

26 May 2015

SEAC/M/26/2015 Final

Final

Minutes of the 26th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

9-13 March 2015

I. Summary Record of the Proceeding

1) Welcome and apologies

Tomas Öberg, Chair of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis (SEAC), ECHA, welcomed the participants of the twenty sixth meeting of SEAC. The Chair briefly introduced the five newly appointed Committee members. He then informed the Committee that apologies had been received from three members and one stakeholder observers. The Committee was informed that one Committee member had resigned. Seven advisors to the members, two representatives of the European Commission, observers of five stakeholder organisations and five accompanying experts present at the meeting were introduced. The Chair informed the participants that two members and five members' advisors were to follow the relevant parts of the meeting via WebEx, and that the RAC rapporteurs, the dossier submitter representatives and the experts following specific agenda items would be presented at the beginning of the relevant discussions.

Furthermore, SEAC was informed regarding the implementation of stakeholder involvement in authorisations as a follow up from the MB discussions in December 2014 (MB/53/2014). For the first time at this plenary, the stakeholder observers will be allowed specific speaking rights in plenaries of RAC and SEAC with the intent of having contributions with regards to consistency and procedural matters, while comments on the cases themselves would be avoided.

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

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

2) Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair introduced the draft agenda of SEAC-26. The agenda was adopted with one modification to postpone the item 4b until the next plenary meeting (Revised general approach for admission of stakeholder organisations to RAC and SEAC – meeting document SEAC/26/2015/02) and one addition under the Agenda Item 7 (NGO concerns on the SEA process under authorisation). The final agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex III. The list of all meeting documents is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

The Chair requested members, their advisors and invited experts participating in the meeting to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Eight members and four advisors declared potential conflicts of interest to the substance-related discussions under the Agenda Items 5.2 and 6.2. These members did not participate in voting under the respective Agenda Items, as stated in Article 9(2) of the SEAC Rules of Procedure. The Chair informed the Committee about the new practice in collecting annual declarations. In order to gain some efficiency in the process ECHA has established a new practice where the members do not have to submit any hardcopies (by emailing the scanned signed versions of all declarations members declare that the information given is correct). In addition, ECHA would like members to keep the original documents in the event of audit requests for a period of seven years.

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-25 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

In relation to the action points of the previous SEAC-25 meeting, the Chair informed the Committee that the updated Rules of Procedure will be presented to SEAC in June 2015, due to the fact that the Secretariat had been putting priority on other efficiency measures. All other action points have been completed or will be followed up during the on-going SEAC-26 meeting.

Furthermore, the Chair informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-25 had been adopted by written procedure and had been uploaded to CIRCABC as well as on the ECHA website. The Chair thanked members and observers for providing comments on the draft SEAC-25 minutes.

The Chair explained that a report covering the developments in the ECHA MB, RAC, MSC, the Forum and BPC had been compiled and distributed to SEAC as a meeting document (SEAC/26/2015/01). He also informed the members that a proposal to amend remuneration of co-opted members is scheduled for agreement at MB-37 in March. The aim is to appoint co-opted members to enable RAC and SEAC to deal with the peak workload of AfA in 2015/2016.

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

b) General SEAC procedures

The Chair informed that the agenda item on the revised general approach for the admission of accredited stakeholder organisations to RAC and SEAC was postponed until later this year.

5) Restrictions

5.1) General restriction issues

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

The Secretariat provided an update on the implementation of the recommendations from the Restrictions Efficiency Task Force (RETF) and specifically by introducing the revised outcome of the conformity check template and the recommendations to the dossier submitter. The main revisions in the templates concerned clearly separating the conformity check issues and the recommendations in the respective documents and the insertion of the Annex on clear scope setting as agreed by RETF. Although one member voiced his reservations regarding removing the RMO analysis question from the conformity check questions, SEAC agreed on the revised templates of conformity check report and the recommendations.

In addition, SEAC agreed to move the presentation of key issues to follow, immediately after the conformity check agreement in plenary; the first version of the opinion would then be introduced at the next meeting instead of key issue document. Some members observed there might be time constraints while

preparing the conformity check outcome and key issues in parallel. The working procedures will be updated accordingly.

The Committee was also informed about other upcoming improvements e.g. revision of opinion template as well as Annex XV report format. One of the recommendations from the RETF was to set up an expert group to discuss improved ways of dealing with societal impacts. SEAC welcomed the idea of an impact assessment expert group which will include one to two members from both RAC and SEAC.

In addition, the Secretariat presented the '*outline of the common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development for restriction proposals*'. SEAC members were invited to send their comments on the common approach paper by 27 March, which will be tabled for agreement at a forthcoming plenary meeting.

5.2) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Opinion development

1) Cadmium and its compounds in artists' paints – final opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (Sweden) who were following the discussions via Webex. He then informed the Committee that following the end of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion on 9 February 2015 (with 12 comments received), the rapporteurs had not made any changes to the opinion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the draft of the SEAC final opinion and the comments received from the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.

