

19 November 2014

SEAC/M/24/2014

Final

Minutes of the 24th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

9 – 12 September 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 fourth meeting of SEAC.

The Chair informed the Committee that apologies had been received from three members and one stakeholder observer. Six advisors to members present at the meeting, two representatives of the European Commission and observers of five stakeholder organisations were introduced. The Chair informed the participants that one member, three members' advisors, fourteen dossier submitter representatives and eight representatives of the European Commission were to follow the relevant parts of the meeting via WebEx.

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-24. The Agenda was adopted with one addition under Agenda Item 7 AOB. The final Agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex III. The list of all meeting documents is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

The 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. Seven members and four 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-23 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

The Chair reported that all action points of SEAC-23 had been completed or will be followed up during the on-going SEAC-24 meeting.

The Chair informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-23 had been adopted by written procedure and had been uploaded to CIRCABC as well as on the ECHA website. The Chair thanked members for providing comments on the draft SEAC-23 minutes.

The Chair explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA MB, RAC, MSC, the Forum and the BPC had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/24/2014/01).

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 Chair informed the Committee that the Secretariat is planning to update the Rules of Procedure (RoPs) of RAC and SEAC, in order to align them with the advice provided by the Conflicts of Interest Advisory Committee (COIAC). The updated RoPs will be presented to the Committee at its next plenary meeting in November 2014.

The Chair then provided a presentation on the increasing workload of RAC and SEAC. He explained that the main peak in the workload will be caused by the expected applications on chromates. As the workload should not affect the quality of the work of the Committees, RAC and SEAC would need to reduce the effort per dossier and/or to find extra capacity in order to meet the requirements. The Chair suggested that the number of meetings per dossier could be reduced, working groups could be used, as well as standard phrases and check lists developed for opinion justifications. He also pointed out that all spare capacity would need to be mobilised and that all members would be needed as rapporteurs. For the next steps, the Chair proposed to develop a paper with concrete proposals, for agreement at the next plenary meeting.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion. Several members did not consider it necessary to co-opt additional members to the Committee and urged members who have not yet taken up any rapporteurships, to volunteer to become a (co-) rapporteur. A few members were of the view that the plenary meetings could last longer (for two weeks) or that SEAC could have five or six plenary meetings per year. Several members emphasised the importance of good quality of applications for authorisation and suggested to provide help to the applicants by organising seminars on preparation of applications. In general, many SEAC members expressed their views in favour of improvements in the AfA process in order to simplify and facilitate the procedure with the main objective to reach agreements on the draft opinions in less number of plenary meetings.

5) Restrictions

5.1) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Opinion Development

1) Nonylphenol – 1st version of the final opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representative (Sweden), following the discussion via WebEx, and the RAC (co-)rapporteurs. The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs then presented the SEAC final opinion to the Committee. They explained that there were two comments received from the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion – one supportive comment for the 60 months transitional period (Silk and Man Made Filament European Users Association) and one wording proposal as regards the conclusion on proportionality (ClientEarth). In the view of the rapporteurs, the current opinion wording as regards proportionality should not be changed, as it reflects the uncertainties related to the restriction proposal and is transparent.

After a short discussion, the Committee decided to support the current wording of the opinion and adopted the SEAC final opinion by consensus. The rapporteurs were asked, together with the Secretariat, to ensure that the Background Document (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 it on the ECHA website.

2) 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) – 5th version of the draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representative (NL), who followed the discussion remotely via WebEx. The (co-)rapporteurs then presented the updated 5th version of the SEAC draft opinion. The rapporteurs explained that they had done a major redrafting and restructuring of the opinion. The costs for the wire coating sector had also been recalculated due to further dialogue with Europacable Winding Wire Group (EWWG). However, the conclusion remained as in June - they supported the RAC approach and concluded that the restriction option is cost-effective and practical, while they were not able to say that it is proportional.

One member raised the principal question what the appropriate legislation under which this and similar dossiers should be handled would be. One stakeholder observer expressed concerns that, a new type of limit value was being introduced by this restriction and this might create confusion among companies. The rapporteur replied that the DNEL value being introduced was not a limit value and was already used in REACH and communicated in Safety Data Sheets (SDSs). Some members questioned how the restriction would be enforced. The Secretariat explained that compliance with the restriction could be assessed by checking that the registration dossiers are updated, the required DNELs are stated in relevant SDSs and that the downstream users' Chemical Safety Reports are updated. The Secretariat confirmed that the Forum did not see any problem with the enforcement of this restriction. Considering the difficulty in following some of the conclusion, a Commission observer suggested that a comparison table describing the key elements of all relevant RMOs is provided so it becomes clearer why the proposed RMO is the most appropriate one.

Several SEAC members made suggestions for rewording the justification to the opinion and an ad-hoc meeting was therefore organised in the margins of SEAC-24 for the (co-)rapporteurs, the Secretariat and two interested SEAC members to finalise the text of the draft opinion. The Committee agreed by consensus on the resulting SEAC draft opinion, as further modified in the following plenary session. The Chair informed the Committee that the Secretariat will launch the public consultation on the agreed draft opinion on 16 September. The public consultation will finish on 14 November and the Committee is expected to adopt its final opinion on this dossier at SEAC-25 in November 2014.

