

**Helsinki, 11 February 2010**  
**SEAC/M/05/2009 final**

**Final**

**Minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis**

**23-24 November 2009**

## **I. Summary Record of the Proceeding**

### **1) Welcome and apologies**

Ms Ann Thuvander, Chair of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants of the fifth meeting of SEAC.

The Chair informed that apologies had been received from four members, three of whom had sent non-voting replacements. Members' advisors present at the meeting as well as representatives of the European Commission (COM) and six stakeholder organisations participating at the meeting as observers were introduced.

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

The Chair informed the participants that the meeting would be recorded and the records would be destroyed after the adoption of the minutes.

### **2) Adoption of the Agenda**

The Secretariat proposed to include in the Agenda under AOB information regarding the survey on satisfaction of members with the work of the Secretariat and organisation of meetings. In addition, a member requested the Secretariat to report on technical problems in CIRCA that had occurred in the past few weeks, to provide clarification on different organisational elements of ECHA and how they relate to each other, and to provide an update on the guidance on authorisation. With these modifications the Agenda was adopted. The final Agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex II.

### **3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda**

No participants declared any conflict of interest to the items on the Agenda of the SEAC-5 meeting.

### **4) Administrative issues**

#### **a) Changes in the SEAC composition/nominations**

The Chair informed that two members had resigned from the Committee since the last SEAC meeting: João Lourenço for personal reasons and Ion Costea who had started to work at ECHA as a Seconded National Expert. No new replacements had been appointed yet.

#### **b) Feedback on using the Kaleva services**

The Chair recalled that at the SEAC-4 meeting members were asked to provide feedback on using the Kaleva travel agency's services by e-mail to the Secretariat. The Secretariat had received one comment, the reply to which would be given under Agenda Item 5 (Status report of SEAC-4 action points). Participants were invited to provide further comments regarding the Kaleva travel agency's services by e-mail to the Secretariat.

### **5) Status report of the action points of SEAC-4 (Parts I & II)**

The Secretariat provided a status report of the SEAC-4 action points and main conclusions. The report covered both the SEAC separate session and the RAC-SEAC joint session action points.

At the SEAC separate session members were asked to provide feedback on using the Kaleva travel agency's services by e-mail to the Secretariat. The Secretariat had received one comment from a member which concerned the possibility to use airlines bonus cards' numbers, when arranging travels through Kaleva. The Secretariat had contacted Kaleva travel agency to clarify this question and reported that Kaleva could indeed use airlines bonus cards' numbers, but the participant would need to inform Kaleva about having such a card under heading "additional information" when registering for a travel.

The Secretariat was also supposed to provide the Forum's working procedure on developing of Forum's advice on enforceability of restriction proposals to the Committee for information. The Secretariat reported that this document had been uploaded to the "Follow-up" section of the SEAC separate session folder in SEAC CIRCA Interest Group.

In addition, the Secretariat was asked to start planning of the work on working procedures regarding authorisation, as an action point of the SEAC separate session. The Secretariat reported that planning of the preparations for authorisation would be explained at the SEAC-5 meeting.

At the RAC-SEAC joint session the Secretariat was asked to forward the meeting document regarding the support available to rapporteurs to CARACAL for information. The Secretariat reported that the document had been sent to the CARACAL Secretariat for uploading to CARACAL CIRCA Interest Group.

In addition, RAC and SEAC had asked the Secretariat to provide the CARACAL meeting document "Procedure for Registry of Intent" to both Committees for information. The Secretariat noted that this document had been uploaded to the "Follow-up" section of the joint RAC-SEAC session folder in CIRCA.

It was also agreed at the joint session that the Secretariat would launch a CIRCA newsgroup on the room document concerning RAC and SEAC members' access to information in REACH-IT. The Secretariat informed that comments submitted by SEAC members had been compiled and responded to and the RCOM<sup>1</sup> had been uploaded to SEAC CIRCA Interest Group in the end of October 2009.

