

23 May 2017

SEAC/A/34/2017 FINAL

Final

Minutes of the 34th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

13 March to 17 March 2017

I. Summary Record of the Proceeding

1) Welcome and apologies

Tomas Öberg, Chairman of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants of the thirty-fourth meeting of SEAC. The Chairman informed the participants that two new members have joined the Committee. The Chairman also informed SEAC that apologies had been received from five members.

The Chairman informed the participants that the meeting would be recorded solely for the purpose of writing the minutes and the recordings would be destroyed once no longer needed.

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

2) Adoption of the Agenda

The Chairman introduced the final draft agenda of SEAC-34. The agenda was adopted without modifications. The final agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex III. The list of all meeting documents is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

The Chairman requested members and their advisors participating in the meeting to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Three members declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions under the Agenda Item 5.1. 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-34 action points, written procedures and update other ECHA bodies

The Chairman informed the participants that all action points of SEAC-33 had been completed or would be followed up during the on-going SEAC-34 meeting. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-33 had been adopted by written procedure and had been uploaded to S-CIRCABC as well as on the ECHA website. The Chairman thanked members for providing comments on the draft SEAC-33 minutes.

The Chairman then explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA MB, RAC, MSC, the Forum and BPC had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/34/2017/01).

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

5) Restrictions

5.1) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Conformity check

1. Diisocyanates – outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representatives from Germany (following via WebEx) and an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier had been submitted by Germany in October 2016 and had been considered in conformity by SEAC, but not in conformity by RAC in December 2016 plenary. The dossier submitter resubmitted their dossier on 6 February 2017. The proposal limits the use of diisocyanates in industrial and professional applications to those cases where a combination of technical and organisational measures as well as a minimum standardised training package have been implemented. Information how to get access to this package is communicated throughout the supply chain. Exemptions are defined for cases where the content of diisocyanates in the substance or mixture placed on the market or used is less than 0.1% by weight, as well as for mixtures containing diisocyanates at higher levels than 0.1% by weight which fulfil criteria that show that the potential risks using such products are very low.

The representative of the dossier submitter provided an introductory presentation on the dossier, focussing on the changes made in the revised report. The Secretariat then briefly reported to SEAC that RAC had considered the revised dossier in conformity at RAC-40 last week, as the dossier submitter had provided additional information in the revised report, especially with regard to substance identity, risk reduction capacity, format of training, practicability aspects and monitorability.

The rapporteurs presented the outcome of the conformity check and informed the Committee that they consider the dossier to be in conformity with the requirements of Annex XV of REACH. They noted that in the revised report, most updates made were in the RAC area, however, the dossier submitter has now provided the calculation tables for costs and clarified the terminology. The rapporteurs also presented to the Committee the recommendations to the dossier submitter as well as the key issues identified by them in this restriction proposal.

The Committee agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements. The Chairman informed the Committee that the public consultation on this restriction proposal will be launched in March 2017.

2. Lead and lead compounds in PVC – conformity check and key issues discussion

The Chairman welcomed the SEAC rapporteurs and the dossier submitter's representative from ECHA, as well as the industry expert accompanying the regular

stakeholder representative. The restriction proposal was submitted by ECHA in December 2016.

The dossier submitter's representative (ECHA) presented the restriction proposal. The dossier proposes a restriction of lead compounds in PVC articles in concentrations equal to or greater than 0.1% (w/w) with a 15 year derogation for certain building and construction articles produced from recycled PVC (with a higher restriction limit of 1% w/w) and a 10-year derogation for PVC silica separators in lead acid batteries.

The rapporteurs presented the outcome of the conformity check and the recommendations to the dossier submitter and proposed to the Committee that they consider the dossier to be in conformity. The Committee agreed that the dossier does conform to the Annex XV requirements. In addition the rapporteurs presented their key issues of the restriction proposal. The discussion focused on the break-even analysis (based on IQ loss effects in children) and whether it is needed to underpin the proportionality of the proposal. One industry expert mentioned that the wording of the restriction should target articles, not placing on the market of lead compounds used in articles. One stakeholder noted that use in lead battery separators, which is proposed for derogation, may already be permitted by other existing legislation (e.g. batteries directive and RoHS).

The Chairman informed the Committee that the public consultation on this restriction proposal will be launched in March 2017.

b) Opinion development

1. TDFAs – third draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter representatives from Denmark and an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer. He informed the participants that the public consultation on this dossier had finished on 15 December 2016, with 13 comments received. Following this, the SEAC rapporteurs had prepared a third draft opinion and a SEAC written consultation on the third draft opinion was launched on 8 February and finished on 28 February with four comments received from SEAC members. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinion following the consultation. The Chairman reminded the participants that the dossier submitter proposes a restriction on the use of (3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,8-tridecafluorooctyl)silanetriol and any of its mono-, di- or tri-O-(alkyl) derivatives in mixtures containing organic solvents placed on the market or used in spray products for consumers (aerosol dispensers, hand pump and trigger sprays and mixtures marketed for spray application). The restriction is targeted at mixtures with organic solvents in spray products for supply to the general public. TDFAs with organic solvent have been shown to cause serious acute lung injury in mice exposed to aerosolised mixtures.