3) Cadmium and its compounds in paints – 4th version of the draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (ECHA) and the RAC rapporteurs, who joined the meeting. The Chair reminded the Committee that this is a technical amendment to an existing restriction at the request of the Commission. After a brief report from the RAC-30 discussions by the RAC rapporteurs, where RAC had adopted its opinion, the SEAC rapporteurs presented to the Committee the SEAC draft opinion. Clarifications were given to questions raised in the Committee on whether the legal procedure under which the restriction is being introduced is applicable.

The Committee agreed by consensus on the SEAC draft opinion. The Secretariat will publish the opinions and their supporting documentation on the ECHA website and launch a 60-day public consultation on the agreed draft opinion. SEAC is expected to adopt its final opinion by December 2014.

4) Cadmium and its compounds in artists' paints – first draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (Sweden), the RAC rapporteur and an industry expert accompanying the Eurometaux stakeholder observer. He informed the Committee that over 600 comments had already been received in the public consultation, many from artists who are against the proposed restriction but there is also some support. The Secretariat gave a short update on the nature of the public consultation comments received so far.

The Chair then asked the RAC rapporteur to report back from the RAC-30 discussions. RAC had asked the rapporteurs to focus further on the bone fractures and breast cancer in their assessment. Following the RAC rapporteur's update, the SEAC rapporteurs presented their first draft opinion. The SEAC rapporteurs expressed the view that the proposed restriction is not the most appropriate EU wide measure. The presentation also outlined the release factors of Cd into soil and the use of alternatives.

In general, SEAC was in support of the work of the (co-)rapporteurs. Based on the information received from the public consultation comments being provided so far, some discussion took place on the use of alternatives such as whether Cd free paints are technically equivalent to Cd paints. In addition, SEAC members also positively considered the use of other RMOs (not included in the restriction report) such as labelling or the restriction could also be limited to non-professional users. SEAC members asked the rapporteurs to explore the cost effectiveness further or explore a disease burden approach based on the RAC conclusion on the risk assessment. A stakeholder observer criticised the relevance of a small value for cost effectiveness and especially whether the restriction is proportionate.

The Chair concluded that SEAC is in support of the work of the rapporteurs so far, the rapporteurs were asked to take into account the comments received from the public consultation, the SEAC written commenting rounds and the SEAC-24 discussions in the revised version of the draft opinion (due by the end of October 2014).

5) Chrysotile – first 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. Subject to final public consultation comments, SEAC was invited to provide sufficient feedback on the main elements as proposed by the SEAC rapporteurs. In addition, the Secretariat gave a short update on the public consultation comments received so far.

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs presented the first draft opinion to the Committee, proposing to focus only on the three first risk assessment options as outlined in the draft opinion.

A stakeholder observer representative asked whether it is necessary to allow the import of free asbestos fibres when the only company who needs them for the maintenance of its existing diaphragms has recently purchased a large stock of fibres to permit over 10 years operation. He also criticised why the issue of covering the whole lifecycle of asbestos (e.g. the mining of asbestos) has not been taken into account in the opinion development. He also challenged in the report the plant closure hypothesis in case of immediate end of the current derogation (4th option) given both the plant strategic location in Europe and the recent investments made by the company to build a power plant next to its production site. On a question from another stakeholder observer representative why importing asbestos fibres is not registered according to Article 2(7) of the REACH Regulation, the Secretariat responded that asbestos is a mineral, therefore it is

exempted based on Annex V (7) of REACH. The Chair then gave the floor to the industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer to answer detailed questions addressed to him and to provide SEAC with general information on the maintenance process as well as safety related inspections by the German authorities.

In response to the questions on the legal aspects in relation to the import of asbestos, the Commission observer reminded the Committee to focus on the SEA related issues, as the legal and political discussions would be held elsewhere.

One SEAC member questioned the difference in impact of the restriction proposal compared to the existing restriction, as there is no net-welfare gain as a result of this restriction. In addition, the industry expert restated that Dow had made a voluntary commitment to the German authorities to stop import of fibres from 2017; the two years were needed to ensure the quality of stocks were sufficient for any further internal usage.

The Chair concluded that a majority of SEAC members is in support of the work of the rapporteurs so far, the rapporteurs were asked to take into account the comments received from the public consultation, the SEAC written commenting rounds and the SEAC-24 discussions in the revised version of the draft opinion (due by the end of October 2014).

6) 4,4-Isopropylidenediphenol (bisphenol A) – key issues document

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (France) and the RAC (co-)rapporteurs and introduced the state of play regarding the restriction dossier on bisphenol A used in thermal paper. The RAC rapporteurs were asked to summarise the identified key issues, intended for discussion at RAC-30. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the key issues to SEAC with regard to scope, technical and economic feasibility of alternatives and proportionality of the risks.

One member considered that the paper-free alternatives (electronic receipts) affect the use of physical till receipts and therefore the baseline (the business as usual scenario), but that they cannot be considered as actual alternatives.

Concerning the proportionality of the risk, the discussion focussed on the time when health effects, such as breast cancer, would occur. Members supported the rapporteur's view that the health benefits and the costs do not necessarily occur at the same time because for instance breast cancer is suggested to occur from pre-natal exposure to BPA and therefore there will be a time delay before the benefits occur. Furthermore, it should be clarified whether the increased incidences of mammary gland changes are equivalent to increased breast cancer incidences before further calculations on the proportionality can be done. The dossier submitter mentioned to come back, based on the discussions in the plenary meeting, with a recalculation of the benefits for mammary gland.

