

SEAC/M/15/2012 FINAL

Final

Minutes of the 15th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

13-15 June 2012

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 fifteenth meeting of SEAC.

The Chair informed that apologies had been received from five members, one Croatian observer and one stakeholder observer. Three invited experts, seven members' advisors present at the meeting as well as two representatives of the European Commission, observers of eight stakeholder organisations, one international observer and two dossier submitter representatives were introduced. The Chair informed that one advisor to a RAC member was to follow the relevant parts of the meeting via teleconference. The Chair also mentioned that the meeting would be recorded and the records would be destroyed after the adoption of the minutes.

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

2) Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair introduced the draft Agenda of SEAC-15. The Chair pointed out that Economic feasibility had been taken out from the Final Draft Agenda under the agenda item 6 Authorisations, as the Secretariat wished to discuss the issues further with interested SEAC members and to table the revised document for possible agreement at the next SEAC-16 meeting. The Chair also proposed the SUBSPORT project to be presented under AOB.

The agenda was adopted with the modifications mentioned above (SEAC/A/15/2012_rev.1). 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 meeting participants to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. One member and two advisors declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions under the agenda items 5.2. The member 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 potential conflicts of interest is given in Annex II of these minutes.

4) Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

a) Report on SEAC-14 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

The Chair reported that all action points of the SEAC-14 meeting had been completed (apart from the document related to Economic feasibility that will be tabled to the Committee for agreement in September).

The Chair also informed that the final minutes of SEAC-14 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-14 minutes.

The Chair explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA Management Board (MB), the Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC), the Member States Committee (MSC) and the Forum had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/15/2012/01). The Chair also informed about the proposal for revised eligibility criteria to be adopted by the MB.

The representative of the Commission provided an update on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in the CARACAL. Several members expressed the view that it would be useful if the Commission could in the future provide written reports on SEAC related developments in these committees. The Commission agreed to consider this.

Two members recommended inviting to the REACH Committee meetings the (co-) rapporteurs or the dossier submitter who could provide further clarifications regarding the opinions of RAC and SEAC on restriction proposals. The representatives of the Commission agreed to consider this suggestion as well.

b) Implementation of the Conflict of Interest Policy – Modification of the SEAC Rules of Procedure

The Chair introduced the room document SEAC/15/2012/02 by outlining that a review of the Committees' Rules of Procedure (RoPs) is necessary to include provisions that members are not allowed to participate in meetings unless they have a valid declaration of interest. The Chair further explained that the respective addition to the SEAC RoPs is suggested to Article 9(1): *"Members who have not submitted the declaration of interests shall not take part in meetings of the Committee and its working groups or decisions by written procedure"*.

One member pointed out that attention should be paid to situations when consultants are providing services to both Committee members and industry due to possible conflict of interest.

The Committee agreed on the proposed wording of the SEAC RoPs to be submitted to the ECHA Management Board for approval.

c) Co-opted members

In accordance with Article 85(4) of the REACH Regulation, the Committees shall aim to have a broad range of relevant expertise among their members. To this end each Committee may co-opt a maximum of five additional members chosen on the basis of their specific competence.

The Chair introduced this topic and referred to the first discussions that had taken place at RAC-1 and SEAC-1. The Chair added that according to Article 4(2) of the Rules of Procedure for RAC and SEAC, the Committees may decide whether additional members should be co-opted and, furthermore, the Committees shall agree on the required competences and on the selection procedure.

The Chair explained that the Secretariat would like to invite SEAC to discuss the general and specific needs for co-opting additional members to the Committee.

One member suggested concentrating on competences that are useful in the tasks that the Committee undertakes (restrictions) rather than trying to identify which competences are lacking. It was agreed that the Secretariat will further develop the analysis of expertise needed for SEAC tasks. It was also suggested that a possibility of specific use of experts and advisors could be considered.

Several members expressed the view that the issue of co-opting is presently not relevant for SEAC given its workload and that not all SEAC members have been appointed as (co-) rapporteurs yet. It was therefore proposed to learn from RAC experience and come back to this issue in the future, if needed.