SEAC was first provided with a brief update from RAC-40 discussions, where RAC had adopted its opinion on TDFAs. Although RAC could not confirm the presence of TDFAs in incidents, RAC concluded that an EU wide restriction is an effective measure to address the risks identified in animal studies.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented their revised third draft opinion. The main changes made were related to withdrawal of the two baseline approaches in the impact assessment and changes in scale of assessment of the impacts as well as use of the

central values in the estimation of the incidents. Furthermore, rapporteurs had made changes in the conditions of restriction and conclusions on the proportionality, practicability and monitorability. The proposed changes also included a more narrow scope to cover only proofing/impregnation spray products.

SEAC welcomed the revised draft opinion prepared by the rapporteurs. SEAC members asked clarifying questions regarding the difference between risk management options and conclusions on proportionality. In addition, some SEAC members raised concerns regarding alternatives and whether they could cause similar health impacts as TDFAs. The Chairman clarified that this issue will be addressed in the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.

SEAC agreed on its draft opinion on the restriction proposal on TDFAs by consensus. The (co-)rapporteurs were tasked, together with the Secretariat, to make the final editorial changes to the agreed SEAC draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (Background Document and responses to comments from the public consultation) is in line with the SEAC draft opinion. The Secretariat will launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in March 2017. The Committee is expected to adopt its final opinion on this dossier at SEAC-35 in June 2017.

2. 4 Phthalates (DIBP, DBP, BBP, DEHP) – third draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitters' representatives from ECHA and Denmark, the RAC rapporteurs (following via WebEx) and an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer. The dossier proposes a restriction on articles containing the four phthalates (diisobutyl phthalate (DIBP); dibutyl phthalate (DBP); benzyl butyl phthalate (BBP) and bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP)) for: i) indoor use and ii) outdoor use, if in contact with human skin or mucous membranes. The Chairman reminded that the public consultation on this restriction proposal ended on 15 December 2016 with 29 comments received. The third draft opinion was made available to SEAC on 8 February 2017 and comments were received from five members in the subsequent commenting round. The rapporteurs had updated the draft opinion following the written consultation, which was distributed to the Committee prior to SEAC-34. The aim of the meeting was for the Committee to agree on its draft opinion on this dossier taking into account the comments received in the public consultation.

The Secretariat provided to the Committee a brief update on RAC discussion on this dossier, held within the ongoing RAC-40 plenary meeting, where RAC had adopted its opinion on this restriction proposal by consensus. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented their third draft opinion focussing on benefits, proportionality, practicality, monitorability, enforceability and overall uncertainties.

With regard to benefits, the rapporteurs proposed to the Committee to clarify in the opinion that they are very uncertain, but more likely underestimated than overestimated (taking into account non-monetised benefits). One member took a reservation with regard to the assessment of benefits.

In relation to proportionality, the rapporteurs suggested to the Committee to consider the restriction proportionate, as it is shown that it is affordable, more cost-effective compared to the previous restriction in toys and break-even analysis tends to confirm benefits/costs analysis on infertility. There is considerable uncertainty in the cost-benefit assessment, however, it is still very likely that benefits outweigh costs. Several members

expressed support for the conclusions of the rapporteurs on proportionality. An industry expert highlighted that industry has made over the last years big investments to replace phthalates with safer alternatives and that they have provided information on this in the public consultation. The rapporteurs noted that these costs have not been made due to this restriction.

With regard to additional requests for derogations, the rapporteurs indicated that they agree with the views of the dossier submitter on them, but that they have hesitations in relation to two requests – for spare parts of vehicles (incl. aircrafts) in the market prior to entry into force to be exempted and materials hidden within or below assemblies in car interiors, which are excluded from scope. It was agreed that specific questions will be asked on these articles within the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.

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

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

The Secretariat presented and the Committee agreed on the pool of (co-)rapporteurs (in line with the restricted meeting document SEAC/34/2017/02) for a restriction proposal on Lead and its compounds in lead shots over wetlands, which will be submitted by ECHA in April 2017.

In addition, the Chairman informed the Committee about a second ECHA dossier which is expected to be submitted in July 2017 proposing a restriction on the placing on the market of certain chemicals in tattoo inks and permanent make-up. The call for expression of interest for this dossier will be launched in the spring 2017.