The Chair concluded that SEAC supported the identified key issues. The SEAC rapporteurs were asked to take the discussions into account in their first draft opinion, which is due by 31 October 2014.

7) Ammonium salts – key issues document

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (France) and the RAC (co-)rapporteurs. The RAC (co-)rapporteurs were invited to briefly present the key issues identified by them in the proposal and considered by them as crucial for further opinion development.

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs then presented the SEAC Key Issues Document to the Committee. The rapporteurs pointed out that they are uncertain whether the

proposed limit value is actually technically feasible and this will need to be confirmed within the public consultation. In their view, stabilisation costs for ammonium salts need further investigation, perhaps through further consultation with the associated industry. The rapporteurs would also like to investigate further the possibility to establish this restriction under the Construction Products Regulation (CPR), despite the fact that the Commission had provided a clarification to the Secretariat and the rapporteurs that the CPR is less appropriate legislative framework than REACH for restricting hazardous substances in construction products. Furthermore, it is stated in the dossier that "10% of the market would wish to use a more expensive, ammonium and boron-free formulation", which in the view of the (co-)rapporteurs is an overestimation. In addition, the rapporteurs consider the 100% reinsulating figure too high to be applicable for the whole Europe.

One SEAC member asked the rapporteurs to consider further whether this is an EU wide problem, as the reported cases only appear to be in France. He also pointed out that the costs seem to be internalised and therefore there is no need for the restriction proposal; this was supported by another SEAC member.

The representative of the dossier submitter responded that the fact that costs are completely or partially internalised, does not mean there would be no need for a restriction, as the substance is dangerous. She added that in the reported cases, costs for re-insulation were indeed internalised either by an insurance company or by a manufacturer, but costs for health problems were not covered by anyone. With regard to the 10% figure being overestimation, the dossier submitter reported that in the next version of the BD they will make a sensitivity analysis.

Several members were of the view that as the Commission had already provided a clear explanation regarding the CPR, there is no need to investigate this issue further.

The Chair asked the rapporteurs to take the SEAC-24 discussion into account in the preparation of the first draft opinion by 31 October. The Committee will hold its discussion on the first draft opinion at SEAC-25 in November 2014.

b) Conformity check

1) Methanol – outcome of the conformity check

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (Poland) and the RAC rapporteurs. The representative of the dossier submitter provided an introductory presentation via WebEx on the proposal to restrict methanol. The proposed restriction is aimed to prevent poisoning cases in consumers resulting from oral exposure to methanol or mixtures containing methanol such as windshield washing fluids and technical ethanol used as a fuel for touristic appliances or as a cleaning agent.

The Chair then gave the floor to the RAC rapporteurs to update the meeting on their recommendation for non-conformity of the dossier, which was due to shortcomings in available information in the dossier on hazard and risk and on the effectiveness of the proposed restriction.

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs presented the outcome of the SEAC conformity check and recommended that the dossier should be considered not in conformity. The rapporteurs stated that information was needed to justify that the restriction is the most appropriate EU wide measure, other EU wide risk management options would need to be identified further. In addition, the dossier does not appear to allow an evaluation of the assessment of the proposed restriction and the identified RMOs against their effectiveness, practicality and monitorability, in particular between the proposed maximum concentration levels of methanol in the proposed RMOs.

Finally, the information on the cost effectiveness refers only to the windshield fluids - it should be expanded to all products proposed for restriction at EU level.

Several members expressed their support to the outcome of the conformity check presented by the rapporteurs. The discussion focussed on whether or not evidence should be added that restriction is indeed the most appropriate EU wide measure, given that the misuse was located mainly in the Northern part of Europe, and that other possible RMOs within the European legislation should be considered. One member emphasized the view that the identification and justification of other possible RMOs is not a reason for non-conformity and recommended not to take this part (E1) forward as not conforming. This proposal was not supported by other SEAC members.

SEAC agreed that the dossier does not conform to the requirements of Annex XV of REACH. The Secretariat will inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.

2) DecaBDE – outcome of the conformity check

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (ECHA), the Norwegian representatives (who followed the discussions via WebEx) as well as the RAC rapporteur to follow the discussions. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier on decaBDE had been submitted by ECHA on 1 August 2014, on request by the Commission. The Norwegian Environment Agency has collaborated with ECHA in the preparation of the restriction dossier. DecaBDE was identified as an SVHC and included in the Candidate List as PBT/vPvB. 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 proposal focuses on the hazard and risk of the use of decaBDE as a flame retardant in plastics and textiles.

The representative of the dossier submitter provided a presentation on the main elements proposed in the dossier. The RAC rapporteur then informed the Committee that the dossier was concluded to be in conformity from the RAC point of view. Furthermore, the SEAC (co-)rapporteurs presented their outcome of the conformity check and their recommendations to the dossier submitter.

Following a short discussion by the Committee, SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. The Secretariat will launch a public consultation on the dossier on 17 September.