## **6) Feedback from other ECHA bodies**

The Secretariat reported on the last meeting of ECHA Management Board (MB) of 29-30 September 2009. The main topic discussed at that meeting had been REACH-IT information security policy. The discussions had not been concluded and would continue at the next meeting of the MB. In addition, ECHA's work programme for 2010 had been adopted and had subsequently been published on ECHA's website. SEAC members were encouraged to take a look at this document. The Secretariat also noted that the MB had adopted the amended guide for reimbursement of travel and accommodation expenses and payment of subsistence allowances<sup>2</sup>, which members had received (via CIRCA) after the MB meeting, and explained the changes introduced in the guide briefly. The Secretariat informed that the next MB meeting is taking place on 17-18 December 2009.

The Chair of the Member State Committee (MSC) reported on the activities of MSC. The Chair informed that the Committee was examining the second set of proposals for Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC) for the Candidate List. In total 15 Annex XV dossiers had been submitted by 3 August 2009 and 14 substances had been addressed for finding unanimous agreement of MSC. In addition, the Committee is expected to reach agreement on the first testing proposal decision at the MSC-10 meeting on 2-4 December 2009. The Chair of

---

<sup>1</sup> Response to comments table

<sup>2</sup> Document MB/59/2009 final, adopted by the MB on 29 September 2009.

MSC also briefly reported from the CARACAL-3 meeting held in October 2009. At that meeting COM had provided an update concerning the work plan for restrictions in transition phase.

A presentation was then given by a representative of COM on the work plan of COM for restrictions. An update was given with regard to substances under Article 137(1)(a) of the REACH Regulation, substances which are carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction (CMR) of category 1 and 2 or 1A and 1B under Article 68(2) of REACH, and possible new restrictions under Article 69(1) of the REACH Regulation.

The new team leader of the Forum Secretariat provided a report on the activities of the Forum. At its meeting in April 2009, the Forum had established a working group on enforceability of restriction proposals. The first tasks of this working group are to proceed with harmonisation of analytical testing methods and to clarify the tasks of the working group and the Forum with regard to the working procedure on development of advice of the Forum on enforceability of restriction proposals. The working group held its first meeting on 16 October 2009.

The Chair of RAC reported on the activities of RAC. The latest RAC meeting had taken place right after the joint RAC-SEAC session held in the end of June – beginning of July 2009. At that meeting RAC had adopted its first opinion regarding classification and labelling of diantimony trioxide (DAT). The Chair of RAC also briefly described the Agenda of the RAC-8 meeting that would be held on 24-26 November 2009.

Finally, the Chair of RAC gave a brief overview of the fifth meeting of the Chairs of EU bodies involved in risk assessment which had taken place in Brussels on 18-19 November 2009. The main aim of the meeting had been to continue the dialogue among scientific committees/panels giving support to EU bodies in the area of risk assessment and to establish an EU basis for the North Atlantic dialogue on risk assessment. It had been decided that three specific working groups would prepare the EU views to be presented in the North Atlantic dialogue:

- emerging risks;
- uncertainty, terminology and weight of evidence;
- exposure assessment.

Members of SEAC were asked to consider their possible involvement in the abovementioned activities and to send their expressions of interest to the SEAC Secretariat. Following a request of a SEAC member, the Secretariat promised to share with SEAC the report of the fifth meeting of the Chairs of EU bodies involved in risk assessment as well as to identify and upload to CIRCA documents related to that meeting with relevance for SEAC.

## **7) Agreement on appointment of rapporteurs for restriction dossiers**

The Secretariat presented the Chair's recommendation for the appointment of rapporteurs and co-rapporteurs for the first restriction dossiers (dimethylfumarate (DMF), lead in jewellery and phenyl mercury compounds). The Secretariat recalled that a call for expression of interest had been launched on 28 August 2009 and closed on 18 September 2009, and summarised the responses received by SEAC members. The Secretariat noted that SEAC should agree on the appointment of rapporteurs at the SEAC-5 meeting, but the formal appointment could only take place after the dossiers had been received by ECHA.

**SEAC agreed on the appointment of rapporteurs and co-rapporteurs for the abovementioned restriction dossiers according to the Chair's recommendation presented in the meeting document SEAC/05/2009/24.**

## **8) Update on upcoming restriction dossiers**

The Secretariat provided an update on upcoming restriction dossiers based on the information in the Registry of Intentions (RoI) as of 20 November 2009. No new intentions had been registered in the RoI since information had been provided at the SEAC-4 meeting. The Secretariat informed that it would soon publish an intention for the submission of an Annex XV restriction dossier on mercury in measuring devices in the RoI, as ECHA had recently received a request to prepare this dossier from the COM<sup>3</sup>.