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues

a) Updated working procedure for authorisation process

The Chairman informed the Committee about the two meeting documents on the agenda of the meeting (SEAC/34/2017/04, a note explaining a new approach for the conformity check, and SEAC/34/2017/03, the updated Committees' working procedure for the opinion development on the applications for authorisation).

He noted that the application for authorisation (AfA) process was implemented in 2012, including how conformity of the applications would be checked. At that time, the procedure stated that after the submission of the application the Secretariat would verify that all the information mentioned in Article 62(4) had been provided by applicants. This was done at the same time as the invoice was prepared for the applicant. Should any information appear to be missing, then the ECHA Secretariat informed the rapporteurs

so that they could take this into account. Upon payment of the invoice, the application was considered "received" and the public consultation was started. At the same time, the rapporteurs formally checked that the application conformed with the requirements of Article 62(4) taking into account the information provided by the Secretariat. If an application was found not to be in conformity, then the Committees would require the applicants to bring it into conformity within the 10 month deadline. At that time only the presence of formally required documents such as the CSR, AoA and SEA (for non-threshold substances) were checked but not their content or meaningfulness and, in practice, all dossiers were considered technically to be in conformity.

From the experience gained in evaluating many applications by RAC and SEAC, from the input from stakeholders and especially on the advice of the Commission, ECHA saw the need to make adjustments to the conformity check procedure. The procedural steps to implement this change were described in the note SEAC/34/2017/04 and were implemented by updating the Committees' working procedure for opinion development on applications for authorisation. The updated working procedure is available for the Committee in the document SEAC/34/2017/03.

The Committee discussed practical issues and potential implications in applying the updated working procedure, such as criteria for the questions, which are related to conformity, follow-up information received from applicants to the conformity-related questions, and expected timeline of applicants' responses to the conformity-related questions. Two representatives of stakeholder observer organisations provided explicit appreciation towards the updated working procedure, and they concurred with the view that criteria for identification of the conformity-related issues need to be defined. Their view was also supported by a SEAC member.

Addressing the comments and questions asked during the discussion, the Secretariat explained that the updated working procedure is applicable with immediate effect. More specifically, the changes in the Committees procedure stipulate that the RAC and SEAC rapporteurs will check, if the application conforms to the requirements of Article 62(4) with the help of Secretariat. However, RAC and SEAC will not conclude on conformity at this stage. When the RAC and SEAC rapporteurs will ask questions/clarifications of the applicants, they will indicate when these relate to conformity. However, in all cases, irrespective of such conformity indications, applications may not conform to the requirements of Article 62(4) if the applicants fail to provide the information requested by the Committees. RAC and SEAC will conclude on the conformity at the same time when they agree on the draft opinions, or earlier, if it is considered that the information provided is sufficient and no conformity issues have been raised by the rapporteurs.

The Chairman pointed out that as this is a policy driven change in administrative practise related to REACH implementation, the updated Committees' working procedure has not been consulted with the Committees, or tabled for agreement.

Since the conformity check has now been integrated into the opinion development procedure, the Committees working procedure for the conformity check of applications for authorisation has become obsolete.

b) Update on incoming/future applications

The ECHA Secretariat informed the Committee that one application for authorisation was received during the February 2017 submission window. It was a downstream user application by a single applicant on the use of sodium chromate and potassium chromate in fabrication of alkali metal dispensers for production of photocathodes. The substances are used by the applicant in very low quantities. Less than 10 workers are directly exposed during the use of the substances. The applicant requested a seven years review period.

c) Report on AfA Task Force and related activities

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the new guide on how to apply for authorisation was published in December 2016¹; the project took approximately 8 months. The Secretariat thanked the SEAC members who took part in the work of the AfA Task Force.

d) Feedback from seminar 'Man via the Environment'

SEAC was provided feedback by stakeholder observer representative about the seminar on "man via the environment" organised by Eurometaux with support from RIVM and ECHA. The seminar took place on 26 January 2017 in Brussels.

6.2) Authorisation applications

a) Discussion on key issues

The Secretariat in cooperation with the SEAC rapporteurs provided general information regarding the three new applications for authorisation listed below. In the presentation of the cases, the Secretariat outlined the key issues identified by the rapporteurs, which would need further clarification by the applicants and asked the Committee for comments and further suggestions.

The Committee discussed these key issues. Where needed, further clarifications will be requested from the applicants on the issues identified and discussed by the Committee.

1. SD_Colle (1 use)
2. CT_Hansgrohe (2 uses)
3. SD_Hapoc (1 use)

b) Agreement on draft opinions

1. CT_Reachlaw (4 uses)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented

¹ "How to apply for authorisation", European Chemicals Agency, December 2016; https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13637/apply_for_authorisation_en.pdf/bd1c2842-4c90-7a1a-3e48-f5eaf3954676

by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion and informed the Committee that the draft opinions have been agreed at this plenary. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions.

