Rapporteurs together with SECR 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 2014.
4) Chrysotile - revised draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the revised SEAC draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on Chrysotile dossier by simple majority. The dissenting views will be recorded in the minutes.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinion. Rapporteurs together with SECR 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 2014.
5) Isopropylidenediphenol (Bisphenol A) – first draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.	Rapporteurs to prepare the revised SEAC draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-25 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the end of January 2015.
6) Ammonium salts – first draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first SEAC draft opinion.	Rapporteurs to prepare the revised SEAC draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-25 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the end of January 2015.

7) DecaBDE - key issues document	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the key issues document for the SEAC draft opinion.	Rapporteurs to prepare the first SEAC draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-25 discussions, by the end of January 2015.
b) Conformity check	
1) PFOA – outcome of the conformity check	
SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. Two members expressed concerns regarding the wide scope of the restriction, which will be reflected in the minutes. SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitter.	SECR to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this to CIRCABC IG. SECR to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.
5.4 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
SEAC agreed on the Recommendation of the Chair for the (co-)rapporteurs for the restriction dossiers which will be submitted to ECHA in the first half of 2015 (as presented in the restricted meeting document SEAC/25/2014/04).	
6. Authorisations	
6.1 General authorisation issues	
a) Draft Working Procedure for RAC and SEAC for developing opinions on the applications for authorisation	
SEAC agreed on the revised Working Procedure for RAC and SEAC for developing opinions on AfA (with modifications introduced during RAC-31/SEAC-25 joint session).	SECR to upload the agreed Working Procedure to CIRCABC and on the ECHA website.
6.2 Authorisation applications	
a) Authorisation applications (applications submitted within the November 2013 submission window) – report from RAC discussion	
1) Six uses of lead sulfochromate yellow (C.I. pigment yellow 34) and lead chromate molybdate sulphate red (C.I. pigment red 104) submitted by <i>DCC Maastricht B. V. OR</i> (Lead chromate pigments 2	
SEAC took note of the RAC discussions on Lead chromate pigments 2 application for authorisation. SEAC agreed that no modifications needed to the twelve SEAC draft opinions on the application for authorisation.	SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
b) Authorisation applications – 2 nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within	

the February 2013 submission window)	
1) Two uses of HBCDD submitted by <i>INEOS Styrenics Netherlands B.V., INEOS Styrenics Ribecourt SAS, INEOS Styrenics Wingles SAS, Synthos Dwory 7 spółka z ograniczon odpowiedzialności spółka komandytowo-akcyjna, Synthos Kralupy a.s., StyroChem Finland Oy, Monotez SA, RP Compounds GmbH, Synbra Technology bv, Sunpor Kunststoff GmbH, Dunastyr Polystyrene Manufacturing C. Co. Ltd, versalis SpA and Unipol Holland bv</i> (HBCDD 1)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the 2 nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions. SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicants for commenting.
c) Authorisation applications – first version of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the May 2014 submission window)	
1) Two uses of trichloroethylene (Trichloroethylene 5) submitted by <i>VLISCO Netherlands BV</i>	
Uses 1 and 2: SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the 1 st versions of the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions. Rapporteurs and SECR to consider the need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinions have been agreed by RAC. SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
2) Use of diarsenic trioxide (Diarsenic trioxide 4) submitted by Yara France	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the 1 st version of the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinion. Rapporteurs and SECR to consider the need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinion has been agreed by RAC. SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
d) Authorisation applications – outcomes of the conformity check and presentation of key issues	
1)-12) Twelve applications for authorisation (Trichloroethylene 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)	
SEAC agreed that the applications are in conformity and discussed the key issues identified in these applications.	SECR to upload the conformity reports to CIRCABC IG. SECR to inform the applicants about the conformity of the applications for authorisation. Rapporteurs to prepare the first outlines of the draft opinions by 11 February 2015.
e) Authorisation applications – adoption of the SEAC final opinions	
1) On the use of bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP 2c) submitted by DEZA a.s.	
SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the comments from the applicant on the SEAC	SECR to send the final opinion to COM, MSs and the applicant.