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

2) Chrysotile – final opinion

The Chair welcomed the RAC rapporteurs (following via Webex) and an industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer. He informed that following the end of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion on 9 February 2015 (with 45 comments received), the rapporteurs had slightly modified the opinion. Namely, in the legal text the two actions "placing on the market" and "use" are to be separated, and furthermore, the placing on the market is to be derogated until the end of the 2017, and the use until the end of 2025. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the draft of the SEAC final opinion and the comments received from the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.

After the presentation, SEAC members asked clarifying questions from the rapporteurs regarding for example the reporting requirements in the SEAC final opinion. A Commission observer requested a clarification with regard to an inconsistency between the preferred option discussed in the justification (which provides that ECHA would be administering the derogation) and the proposed amendment (which does not contain such condition).

The Committee adopted the opinion by absolute majority (a majority of all members having the right to vote). Two members took a minority position to the

opinion based on reasons included in separate documents which have been published on the ECHA website. One of them stated that there are no grounds for a restriction; furthermore in the minority position note, he voices his concern over the i) wording of the proposal, ii) timing of the proposal, and iii) information concerning potential alternatives. The other member stated that the time limited derogation for Chrysotile is unjustified on both economic efficiency (cost-benefit) and socioeconomic analytical grounds.

The Chair informed that the Secretariat together with the rapporteurs will make the final editorial changes to the opinion and align the Background Document with the adopted SEAC final opinion. The Secretariat will forward the RAC and SEAC opinions and the BD to the Commission.

3) 4,4-Isopropylidenediphenol (bisphenol A) – revised draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (France). He then introduced the state of play regarding the restriction dossier on bisphenol A used in thermal paper. The Chair explained that at RAC-32, RAC made considerable progress in their agreement on main elements of the revised draft opinion, but has not adopted its opinion. This is the first time RAC did not adopt an opinion within the legal deadline of nine months. This can be justified via Article 95 of REACH, which requires ECHA to work with other Community Agencies to solve any conflicts or clarify to the Commission the nature of the conflict. The EFSA scientific opinion on bisphenol A was adopted 11 December 2014 and published on 21 January 2015. A consultation round will be organised on the revised RAC opinion and the dossier will be scheduled again at RAC-33 in June for discussion and possible adoption. Consequently the revised SEAC opinion is not for agreement at SEAC-26, but will follow the timelines of adoption for RAC.

The Secretariat then summarised the outcome of the discussion on the revised draft opinion of RAC, which took place in RAC-32. The SEAC rapporteurs presented the revised draft opinion to SEAC and clarified that the draft opinion would need to be updated based on the recent conclusions in RAC-32.

The Chair stated that at this SEAC-26 meeting, the Committee should discuss the revised draft opinion and to give input to the rapporteurs on key issues for further opinion development.

The discussion focussed on complications of assessing the proportionality (benefits/costs) of the proposal. Some discussion took place on recommendations that can be made based on other regulatory measures proposed by the dossier submitter under different legislations.

The Chair concluded that at this stage it was uncertain what type of health impacts there are to be evaluated, pending further discussions in RAC. Therefore no further conclusion could be drawn on the benefits of the proposal.

The rapporteurs presented the proposed updated costs estimates. Several members expressed the view that that it was too early to conclude on benefits, costs and proportionality analysis, as SEAC is still awaiting the conclusion of RAC on the risk assessment.

The SEAC rapporteurs were asked to take the discussions into account in their revised draft opinion, which is due by beginning of May 2015. The revised draft opinion is scheduled for possible agreement at SEAC-27 in March 2015, pending the adoption of the opinion in RAC-33.

4) Ammonium salts - revised draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representative (France), who followed the discussion remotely via WebEx. He reminded the participants that this restriction dossier has been submitted under Article 129 of the REACH Regulation (safeguard clause). Substances in the scope of the restriction proposal are inorganic ammonium salts that are used as additives in cellulose insulation for their flame retardant properties. The revised draft opinion of SEAC, the responses to public consultation comments and the background document were uploaded on CIRCABC in early February and comments were received from four SEAC members in the following written consultation.

The Secretariat was invited to briefly present the results of the RAC-32 discussions, where RAC adopted its opinion on this dossier.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC revised draft opinion to the Committee with particular focus on cost/benefit aspects and proportionality. A short discussion took place on the length of the transitional period. The rapporteurs specified that while the dossier submitter had proposed 12 months for transitional period, some indications had been received within the public consultation from industry that 12 months is not sufficient. The Secretariat clarified that the most common transitional period for restrictions is 18 months. In addition, the Secretariat stated in this particular case 12 months might be justified due to the emergency measure, however, there were differing views in the Committee. It was agreed to keep 12 months as proposed transitional period in the SEAC draft opinion, but to ask in the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion whether industry considers it sufficient (and to provide evidence, if considered not sufficient).

The rapporteurs explained that within the public consultation a proposal for a derogation had been received from industry for outdoor exterior products such as cladding where there is no release to the indoor environment. As industry had not provided sufficient evidence that such materials even contain ammonium salts, the Committee agreed that the derogation is not justified. Furthermore, SEAC agreed with the rapporteurs that the reference to the CEN method should be included in the text of the proposed restriction following the advice given by the Forum. Several suggestions were provided by members for improving the clarity of the proportionality assessment carried out by the rapporteurs.