It was also agreed that the Secretariat will brief SEAC on the RAC discussions on this matter (expected to take place at RAC-21).

d) Rules of procedure pursuant to Article 110 of REACH on worker protection

The Secretariat introduced the room document SEAC/15/2012/03 on the specific requirements for ECHA according to Article 110 of the REACH Regulation to establish rules

of procedure concerning worker protection issues following consultation of SEAC among other bodies. The Secretariat reminded that the initial involvement of RAC and SEAC had taken place in summer 2009 when a roadmap towards possible elements for co-operation had been introduced. Consequently, a draft text establishing the rules of procedure concerning worker protection was prepared by the ECHA Secretariat, which are now open for consultation by the Committees.

SEAC took note of the revised rules of procedure and that the Secretariat will send the document to the ECHA Management Board for approval.

5) Restrictions

5.1) General restriction issues

a) Update on intended restriction dossiers (joint RAC/SEAC session)

The Secretariat informed the Committees about two new intentions included in the Registry of Intentions: lead and lead compounds in articles intended for consumer use prepared by Sweden and 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) prepared by the Netherlands (submission foreseen for both dossiers in April 2013).

The Chair mentioned that soon after the RAC-21/SEAC-15 meeting, the call for expressions of interest in (co-)rapporteurship will be launched for the above mentioned expected restriction dossiers and encouraged RAC and SEAC members to volunteer.

b) Update on the review of the restriction process (joint RAC/SEAC session)

The Chair first pointed out that with regard to the discussion note "How to document an opinion not supporting a restriction proposal?" that had been presented and discussed by both Committees in March, the Secretariat proposes that after gaining experience with the opinions on the Phthalates restriction dossier, possible further guidance to the (co-) rapporteurs or the updating of the opinion template could be considered.

The Secretariat then reminded that in the last RAC and SEAC plenary meetings, the Committees had been informed about the plans to revise the working procedure for elaboration of the Forum advice on enforceability of restriction proposals and provided an update on the ongoing revision of the restriction process in the Forum. The Forum Working Group on Enforceability of Restrictions met on 21 March 2012 and agreed on the main lines for the revised working procedure. According to the revised procedure, the Forum will be consulted twice during the restriction process. The Forum will elaborate the draft advice by the end of week 12-16 and the final advice by the end of week 33 of the restriction process (before RAC adopts its opinion and SEAC agrees on its draft opinion). The draft Forum advice will be based on the original Annex XV proposal while the final Forum advice will take into account the third versions of the RAC opinion and the SEAC draft opinion as well as comments from the public consultation. The final advice will be adopted by the Forum in written procedure. The support on enforcement related issues to the RAC and SEAC (co-)rapporteurs will be provided by the Forum's lead member, in co-operation with the Forum's Working Group, throughout the whole opinion development process of RAC and SEAC. The Secretariat explained that the revised working procedure will be submitted to the Forum for adoption at Forum-12 (18-20 June 2012) and will be applied for next dossiers in conformity with REACH Annex XV requirements starting already from the DCB restriction dossier. The Chair mentioned that the RAC and SEAC working procedures for opinion development will be revised to reflect the Forum changes in autumn/winter 2012.

One member gave a recommendation to the Forum to elaborate further administrative tools to check whether companies comply with the provisions of Annex XVII of REACH (e.g. looking into handbooks, production data sheets, etc). The Secretariat agreed to submit this suggestion to the Forum.

Another member referred to the report on enforcement activities performed by MS authorities as well as companies, combined by the Commission within the REACH review,

and suggested that RAC and SEAC should also study and learn from this report. The Secretariat, as well as other members of RAC and SEAC, supported this proposal.

In SEAC-15:

One member expressed the view that in cases where RAC cannot identify risks, SEAC could still come to a position that it can formulate an opinion. Several SEAC members emphasised the importance of this discussion and explained that they would appreciate guidance on how to proceed in such cases. It was suggested that the opinion template agreed by SEAC in 2009 would need to be changed and it was proposed to review this template. Another member, however, emphasised that the legal framework for RAC and SEAC is very clear from the legislation. RAC looks whether there is a risk that needs to be controlled or not. If RAC is of the opinion that there is no risk that needs to be controlled, it would be illogical for SEAC to come to a contradicting opinion. Consequently, such an opinion would go beyond this Committee's mandate.