A member asked whether it is appropriate for an appointed rapporteur to be in contact with the Member State (MS) submitting a dossier already in the preparation phase of the dossier. The Secretariat replied that such contacts had not been anticipated, as a rapporteur is supposed to be independent and should not therefore be involved in the preparation of the dossier which he/she will later evaluate. Thus possible questions to the MS should be channelled through the Secretariat. However, after the submission of the dossier, the rapporteur is expected to be in direct contact with the submitting MS.

Another member referred to the CARACAL meeting document containing suggested submission dates for restriction dossiers for 2010 and asked whether a similar document is planned for 2011 and further, explaining that such information would help the Competent Authorities (CAs) and RAC and SEAC members in planning their future work. The Secretariat replied that a document with suggested submission dates for 2011 was already under preparation.

## **9) Authorisation**

### **a) Introduction to authorisation process**

The session was initiated with an introductory presentation on authorisation by the Secretariat. The presentation consisted of a brief overview of the authorisation procedure, the content of authorisation applications and decisions, and a description of the granting procedure and how RAC and SEAC are involved. The preparations needed from ECHA to process authorisation applications and the timeline for the preparations were also explained.

A participant asked whether it is possible to submit a joint application from several companies for one and the same substance. The Secretariat explained that an authorisation application is not only substance specific, but also use and applicant or supply-chain specific. Joint applications would therefore be possible. The Secretariat's current expectation is that ECHA would receive relatively small number of applications in 2010.

One SEAC member raised the question whether there would be any possibilities to receive notifications by industry about planned submissions of authorisation applications (similarly to the RoI for restrictions). The Secretariat replied that no formal notifications are required under the REACH Regulation. However, ECHA could invite industry to inform about their plans.

One participant emphasised the importance of the part on availability and feasibility of alternatives in an authorisation application and expressed his concerns about the quality and completeness of information on alternatives given by the applicant. He was also unsure whether consultation of third parties on the issue of alternatives would bring enough useful information, as the exact use of the substance could not often be published due to confidentiality reasons. Because of the limited financial resources available to the rapporteur, there would be limited possibilities to let external consultants carry out in-depth analysis of alternatives. The member inquired whether the Secretariat saw any possibility to help rapporteurs with regard to this issue. The Secretariat noted that it would indeed not be easy to

---

<sup>3</sup> The intention was published on 25 November 2009.

get balanced information on alternatives. However, the Secretariat would most likely not have resources for gathering of additional information on alternatives to assist rapporteurs. It was further noted that according to the REACH Regulation, the Competent Authorities are required to assist rapporteurs in such tasks.

### **b) Getting prepared for handling of authorisation applications**

The Secretariat presented the work plan for RAC and SEAC for getting prepared to process authorisation applications (meeting document SEAC/05/2009/25<sup>4</sup>). It was emphasised that as the first applications for authorisation could be expected to arrive to ECHA between mid-2010 and mid-2012, the objective is to have all procedures and documents necessary for the Committees in place by July 2010. The Secretariat listed the procedures and documents needed for RAC and SEAC to process authorisation applications and mentioned that to the extent possible there would be common documents for RAC and SEAC. It was explained that initial discussions on the first procedures would be held in both Committees in January 2010 (for RAC at the RAC-9 meeting, for SEAC via CIRCA).

### **c) Role of SEA in authorisation**

The Secretariat gave a presentation on a socio-economic analysis (SEA) in authorisation. The presentation included a general description of a SEA in authorisation, the reasons for conducting a SEA, the differences/similarities of a SEA in restriction proposals versus authorisation applications and what might be included in the SEA. Finally, some specific issues for SEAC in relation to SEA in authorisation were discussed.