The Committee agreed on the draft opinion on the dossier by consensus (with modifications introduced into the opinion during the meeting). It was agreed that the rapporteurs, together with the Secretariat, will make the final editorial changes to the agreed opinion and will ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion. The Secretariat will launch the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in March 2015 and the Committee will need to adopt its final opinion on the dossier in June 2015 plenary.

5) DecaBDE – first draft opinion

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (ECHA), the Norwegian representatives (following via Webex) as well as the RAC rapporteurs and two industry experts accompanying stakeholder observers. He reminded the participants that decaBDE was identified as an SVHC and included in the Candidate List as PBT/vPvB. DecaBDE exhibits a widespread occurrence in the environment and in wildlife. This bromine saturated diphenyl ether debrominates in the environment to lower homologues which are PBTs/vPvBs or act as precursors to

substances with PBT/vPvB properties. In addition to PBT/vPvB concerns, other potential impacts of exposure to decaBDE may result in neurotoxicity in mammals, including humans. The proposal focuses on the hazard and risk of the use of decaBDE as a flame retardant in plastics and textiles.

The RAC (co-)rapporteurs were invited to briefly present their first draft opinion and the results of the RAC-32 discussion on this dossier to SEAC. After this presentation, the SEAC (co-)rapporteurs then presented the SEAC first draft opinion to the participants of the meeting. Two members stated that the proposed restriction should not negatively affect recycling and raised the question of a possible derogation for the recycling sector. Several members expressed their support to the proportionality assessment.

The Chair concluded that SEAC supported the rapporteurs conclusions that action is needed on EU wide basis as well as that the proposed restriction is the most appropriate measure. There was also support for the rapporteurs' assessment that a quantitative human health risk assessment would not significantly improve the evidence base for evaluating proportionality.

Finally, the SEAC rapporteurs were asked to take the public consultation comments received by 17 March 2015 as well as the SEAC discussions into account in their revised draft opinion, which is due by beginning of May 2015. SEAC is expected to agree on its draft opinion on this dossier at SEAC-27 in June 2015.

6) PFOA – key issues document

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (Germany, together with Norway) – following via WebEx, the RAC rapporteurs and an industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer. The Chair reminded the Committee that the dossier on Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) was submitted by Germany jointly with Norway in October 2014 and was considered to be in conformity by both Committees in December last year.

The dossier submitter proposes a restriction on manufacture, marketing and use of PFOA, its salts and PFOA-related substances, as well as of articles and mixtures containing these substances. The Chair informed the participants that the key issues document prepared by the rapporteurs was made available to SEAC on 9 February and comments were received from two SEAC members in the following written consultation.

The RAC rapporteurs were invited to briefly update SEAC on the discussions on this dossier held within RAC-32.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented their key issues document to the Committee. The rapporteurs identified the following key issues in the proposed restriction that in their view will need attention in the opinion development – wideness of the scope, need for derogations for uses where suitable alternatives are not available, concluding on proportionality based on cost-effectiveness estimates, proposed limit value (2 ppb) and transitional period (18 months), exemptions for second hand market and for recycled material, non-availability of standard analytical methods to measure the contents of PFOA and PFOA-related substances in articles and mixtures. Several members agreed with the approach of the rapporteurs. They emphasised the importance of understanding that this dossier has a very wide scope with many articles and uses included. One member stressed the importance of taking into account in the assessment the performance effects (loss in product performance due to switch to alternatives).

It was also mentioned that it would be good to have a qualitative description of human health impacts in the report. The RAC rapporteurs explained that RAC had agreed to approach the dossier submitter in order to clarify whether their main concern in the dossier was environment or human health. It was agreed that the rapporteurs will discuss this issue further.

An industry expert explained that industry in Europe has over the last 10 years moved away from PFOA and industry is therefore in favour of this restriction. However, industry has a problem with the low limit value proposed in the dossier and will provide comments on this within the ongoing public consultation.

The Chair concluded that SEAC supported the main elements of the opinion as presented by the rapporteurs. He informed that the rapporteurs will need to deliver their first draft opinion on this dossier by beginning of May 2015 (to be discussed at SEAC-27).

b) Conformity check

1) Methanol – outcome of the conformity check

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representative (Poland), who followed the meeting remotely via WebEx. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier on methanol had been resubmitted by Poland on 16 January 2015 following the decisions made by RAC and SEAC in September 2014 that the dossier originally submitted by Poland was not in conformity. The conformity check process was launched in RAC and SEAC on 12 February and the Committees were expected to reach a conclusion on conformity at the March plenary meetings.

The Chair mentioned that the proposed restriction is aimed to prevent poisoning cases in consumers resulting from oral exposure to windshield washing fluids and denaturated alcohol containing methanol in concentrations equal to, or greater than 3.0% by weight.

The Secretariat, on behalf of the RAC Rapporteurs, reported back from RAC-32 discussions, where RAC had concluded that the dossier does conform to the Annex XV requirements.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the outcome of the conformity check and the recommendations to the dossier submitter and proposed to the Committee that the dossier can be considered in conformity from the SEAC point of view. The members supported the recommendations of the rapporteurs. The Committee subsequently agreed that the dossier conforms to the Annex XV requirements.