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

The Secretariat presented the proposed (co-)rapporteurs for the restriction dossiers **Grill lighters fluids and fuels for decorative lamps labelled R65 or H304** (to be submitted by ECHA), and **Octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4); Decamethylcyclopentasiloxane (D5)** (to be submitted by United Kingdom), as outlined in the meeting document SEAC/24/2014/02 RESTRICTED. The Chair requested more members to come forward to volunteer as (co-)rapporteurs for the processing of the restriction dossiers. The agreement on the appointment of rapporteurs will follow later in 2014. SEAC took note of the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for the restriction dossiers which will be submitted to ECHA in the first half of 2015.

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues

a) RAC and SEAC working procedure on "fit-for-purpose" applications for authorisation

The Chair invited a representative of the Secretariat to give an oral update on the streamlined AfA approach for special cases and the task force that has been established to help develop this approach. The task force has been initiated at the CARACAL meeting on 8-9 July where the Commission agreed with the Member States that a task force would be set up with representatives from ECHA, the Commission, RAC, SEAC and Member State Competent Authorities. An initial meeting of the task force took place on 26 August via teleconference, mainly to discuss the organisation of the work and to have a first exchange of views on how applications for low volume and spare parts uses could be dealt with. The task force's first set of recommendations would be on the agenda for the next CARACAL meeting, which will take place on 12-13 November. He also briefly informed SEAC about the "Lessons Learned on Applications for Authorisation" workshop/conference planned for the beginning of next year.

6.2) Authorisation applications

a) Authorisation applications on phthalates – 3rd versions of the SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the August 2013 submission window)

1) Two uses of DEHP submitted by *ARKEMA FRANCE* (DEHP 2a):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendaring, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

The Chair informed the Committee that uses 1 and 2 of the DEHP2a, DEHP2b and DEHP2c applications for authorisation would be discussed under the same Agenda Item due to the similarities in the applications.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that RAC had adopted the draft opinions by written procedure. RAC confirmed that the risk for workers of the use is not adequately controlled and recommended a short review period to SEAC. RAC did not propose additional conditions or monitoring arrangements.

The SEAC rapporteur presented the main conclusions of the third versions of the draft opinions. The rapporteur estimated that there are consistent indications that to a significant proportion of compounders and article manufacturers alternatives are not economically feasible. The rapporteur considered that, as a whole, alternatives are not economically feasible.

The rapporteur explained that a worst case estimate of the annually avoided infertility cases of the non-use scenario was below the break-even interval (the break-even interval was derived from the monetary valuation of infertility cases and the estimated substitution costs). The rapporteur concluded that the analysis thus indicates that the benefits of continued use of DEHP outweigh the risks.

Several members expressed reservations regarding the assessment of the risks from continued use, questioning the level of scrutiny and the responsibility of SEAC in evaluating assumptions apart from those made by the applicant.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by simple majority. One member has expressed a minority position.

2) Two uses of DEHP submitted by *Grupa Azoty Zakłady Azotowe Kędzierzyn Spółka Akcyjna* (DEHP 2b):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendaring, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

Due to their similarities in the applications, the uses 1 and 2 of the DEHP2b application were discussed under the same Agenda Item with uses 1, and 2 of DEHP2a and DEHP2c. For description summary of the discussion see Agenda Item 6.2.a)1 of the minutes.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by simple majority. One member has expressed a minority position.

3) Three uses of DEHP submitted by *DEZA a.s.* (DEHP 2c):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendaring, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

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

Due to their similarities in the applications, the uses 1 and 2 of the DEHP2c application were discussed under the same Agenda Item with uses 1, and 2 of DEHP2a and DEHP2b. For the description of the discussion see Agenda Item 6.2.a)1 of the minutes.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinions for uses 1 and 2 by simple majority. One member has expressed a minority position.

Similar to uses 1 and 2, the use 3 of the DEHP2c application was discussed at a separate Agenda Item together with the DBP2 use 3. The Secretariat informed the Committee that RAC had agreed on the draft opinion for this use of DEHP by consensus. RAC confirmed that the risk of the use is adequately controlled and did not make recommendations to SEAC for the length of the review period. RAC recommended that in case the authorisation is granted, it does not cover the production of capacitors.

The SEAC rapporteur presented the main conclusions of the third version of the draft opinion. It was noted that, in line with the recommendation of RAC, the assessment by the rapporteur did not cover production of capacitors. As the RAC conclusion was that there is adequate control for this use of DEHP, the SEAC rapporteur has focused the analysis on the suitability of alternatives and the review period.

SEAC agreed on the draft opinion for use 3 by consensus.

4) The second and the third uses of DBP submitted by DEZA a.s. (DBP 2):

Use 2: Use in propellants

The Chair invited the rapporteur to brief SEAC about the RAC discussions on this dossier. The SEAC rapporteur informed SEAC that RAC had agreed by consensus on the draft opinion on this use by written procedure. Specifically, RAC agreed that the risk of the use is adequately controlled and did not make recommendations to SEAC for the length of the review period.

The rapporteur presented the draft opinion with special focus on information relevant for the determination of the review period: the R&D programme and requalification requirements for propellants, as well as socio-economic impacts of no authorisation. The applicant's timelines for R&D programme and requalification were considered plausible by the rapporteur.

After a short discussion on the scope of the application for authorisation and on the availability of the alternatives the Committee agreed on the SEAC draft opinion by consensus.

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

The Chair informed the Committee that due to the similarities in the applications, this use was discussed together with the DEHP2c use 3.