One member asked how to make sure that the information available to a rapporteur on alternatives is complete. The Secretariat replied that the primary source of information on alternatives would be the application. It was emphasised that SEAC should assess the information provided in the application. Thus, it would not have to come up with new information. If there are reasons to believe that the information on alternatives provided in the application is incomplete, there will be a possibility to go back to the applicant and ask for additional information. Also the public consultation can be used to collect information on alternatives from the third parties. One stakeholder observer suggested that in order to deal with “strategic behaviour” one could consider the possibility to offer financial or other incentives to industry for providing correct and complete information. He added that rapporteurs could benefit from guidelines on how to assess the accuracy of the information provided by the applicant. The Secretariat responded noting that as far as financial incentives are concerned, the REACH Regulation and the Fee Regulation does not allow for this. However, the idea of giving incentives for industry to provide correct and complete information could be considered.

The need for close collaboration with RAC in the authorisation process was stressed by members as well as by the Secretariat.

One member raised the issue of accumulated exposure and how that could be addressed when dealing with applications for authorisation. It was noted that the way the authorisation process is set up makes it difficult to consider accumulative exposure when RAC and SEAC are preparing their opinions. It was further noted that in the restriction process accumulative exposure is taken into account.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Secretariat drew attention to the mistake in the meeting document SEAC/05/2009/25, which had been provided to SEAC prior the meeting (in the second paragraph of Introduction) – authorisation decisions are taken according to the regulatory procedure without scrutiny, not with. The Secretariat assured that this mistake would be corrected and the revised version would be uploaded to CIRCA.

One participant asked about the length of the time period which an applicant would have to consider when applying for an authorisation and for which an authorisation to use a substance would eventually be granted. The Secretariat responded that according to the REACH Regulation the authorisation decisions are not time-limited. However, all decisions need to contain a time-limited review period. The holder of the authorisation has to submit a review report at the latest 18 months before the expiry of this period. This review report will be subject to opinions of RAC and SEAC and decision by the Commission in accordance with the same procedure as the authorisation decision.

#### **10) Framework for dealing with requests according to Art 77(3)(c) of REACH**

The Secretariat presented the draft framework for dealing with requests for opinions according to Article 77(3)(c) of the REACH Regulation. The need for such framework came from a recent case – RAC had received a request from the Executive Director (ED) of ECHA related to borates and is expected to provide its opinion in the beginning of 2010. The Secretariat described the elements of the proposed framework. Finally, the Secretariat explained that the same document would be discussed in RAC within the RAC-9 meeting in January 2010 and that both Committees could reach formal agreement on the framework in March 2010 within the RAC-10 and SEAC-6 meetings. The Secretariat added that SEAC members would also be given a possibility to provide written comments on the draft framework via a CIRCA newsgroup which would be created soon after the SEAC-5 meeting.

One member emphasised that although it is very important to keep the framework flexible, it has to be ensured that SEAC members are given enough time to react to the draft opinion before it is adopted as the whole Committee would be responsible for the opinion.

Another member questioned whether the SEAC Rules of Procedure (RoPs) would have to be revised because of the framework for dealing with requests for opinions according to Article 77(3)(c) of the REACH Regulation. The Chair replied that the Secretariat considered the proposed framework to be in line with the SEAC RoPs and saw therefore no need for revision of the RoPs because of the framework.

#### **11) Risk Management Options at Community level (joint session with RAC)**

The session was initiated with a presentation given by the Secretariat on the purpose of assessing RMO (justification of restriction as most appropriate Community wide measure). Future tasks of members of RAC and SEAC with regards to reviewing the justification that a restriction was the most appropriate risk management solution were explained. An introduction was also given to explain which RMOs could be considered in such a review and on what basis the RMOs could be assessed. During the session two presentations on specific legislative areas with high relevance for risk reduction of chemicals were given to explain them in more detail and to illustrate their links to REACH: waste legislation was presented by Christine Wistuba (DG ENV, COM) and occupational health legislation (OHL) was presented by Christine Northage (Health and Safety Executive, UK). Commentaries to these presentations were provided by Cees Luttkhuizen (SEAC member) and Boguslaw Baranski (RAC member) respectively.

#### Conclusions on waste legislation

- The scope of substance related risk management under waste legislation is more narrow, focused on a few hazardous substances and aimed to contribute to the objectives of waste legislation. However, the risk management in waste legislation could be used to address risks associated with substances as identified by REACH. When discussing the most

appropriate RMO including economical feasibility, monitoring and enforcement, waste legislation may offer one possible RMO as an alternative to restriction or authorisation under REACH. Decisions should be taken after careful analysis and discussion with experts on waste legislation and will depend on the case/specificity of use.