SEAC noted that the assessment reports are similar in all significant aspects to those submitted by LANXESS Deutschland GmbH for the same uses of chromium trioxide.

SEAC discussed the benefit-cost analysis. The analysis was done on the respective uses in the application for authorisation by LANXESS Deutschland GmbH. The Committee discussed to what extent it is applicable to the uses of chromium trioxide, as submitted by REACHLaw Ltd.

Some SEAC members and the representative of the European Commission reminded about importance of consistency of the Committees' opinions on applications for authorisation, where the applicants have legitimate rights to use data from the previously received applications and the situation between the two applications has been demonstrated to be sufficiently similar.

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

2. CT_Clariant (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion and informed the Committee that the draft opinion has been agreed at this plenary. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

In the following discussion SEAC mainly discussed the length of the review period and the need of a reporting condition.

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

3. CT_Cryospace (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion and informed the Committee that the draft opinion has been agreed at this plenary. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

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

4. SD_Borealis (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion and informed the Committee that the draft opinion has been agreed at this plenary. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

SEAC discussed applicant's arguments for requesting an extensively long review period.

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

5. SD_Ormezzano (2 uses)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion and informed the Committee that the draft opinions have been agreed at this plenary. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions.

The Committee discussed availability of the alternatives. The SEAC rapporteurs reminded that the application covers dyeing of wool with dark colours only, for which it is the most difficult to find feasible alternatives. A representative of one stakeholder organisation argued that the textile industry has moved to available safer alternatives. In response the SEAC rapporteurs explained that the same level of quality could not be succeeded by the use of available alternatives.

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

6. AD_BAE (2 uses)

The Chairman introduced the two applications for authorisation (2 uses). At SEAC-33, the Committee discussed the key issues and agreed on the conformity of the applications. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions.

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

7. EDC_Biotech (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee discussed the key issues and agreed on the conformity of the application. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee discussed the cost estimations (measured or modelled) and the rapporteurs' opinion on the Applicant's justification of the requested length of the review period.

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

8. EDC_ORGAPHARM (2 uses)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee discussed the key issues and agreed on the conformity of the application. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

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

9. EDC_Akzo (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee discussed the key issues and agreed on the conformity of the application. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

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

10. EDC_Bayer (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman informed the Committee that RAC had postponed the discussion and agreement of the opinion on this application until June 2017 plenary and therefore, no update from RAC was provided. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft

opinion. It was suggested that the arguments to justify the recommended review period would be strengthened. Furthermore, the Commission observer advised to avoid using the work "proportionate" in the conclusions as well as to state clearly in the Analysis of Alternatives sections that SEAC agrees that no technically and economically feasible alternatives are available.

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

11. EDC_Olon (2 uses)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman informed the Committee that RAC had postponed the discussion and agreement of the opinions on this application until June 2017 plenary and therefore, no update from RAC was provided. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions. For both opinions, it was suggested that the rapporteurs would provide clearer arguments for the setting of the recommended review period.

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

12. Diglyme_Isochem (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee discussed the first version of the draft opinion. The SEAC members were asked to consider the agreement on the second version of the SEAC draft opinion at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to remind SEAC about the RAC draft opinion, which was agreed at RAC-39. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion. The discussion focused mainly on the supply chain implications of the non-use scenario and on the break-even analysis. A representative of the European Commission stated that the supply chain analysis is indeed important, and that further qualification of the uncertainties would help clarify actual welfare losses.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) which will be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat.

c) Discussion on draft opinions

1. MOCA_Reachlaw (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At SEAC-33, the Committee agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented

by the rapporteurs. The SEAC members were asked to discuss the opinion development progress on this application for authorisation.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the progress on the opinion development on the application for authorisation.

The SEAC rapporteurs informed the Committee that MOCA has been already been substituted in the manufacture of many products. However, according to the applicant substitution is not possible yet for all products.

SEAC took note and discussed the key elements presented by the rapporteurs. One SEAC member noted that considering the broadness of the use applied for there is a good potential to continue substitution of MOCA to safer alternatives. The SEAC rapporteurs admitted that during the dialogue the applicant proposed a staged substitution (small products to be substituted earlier and heavier ones at a later stage.) for this AfA. Most SEAC members were of the opinion that the Committee has no mandate to divide the existing use into subcategories determined by criteria of the produced articles, although some SEAC members would be in favour of this approach, possibly by imposing conditions in the SEAC opinion. Some SEAC members also pointed out that the uses of Annex XIV substances cannot be recommended when there are existing economically and technically feasible alternatives for those uses.

The Chairman asked the SEAC rapporteurs to consider the plenary discussion in the opinion development, and to draft the SEAC opinion for discussion and agreement at the SEAC-35 meeting in June 2017.