It was concluded that the Secretariat will discuss with the Commission the remits of RAC and SEAC and will revert to SEAC after this clarification with possible suggestions for action to be taken.

5.2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Phthalates – 2nd version of SEAC draft opinion

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs gave an overview of the events since the SEAC meeting in March 2012. They reflected on the members' comments on the different versions of the draft opinion since March and reported on the third party comments received in the second half of the public consultation. Furthermore, they presented the key developments in the fourth version of the draft opinion, in particular the analysis of the baseline and the difficulties with the assessment of benefits and proportionality. SEAC considered the conclusion of RAC that the proposed restriction is not justified because the available data do not indicate that currently (2012) there is a risk from combined exposure to the four phthalates. Furthermore, after considering the regulatory requirements and consequent reduction in use to be further reducing the risk, as will the authorisation requirements imposed on these phthalates in the next few years, the SEAC (co-)rapporteurs highlighted that in accordance with established procedures SEAC does not have a basis to form an opinion. In addition, the issue of recycling was included in the fourth version of the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee discussed the implications of a "no basis" for SEAC opinion on the content of the draft opinion and it was suggested that the opinion should be concise but nevertheless address also the proportionality issues that the Committee assessed during the process. SEAC agreed to change the formulation of the draft opinion to "SEAC has no basis to support the proposed restriction".

With regard to the baseline, the dossier submitter commented that the assumption that the use of the four phthalates would decline in the EU is in their opinion highly uncertain. Furthermore, the dossier submitter noted that there are no indications that the use of phthalates in imported articles will not increase as the use of phthalates has increased in Asia since 2006 and that the amount of the four phthalates in imported articles may become 2-3 times higher than indicated in the draft Background Document. Another member, however, reminded SEAC that the RAC conclusion on the decrease of the risk characterisation ratios (RCRs) in the future is related to the slope of the baseline curve which is likely to remain the same regardless of the amount of imports. The Committee was also reminded that RCRs used by RAC are based on biomonitoring data and therefore the exposure due to actual imports is accounted for. The rapporteur added that several sources suggest that imports to the EU are likely to decline even if the use of phthalates in Asia is growing due to sharp economic growth and consumption in that region. He reminded also of the trends of the growing volumes of non-phthalate plasticisers in Asia.

Some concerns were raised regarding the impact of the RAC and SEAC opinions on the authorisation process. The rapporteur noted, however, that the application fees, the obligation to provide a substitution plan by the applicant and the possibility to propose

shorter review periods in the authorisation process which may affect the number of and decision on applications.

SEAC agreed by consensus on the draft opinion on the four phthalates. SEAC took note of the Background Document. It was further agreed that the (co-)rapporteurs will ensure that the supportive documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion before publication on the ECHA website. The Secretariat will launch a public consultation on the draft opinion. The Secretariat informed that as the RAC opinion diverges significantly from the restriction suggested, the process for the extension of the deadline of the opinion of SEAC by 90 days (based on Article 71(3) of REACH) has been initiated.

b) Chromium VI – 1st version of SEAC draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the RAC (co-)rapporteurs and the dossier submitter who were following the discussion as meeting participants.

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs provided a presentation on the first version of the SEAC draft opinion, the first Forum advice and comments received from SEAC members on the proposal. Issues brought up by the (co-)rapporteurs for further discussion were mainly related to the first Forum advice and focused on the choice between RMO1 (restriction of the chromium (VI) content of articles of leather which may come into direct and prolonged contact with the human skin) and RMO2 (restriction of chromium (VI) content in all articles of leather) as well as on the higher concentration limit (4.5 rather than 3ppm) proposed by the Forum.