- Rapporteurs and members of RAC and SEAC need to have a generic overview of EU waste legislation. As decisions on the most appropriate RMO will depend on the case and need in-depth discussion, the establishment of good working relations with colleagues responsible for waste legislation is important.

#### Conclusion on occupational health legislation

- The RMM under OHL (CAD<sup>5</sup>/Carc<sup>6</sup> Directive) can be considered as one of the RMO in restriction dossiers. However, a number of differences exist between the objectives and scope of REACH and the CAD/Carc Directive. Under REACH, the main obligations are on the manufacturer/importer with some obligations on down-stream users, whilst under the CAD/Carc Directive all obligations are on individual employers. The scope of REACH is broader than the scope of the CAD/Carc Directive; REACH focuses on all identified uses of a substance whilst the CAD/Carc focuses on all activities concerning all hazardous substances at a site. The RMO under REACH are substance driven, while the RMOs under CAD/Carc are process driven.
- The role of the Scientific Committee for Occupational Exposure Limit Values (SCOEL) and the Senior Labour Inspectors Committee (SLIC) with respect to the work of RAC was highlighted.

#### General conclusion from the RMO session

- In their work on restriction dossiers, RAC and SEAC review the justification that the proposed restriction is the most appropriate risk management option. There is no new assessment of Risk Management Options, in principal all information that RAC and SEAC members will evaluate should be included in the Annex XV restriction dossier by the dossier submitter. Interested parties may submit further information or comments during the public consultation on the Annex XV restriction report. The cases are likely to be different; ranging from relatively simple to more complicated comparison of 'equally good' options which have different strengths and drawbacks.
- It is likely that the review of risk management options will focus more on restriction options and the possible need for the modification of the scope and/or restriction conditions of the proposal under scrutiny than on the review of other Community wide options. Rapporteurs need to focus on the restriction options when formulating opinions. However, rapporteurs (and members) do need to understand the aim, scope and functioning of the identified other Community legislation

---

5 The EC Chemical Agents Directive 98/24/EC (CAD) lays down minimum requirements for the protection of workers from risks to their safety and health arising, or likely to arise, from the effects of chemical agents that are present at the workplace or as a result of any work activity involving chemical agents.

6 The Carcinogens Directive (90/394/EEC). The objective of this Council Directive is to protect workers from the risks related to exposure to carcinogens at work. The Directive lays down rules on how workers should be protected from carcinogens and mutagens and how exposure to these should be reduced.



- The identification of other RMOs that could be relevant will be done on a case-by-case basis. General knowledge on other RMOs can be found in the guidance documents and other general sources of information (e.g. websites). For specific case-by-case knowledge members of RAC and SEAC should rely on the support and expertise of the competent authorities of their MSs.

## **12) Co-operation with other Community bodies**

### **a) Report on meeting of the Chairs of EU bodies involved in risk assessment (18-19 November 2009)**

The report was provided under Agenda Item 6 Feedback from other ECHA bodies.

### **b) Draft rules of procedure for co-operation with ACSH and SCOEL**

The Secretariat provided an update on the developments with the draft RoPs for co-operation with the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and with the Advisory Committee of Safety and Health at Work (ACSH) and the Scientific Committee for Occupational Exposure Limits (SCOEL). SEAC members were consulted on both sets of the draft RoPs via CIRCA from 13 until 27 October 2009. The Secretariat summarised comments received from SEAC members. Finally, the Secretariat informed that COM's Directorate-General for Employment had asked for more time to consider the draft RoPs with ACSH and SCOEL so they would not be finalised before 2010. Regarding the RoPs for cooperation with EFSA the Secretariat would proceed as planned, and these RoPs would be submitted to the MB for adoption at its December 2009 meeting.

## **13) Access to information**

### **b) SEA webportal**

The Secretariat made a presentation on the data portal for SEA and on the new information on restrictions on ECHA's webpage. SEAC members were invited to visit the sites and to provide feedback and suggestions.

## **14) Revision of SEAC Rules of Procedure**

The Chair noted that the reasons for the revision of the SEAC RoPs had been to streamline them with the changes proposed in other Committees and to increase the clarity of the text. The Secretariat introduced the proposed changes (based on the meeting document SEAC/05/2009/27) and suggested one additional change to make the text more clear (Article 5(1), the last line of the added text – to change “will” to “may”).