The Chair informed the participants that the Secretariat will launch a public consultation on the Annex XV report on 18 March 2015. The Secretariat will inform the dossier submitter of the outcome of the conformity check.

2) Dimethylformamide

The Chair welcomed the dossier submitter representatives (Italy). The Chair reminded the Committee that the dossier on DMF was submitted by Italy on 16 January 2015. The conformity check process was launched in RAC and SEAC on 12 February and the Committees were expected to reach a conclusion on conformity at the March plenary meetings.

The representative of the dossier submitter presented the restriction proposal based on introduction of a requirement to use harmonised DNEL values for

inhalatory and dermal exposure by manufacturers, importers and downstream users of the substance on its own or in mixtures. In addition, the proposal also included a ban of professional uses, except laboratory use, and introduction of concentration limits for DMF content in certain types of articles.

The Secretariat, on behalf of the RAC rapporteurs, reported back from RAC-32 discussions, where RAC had concluded that the dossier does not conform to the Annex XV requirements due to shortcomings in information on hazard and risks as well as in justification that the restriction is the most appropriate community wide action.

The SEAC rapporteur then presented the outcome of the SEAC conformity check and recommendations to the dossier submitter and proposed to the Committee that the dossier should be considered not to be in conformity with respect to the evaluation of proportionality and costs to the society.

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

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

According to the procedure for the appointment of rapporteurs, for AfA, Restriction dossiers and CLH which was revised and agreed at SEAC-25, the Secretariat presented the members who volunteered for SEAC (co-)rapporteurships for the restriction dossiers on Perfluorooctyl silanes (PFAS) (to be submitted by Denmark). SEAC agreed on the pool of (co-)rapporteurs as outlined in the meeting document 26/2015/05 RESTRICTED. The Chair announced the selection of the (co-)rapporteurs for the upcoming restriction dossier on Perfluorooctyl silanes (PFAS).

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues

The Chair reminded the Committee that last year in November RAC and SEAC in a joint session adopted a revised working procedure for developing opinions on applications for authorisation (RAC/31/2014/07 rev 01 and SEAC/24/2014/05 rev 1). As agreed in that document, prior to implementation of one of the measures, i.e. fast-tracking of opinions through an A-list, criteria would need to be developed and agreed by the Committees for selecting suitable candidate dossiers. In between the plenary meetings, the Secretariat developed draft A-listing criteria which were sent for short RAC and SEAC consultations in February 2015 (comments were received from one RAC member and from five SEAC members).

Following the presentation on the draft A-listing criteria, the Committee requested the Secretariat to introduce, either in the working procedure or in the A-listing criteria document, an option / a procedure to remove the A-listed third version of the Committee's draft opinion from the A-list (so called "de-listing" option).

The Committee then agreed on A-listing criteria as specified in the document "Introduction of a differentiated approach to agreement on the Committees' draft opinions on the applications for authorisation" (SEAC/26/2015/06). Furthermore, SEAC was informed of recent updates to the opinion template.

6.2) Authorisation applications

a) Authorisation applications – first version of SEAC draft opinion

1) Trichloroethylene 1:

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 the plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the draft opinion. The Committee agreed with the conclusions of the rapporteurs that the information provided by the applicant was sufficient to conclude on the technical and economic feasibility of alternatives to the substance for the use applied for. Based on its scrutiny of the analysis of alternatives, SEAC concurred with the assessment made by the applicant, which stated that no technically and economically feasible alternatives will be available before the sunset date. SEAC concluded that the benefits of continued use have been adequately demonstrated to outweigh the risks.

The Committee discussed the length of the review period in the light of the RAC recommendation and then agreed on the draft opinion by simple majority.

2) Trichloroethylene 2a:

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

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

Use 3: Use of trichloroethylene in packaging

Use 4: Use of trichloroethylene in formulation

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 for the five uses applied for.

The RAC rapporteurs were invited to update the Committee on the discussions held at RAC-32. RAC has agreed on the draft opinion for use 2, and will decide on the draft opinions for the remaining uses in a forthcoming plenary meeting.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the draft opinions. For the uses 1, 2, 3, and 4 the Committee agreed on the draft opinions by consensus. For use 5, SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by simple majority. As RAC has not yet agreed on its draft opinions for the uses 1, 3, 4 and 5, the SEAC rapporteurs were

requested to assess whether there is a need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinions have been agreed by RAC.

1) Trichloroethylene 2b:

Use 1: Use of trichloroethylene in formulation

Use 2: Use of trichloroethylene in packaging

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 for the two uses applied for.

The RAC rapporteurs were invited to update the Committee on the discussions held at RAC-32. RAC will decide on the draft opinions in a forthcoming plenary meeting.

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

2) Trichloroethylene 3:

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC agreed on the conformity of the application and discussed the key issues, as presented by the rapporteurs. The Committee was asked to consider the agreement on the SEAC draft opinion at the plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the draft opinion. Based on its scrutiny of the analysis of alternatives, SEAC concurred with the assessment made by the applicant, which stated that no technically and economically feasible alternatives will be available before the sunset date. SEAC concluded that the benefits of continued use have been adequately demonstrated to outweigh the risks. The remaining risks were low and the socio-economic benefits were high.