SEAC members shared the view that the draft opinion should further evaluate the data and methodologies used in the dossier, and it should contain the (co-)rapporteurs' assessment of the presented data. In addition, a repetition in the draft opinion on sections allocated to RAC should be avoided as far as possible.

Some members expressed their reservation about certain aspects of the assessment in the dossier. For example, regarding chromium-induced allergies, the representativeness of the Danish data to the whole EU was questioned. It was suggested that the Secretariat should contact the European Society of Contact Dermatitis to provide references of the data they submitted via the public consultation. The RAC (co-)rapporteurs present in the meeting supported this request and expressed the opinion that the information submitted by the European Society of Contact Dermatitis seems to support the representativeness of the Danish data.

A stakeholder observer representative asked if the SEA had been done for different RMOs.

The SEAC (co-)rapporteurs explained that both RMO1 and RMO2 are well justified, and the assessment includes also a SEA. However, in their view the dossier does not provide sufficient data to assess the impacts of RMO3 (restriction of total chromium content of leather). Although there is no proper SEA done for RMO3, the expected costs for industry seem to be much higher than in the two other RMOs, and therefore, no support for RMO3.

It was agreed that the (co-)rapporteurs, in co-operation with the Secretariat, will prepare a response to comments of SEAC members on the dossier and on the first version of the SEAC draft opinion and the RCOM will be distributed to SEAC. The (co-)rapporteurs should take the comments into account while preparing the second version of the SEAC draft opinion.

c) Dichlorobenzene – outcome of the conformity check

The Chair welcomed the RAC (co-)rapporteurs who were following the discussion as meeting participants. The Chair also informed that the ECHA scientific dossier managers were following the discussions as observers in order to provide technical support, if needed. They were not representing the dossier submitter.

The Chair invited the SEAC (co-)rapporteurs to give a presentation on the outcome of the conformity check. The (co-)rapporteurs recommended to the Committee to agree that the dossier conforms to the requirements of Annex XV of the REACH Regulation.

The main recommendations to the dossier submitter were presented to SEAC by the (co-)rapporteurs. The dossier submitter was recommended, for example, to clarify the wording of the restriction and to conclude on why existing risk management measures are not considered sufficient; however, these should not affect the agreement of the Committee on conformity. The need to clarify the scope of the dossier was also discussed by the Committee but was considered to be dealt with during the next phase of opinion development.

After a brief discussion, SEAC agreed that the dossier is in conformity.

The Secretariat will compile the RAC and SEAC outcomes of the conformity check, and will upload this to CIRCABC. The Secretariat will also inform the dossier submitter on the Committees' recommendations. The (co-)rapporteurs were invited to start developing the opinion in accordance with the procedure on opinion development. The Secretariat will launch a public consultation on the restriction proposal on 19 June 2012.

In the joint RAC/SEAC session:

After the dossier was agreed to be in conformity by both Committees, the dossier submitter presented the proposed restriction dossier to RAC and SEAC. Some questions were raised about the alternatives and the reason why the proposal was justified as priority by the Commission. Both ECHA and the Commission provided additional clarification on this.

5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

The Secretariat introduced the meeting document SEAC/15/2012/04 containing the Chair's recommendation regarding the appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for the nonylphenol restriction dossier. The Committee agreed on the appointment as proposed in the recommendation. The Secretariat informed that the dossier is expected to be submitted by 3 August and the conformity check process will be launched on 16 August 2012. Both Committees RAC and SEAC are expected to conclude regarding the conformity of the dossier in their September 2012 plenary meetings.

6) Authorisations (joint RAC/SEAC session)

a) Report from the Den Haag workshop on Environmental Impact Assessment and future steps with regard to capacity building

The Secretariat introduced the topic of the authorisation capacity building and gave an update of its current status and future plans. It was emphasised that specifically the RAC-SEAC interface needs to be further developed, other key issues identified and the programme updated accordingly.

In further closing the RAC-SEAC interface, one of the organisers of the Den Haag workshop gave a presentation on the methodology developed and case studies of environmental impact assessment as well as on the results of the workshop.