One member asked for clarification regarding the proposed change in Article 5(2), which stated that *“If a member does not attend four consecutive meetings without justification, following a proposal from the Chair, the Executive Director of the Agency may request the appointing body to take a decision to revoke the appointment of the member.”* The member explained that it was not clear if the Secretariat meant a justification or actually a notification. The Secretariat responded that they indeed had meant a justification.

**SEAC agreed on the changes proposed for the SEAC RoPs in accordance with the meeting document SEAC/05/2009/27 and with one additional change proposed at the meeting. The Secretariat would forward the revised RoPs to the MB for adoption at its March 2010 meeting.**

## **15) AOB**

### **a) Satisfaction survey**

The Chair informed that as ECHA is currently setting up its own quality management system, it is very important for the Secretariat to know how members of the Committees and the Forum experience the support provided by the Secretariat. The Secretariat is therefore planning to launch a satisfaction survey in the three Committees and in the Forum. The survey would be sent out in December 2009 or in the beginning of 2010. The Chair encouraged SEAC members to respond to the questionnaire.

### **b) Technical problems in CIRCA**

The Chair noted that the Secretariat had been aware of the technical problems that had occurred in CIRCA during the past few weeks. The Secretariat had been contacting the CIRCA administrators, but had not received any clear answers as yet. The Chair suggested that SEAC members should always inform the Secretariat about technical problems they are experiencing in CIRCA.

### **c) Clarification on different organisational elements of ECHA and how they relate to each other**

The Chair gave a brief overview of which organisational elements of ECHA to contact as a Committee member and as a CA representative. Everything directly related to the Committee should be dealt with by the SEAC Secretariat, preferably using the functional mailbox. The Chair suggested that if a member is not sure of whom to contact (either in the role of a SEAC member or a CA representative), they could contact the SEAC Secretariat who could guide to the right person in ECHA.

### **d) Update on the guidance on authorisation**

One of COM representatives informed that the situation with the guidance on authorisation is still the same as that explained at the SEAC-4 meeting.

## **16) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-5**

SEAC endorsed the SEAC-5 main conclusions and action points.

## II. Conclusions and action points

### MAIN CONCLUSIONS & ACTION POINTS - SEAC-5, 23-24 November 2009

(Adopted at the SEAC-5 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
<b>2. Adoption of the agenda</b>	
<p>The revised agenda was adopted with the following additions under AOB:</p> <p>Technical problems in CIRCA that have occurred in the past few weeks. Provide clarification on the different organizational elements of ECHA and how they relate to each other. Provide an update on the guidance on authorization Present the survey on satisfaction of members with respect to the work of the Secretariat and the organization of meetings.</p>	<p>SEAC-Secretariat to upload the revised agenda to SEAC CIRCA IG as part of the minutes.</p>
<b>3. Declarations of conflict of interest</b>	
<p>No declarations of conflict of interest were declared.</p>	
<b>4a. Changes in the SEAC composition/nominations</b>	
<p>SEAC took note of the changes in the composition of SEAC.</p>	
<b>4b. Feedback on using the Kaleva services.</b>	
<p>No further comments until now.</p>	<p>Members to provide feedback to SEAC- Secretariat by e-mail if necessary.</p>
<b>5. Status report of SEAC-4 action points</b>	
<p>SEAC took note of the status report concerning the action points of SEAC-4 (SEAC separate and joint RAC/SEAC session)</p>	
<b>6. Feedback from other ECHA bodies</b>	
<p>SEAC took note of the latest activities of MB, MSC, FORUM and RAC as well as the report on the last CARACAL meeting and the Meeting of Chairs on Risk Assessment that took place November 18-19, 2009 in Brussels.</p>	<p>SEAC-Secretariat to upload the report from the meeting of Chairs on Risk Assessment, when available, and to upload the relevant documents of that meeting to SEAC CIRCA IG.</p>