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

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the key elements and the state of play regarding the opinion development on the four upstream (importer) applications for authorisation prepared with the support of the Global Chromates Consortium for Aerospace (GCCA). Three of the applications have been submitted by Haas Group International SCM Ltd with one use each: chromium trioxide for chemical conversion treatment and slurry coating by aerospace companies and their suppliers; sodium dichromate; and potassium dichromate for sealing after anodizing by aerospace companies and their suppliers. The fourth application has been submitted by Aviall Services Inc. as the lead applicant and Haas Group International as co-applicant for two uses of sodium chromate: Use 1: Formulation of mixtures; Use 2: Sealing after anodizing, chemical conversion coating, pickling and etching applications by aerospace companies and their suppliers.

A review period of 12 years or more is requested for all five uses covered in these applications for authorisation. SEAC noted that thousands of workers are involved, and that the applications cover small scale use at many individual sites. The SEAC rapporteurs informed the Committee that while many aspects of the applications are closely related to similar previous applications by the CCST application (by Brenntag UK Ltd) and the CTAC consortia (by LANXESS Deutschland GmbH), there are some differences that need to be considered. Amongst others, the applications submitted by

the GGCA consortium cover in comparison to applications submitted by the CCST and the CTAC consortia less processes (e.g., no electroplating), based the exposure assessment almost exclusively on modelling, and used lower volumes and maximum bath concentrations. SEAC discussed how the GGCA applications relate to those of CCST and CTAC, and suggested issues to be clarified further with the applicants at the dialogue.

The Committee supported the key principles presented by the SEAC rapporteurs. The draft opinions on these applications for authorisation will be tabled for discussion and agreement at SEAC-35 in June 2017.

6. CT_HAPOC (4 uses)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. The SEAC members were asked to discuss the model draft opinion on the Use 2 of this application for authorisation.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the progress on the opinion development on the application for authorisation.

During the discussion the Committee critically discussed the approach chosen by the applicant, which in general does not follow the guidance documents. They raised a number of questions on methodologies used by the applicant. SEAC members found the SEA of the application containing a number of hypotheses and assumptions that makes it challenging to assess.

The Committee members supported the overall conclusions of the rapporteurs as they were presented to the Committee.

The Chairman asked the SEAC rapporteurs to consider the plenary discussion in the opinion development, and to draft the SEAC opinions for discussion and agreement at the SEAC-35 meeting in June 2017.

7. CT_HAPOC_2 (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the Committee heard the status update by the SEAC rapporteurs.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-40. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteur then presented the progress on the opinion development on the application for authorisation.

The rapporteurs informed the Committee that considering similarities in the approach taken by the same applicant as of CT_Hapoc, the rapporteurs will continue their work on the opinion development on CT_Hapoc_2 applying the same approach as discussed by the Committee on CT_Hapoc application for authorisation.

8. CT_HAPOC_3 (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the Committee heard the status update by the SEAC rapporteurs.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-39. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteur then presented the progress on the opinion development on the application for authorisation.

The rapporteurs informed the Committee that considering similarities in the approach taken by the same applicant as of CT_Hapoc, the rapporteurs will continue their work on the opinion development on CT_Hapoc_3 applying the same approach as discussed by the Committee on CT_Hapoc application for authorisation.

d) Adoption of Final Opinions

1. AsA_Circuit (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the SEAC-32 plenary meeting the Committee had agreed on the draft opinion. The draft opinion was sent to the applicant, who commented on the draft opinion. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinion based on the comments from the Applicant, as well as from members which were made during the subsequent consultation of the updated draft prior to the plenary meeting.

The Chairman informed SEAC that RAC agreed its final opinion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the draft SEAC final opinion.

The Committee discussion focused on the changes of the opinion made after comments provided by the applicant including the part of the opinion on economic feasibility of the alternatives and proposed review period. Some of the members questioned the need to set condition on the review report with reference to the R&D program and limitation of tonnage of the substance to be used.

The final opinion was subsequently adopted by simple majority. Two members expressed their minority positions, which will be published on the ECHA website. The opinion will be sent to the applicant, the European Commission and the Member States.

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

2. CT_Circuit (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the SEAC-32 plenary meeting the Committee had agreed on the draft opinion. The draft opinion was sent to the applicant, who commented on the draft opinion. The rapporteurs updated the draft opinion based on the comments from the applicant, as well as from members which were made during the subsequent consultation of the updated draft prior to the plenary meeting.

The Chairman informed SEAC that RAC agreed its final opinion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the draft SEAC final opinion.

The Committee discussion focused on the changes of the opinion made after comments provided by the applicant including the part of the opinion on scope of the analysis of

potential alternatives. Members discussed if the applicant made sufficient effort to assess all potential alternatives including alternative technologies and taking in to account different sector of the products. Some of the members questioned the need to set condition on the review report.