<p>draft opinion on use 3.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus.</p>	
<p>2) On the use of dibutyl phthalate (DBP 2) submitted by DEZA a.s.</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the comments from the applicant on the SEAC draft opinion on use 3.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by consensus.</p>	<p>SECR to send the final opinion to COM, MSs and the applicant.</p>
<p>6.3 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 SEAC/25/2014/06 RESTRICTED room document).</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 CIRCABC IG.</p>
<p>8. Action points and main conclusion of SEAC-25</p>	
<p>SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-25.</p>	<p>SECR to upload the action points and main conclusions to CIRCABC IG.</p>

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-25

SEAC members
ALEXANDRE João
ALEXANDROPOULOU Ionna
BOUSTRAS George
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
COGEN Simon
CSERGŐ Robert
DALTON Marie
DANTINNE Catheline
D'AMICO Flaviano
FIORE-TARDIEU Karine (also DS representative for Bisphenol-A restriction dossier)
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIU Stavros
GOLOVACIOVA Ilona
GRANDI Silvia (via WEBEX)
KIISKI Johanna
KRAJNC Karmen
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
MEXA Alexandra
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
PALOTAI Zoltán
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SIMON Franz Georg
SLETTEN Thea Marcellia
SMILGIUS Tomas
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina Velinova
THIELE Karen
THORS Åsa

Advisors, experts & dossier submitters (DS)
BERNHEIM Theresa (advisor to K. Thiele)
BODIN Laurent (DS representative for Bisphenol-A restriction dossier, via WEBEX)
CASTELLI Stefano (advisor to F. D'Amico)
CAVALIERI Luisa (advisor to K. Fiore and DS representative for Inorganic ammonium salts)
CARLSSON Mattias, CEDERBERG Inger, IVARSSON Jenny, VIRDARSON Jenny, PARKMAN Helena, WARHOLM Margareta (DS representatives for Cadmium in artists' paints, via WEBEX)
FEAYAERTS Jean-Pierre (advisor to S. Cogen, via WEBEX)
FOTLAND Tor Øystein (in person) TOLFSEN Christina Charlotte and KOPANGEN Marit (via Webex) - (Norwegian Environment Agency) - as experts for the DecaBDE restriction dossier
JONGENEEL Rob, LUIT Richard and OOSTERHUIS Frans (advisors to C. Luttikhuisen)
KAJIC Silva (Invited Expert, HR)
LE COQ Pierre (DS representative for Inorganic ammonium salts, via WEBEX)
LESTANDER Dag (Advisor to Å. Thors, via WEBEX)
MYHRE Oddvar (Norwegian Institute of Public Health) - as expert for the DecaBDE restriction dossier
VERHOEVEN Julia (advisor to C. Luttikhuisen and DS representative for NMP, via WEBEX)

RAC (co-)rapporteurs
BJØRGE Christine
DUNAUSKIENE Lina
DUNGEY Stephen
JENSEN Frank
KADIKIS Normunds
MULLOOLLY Yvonne
PARIS Pietro
SCHULTE Agnes
STOLZENBERG Hans-Christian
SØRENSEN Peter Hammer
TADEO Jose Luis
VAN DER HAGEN Marianne (via WEBEX)

Stakeholder observers
BUONASANTE Vito (CLIENT EARTH)
VAN ASSCHE Frans (Internaitonal Zinc Association, accompanying EUROMETAUX observer - Cadmium two restriction dossiers)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
MUSU TONY (ETUC)
NETTERSHEIM Rolf (Dow, expert accompanying CEFIC observer - Chrysotile restriction dossier)
SANTOS Tatiana (EEB)
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)

Commission observers
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG ENTR)
GALLEGO Mateo (DG ENV)
LUVARA` Giuseppina (DG ENTR)