The Committee discussed the length of the review period and then agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.

3) Trichloroethylene 4:

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 the plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the draft opinion. The Committee agreed with the conclusions of the rapporteurs that the information provided by the applicant was sufficient to conclude on the technical and economic feasibility of alternatives to the substance for the use applied for. Based on its scrutiny of the analysis of alternatives, SEAC concurred with the assessment made by the applicant, which stated that no technically and economically feasible alternatives will be available before the sunset date. SEAC concluded that the benefits of continued use have been adequately demonstrated to outweigh the risk.

The Committee discussed the length of the review period in the light of the RAC recommendation and then agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.

4) Trichloroethylene 6:

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 the plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the draft opinion. The Committee agreed with the conclusions of the rapporteurs that the information provided by the applicant was sufficient to conclude on the technical and economic feasibility of alternatives to trichloroethylene for the use applied for. Based on its scrutiny of the analysis of alternatives, SEAC concurred with the assessment made by the applicant, which stated that no technically and economically feasible alternatives will be available before the sunset date. SEAC concluded that the benefits of continued use have been adequately demonstrated to outweigh the risk.

The Committee discussed the length of the review period in the light of the RAC recommendation and then agreed on the draft opinion by simple majority.

5) Trichloroethylene 7:

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 the plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the draft opinion. The Committee agreed with the conclusions of the rapporteurs that there were no technically feasible alternatives which will be available before the sunset date. The limited information on costs that was made available to SEAC was deemed to be sufficient to conclude on the economic infeasibility of the different alternatives. SEAC concluded that the benefits of continued use have been adequately demonstrated to outweigh the risks.

The Committee discussed the length of the review period in the light of the RAC recommendation and then agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.

6) Trichloroethylene 8:

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 the plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the draft opinion. SEAC agreed with the recommendations of the rapporteurs that the benefits of continued use outweigh the risks and that there will be no technically and economically feasible alternatives available before the sunset date.

The Committee discussed the length of the review period in light of the RAC recommendation and then agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.

7) Trichloroethylene 9:

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 the plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the SEAC draft opinion. The discussion centred on the analysis of alternatives particularly on the question as to why the applicant is not using an alternative substance since an alternative is already used in other plants owned by the applicant. SEAC concluded that the benefits of continued use outweigh the risks and that there will be no technically and economically feasible alternatives available before the sunset date.

The Committee discussed the length of the review period and then agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.

8) Trichloroethylene 10:

Use 1: Use as an extraction solvent in caprolactam production

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 the plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented to the Committee the first version of the SEAC draft opinion for this use. The rapporteurs expressed their concerns on the quality of the application in the areas of the analysis of alternatives and the socio-

economic analysis. The rapporteurs noted that large uncertainties, based on the quality issues associated with the application, weaken the conclusions.

SEAC agreed that the SEA should not be based on the current economic situation of the applicant but rather the emphasis should be placed on the substantial (and accepted) costs of switching to a "non drop-in" alternative. SEAC also considered that the costs to society of potential unemployment for some workers should not be the main element of the cost/benefit analysis. However, SEAC agreed that they should remain as part of the benefits assessment. SEAC concluded that the benefits of continued use outweigh the risks and there will be no technically and economically feasible alternatives available before the sunset date. The Committee discussed the length of the review period in the light of the RAC recommendation and then agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.

9) Trichloroethylene 11:

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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 the plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee agreed with the conclusions of the rapporteurs that there were no technically feasible alternatives which will be available before the sunset date. The limited information on costs that was made available to SEAC was deemed to be sufficient to conclude on the economic infeasibility of the different alternatives. SEAC concluded that the benefits of continued use have been adequately demonstrated to outweigh the risks.

The Committee discussed the length of the review period in the light of the RAC recommendation and then agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.

10) Trichloroethylene 12:

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

The Chair introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC 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.

The RAC rapporteurs were invited to update the Committee on the discussions held at RAC-32. RAC will decide on the draft opinions in a forthcoming plenary meeting.

The SEAC rapporteurs presented the first version of the draft opinion to the Committee. SEAC agreed to discuss this application further in the forthcoming plenary meeting. The rapporteurs will prepare the second version of the draft opinion following the discussion held at SEAC-26.

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

1) Lead chromate 1:

Use 1: Industrial use of lead chromate in manufacture of pyrotechnical delay devices contained into ammunition for naval self-protection

The SEAC rapporteurs provided brief information on the application for authorisation and presented the draft outcome of the conformity check. The rapporteurs also presented their first impression of the application, highlighting some key issues for the attention of the Committee.

SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and on the rapporteurs' proposals with regard to the key issues in the application. The Secretariat will inform the applicant about the outcome of the conformity check.

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

The pool of rapporteurs, as outlined in the amended restricted room document SEAC/26/2015/07_rev.1, was agreed by SEAC.

7) AOB

a) Update of the workplan

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

b) Report from the Dutch PBTs project

The Chair invited the advisors of the Dutch SEAC member to present the interim results within their project plan on 'Development of a benchmark applicable for the SEAC approach to evaluate restriction proposals and authorisation applications for PBT/vPvB substances'.