RAC and SEAC members welcomed the presentation on steps taken in closing the gap between risk assessment and impact assessment. Nevertheless, members pointed out that further development may be needed. For example the proposed PBT-scoring approach may need to be further developed to include also vPvB-scoring and in the future probabilistic approaches. Also human health hazard classes could be included.

Members pointed out that the dataset of a substance and its alternative(s) might be very unequal in "real cases" and this may make the comparison difficult, e.g. when comparing possibly "information rich" SVHCs to possibly "information poor" alternatives. Furthermore, it was mentioned that the actual link needs to be established between the weighing of impact indicators to welfare relevant endpoints that are needed for SEA. The advantage of this presented approach to other earlier developed methods, such as eco system services, could be better explained.

The stakeholder observer from Eurometaux welcomed as well the presentation and stressed industries' effort to support further work made in closing the gap as it is needed

for their authorisation dossiers. The stakeholder observer from Cefic noted many improvements in risk assessment at different occasions serving different processes (e.g. the ECHA workshop on dossier and substance evaluation in February 2012). He proposed to combine and coordinate all the initiatives taken in the different risk processes like authorisation and restriction but also evaluation in order to improve risk assessment in general.

b) Public information in the process of application for authorisation

The Secretariat presented the outcome of the consultation process with stakeholders from industry, NGOs, and trade unions on what information needs to be published in the authorisation process and how the outcome was aligned to the ECHA values of transparency, independence, trustworthiness and efficiency.

Further information on these subjects was provided in the meeting documents a) (RAC/21/2012/12; SEAC/15/2012/06) on broad information on uses (BIU) and b) (RAC/21/2012/11; SEAC/15/2012/05) on elements of the opinion that will be published once an opinion is adopted.

RAC and SEAC members were supportive of the conclusions in the documents.

c) Participation of case-owners and stakeholder observers in opinion development process

The Secretariat presented the content of the meeting document (RAC/21/2012/13; SEAC/15/2012/07) on the participation of case-owners and stakeholder observers (STOs) in the opinion development process on applications for authorisation (AfA).

The suggested approach takes into account the experience so far in the MSC. Furthermore, the complexity of the authorisation process (where each case is discussed eight or ten times in RAC and SEAC meetings) was highlighted as a consideration. For efficiency reasons and to ensure a smoothly running procedure, it is proposed that case-owners would participate in separate "hearings" in the AfA process, rather than in plenary meetings. These would be held about 6-7 weeks after the close of the consultation. Members and STOs concurred with this approach.

There is a desire to include STOs in the Committees' work to ensure transparency and accountability. However, it was recognised that Confidential Business Information (CBI) is likely to be discussed in the plenary sessions. ECHA needs to ensure that such information is treated in a trustworthy manner so that the applicants will provide accurate information that is necessary for the Committees to form their opinions. For this reason, it was proposed that STOs should not participate in the Committees' plenary sessions where specific cases are to be discussed. This policy would operate for a period of 18 months while the significance of CBI in cases and the necessary arrangements to manage it are assessed. In the interim, STOs would receive a non-confidential briefing in open session on the Committees' deliberations and any issues which had been raised.

RAC members pointed out that the AfA process is new to all and they thought that comments from observers have been valuable during the opinion making process in the past and this could also be the case in AfA.

Some RAC and SEAC members thought that the proposed approach is appropriate and well justified. It was also noted that STOs will primarily provide information on alternatives during public consultation.

Some STOs pointed out that they are bound to signed declarations of confidentiality. Furthermore, they expressed a concern of opinions being adopted in a "black box" without providing an opportunity to contribute to the process.

The Secretariat replied that while understanding the arguments provided it will be essential for the good functioning of the process that CBI is not disclosed. The Secretariat also emphasised the need for equal treatment as well as the good independent functioning of the Committees to be ensured at all times. The Secretariat recognised the concerns expressed by STOs and some members.

Following the presentation at this plenary meeting, the document will be discussed at the Management Board in June 2012. ECHA will provide a summary of the views expressed by the Committees at the meeting.