The Secretariat informed SEAC that RAC had agreed on the draft opinion by consensus. RAC confirmed that the risk of the use is adequately controlled and there is no RAC recommendation on the conditions and monitoring arrangements and on the review period. RAC is of the opinion that the use of the substance in capacitors is within the scope of the application.

The SEAC rapporteur presented the case with the main focus on the difference between DEHP2c use 3 and this application, noting the limited information on technical and economic feasibility of alternatives.

Following a short discussion by the Committee, SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.

5) Two uses of DEHP submitted by VINYLOOP FERRARA S.p.A., Stena Recycling AB and Plastic Planet srl (DEHP 4):

Use 1: Formulation of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in compounds and dryblends

Use 2: Industrial use of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in polymer processing by calendering, extrusion, compression and injection moulding to produce PVC articles

The Chair invited the Secretariat to brief SEAC on the state of play in RAC regarding the application for authorisation. RAC agreed on its draft opinions in the written procedure by simple majority of the received votes.

The rapporteur presented the third versions of the SEAC draft opinions and his arguments for the review period to be included as a recommendation to the Commission.

The Committee discussed the issues related to the length of the review period.

SEAC agreed by consensus on the SEAC draft opinions for two uses of DEHP submitted by three applicants. The Chair informed that the Secretariat, together with the rapporteur, would do the final editing of the draft opinions.

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

- 1) Three applications (1-3) for authorisation of different uses of diarsenic trioxide submitted by Boliden Kokkola Oy, Nordenhamer Zinkhütte GmbH, Linxens France
– report from RAC discussion

The Chair welcomed the RAC rapporteurs, who together with the Secretariat informed SEAC about the outcome of the RAC discussion and the RAC decision to recommend for applications 1 and 2 a short review period due to deficiencies in the exposure assessment in case of reapplication.

The rapporteurs were of the opinion that there is no need to reopen the SEAC discussion on the draft opinions on those applications. This view was supported by SEAC.

- 2) 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 welcomed the RAC rapporteurs and invited them to brief SEAC on the RAC discussions on the application for authorisation held at RAC-30. The RAC rapporteur provided information about the level of scrutiny RAC is examining the applications for authorisation.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the second versions of the draft opinions and their arguments for the review period to be included as a recommendation to the Commission. The following discussion by members focussed on issues related to the availability of alternatives and the length of the review period.

SEAC agreed by consensus on the SEAC draft opinions for six uses of two lead chromate pigments. The Chair informed that the rapporteurs, together with the Secretariat, would do the final editing of the draft opinions; the rapporteurs and the Secretariat would have to consider the need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinions have been agreed by RAC.

c) Authorisation applications – first outlines of 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 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 (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 Chair welcomed the RAC rapporteurs and invited them to brief SEAC on the RAC discussions on this application for authorisation. The RAC rapporteurs updated the Committee on the discussions held at RAC-30.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first draft outlines of the opinions to SEAC. The rapporteurs asked for the feedback of the Committee with regard to the availability, and the technical and economic feasibility of polymeric flame retardants (pFR). The Chair opened the floor for discussion and the rapporteurs provided further clarifications to members on some technical points with regard to the application.

The Chair summarised that SEAC agreed with the observation of the rapporteurs that, based on the information provided by the applicants and the third parties, pFR would be available for replacing the use of HBCDD by the applicants much before 2019, however the exact time remains unclear and depends on several external factors. The Chair asked the rapporteurs to take the discussions into account in the first versions of the SEAC draft opinions.

d) Authorisation applications – outcomes of the conformity check

- 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 welcomed the RAC rapporteur who informed the Committee that the dossier was concluded to be in conformity from the RAC point of view. The SEAC rapporteurs then provided brief information on the application for authorisation and presented the draft outcome of the conformity check. The rapporteurs also presented a possible first set of questions they would like to ask from the applicant.

SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity. The Chair informed the Committee that the first outline of the draft opinion should be received from the rapporteurs by 5 November 2014.

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 welcomed the RAC rapporteur who informed the Committee that the dossier was concluded to be in conformity from the RAC point of view. The SEAC rapporteurs then provided brief information on the application and presented the draft outcome of the conformity check.

Within a short discussion, members asked for clarification how important the substance is for the applicant and if the negative decision on authorisation will result in closure of the plant.

SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity. The Chair informed the Committee that the first outline of the draft opinion should be received from the rapporteurs by 5 November 2014.

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

SEAC agreed on the renewed pool of (co-)rapporteurs for the applications for authorisation process without discussion.

The Chair appointed the (co-)rapporteurs for the upcoming nine applications for authorisation (TCE 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10) on the uses of trichloroethylene.

7) AOB

a) Update of the workplan

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

b) Report from the Working group on PBT evaluation

The Chair opened the discussion explaining that the initial framework for restriction reports and applications for authorisation for PBT and vPvB substances framework was introduced by SEAC working group (WG) at SEAC-23 and was now tabled for agreement.

A member of the SEAC working group then presented the progress made since SEAC-23 and introduced the updated approach (meeting document SEAC-24/2014/04). The member explained that the proposed framework is based on a

cost-effectiveness analysis approach. The starting point is that a unit of emission of any PBT/vPvB substance is considered the same in terms of potential damage to health or the environment. However, qualitative case properties describing the damage potential would be considered case-by-case.

Issues for future work identified by the WG still include development of benchmarks, further work on the qualitative case properties, as well as development of a more systematic way to consider qualitative properties.