ECHA staff
BERGES Markus
BLAINEY Mark
HENNIG Philipp
KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia
KIOKIAS Sotirios
KIVELA Kalle
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
KOULOUMPOS Vasileios
KOSTIKA Ismini Polyxeni
LOGTEMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORŽS Arnis
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MAZZOLINI Anna
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
MOTTET Denis
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
ÖBERG Tomas
REGIL Pablo
RODRIGUEZ IGLESIAS Pilar
ROGGEMANN Maarten
SADAM Diana
SHUQOM Natasha
SIMPSON Peter
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
TASKILA Jonna
VAINIO Matti
VAN HAELST Anniek

The following participants (in addition to some of the attendees above) attended the Joint RAC-SEAC Session

RAC participants

RAC members
BARANSKI Bogusław
BIRO Anna
BJORGE Christine
CARVALHO João
CZERCZAK Slawomir
Di PROSPERO FANGHELLA Paola

Advisors to RAC members
ESPOSITO Dania (advisor to Pietro Paris)
PAPPONEN Hinni (advisor to Riitta Leinonen)
PECZKOWSKA Beata (advisor to Boguslaw Baranski)
VÄÄNÄNEN Virpi (advisor to Tiina Santonen)
ROUSSELLE Christophe (advisor to Elodie Pasquier)

DUNAUSKIENĖ Lina
DUNGEY Stephen
GRUIZ Katalin
GUSTAFSON Anne-Lee
HAKKERT Betty
ILIE Mihaela
JENSEN Frank
KADIŪIS Normunds
KAPELARI Sonja
KORATI Safia
LEINONEN Riitta
LUND Bert-Ove
MENARD Anja
MULLOOLY Yvonne
NEUMANN Michael
PARIS Pietro
PASQUIER Elodie
PRONK Marja
RUCKI Marian
RUPPRICH Norbert
SANTONEN Tiina
SCHLÚTER Urs
SCHULTE Agnes
SMITH Andrew
SOGORB Miguel
SOERENSEN Peter
STASKO Jolanta
STOLZENBERG Hans-Christian
TADEO José Luis
TSITSIMIPIKOU Christina
UZOMECKAS Zilvinas
VARNAI Veda Marija
VIVIER Stephanie

Invited experts
HÖLZL Christine (prospective RAC member)
KALOGIROU Andreas (prospective RAC member)

Stakeholder observers
ANNYS Erwin, CEFIC
BARRY Frank, ETUC
ROHDE Arlean, CONCAWE
ROMANO Dolores, EEB
VEROUGSTRAETE Violaine, Eurometaux

Commission observers
HEIDORN Christian (DG ENV)
LUVARA Giuseppina (DG ENTR)
MORRIS Alick (DG EMPL)
SAARIKOSKI Sirkku (DG EMPL)

IV. List of Annexes

- ANNEX I. List of documents submitted to the members of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis
- ANNEX II. Declared conflicts of interest
- ANNEX III. Final Agenda

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

Final Draft Agenda	<i>SEAC/A/25/2014_rev.1</i>
Report on SEAC-24 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies (AP 4.a)	<i>SEAC/25/2014/01</i>
General SEAC procedures (AP 4.b)	<i>SEAC/25/2014/02</i>
Review of the restriction process – update from the Task Force (AP 5.1.a)	<i>SEAC/25/2014/03</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers (AP 5.3)	<i>SEAC/25/2014/04</i> <i>RESTRICTED</i>
General authorisation issues	<i>SEAC/25/2014/05</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (AP 6.3)	<i>SEAC/25/2013/06</i> <i>RESTRICTED ROOM</i> <i>DOCUMENT</i>

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST TO THE RESPECTIVE AGENDA ITEMS