7) AOB

- Update of the workplan

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

- Introduction of SUBSPORT project

A presentation on the SUBSPORT (Substitution Support Portal) project was provided to SEAC. The Committee members were encouraged to get acquainted with the presented tool (www.subsport.eu).

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-15

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-15, 13-15 June 2012

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 minor modifications (presentation of the SUBSPORT Project under AOB).	Secretariat to upload the revised agenda to SEAC CIRCA 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-14 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies</i>	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-14. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies, including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in REACH Committee and CARACAL.	<p>Economic feasibility document is postponed from SEAC-14 action points to September meeting.</p> <p>The Commission to consider providing written reports on the SEAC related issues discussed in the REACH Committee and CARACAL.</p> <p>The Commission to consider inviting rapporteurs, ECHA or dossier submitter to REACH Committee meetings.</p>
<i>b) Implementation of the Conflict of Interest Policy – Modification of the SEAC Rules of Procedure</i>	
SEAC took note of the room document (SEAC/15/2012/02) and agreed on the wording of the SEAC RoPs to be submitted to the ECHA Management Board for approval.	Secretariat to submit the revised RoPs to the ECHA Management Board for approval.
<i>c) Co-opted members</i>	
SEAC discussed the need for co-opting additional members to the Committee based on Article 85(4) of REACH. SEAC concluded that there is no immediate need to co-opt additional members to the Committee.	<p>Secretariat to brief SEAC on RAC discussion on this issue.</p> <p>Secretariat to further develop the analysis of expertise needed for SEAC tasks.</p> <p>SEAC Members to provide comments to Secretariat on possible issues to be considered.</p>
<i>d) Rules of procedure pursuant to Article 110 of REACH on worker protection</i>	

SEAC took note of the room document (SEAC/15/2012/03).	Secretariat to review the confidentiality policy for documentation for transparency reasons. Secretariat to submit the draft RoPs on worker protection to the ECHA Management Board for discussion and possible adoption.
5. Restrictions	
5.1 General restriction issues	
<i>b) Update on the review of the restriction process</i>	
SEAC discussed the potential situation where RAC concludes that it cannot identify risk while SEAC would support the restriction.	Secretariat to discuss with the COM the remits of RAC and SEAC and revert to SEAC after this clarification with possible suggestions for actions to be taken, including for example possible update of the templates (by the end of 2012).
5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Phthalates – discussion on the 4 th version of SEAC draft opinion and agreement on SEAC draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented the 4 th version of the draft opinion. SEAC discussed the main changes made to the draft opinion of SEAC. SEAC agreed by consensus on the draft opinion on phthalates. SEAC took note of the Background Document.	Rapporteurs to ensure that the supportive documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion. Secretariat to launch a public consultation on the draft opinion.
b) Chromium VI – 1st version of SEAC draft opinion	
SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the draft opinion, the first Forum advice and comments received from the Committee members, through the public consultation so far and from the dossier submitter.	(Co-) rapporteurs in cooperation with the Secretariat to submit a response to comments of SEAC members on the dossier to the Secretariat for distribution to SEAC members. (Co-) rapporteurs to take the comments into account while preparing the 2 nd version of the draft opinion. Secretariat to contact European Society of Contact Dermatitis to provide references of the data they submitted via public consultation.
c) Dichlorobenzene – outcome of the conformity check	
SEAC agreed that the dossier is in conformity with the Annex XV requirements and discussed the recommendations to the dossier submitter.	Secretariat to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this to CIRCABC. Secretariat to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check. The rapporteurs to start developing the opinion in accordance with the procedure on opinion development (pending on the RAC agreement on the outcome of the conformity check).

	Secretariat to launch a public consultation on the proposed restriction on 19 June 2012 (pending on the RAC agreement on the outcome of the conformity check).
5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
SEAC agreed on the appointment of (co-) rapporteurs for the restriction dossier on nonylphenol (SEAC/15/2012/04).	
7. AOB	
SEAC took note of the revised eligibility criteria of RAC and SEAC. SEAC was informed about the workplan for the future months.	Secretariat to upload the presented workplan on CIRCabc. Secretariat to provide statistics on the time spent by rapporteurs on processing of past restriction dossiers (for September meeting).
SEAC was provided with a presentation on the SUBSPORT project.	SEAC members to get acquainted with the presented tool.
8. Action points and main conclusion of SEAC-15	
SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-15.	Secretariat to upload the action points and main conclusions to CIRCabc IG.