The final opinion was subsequently adopted by consensus. The opinion will be sent to the applicant, the European Commission and the Member States.

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

3. CT_Gerhardi (1 use)

The Chairman introduced the status of the opinion development process on the application for authorisation. In the September 2016 (SEAC 32) plenary meeting, the Committee agreed upon a review period shorter than that requested by the applicant; consequently, the applicant officially expressed his intention to comment on the draft opinion. A dialogue was held with the applicant and third parties to discuss specific information on alternatives and other SEA related issues on the application.

Based on the comments from the applicant, which included: further explanation on the (lack of) market acceptance from OEMs (original equipment manufacturers), contractual obligations for the applicant, scope of the application and technical limitations of the alternatives, the rapporteur revised the opinion proposing now a long review period. This was to some extent supported by commenting members during the SEAC consultation.

During the plenary discussion, one member asked that an interim / annual status report on substitution activities be provided by the applicant. However, this option was discussed already earlier (in the context of other applications) and it was concluded that currently there is no system in place to review such a report and it is unclear how the results could be translated into action. Other members supported the revised opinion and suggested that the Committee should hold a general discussion about features of such a reporting system in future.

Some members found the justification, namely the reasoning for non-use of certain alternatives and the customer acceptance, imbalanced in the opinion.

The opinion was adopted by simple majority. Four members expressed their minority positions, which will be published on the ECHA website. The adopted opinion will be sent to the Applicants, the European Commission and the Member States. The Chairman thanked the AfA team and the rapporteur for the work on the application.

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

The pool of (co-)rapporteurs, as outlined in the amended restricted room document SEAC/34/2017/05 rev.1, was agreed by SEAC.

7) AOB

a) Update of the workplan

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

b) Inventory of valuation studies completed recently in Nordic collaboration

A SEAC member presented an inventory of valuation studies completed recently in Nordic collaboration, "Valuation Literature on Chemicals: A Description of an Inventory of valuation Literature on Chemicals" published by the Nordic Council of Ministers.

c) ECHA work on substitution

SEAC was provided with a presentation by the Secretariat on ECHA's work on substitution. Several SEAC members expressed appreciation towards ECHA's work and came up with further suggestions in this area. Furthermore, SEAC STO representatives also supported the approach and emphasised the need for joint efforts in finding alternatives.

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-34

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

II. Main conclusions and action points

SEAC-34, 13 March-17 March 2017

(Adopted at SEAC-34 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 without modifications.	SECR to upload the adopted agenda to SEAC S-CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.
3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda	
Conflicts of interest have been declared and will be taken to the minutes.	
4. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities	
<i>a) Report on SEAC-33 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies</i>	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-33. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/34/2017/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in the CARACAL.	
5. Restrictions	
5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Conformity check	
1. Diisocyanates– outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues	
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 S-CIRCABC IG. SECR to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.
2. Lead and lead compounds in PVC – conformity check and key issues discussion	

<p>SEAC agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements.</p> <p>SEAC took note of the recommendations to the dossier submitter.</p>	<p>SECR to compile the RAC and SEAC final outcomes of the conformity check and upload this to S-CIRCABC IG.</p> <p>SECR to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.</p>
b) Opinion development	
1) TDFAs – third draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the third draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on TDFAs dossier by consensus. The reservations taken will be reflected in the minutes.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and ORCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in March 2017.</p>
2) 4 Phthalates (DIBP, DBP, BBP, DEHP) – third draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the third draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on 4 Phthalates dossier by consensus (with modifications agreed at SEAC-34). The reservations taken will be reflected in the minutes.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and ORCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in March 2017.</p>
5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
<p>SEAC agreed on the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction proposal on Lead and its compounds in shots (in line with restricted meeting document SEAC/34/2017/02).</p>	
6. Authorisation	
6.1 General authorisation issues	
a) Updated working procedure for authorisation process	
<p>SEAC took note of the updated working procedure for authorisation process.</p>	
b) Update on incoming/future applications	
<p>SEAC took note of the update on the</p>	

incoming/future applications for authorisation.	
c) Feedback from seminar 'Man via the Environment'	
SEAC took note of the presentation by Eurometaux and SECR on the outcome of the seminar, held on 26 January 2017 in Brussels.	
6.2 Authorisation	
a) Discussion on key issues	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SD_Colle (1 use) 2. CT_Hansgrohe (2 uses) 3. SD_Hapoc (1 use) 	
SEAC discussed the key issues identified in the applications for authorisation received during the November 2016 submission window.	Rapporteurs to take the discussions into account in the preparation of the first versions of the draft opinions.
b) Agreement on draft opinions	
1. CT_Reachlaw (4 uses)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions. SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
2. CT_Clariant (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion. SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
3. CT_Cryospace (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion. SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
4. SD_Borealis (1 use)	