The Chair invited SEAC to discuss the preliminary results and members were asked to send their comments on the draft report by 10 April. The final report of the Dutch project team will be presented at SEAC 27 in June.

c) Introduction to Secure CIRCABC Project by ECHA Secretariat

The Secretariat provided information about the Secure-CIRCABC project. The presentation explained the scope of the project, timelines and informed SEAC members what they can expect and what will be expected from them in next six months concerning the collaboration platform. During Q&A session SEAC members provided feedback mainly concerning two factor identification via mobile PIN code and its possible backup systems and requested for improvement concerning filing structure.

d) NGO concerns on the SEA process under authorisation

Two stakeholder observer representatives (EEB and ETUC) presented their views of the authorisation process in SEAC. They stated, for example that the opinions and justifications are not always consistent. They also claimed to have observed a tendency that instead of recommending to the Commission not to grant authorisation, a short review period was recommended. Furthermore, the EEB and ETUC representatives recommended to SEAC to leave the burden of proof of the need for the authorisation to on the applicants. They suggested that applications based on broad uses or insufficient data should not be considered conforming. They also said that the way SEAC was analysing economic feasibility is not in their view correct and suggested this to be further developed.

SEAC members discussed these elements. Overall the assessment by the applicants needs to be both from applicants' point of view and from the supply chain and from the society's point of view. The "optimism bias" in applications has been recognised and the public consultation and the dialogues are ways of addressing this issue. Assessments are made on a case-by-case basis and SEAC strives for consistency. The example given by the NGO observers was not actually relevant as it was referring to the applicant's views, not those of SEAC. The Chair concluded that the exchange of views regarding the SEAC process was appreciated by all parties. He encouraged continuing such dialogues based on the mutual respect for each other's work.

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-26

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

II. Main conclusions and action points

MAIN CONCLUSIONS & ACTION POINTS

SEAC-26, 9-13 March 2015

(Adopted at SEAC-26 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
2. Adoption of the agenda	
<p>The agenda was adopted with minor modifications.</p>	<p>SECR to upload the adopted agenda to SEAC CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.</p>
3. Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda	
<p>Conflicts of interest have been declared and will be taken to the minutes.</p>	
4. Report from other ECHA bodies and activities	
<i>a) Report on SEAC-25 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies</i>	
<p>SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-25. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/26/2015/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee.</p>	<p>SECR to table the revised RoPs for discussion and agreement at the June 2015 plenary meeting.</p> <p>SECR to table the revised approach for admission of stakeholder organisations to RAC and SEAC for discussion and agreement once it is clear how MSC will proceed in this regard.</p>
5. Restrictions	
5.1 General restriction issues	
<p>SEAC took note of the presentation on implementation of the Restrictions Efficiency Task Force recommendations as well as on the outline for a common approach of RAC and SEAC in opinion development for restriction proposals.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the revised templates for conformity check report and recommendations to the dossier submitter (SEAC/26/2015/03 and SEAC/26/2015/04).</p> <p>One member expressed concern regarding removing the RMO related question from the conformity check report (question E1).</p> <p>SEAC agreed to have the key issues presentation during the first plenary meeting, after the conformity check agreement, and to test this approach for D4/D5 and PFAS restriction dossiers.</p> <p>SEAC welcomed the idea of impact assessment expert group.</p>	<p>SECR to upload the agreed revised templates to CIRCABC and use them starting from restriction dossiers arriving to ECHA in April 2015.</p> <p>Members to send comments on the outline of common approach to SECR by 27 March.</p> <p>SECR to present the draft common approach paper for discussion and possible agreement at June 2015 plenaries.</p>

5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Opinion development	
1) Cadmium and its compounds in artist paints – final opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented the SEAC final opinion and the results of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted its final opinion on the Cadmium and its compounds in artist paints dossier by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the adopted SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SECR to forward the adopted opinion and its annexes to COM and publish it on the ECHA website.</p>
2) Chrysotile - final opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion and the results of the public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC adopted its final opinion on the Chrysotile dossier by simple majority. The minority views will be reflected in the minutes.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the adopted SEAC final opinion.</p> <p>SECR to forward the adopted opinion and its annexes to COM and publish it on the ECHA website.</p>
3) Isopropylidenediphenol (Bisphenol A) – revised draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the revised SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the second revised SEAC draft opinion for discussion and possible agreement at SEAC-27, taking into account the SEAC-26 discussions and the RAC opinion development.</p>
4) Ammonium salts – revised draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the revised SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion on Ammonium salts dossier by consensus (with modifications introduced during SEAC-26).</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinion and to ensure that the supporting documentation (BD and RCOM) is in line with the agreed SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to launch a public consultation on the SEAC draft opinion in March 2015.</p>
5) DecaBDE - first draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the revised SEAC draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-26 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the beginning of May.</p>
6) Perfluorooctanic acid (PFOA) – key issues document	