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-15

SEAC Members	Advisors to SEAC members, Dossier Submitters (DS)
ALEXANDRE João	BEEKMAN Martijn (Advisor to C. Luttikhuizen)
BENDL Jiri	COGEN Simon (Advisor to J-P. Feyaerts)
BOUSTRAS Georgios	GUSTAFSSON Lars (Advisor to A. Thors)
BRIGNON Jean-Marc	HENNIG Philipp (Advisor to K. Thiele)
CSERGO Robert	JENSEN Frank (Advisor to L. Fock, Phthalates DS representative and RAC Member)
DALTON Marie	PAPPONEN Hinni (Advisor to J. Kiiski)
DANTINNE Catheline	SCHOU Jørgen Peter (Advisor to L. Fock)
FANKHAUSER Simone	VERHOEVEN Julia (Advisor to C. Luttikhuizen)
FEYAERTS Jean-Pierre	Stakeholder Observers
FIORE-TARDIEU Karine	BRAATHEN Nils-Axel
FOCK Lars	CLAES Walter (EuPC representing VinylPlus)
FURLAN Janez	COCKCROFT Linda-Jean (Arkema, Cefic)
GEORGIOU Stavros	DIMTCHEVA Ralitzza (UEAPME)
GRANDI Silvia	HOLLAND Mike (EEB)
KIISKI Johanna	JÀNOSI Amaya (Cefic)
KNOFLACH Georg	KÜHN Ingolf (Business Europe)
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees	MUSU Tony (ETUC)
LADOPOULOU Angela	WATERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)
RODRIGUEZ DE SANCHO Maria Jesus	ECHA staff
SCHUCHTAR Endre	JACQUEMIN Katline
SKARŽINSKAS Vitalius	KIOKIAS Sotirios
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina Velinova	KIOSK-BIENKO Joanna
THIELE Karen	KIVELA Kalle
THORS Åsa	KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
TIRCHILA Luminita	LEFÈVRE Rémi
	MERKOURAKIS Spyrydion
Invited Experts	LIPKOVA Adriana
CASTELLI Stefano	ORISPÄÄ Katja
LANGTVET Espen	ÖBERG Tomas
URBAN Klaus	PELTOLA Jukka
	ROGGEMAN Maarten
Representatives of the European Commission	SADAM Diana
BENGYUZOV Manol	SIHVONEN Kirsi
ZIELINSKI Janusz	SHUQOM Natasha
	THUVANDER Ann
	VAINIO Matti
RAC (co)-Rapporteurs	VAN HAELST Anniek

DUNAUŠKIENE Lina
MULLOOLY Yvonne
PRONK Marja
SCHULTE Agnes
SCHLÜTER Urs
SMITH Andrew

Joint RAC/SEAC session

RAC Members
ANDERSSON Alicja
BARANSKI Boguslaw
BARRON Thomasina
BJØRGE Christine
BORGES Teresa
Di PROSPERO FANGHELLA Paola
DUNAUŠKIENE Lina
DUNGEY Stephen
GREIM Helmut
GRUIZ Katalin
HAKKERT Betty
JENSEN Frank
KADIKIS Normunds
LEINONEN Riitta
LOSERT Annemarie
LUND Bert-Ove
MULLOOLY Yvonne
OLTEANU Maria
PARIS Pietro
PICHARD Annick
PINA Benjamin
POLAKOVICOVA Helena
PRONK Marja
RUCKI Marian
RUPPRICH Norbert
SCHLUETER Urs
SCHULTE Agnes
SMITH Andrew
SØRENSEN Peter