<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
5. SD_Ormezzano (2 uses)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
6. AD_BAE (2 uses)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
7. EDC_Biotech (1 use)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
8. EDC_ORGAPHARM (2 uses)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
9. EDC_Akzo (1 use)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
10. EDC_Bayer (1 use)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>Rapporteurs to revise the draft opinion following the agreement on the draft opinion in RAC (if needed).</p>

	SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
11. EDC_Olon (2 uses)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions. Rapporteurs to revise the draft opinion following the agreement on the draft opinion in RAC (if needed). SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
12. Diglyme_Isochem (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion. SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinion. SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
c) Discussion on draft opinions	
1. MOCA_Reachlaw (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the progress with the SEAC opinion development.	Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in further opinion development.
2. CT_Haas (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the progress with the SEAC opinion development.	Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in further opinion development.
3. SD_Haas (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the progress with the SEAC opinion development.	Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in further opinion development.
3. PD_Haas (1 use)	

SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the progress with the SEAC opinion development.	Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in further opinion development.
4. SC_Aviail (2 uses)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the progress with the SEAC opinion development.	Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in further opinion development.
5. CT_Hapoc (4 uses)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the progress with the SEAC opinion development and the model draft opinion on Use 2.	Rapporteurs to take the discussion into account in further opinion development (and plan for agreement in June 2017 plenary).
6. CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use)	
SECR presented an update on the progress with the opinion development.	Rapporteurs to proceed with the opinion development.
7. CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use)	
SECR presented an update on the progress with the opinion development.	Rapporteurs to proceed with the opinion development.
d) Adoption of Final opinions	
1. AsA_Circuit (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion. SEAC adopted the final opinion by simple majority. The minority positions (taken by two SEAC members) will be published together with the opinion.	Rapporteurs , together with SECR , to do the final editing of the adopted opinion. SECR to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.
2. CT_Circuit (1 use)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion. SEAC adopted on the final by consensus.	Rapporteurs , together with SECR , to do the final editing of the adopted opinion. SECR to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.
3. CT_Gerhardi (1 use)	

<p>The SECR presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted the final opinion by simple majority. The minority positions (taken by four SEAC members) will be published together with the opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs, together with SECR, to do the final editing of the adopted opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the final opinion to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.</p>
<p>6.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)</p>	
<p>SEAC agreed on the updated pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (considered as agreement on appointment in line with SEAC/34/2017/05 restricted room document).</p>	<p>SEAC members to volunteer to the pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation.</p> <p>SECR to upload the updated document to confidential folder on S-CIRCABC IG.</p>
<p>8. Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-34</p>	
<p>SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-34.</p>	<p>SECR to upload the action points and main conclusions to S-CIRCABC IG.</p>

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-34

SEAC members	Advisors, invited experts, observers & dossier submitters (DS)
ALEXANDRE Joao	BERNHEIM Teresa (advisor to Karen Thiele)
ALEXANDROPOULOU Ioanna	DOMINIAK Dorota (advisor to I. Rydlewska-L.)
BERGS Ivars	FOCK Lars (DS TDFAs)
BRIGNON Jean-Marc	HELMEDACH Achim (advisor to Karen Thiele)
CASTELLI Stefano	JONGENEEL Rob (advisor to R. Luit via webex)
CAVALIERI Luisa	LERCHE Dorte (advisor to Lars FOCK via webex)
COGEN Simon	REALE Priscilla (Advisor to Luisa Cavalieri via webex)
CSERGŐ Robert (co-opted)	RASMUSSEN Louise Baad (advisor to Lars FOCK)
DELCOURT Benjamin	
DOUGHERTY Gary	WINTHER Toke (DK) as dossier submitter for TDFAs
DRAKE Lars (co-opted)	AVERBECK Frauke as dossier submitter for Diisocyanate
FANKHAUSER Simone	GUHE Christine as dossier submitter for Diisocyanates
FIORE Karine	DROSSARD Claudia as dossier submitter for Diisocyanate
FOCK Lars	ROUW Aart as dossier submitter for Diisocyanates
FURLAN Janez	WALENDZIK Gudrun as dossier submitter for Diisocyanate
GEORGIOU Stavros	
JANSSEN Martien	
JONES Derrick (co-opted)	
KIISKI Johanna	RAC (co-)rapporteurs
KNOFLACH Georg	DUNAUSKIENE Lina
KRAJNC Karmen	Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts
LOČS Jānis	
LÜDEKE Andreas	BUONSANTE Vito (ClientEarth)
LUIT Richard	CAVALLERO Alain (ESPA European Stabiliser Producer Association, accompanying CEFIC for the discussion on Lead in PVC)
NICOLAIDES Leandros	
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo	De KORT PATRICK (EUPC European Plastics Converters)
NORING Maria	HAIDER Sonja (ChemSec)
OLTEANU Maria	JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
RYDLEWSKA-LISZKOWSKA Izabella	KROESCHE Christoph (EVONIK Industries, accompanying CEFIC for the discussions on TDFAs only)
SCHUCHTAR Endre	
SMILGIUS Tomas	
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina	
THIELE Karen	
THORS Åsa	LUCKE-BRUNK Gudrun (Covestro Deutschland AG, accompanying CEFIC for the discussions on Diisocyanates only)
URBAN Klaus	