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

<u>Name of participant</u>	<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Interest declared</u>
BERNHEIM Teresa	5.2b-1 PFOA	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
BRIGNON Jean-Marc	5.2a-5 Bisphenol A 5.2a-6 Ammonium salts	Participation in the preparation of both restriction dossiers
CAVALIERI Luisa	5.2a-5 Bisphenol A 5.2a-6 Ammonium salts	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers
CSERGO Robert	6.2d-12 Trichloroethylene 12	Previous position of MSCA in REACH Committee in favour of a longer sunset date for TCE
DANTINNE Catheline	5.2a-4 Chrysotile	Strong position as MSCA representative against the dossier
FIGLIORE Karine	5.2a-5 Bisphenol A 5.2a-6 Ammonium salts	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers
JONGENEEL Rob	5.2a-1 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Working for the organisation preparing the restriction dossier
LESTANDER Dag	5.2a-3 Cadmium in artists' paints	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
LUIT Richard	5.2a-1 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees	5.2a-1 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
OOSTERHUIS Frans	5.2a-1 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Advisor to the member working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
SLETTEN Thea Marcelia	5.2a-7 DecaBDE 5.2b-1 PFOA	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
THIELE Karen	5.2b-1 PFOA	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
THORS Åsa	5.2a-3 Cadmium in artists' paints	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
VERHOEVEN Julia	5.2a-1 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Working for the organisation preparing the restriction dossier

Final Agenda

25th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

25-28 November 2014

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

25 November: starts at 10:00

28 November: ends at 13:00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/25/2014
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-24 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

SEAC/25/2014/01
For information

- b) General SEAC procedures

SEAC/25/2014/02
For discussion and agreement

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 General restriction issues

- a) Review of the restriction process – update from the Task Force

SEAC/25/2014/03
For information and discussion

5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Opinion development

- 1) 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) – 1st version of the final opinion
For adoption
- 2) Cadmium and its compounds in paints – 1st version of the final opinion
For adoption
- 3) Cadmium and its compounds in artist paints – revised draft opinion
For agreement
- 4) Chrysotile - revised draft opinion
For agreement
- 5) Isopropylidenediphenol (Bisphenol A) – first draft opinion
For discussion
- 6) Ammonium salts – first draft opinion
For discussion
- 7) DecaBDE - key issues document
For discussion

b) Conformity check

- 1) PFOA – outcome of the conformity check
For agreement

5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC/25/2014/04
(restricted document)
For agreement

Item 6 – Authorisations

6.1 General authorisation issues

SEAC/25/2014/05
For discussion and agreement

6.2 Authorisation applications

- a) Authorisation applications (applications submitted within the November 2013 submission window) – report from RAC discussion
 1. Six uses of lead sulfochromate yellow (C.I. pigment yellow 34) and lead chromate molybdate sulphate red (C.I. pigment red 104) submitted by *DCC Maastricht B. V. OR* (Lead chromate pigments 2):

Use 1: Distribution and mixing pigment powder in an industrial environment into solvent-based paints for non-consumer use

Use 2: Industrial application of paints on metal surfaces (such as machines vehicles, structures, signs, road furniture, coil coating etc.)

Use 3: Professional, non-consumer application of paints on metal surfaces (such as machines, vehicles, structures, signs, road furniture etc.) or as road marking

Use 4: Distribution and mixing pigment powder in an industrial environment into liquid or solid premix to colour plastic/plasticised articles for non consumer use

Use 5: Industrial use of solid or liquid colour premixes and pre-compounds containing pigment to colour plastic or plasticised articles for non-consumer use

Use 6: Professional use of solid or liquid colour premixes and pre-compounds containing pigment in the application of hotmelt road marking

For information

b) Authorisation applications – 2nd versions of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the February 2013 submission window)

1. Two uses of HBCDD submitted by *INEOS Styrenics Netherlands B.V., INEOS Styrenics Ribecourt SAS, INEOS Styrenics Wingles SAS, Synthos Dwory 7 spółka z ograniczoną odpowiedzialnością spółka komandytowo-akcyjna, Synthos Kralupy a.s., StyroChem Finland Oy, Monotez SA, RP Compounds GmbH, Synbra Technology bv, Sunpor Kunststoff GmbH, Dunastyr Polystyrene Manufacturing C. Co. Ltd, versalis SpA and Unipol Holland bv* (HBCDD 1):

Use 1: Formulation of flame retarded expanded polystyrene (EPS) to solid unexpanded pellets using hexabromocyclododecane as the flame retardant additive (for onward use in building applications)

Use 2: Manufacture of flame retarded expanded polystyrene (EPS) articles for use in building applications

For discussion/agreement

c) Authorisation applications – first version of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the May 2014 submission window)