<b>7. Agreement on appointment of rapporteurs for restriction dossiers</b>	
SEAC agreed on the appointment of rapporteurs and co-rapporteurs for the first restriction dossiers according to the Chair's Recommendation (SEAC/05/2009/24).	
<b>8. Update from ROI</b>	
SEAC took note of the current intents in the ROI. ECHA will publish in the ROI the intent for the submission of Annex XV restriction dossier on mercury in measuring devices.	ECHA to provide submission windows for 2011.
<b>9. Authorisation</b>	
SEAC took note of the work plan on authorisation for RAC and SEAC (SEAC/05/2009/25).  SEAC concluded that there is a need to work closely together with RAC on Authorisation.  SEAC concluded that there is a need to address the issue of accumulated exposure when dealing with applications for authorisations, together with RAC.	SEAC-Secretariat to clarify the issue of the length of the period which an applicant has to consider when applying for authorisation and for which he eventually will be granted the authorisation to use a substance.
<b>10. Framework for dealing with requests for opinion according to Article 77(3)(c)</b>	
SEAC took note of the draft framework.	SEAC-Secretariat to launch commenting round on the draft framework by 26 November and aim to agree on the framework at SEAC-6. SEAC-S to provide a new draft taking into account comments from both RAC and SEAC
<b>11. Risk Management Options at Community level (joint session with RAC)</b>	
SEAC / RAC took note of the presentations during the RMO session.	SEAC-Secretariat to distribute CARACAL document (dated: 3rd of April 2009) on waste and recovered substance.  SEAC-Secretariat to distribute Council non-paper concerning interface of RoHs Directive and REACH.
<b>12b. Draft rules of procedure for co-operation with ACSH and SCOEL</b>	
SEAC took note of the developments of the draft rules of procedure for co-operation with ACSH and SCOEL.	

<b>13a. Distribution of confidential information to members (closed session)</b>	
SEAC took note of the update on the issue of confidential information.	
<b>13b. Webportal</b>	
SEAC took note of the presentation on the SEA webportal and the website on restrictions.	SEAC members are invited to visit the SEA-webportal. SEAC members to provide possible feedback and suggestions regarding the portal.
<b>14. Revision of the SEAC rules of Procedure</b>	
SEAC took note of the proposed changes to the RoPs as described in meeting document SEAC/05/2009/27. SEAC endorsed the revision with one additional change (Art 5(1), the last line of the added text - change “will” into “may”).	SEAC-Secretariat to forward the endorsed RoPs to the MB for adoption at their meeting in March 2010.
<b>AOB</b>	
SEAC took note of the Survey which is planned to be launched in the second half of December. SEAC took note of the update on technical problems in CIRCA, SEAC took note of the clarification on the different organizational elements of ECHA and how they relate to each other and on the update on the guidance on authorization	SEAC members to keep an eye on the performance of CIRCA and to inform SEAC-Secretariat, should there be any problems with CIRCA.
<b>General</b>	
	SEAC-Secretariat to upload all SEAC-5 presentations and the action points to CIRCA IG by November 27

### III. List of Attendees

<b>SEAC members:</b>	<b>Advisors to the SEAC members:</b>
BASTOS, Henri	BEEKMAN, Martijn (advisor to LUTTIKHUIZEN, C.)
BENDL, Jiri*	DOMINIAK, Dorota (advisor to RYDLEWSKA, I.)
BRIGNON, Jean Marc	GRANDI, Silvia (advisor to RECCHIA, L. M.)
BROKAITE, Kristina	GULBRANDSEN, Magnus Utnus (advisor to LANGTVET, E.)
DALTON, Marie **	KIISKI, Johanna (advisor to SALONEN, H.)
DANTINNE, Catheline	MONFORT, Donatienne (advisor to DANTINNE, C.)
FAHERTY, Mark	VERMANDE, Emilie (advisor to BASTOS, H.)
FANKHAUSER, Simone	
FEYAERTS, Jean-Pierre	<b>Representatives of the Commission:</b>
FOCK, Lars	GIL, Sebastian (DG ENV)
FORKMAN, Mats	LUVARA, Giuseppina (DG ENT)
FURLAN, Janez	
GEORGIOU, Stavros	<b>ECHA staff:</b>
GUSTAFSSON, Lars	CALVO TOLEDO, Juan Pablo
HAJAS, Martin	DE BRUIJN, Jack
KOZAK, Kristof	FUHRMANN, Anna
LANGTVET, Espen	HAUTAMÄKI, Anne
LUTTIKHUIZEN, Cees	KARHU, Elina
RECCHIA, Luca Maria	KIVELÄ, Kalle
RYDLEWSKA-LISZKOWSKA, Izabela	KLEMETTI, Kari
SALONEN, Heikki	KOWALSKI, Ulrike
SCHUCHTAR, Endre	LANKOSKI, Jussi
SUSNIK, Marko	LEFEVRE, Remi
TELLING, Aive	LOGTMEIJER, Christiaan
THEOHARI, Maria	PELTOLA, Jukka
THIELE, Karen	RUOSS, Jürgen
URBAN, Klaus***	SADAM, Diana
VOIVONTAS, Dimosthenis	STOYANOVA, Evgenia
	SUNDQUIST, Anna-Liisa
	TARAZONA, Jose
	THUVANDER, Ann
*replacing BIZKOVA, Rut	VAINIO, Matti
**replacing McGUINNESS, Sharon	YLÄ-MONONEN, Leena
***replacing SIMON, Franz-Georg	
	<b>Stakeholder observers:</b>
	BROUWER, Roy (EAERE)
	DIMTCHEVA, Ralitzia (UEAPME)
	HOLLAND, Michael (EEB)
	LEENAERS, Joeri (Eurometaux)
	MUSU, Tony (ETUC)