<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the key issues document for the SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the first SEAC draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-26 discussions, by the beginning of May.</p>
<p>b) Conformity check</p>	
<p>1) Methanol – outcome of the conformity check</p>	
<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 CIRCABC IG.</p> <p>SECR to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.</p>
<p>2) Dimethylformamide – outcome of the conformity check</p>	
<p>SEAC agreed that the dossier does not conform 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 CIRCABC IG.</p> <p>SECR to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.</p>
<p>5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers</p>	
<p>SEAC agreed on the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for the PFAS restriction proposal (as presented in the restricted meeting document SEAC/26/2015/05) and was informed of the (co-)rapporteurs selected by the Chair for this dossier.</p>	
<p>6. Authorisations</p>	
<p>6.1 General authorisation issues</p>	
<p>SEAC agreed on the A-listing criteria meant for the fast agreement of the Committee on the third versions of the draft opinions on the applications for authorisation (SEAC/26/2015/06).</p> <p>Possibility for de-listing to be reflected in the minutes.</p> <p>SEAC was informed of changes to the opinion template.</p>	<p>SECR to upload the agreed A-listing criteria to CIRCABC and on the ECHA website and to consider SEAC suggestions in the future updates of the working procedure/A-listing criteria.</p> <p>SECR to upload the updated template to CIRCABC and to consider SEAC suggestions for future updates.</p>
<p>6.2 Authorisation applications</p>	
<p>a) Authorisation applications – first version of the SEAC draft opinions</p>	
<p>1) 1)-12) Applications for authorisation (Trichloroethylene 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)</p>	
<p>TCE 12:</p> <p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the second version of the SEAC draft opinion, taking into account the</p>

the first version of the SEAC draft opinion.	SEAC-26 discussions and the views expressed in RAC. SECR to launch a written consultation on the second version of the draft opinion.
TCE 1; TCE 2a uses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; TCE 2b uses 1, 2; TCE 3; TCE 4; TCE 6; TCE 7; TCE 8; TCE 9; TCE 10; TCE 11: SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first versions of the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by consensus (except for TCE 1; TCE 2a use 5; TCE 6). For TCE 1; TCE 2a use 5; TCE 6: SEAC agreed on the draft opinions by simple majority. The minority views will be reflected in the minutes.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions. For TCE 2a uses 1, 3, 4; TCE 2b uses 1, 2: Rapporteurs and SECR to consider the need to come back to discussions in SEAC after the opinions have been agreed by RAC. SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicants for commenting.
b) Authorisation applications – outcomes of the conformity check and presentation of key issues	
1) Lead chromate 1	
SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and discussed the key issues identified in this application.	SECR to inform the applicant about the conformity of the application for authorisation. Rapporteurs to prepare the first version of the draft opinion by 13 May.
6.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)	
SEAC agreed on the updated pool of (co-) rapporteurs for applications for authorisation (considered as agreement on appointment in line with SEAC/26/2015/07 RESTRICTED room document).	SEAC members to volunteer to the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for applications for authorisation. SECR to upload the updated document to confidential folder on CIRCABC IG.
7.b) AOB – report from the Dutch PBT project	
SEAC took note of the presentation on the Dutch PBT project.	SEAC members to provide comments to the project board by 10 April. Project board to report back to SEAC at SEAC-27.
8. Action points and main conclusion of SEAC-26	
SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-26.	SECR to upload the action points and main conclusions to CIRCABC IG.

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-26

SEAC members
ALEXANDRE João
ALEXANDROPOULOU Ionna
BENDL Jiří
BERGS Ivars
BOUSTRAS George (via WEBEX)
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
COGEN Simon
CSERGÓ Robert
DANTINNE Catheline
D'AMICO Flaviano
DOUGHERTY Gary
FANKHAUSER Simone
FIORE-TARDIEU Karine (also DS representative for Bisphenol-A restriction dossier)
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros
GRANDI Silvia (via WEBEX)
KAJIĆ Silva
KIISKI Johanna
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LOČS Jānis
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
MEXA Alexandra
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
PALOTAI Zoltán
PÍŠKOVÁ Martina
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SIMON Franz Georg
SLETTEN Thea Marcelia

Advisors, experts & dossier submitters (DS)
BERNHEIM Theresa (advisor to K. Thiele)
CASTELLI Stefano (advisor to F. D'Amico, and DS representative for DMF)
CEDERBERG Inger, IVARSSON Jenny, VIRDARSON Jenny, PARKMAN Helena, WARHOLM Margareta (DS representatives for Cadmium in artists' paints, via WEBEX)
CORRELL MYHRE Ingunn, KOPANGEN Marit [Norway], and STARKE Sue Martina, STAUDE Claudia, Annegret BIEGEL-ENGLER [Germany] (DS representatives for PFOA restriction dossier, via WEBEX)
FEYAERTS Jean-Pierre (advisor to S. Cogen, via WEBEX)
FOTLAND Tor Øystein, TOLFSEN Christina Charlotte and KOPANGEN Marit (via Webex) - as experts for the DecaBDE restriction dossier
JONGENEEL Rob, BROUWER Roy, OOSTERHUIS Frans (in person), LUIT Richard and VERHOEVEN Julia (via WEBEX) (advisors to C. Luttikhuisen)
LE COQ Pierre (DS representative for Inorganic ammonium salts restriction dossier, via WEBEX)
LESTANDER Dag (Advisor to Å. Thors, and DS representative for Cadmium in artists' paints)
MAJKA Jerzy, GODALA Mariusz and KALSKI Andrzej (DS representatives for Methanol restriction dossier, via WEBEX)
MARTINUSSEN SNEVE Marie (advisor to T.M. Sletten)