The Committee agreed on the approach and initial framework for the evaluation of restriction reports and applications for authorisation for PBT and vPvB substances in SEAC. The Chair concluded that the work of the SEAC WG on PBT evaluation will continue, and the approach, as agreed at SEAC-24, will be published on the ECHA website.

The SEAC WG on PBT evaluation was not yet in a position to present a proposal for the continuation of the work. One WG member mentioned to look into the possibility of getting resources to develop further some methodological aspects in the framework. If found useful, the SEAC WG on PBT evaluation could be involved in drafting this possible mandate.

c) Damage costs for toxic metals

The observer from the European Association of Environmental and Resource Economists (EAERE) provided to SEAC a brief presentation on the findings of a new research on damage costs for the emission of toxic metals (As, Cd, Hg, Pb, Cr, Ni) to air and major air pollutants (primary PM_{2.5} and SO₂, NO_x, NH₃, VOCs and reaction products i.e. secondary PM_{2.5}, ozone and NO₂).

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-24

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-24, 9-12 September 2014

(adopted at SEAC-24 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 7 AOB.	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-23 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies</i>	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-23. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/23/2014/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in CARACAL.	
<i>b) General SEAC procedures</i>	
SEAC was informed on the forthcoming update of the Rules of Procedure of RAC and SEAC, in order to align them with the advice provided by COIAC. Furthermore, SEAC was provided with a presentation on the increasing workload and the implications of this on SEAC work.	SECR to present the updated RoPs in the November 2014 meeting. SECR to prepare a proposal, taking into account SEAC-24 discussions, and present it to the Committee in the November 2014 meeting.
5. Restrictions	
5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Opinion development	
1) Nonylphenol – 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 NP/NPE 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.

2) 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) – 5 th version of the draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented the 5th version of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC discussed the main changes made to the draft opinion of SEAC.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on NMP by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the opinion in accordance with the discussion.</p> <p>SECR to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion on 16 September 2014.</p>
3) Cadmium and its compounds in paints – 4 th version of the draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the 4th version of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on Cadmium and its compounds in paints by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the opinion.</p> <p>SECR to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion on 16 September 2014.</p>
4) Cadmium and its compounds in artists' paints – first draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare a revised SEAC draft opinion by 31 October 2014, taking into account the SEAC-24 discussions.</p>
5) Chrysotile - first draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare a revised SEAC draft opinion by 31 October 2014, taking into account the SEAC-24 discussions.</p>
6) 4,4-Isopropylidenediphenol (bisphenol A) – key issues document	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the key issues document for the SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the first SEAC draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-24 discussions, by the end of October 2014.</p>
7) Ammonium salts– key issues document	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the key issues document for the SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the first SEAC draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-24 discussions, by the end of October 2014.</p>
b) Conformity check	
1) Methanol – outcome of the conformity check	
<p>SEAC agreed that the dossier does not conform to the Annex XV requirements.</p>	<p>SECR to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload</p>

SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitter.	this to CIRCABC IG. SECR to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.
2) DecaBDE – outcome of the conformity check	
SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. 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 launch a public consultation on the Annex XV report on 17 September 2014.
5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
SEAC took note of the pool of (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/24/2014/02).	SEAC members to come forward as volunteers for the (co-)rapporteurships.
6. Authorisations	
6.1 General authorisation issues	
a) RAC and SEAC working procedure on "fit-for-purpose" applications for authorisation	
SEAC was provided with an update on the AfA task force and the work to develop a streamlined authorisation approach for certain special categories of applications.	SECR to provide further update on the work in the November 2014 plenary meeting.
6.2 Authorisation applications	
a) Authorisation applications on phthalates – 3 rd versions of SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the August 2013 submission window)	
1) Two uses of DEHP submitted by <i>ARKEMA FRANCE</i> (DEHP 2a)	
SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the 3 rd versions of the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by simple majority. The minority opinion will be recorded in the minutes. The concerns raised by several members will be recorded in the minutes.	Rapporteur together SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions. SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
2) Two uses of DEHP submitted by <i>Grupa Azoty Zakłady Azotowe Kędzierzyn Spółka Akcyjna</i> (DEHP 2b)	
SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the 3 rd versions of the SEAC draft opinions.	Rapporteur together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions.

<p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by simple majority.</p> <p>The minority opinion will be recorded in the minutes.</p> <p>The concerns raised by several members will be recorded in the minutes.</p>	<p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>3) Three uses of DEHP submitted by <i>DEZA a.s.</i> (DEHP 2c) :</p>	
<p>Uses 1 and 2:</p> <p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the 3rd versions of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by simple majority.</p> <p>The minority opinion will be recorded in the minutes.</p> <p>The concerns raised by several members will be recorded in the minutes.</p> <p>Use 3:</p> <p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the 3rd version of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteur together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>4) Two uses (use2 and use3) of DBP submitted by <i>DEZA a.s.</i> (DBP 2):</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the 3rd versions of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteur together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>5) Two uses of DEHP submitted by <i>VINYLOOP FERRARA S.p.A., Stena Recycling AB and Plastic Planet srl</i> (DEHP 4):</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the 3rd versions of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.</p>	<p>SECR together with rapporteur to do the final editing of the draft opinions for consistency and language.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>b) Authorisation applications – 2nd version of SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the November 2013 submission window)</p>	
<p>1) Three applications (1-3) for authorisation of different uses of diarsenic trioxide submitted by <i>Boliden Kokkola Oy, Nordenhamer Zinkhütte GmbH,m, Linxens France</i></p>	