1. Two uses of trichloroethylene (Trichloroethylene 5) submitted by VLISCO Netherlands BV:

Use 1: The use of trichloroethylene as a solvent for the removal and recovery of resin from dyed cloth

Use 2: The use of trichloroethylene as a solvent in a process to recover and purify resin from process water

2. Use of diarsenic trioxide (Diarsenic trioxide 4) submitted by Yara France

Use 1: The use of diarsenic trioxide as a processing aid for the removal of carbon dioxide in synthesis gas formed in the production of ammonia

For discussion/agreement

d) Authorisation applications – outcomes of the conformity check and presentation of key issues

1. Trichloroethylene 1 submitted by Microporous GmbH:

Use 1: Trichloroethylene used as degreasing solvent in the manufacture of polyethylene separators for lead-acid batteries

2. Trichloroethylene 2a submitted by DOW DEUTSCHLAND ANLAGENGESELLSCHAFT GmbH:

Use 1: Use Of Trichloroethylene in Industrial Parts Cleaning by Vapour Degreasing in Closed Systems where specific requirements (system of use-parameters) exist

Use 2: Industrial use as process chemical (enclosed systems) in Alcantara Material production

Use 3: Use of trichloroethylene in packaging

Use 4: Use of trichloroethylene in formulation

Use 5: Use of Trichloroethylene as Extraction Solvent for Bitumen in Asphalt Analysis

3. Trichloroethylene 2b submitted by Richard Geiss GmbH:

Use 1: Use of Trichloroethylene in formulation

Use 2: Use of trichloroethylene in packaging

4. Trichloroethylene 3 submitted by ROQUETTE Frères:

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene as a processing aid in the biotransformation of starch to obtain betacyclodextrin

5. Trichloroethylene 4 submitted by Parker Hannifin Manufacturing Netherlands (Filtration & Separation) BV:

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene (TCE) as a process solvent for the manufacturing of modules containing hollow fibre gas separation membranes

6. Trichloroethylene 6 submitted by ENTEK International Limited:

Use 1: Trichloroethylene as an extraction solvent for removal of process oil and formation of the porous structure in polyethylene based separators used in lead-acid batteries

7. Trichloroethylene 7 submitted by RAG Aktiengesellschaft and RAG Anthrazit Ibbenbüren GmbH:

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene-containing vulcanising and bonding agents for endless connections and repair of chloroprene rubber transportation belts in underground hard coal mining

8. Trichloroethylene 8 submitted by DOMO Caproleuna GmbH:

Use 1: Industrial use as an extraction solvent for the purification of caprolactam from caprolactam oil

9. Trichloroethylene 9 submitted by Grupa Azoty S.A.:

Use 1: Industrial use as a process chemical in caprolactam purification

10. Trichloroethylene 10 submitted by SPOLANA a.s.:

Use 1: Use as an extraction solvent in caprolactam production

11. Trichloroethylene 11 submitted by A.L.P.A.-Azienda Lavorazione Prodotti Ausiliari S.P.A. and CAFFARO INDUSTRIE S.P.A

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene as solvent in the synthesis of vulcanization accelerating agents for fluoroelastomers

12. Trichloroethylene 12 submitted by CHIMCOMPLEX SA BORZESTI:

Use 1: Industrial use of trichloroethylene as a solvent as a degreasing agent in closed systems

For agreement

e) Authorisation applications – adoption of the SEAC final opinions

1. On the use of bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP 2c) submitted by DEZA a.s.

Use 3: Use in ceramic sheets and printing pastes for production of capacitors and lambda sensor elements

2. On the use of dibutyl phthalate (DBP 2) submitted by DEZA a.s.

Use 3: Industrial use of DBP in ceramic sheets and printing pastes for production of capacitors and lambda sensor elements

For adoption

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

SEAC/25/2014/06

(restricted room document)

For agreement

Item 7 – AOB

- a) Update of the work plan
- b) Report from NeRSAP meeting
- c) Presentation on project for work on PBTs
- d) Report from the 3rd preparatory seminar on Chromates

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-25

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-25

For adoption