Advisors to RAC members
CITRO Lucia (Advisor to Pietro Paris)
DOBEL Shima (Advisor to Frank Jensen)
JANONYTE Agne (Advisor to Lina Dunauskiene)
Mc Garry Helen (Advisor to Andrew Smith) and advisor supporting rapporteurs on the tetrahydrofurfuryl
MAHIOUT Selma (Advisor to Riitta Leinonen)
PAPPONEN Hinni (Advisor to Riitta Leinonen)
SCHUUR Gerlienke (Advisor to Marja Pronk)
VIVIER Stéphanie (Advisor to Annick Pichard) and adviseor supporting rapporteurs on the fluazinam
Stakeholder observers
ANNYS Erwin (Cefic)
FRUITIER-POLLOTH Claudia (EuPC following phthalates)
MEISTERS Marie-Louise (ECETOC)
ROWE Rocky (ECPA)
VEROUGSTRAETE Violaine (Eurometaux)
VOLKER Soballa (Business Europe)
Other observers
VARNAI Veda (Croatian observer)
ECHA staff
CALVO TOLEDO Juan Pablo
DUBOURG Richard
HUUSKONEN Hannele
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
LEFÈVRE Rémi
MALM Jukka
MATTHES Jochen

IV. List of Annexes

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

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

Final Draft Agenda	<i>SEAC/A/15/2012</i>
Feedback from other bodies and activities	<i>SEAC/15/2012/01</i>
Implementation of the Conflict of Interest Policy - Modification of the SEAC Rules of Procedure	<i>SEAC/15/2012/02</i>
Rules of procedure of the European Chemicals Agency concerning cooperation with other relevant European Union bodies in the area of worker protection	<i>SEAC/15/2012/03</i>
Rules of procedure pursuant to Article 110 of REACH on worker protection	<i>SEAC/15/2012/03 (room document)</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossier on nonylphenol	<i>SEAC/15/2012/04</i>
What to make public of opinions on applications for authorisation	<i>SEAC/15/2012/05</i>
Public information in the process of applications for authorisation	<i>SEAC/15/2012/06</i>
Participation of case owners and stakeholder observers in the opinion development process (authorisation)	<i>SEAC/15/2012/07</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> ¹
FOCK Lars	7.2a Phthalates 7.2b Chromium VI	Dossier submitter
JENSEN Frank	7.2a Phthalates 7.2b Chromium VI	Dossier submitter
SCHOU Jørgen Peter	7.2a Phthalates 7.2b Chromium VI	Dossier submitter

¹ Dossier submitter means (his or her institution's) participation in the preparation of the dossiers submitted by the MSCA.

13 June 2012
SEAC/A/15/2012_rev.1

Final Agenda
15th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

13-15 June 2012
ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)
13 June: starts at 10:00
15 June: ends at 13:00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/15/2012
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-14 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies
SEAC/15/2012/01
For information
- b) Implementation of the Conflict of Interest Policy – Modification of the SEAC Rules of Procedure
SEAC/15/2012/02
For agreement
- c) Co-opted members
For discussion
- d) Rules of procedure pursuant to Article 110 of REACH on worker protection
SEAC/15/2012/03 (room document)
For consultation

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 General restriction issues

- a) Update on intended restriction dossiers
For information
- b) Update on the review of the restriction process
For information

5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) Phthalates – discussion on the 4th version of SEAC draft opinion and agreement on SEAC draft opinion

For discussion and possible agreement

- b) Chromium VI – 1st version of SEAC draft opinion

For discussion

- c) Dichlorobenzene – outcome of the conformity check

For agreement

5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC/15/2012/04

For agreement

Item 6 – Authorisations

- a) Report from the Den Haag workshop on Environmental Impact Assessment and future steps with regard to capacity building

For discussion

- b) Public information in the process of application for authorisation

SEAC/15/2012/05

SEAC/15/2012/06

For discussion

- c) Participation of case-owners and stakeholder observers in opinion development process (Closed session)

SEAC/15/2012/07 (room document)

For discussion

Item 7 – AOB

- a) Update of the work plan
- b) Introduction of SUBSPORT project

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-15

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-15

For adoption