SEAC took note of the report from the RAC-30 discussions on these applications.	SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
2) 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 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. Rapporteurs and SECR to consider the need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinions have been agreed by RAC.
c) Authorisation applications – first outlines of 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 ograniczoną odpowiedzialnością, 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 first outlines of the SEAC draft opinions.	Rapporteurs to consider plenary discussion and to prepare the 1 st versions of the SEAC draft opinions by 6 October 2014. SECR to launch a SEAC consultation on the 1 st versions of the SEAC draft opinions.
d) Authorisation applications – outcomes of the conformity check	
1) Two uses of trichloroethylene (Trichloroethylene 5)	
SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity.	SECR to upload the conformity report to CIRCABC IG. SECR to inform the applicant about the conformity of the application for authorisation. Rapporteurs to prepare the first outline of the draft opinion by 5 November.
2) Diarsenic trioxide 4	
SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity.	SECR to upload the conformity report to CIRCABC IG. SECR to inform the applicant about the conformity of the application for authorisation. Rapporteurs to prepare the first outline of the draft opinion by 5 November.
6.3 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/24/2014/03 RESTRICTED room document) and was informed of the (co-)	SEAC members to volunteer to the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for applications for authorisation. SECR to upload the updated document to

rapporteurs for the authorisation applications submitted to ECHA.	confidential folder on CIRCABC IG.
7. AOB	
b) Report from the Working group on PBT evaluation	
<p>SEAC took note of the report from the Working group on PBT evaluation.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the updated approach for evaluation of PBT and vPvB substances as presented in the meeting document SEAC/24/2014/04.</p>	<p>SECR to upload the agreed framework on CIRCABC and on ECHA website.</p> <p>The Working group to continue with further development of the framework and to update SEAC at the forthcoming plenary meetings.</p>
8. Action points and main conclusion of SEAC-24	
SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-24.	SECR to upload the action points and main conclusions to CIRCABC IG.

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-24

SEAC members
ALEXANDROPOULOU Ionna
BENDL Jiri
BOUSTRAS George (via WEBEX)
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
COGEN Simon
CSERGŐ Robert
DANTINNE Catheline
D'AMICO Flaviano
FANKHAUSER Simone
FIORE-TARDIEU Karine
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros
GOLOVACIOVA Ilona
GRANDI Silvia
KIISKI Johanna
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
MEXA Alexandra
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
PALOTAI Zoltán
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SIMON Franz Georg
SLETTEN Thea Marcella
SMILGIUS Tomas
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina Velinova
THIELE Karen
THORS Åsa

Advisors, experts & dossier submitters (DS)
BEEKMAN Martijn (DS representative for NMP, via WEBEX)
BERNHEIM Theresa (advisor to K. Thiele)
CARFÌ Francesca (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)
FOTLAND Tor Øystein, BAUMBUSCH Angelika, KOPANGEN Marit and KJUUS Berit Eyde (Norwegian Environment Agency) - as experts for the DecaBDE restriction dossier (via Webex)
GODALA Mariusz and MAJKA Jerzy (DS for Methanol, via WEBEX)
JONGENEEL Rob (advisor to C. Luttikhuisen)
LE COQ Pierre (DS representative for Inorganic ammonium salts, via WEBEX)
LESTANDER Dag (DS representative for Nonylphenol, via WEBEX)
LUIT Richard (advisor to C. Luttikhuisen, via WEBEX)
NIEMELÄ Helena (advisor to J. Kiiski)
TERENDIJ Carline and REDAELLI Matteo (DS representatives for Bisphenol A, via WEBEX)

RAC (co-)rapporteurs
BJØRGE Christine
DUNAUSKIENE Lina
DUNGEY Stephen
JENSEN Frank
KADIŖIS Normunds
KORATI Safia
MULLOOLLY Yvonne
PARIS Pietro
ROTHER Dag (advisor to A.Schulte)
RUPPRICH Norbert
SCHULTE Agnes
STOLZENBERG Hans-Christian
SØRENSEN Peter Hammer
TADEO Jose Luis
VAN DER HAGEN Marianne
VARNAI Veda
VAN DER HAGEN Marianne
VARNAI Veda

Stakeholder observers
BUONASANTE Vito (CLIENT EARTH/EEB)
HOLLAND Michael (EMCR/EAERE)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
MUSU TONY (ETUC)
NETTERSHEIM Rolf (Dow, expert accompanying CEFIC observer - Chrysotile restriction dossier)
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)

Representative of the European Commission
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG ENTR)
GALLEGO Mateo (DG ENV)
BERTATO Valentina (DG ENTR) (via WEBEX)
BORRAS-HERRERO Anna (DG ENTR) (via WEBEX)
FERNANDES-DE-BARROS Mariana (DG ENTR) (via WEBEX)
LUVARA' Giuseppina (DG ENTR) (via WEBEX)
POPOVA Temenuzhka (DG ENTR) (via WEBEX)
RIEPMAN Wim (DG SANCO) (via WEBEX)
ROZWADOWSKI Jacek (DG ENTR) (via WEBEX)
STRECK Georg (DG ENTR) (via WEBEX)