#### **IV. List of Annexes**

- ANNEX I. List of documents submitted to the Members of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis
- ANNEX II. Final Agenda

## ANNEX I

### Documents submitted to the Members of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

Revised Draft Agenda (Agenda Point 2)	SEAC/A/05/2009_rev.1
Recommendation to SEAC on the appointment of rapporteurs (Agenda Point 7)	SEAC/05/2009/24
Preparation for handling of authorisation applications – Outline of a work plan for RAC and SEAC (Agenda Point 9b)	SEAC/05/2009/25
Framework for dealing with requests for opinions according to Art 77(3)(c) of REACH Regulation (Agenda Point 10)	SEAC/05/2009/26
Revision of Rules of Procedure of SEAC (Agenda Point 14)	SEAC/05/2009/27



23 November 2009  
SEAC/A/05/2009\_rev.1

## Final Agenda

### Fifth meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

23 - 24 November 2009

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

23 November: starts at 14.00

24 November: ends at 16.00

**Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies**

**Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda**

*SEAC/A/05/2009\_rev.1*

*For adoption*

**Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda**

**Item 4 – Administrative issues**

Changes in the SEAC composition/nominations

*For information*

Feedback on using the Kaleva services

*For information*

**Item 5 – Status report of the action points of SEAC-4 (Parts I & II)**

*For information*

**Item 6 – Feedback from other ECHA bodies**

*For information*

**Item 7 – Agreement on appointment of rapporteurs for restriction dossiers**

SEAC/05/2009/24

*For agreement*

**Item 8 – Update on upcoming restriction dossiers**

*For information*

**Item 9 – Authorisation**

Introduction to authorisation process

*For information*

Getting prepared for handling of authorisation applications

SEAC/05/2009/25

*For information*

Role of SEA in authorisation

*For information*

**Item 10 – Framework for dealing with requests for opinions according to Article 77(3)(c) of REACH Regulation**

SEAC/05/2009/26

*For discussion*

**Item 11 – Risk Management Options at Community level (joint session with RAC)**

- Overview of relevant Community legislation
- How to assess RMO's
- Examples

**Item 12 – Co-operation with other Community bodies**

Report on meeting of the Chairs of EU bodies involved in risk assessment (18-19 November 2009)

*For information*

Draft rules of procedure for co-operation with ACSH and SCOEL

*For information and discussion*

**Item 13 – Access to information**

Distribution of confidential information to members (*closed session*)

*For information*

SEA webportal

*For information*

**Item 14 – Revision of the SEAC Rules of Procedure**

*SEAC/05/2009/27*

*For discussion and possible agreement*

**Item 15 – AOB**

Satisfaction survey

*For information*

Technical problems in Circa

*For information*

Clarification on different organisational elements of ECHA and how they relate to each other

*For information*

Update on the guidance on authorisation

*For information*

**Item 16 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-5**

Table with Action points and decisions from SEAC-5

*For adoption*