ZAMFIR Adrian-Stefan	MUSU Tony (ETUC)
/	WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)
Commission observers	ECHA STAFF
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)	BROERE William
GALLEGO Matteo (DG ENV)	DVORAKOVA Dana
	HENRICHSON Sanna
PROKES Pavel (DG Grow via WebEx)	JACQUEMIN Katline
	KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia
	KIVELÄ Kalle
	KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
	KOULOUMPOS Vasileios
	LINNA Risto
	LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
	LUDBORZS Arnis
	MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
	MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
	NICOT Thierry
	ORISPÄÄ Katja
	PELTOLA Jukka
	PILLET Monique
	REGIL Pablo
	RHEINBERGER Christoph
	ROGGEMAN Maarten
	SADAM Diana
	SCHULTHEISS Christian
	SIMPSON Peter
	SOSNOWSKI Piotr
	STOYANOVA Evgenia
	ÖBERG Tomas

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 Draft Agenda

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

Document	Number
Final Draft Agenda	<i>SEAC/A/33/2016</i>
Report on SEAC-32 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies	<i>SEAC/33/2016/01</i>
Boundaries of socio-economic analysis in applications for authorisation	<i>SEAC/33/2016/02</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (closed session)	<i>SEAC/33/2016/03</i> <i>(restricted room document)</i>

ANNEX II**DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST TO THE RESPECTIVE AGENDA ITEMS**

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

<u>Name of participant</u>	<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Interest declared</u>
LUDEKE Andreas	5.1a-1 Diisocyanates	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
FOCK Lars	5.1b-1 TDFAs	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
FOCK Lars	5.1b-2. Phthalates	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier

2 March 2017
SEAC/A/34/2017

Final Draft Agenda

34th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

13 – 17 March 2017

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

13 March starts at 9.00

17 March ends at 13.00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/34/2017
For adoption

Item 3 – Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

Item 4 – Report from other ECHA bodies and activities

- a) Report on SEAC-33 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

SEAC/34/2017/01
For information

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) Conformity check

- 1) Diisocyanates – outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues
- 2) Lead and lead compounds in PVC – outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues

For agreement

b) Opinion development

- 1) TDFAs – third draft opinion
- 2) 4 phthalates – third draft opinion

For discussion and agreement

5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

***SEAC/34/2017/02
(restricted document)
For agreement***

Item 6 – Authorisation

6.1 General authorisation issues

- a) Updated working procedure for authorisation process

***SEAC/34/2017/03
SEAC/34/2017/04
For information***

- b) Update on incoming/future applications
- c) Report on AfA Task Force and related activities
- d) Feedback from seminar 'Man via the Environment'

For information

6.2 Authorisation applications

- b) Discussion on key issues

1. SD_Colle (1 use)
2. CT_Hansgrohe (2 uses)
3. SD_Hapoc (1 use)

For discussion

- c) Agreement on draft opinions

1. CT_Reachlaw (4 uses)
2. CT_Clariant (1 use)
3. CT_Cryospace (1 use)
4. SD_Borealis (1 use)

5. SD_Ormezzano (2 uses)
6. AD_BAE (2 uses)
7. EDC_Biotech (1 use)
8. EDC_ORGAPHARM (2 uses)
9. EDC_Akzo (1 use)
10. EDC_Bayer (1 use)
11. EDC_Olon (2 uses)
12. Diglyme_Isochem (1 use)

For discussion and agreement

d) Discussion on draft opinions

1. MOCA_Reachlaw (1 use)
2. CT_Haas (1 use)
3. SD_Haas (1 use)
4. PD_Haas (1 use)
5. SC_Aviail (2 uses)
6. CT_Hapoc (4 uses)
7. CT_Hapoc_2 (1 use)
8. CT_Hapoc_3 (1 use)

For discussion

e) Adoption of final opinions

1. AsA_Circuit (1 use)
2. CT_Circuit (1 use)
3. CT_Gerhardi (1 use)

For discussions and adoption

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

***SEAC/34/2017/05
(restricted room document)
For agreement***

Item 7 – AOB

- a) Update of the work plan
- b) Inventory of valuation studies completed recently in Nordic collaboration
- c) ECHA work on substitution

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-34

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-34

For adoption