ECHA staff
BERGES Markus
BLAINEY Mark
GIORDANO Serena
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
PELTOLA Jukka
REGIL Pablo
ROCKE Timo
RODRIGUEZ IGLESIAS Pilar
ROGGEMANN Maarten
SADAM Diana
SHUQOM Natasha
SIMPSON Peter
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
STOYANOVA Evgenia
VAINIO Matti
VAN HAELEST Anniek
ZBIHLEJ Tomáš

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/24/2014</i>
Report on SEAC-24 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies (AP 4.a)	<i>SEAC/24/2014/01</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers (AP 5.2)	<i>SEAC/24/2014/02</i> <i>RESTRICTED</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (AP 6.3)	<i>SEAC/24/2013/03</i> <i>RESTRICTED</i>
Report from the Working group on PBT evaluation (AP 07b)	<i>SEAC/24/2014/04</i>

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST TO THE RESPECTIVE AGENDA ITEMS

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

<u>Name of participant</u>	<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Interest declared</u>
BRIGNON Jean-Marc	5.1a-6 Bisphenol A 5.1a-7 Ammonium salts	Participation in the preparation of both restriction dossiers
CAVALIERI Luisa	5.1a-6 Bisphenol A 5.1a-7 Ammonium salts	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers
DANTINNE Catheline	5.1a-5 Chrysotile	Strong position as MSCA representative against the dossier
FIGLIORE Karine	5.1a-6 Bisphenol A 5.1a-7 Ammonium salts	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers
JONGENEEL Rob	5.1a-2 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
KIISKI Johanna	5.1b-1 Methanol	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
LUIT Richard	5.1a-2 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees	5.1a-2 Methylpyrrolidin-2-one (NMP)	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
NIEMELÄ Helena	5.1b-1 Methanol 6.2b-1; 6.2d-2 Applications for Authorisation on Diarsenic trioxide	Participation in the preparation of restriction dossier Previous employment in consultancy
SLETTEN Thea Marcella	5.1b-2 DecaBDE	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
THORS Åsa	5.1a-1 Nonylphenol 5.1a-4 Cadmium in artists' paints	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers

Final Draft Agenda

24th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

9-12 September 2014

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

9 September: starts at 10:00

12 September: ends at 13:00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/24/2014
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-23 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

SEAC/24/2014/01
For information

- b) General SEAC procedures

For discussion

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) Opinion development

- 1) Nonylphenol – 1st version of the final opinion

For adoption

2) 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) – 5th version of the draft opinion
For agreement

3) Cadmium and its compounds in paints – 4th version of the draft opinion
For agreement

4) Cadmium and its compounds in artist paints – first draft opinion
For discussion

5) Chrysotile - first draft opinion
For discussion

6) Isopropylidenediphenol (Bisphenol A) – key issues document
For discussion

7) Ammonium salts – key issues document
For discussion

b) Conformity check

1) Methanol - outcome of the conformity check
For agreement

2) DecaBDE - outcome of the conformity check
For agreement

5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC/24/2014/02
(restricted document)
For information

Item 6 – Authorisations

6.1 General authorisation issues

a) RAC and SEAC working procedure on "fit-for-purpose" applications for authorisation
For information/discussion

6.2 Authorisation applications

a) Authorisation applications on phthalates – 3rd versions of SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the August 2013 submission window)

3) Two uses of DEHP submitted by *ARKEMA FRANCE* (DEHP 2a):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendering, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

For agreement

- 4) Two uses of DEHP submitted by *Grupa Azoty Zakłady Azotowe Kędzierzyn Spółka Akcyjna* (DEHP 2b):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendering, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

For agreement

- 5) Three uses of DEHP submitted by *DEZA a.s.* (DEHP 2c):

Use 1: Formulation of DEHP in compounds, dry-blends and Plastisol formulations

Use 2: Industrial use in polymer processing by calendering, spread coating, extrusion, injection moulding to produce PVC articles

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

For agreement

- 6) The second and the third uses of DBP submitted by *DEZA a.s.* (DBP 2):

Use 2: Use in propellants

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

For agreement

- 7) Two uses of DEHP submitted by *VINYLOOP FERRARA S.p.A., Stena Recycling AB and Plastic Planet srl* (DEHP 4):

Use 1: Formulation of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in compounds and dryblends

Use 2: Industrial use of recycled soft PVC containing DEHP in polymer processing by calendering, extrusion, compression and injection moulding to produce PVC articles

For agreement

- 3) Authorisation applications – 2nd versions of SEAC draft opinions (applications submitted within the November 2013 submission window)

1. Three applications (1-3) for authorisation of different uses of diarsenic trioxide submitted by *Boliden Kokkola Oy, Nordenhamer Zinkhütte GmbH, Linxens France*
– report from RAC discussion

For information

2. 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 agreement

- 4) Authorisation applications – first outlines of 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 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* (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

- 5) Authorisation applications – outcomes of the conformity check

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

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

For agreement

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

SEAC/24/2014/03

(restricted room document)

For agreement

Item 7 – AOB

a) Update of the work plan

For information

b) Report from the Working group on PBT evaluation

SEAC/24/2014/04

For discussion/agreement

c) Damage costs for toxic metals

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-24

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-24

For adoption