RAC (co-)rapporteurs
BARAŃSKI Bogusław
CZERCZAK Sławomir
DUNAUSKIENĖ Lina
DUNGEY Stephen
JENSEN Frank
LUND Bert-Ove
KAPELARI Sonja
SCHLÜTER Urs (via WEBEX)
SCHULTE Agnes
STAŠKO Jolanta
VAN DER HAGEN Marianne (via WEBEX)

Stakeholder observers
HAIDER Sonja (CLIENT EARTH)
HOLLAND Michael (EAERE)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
MUSU TONY (ETUC)
SANTOS Tatiana (EEB)

SMILGIUS Tomas
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina Velinova
THIELE Karen
THORS Åsa

Commission observers
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)
GALLEGO Mateo (DG ENV)
BERTATO Valentina (DG GROW, via WEBEX)
FERNANDES DE BARROS Mariana (DG GROW, via WEBEX)
PROKES Pavel (DG GROW, via WEBEX)
ROZWADOWSKI Jacek (DG GROW, via WEBEX)
STRECK Georg (DG GROW, via WEBEX)

WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)
GESTERMANN Sven (Bayer), expert accompanying CEFIC observer, for the BPA restriction dossier
AGERSTRAND Marlene (ITM University - Sweden), accompanying EEB observer for BPA, DecaBDE and PFOA restriction dossiers
BOCK Ronald (Chemours (DuPont) - FluoroCouncil representative), accompanying CEFIC observer - PFOA restriction dossier
MICHAUX Michel (Brominated Compounds Consortium), accompanying CEFIC observer - DecaBDE restriction dossier
NETTERSHEIM Rolf (Dow), expert accompanying CEFIC observer - Chrysotile restriction dossier

ECHA staff
BERGES Markus
BLAINEY Mark
BOWMER Timothy
HENNIG Philipp
HENRICHSON Sanna
KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia (via WEBEX)
KIOKIAS Sotirios
KIVELÄ Kalle
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
KOSTIKA Ismini Polyxeni
LEGZDIŅA Ilze
LIOPA Elīna
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORŽS Arnis
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MAZZOLINI Anna
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
MAROSVOLGYI Nikoletta
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
ÖBERG Tomas
PELTOLA Jukka
PELTOLA-THIES Johanna
REGIL Pablo
ROGGEMAN Maarten
SADAM Diana
SHUQOM Natasha
SIMPSON Peter
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
STOYANOVA Evgenia
TASKILA Jonna
VAINIO Matti
VAN HAELST Anniek

IV. List of Annexes

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

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

Final Draft Agenda	<i>SEAC/A/26/2015_rev.1</i>
Report on SEAC-25 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies (AP 4.a)	<i>SEAC/26/2015/01</i>
<i>Postponed agenda item – not discussed:</i> General SEAC procedures: Revised general approach for admission of accredited stakeholder organisations to RAC and SEAC (AP 4b)	<i>SEAC/26/2015/02</i> <i>RESTRICTED</i>
General restriction issues – Revised conformity check report (AP 5.1)	<i>SEAC/26/2015/03</i>
General restriction issues – Revised recommendations document (AP 5.1)	<i>SEAC/26/2015/04</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers (AP 5.3)	<i>SEAC/26/2015/05</i> <i>RESTRICTED</i>
General authorisation issues – A-listing criteria (AP 6.1)	<i>SEAC/26/2015/06</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (AP 6.3)	<i>SEAC/26/2015/07</i> <i>RESTRICTED ROOM</i> <i>DOCUMENT</i>

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST TO THE RESPECTIVE AGENDA ITEMS

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

Name of participant	Agenda item	Interest declared
BERNHEIM Teresa	5.2a-6 PFOA	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
BRIGNON Jean-Marc	5.2a-3 Bisphenol A 5.2a-4 Ammonium salts	Participation in the preparation of both restriction dossiers
	5.2b-2 DMF	Participation in the commenting on the restriction dossier
CASTELLI Stefano	5.2b-2 DMF	Representing the restriction dossier submitter
CSERGŐ Robert	6.2a-12 Trichloroethylene 12	Previous position of MSCA in REACH Committee in favour of a longer sunset date for TCE
DANTINNE Catheline	5.2a-2 Chrysotile	Strong position as MSCA representative against the dossier
FIORE-TARDIEU Karine	5.2a-3 Bisphenol A 5.2a-4 Ammonium salts	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossiers
KIISKI Johanna	5.2b-1 Methanol	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
LESTANDER Dag	5.2a-1 Cadmium in artists' paints	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
MARTINUSSEN SNEVE Marie	5.2a-5 DecaBDE	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
	5.2a-6 PFOA	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
SLETTEN Thea Marcellia	5.2a-5 DecaBDE	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
	5.2a-6 PFOA	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
THIELE Karen	5.2a-6 PFOA	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
THORS Åsa	5.2a-1 Cadmium in artists' paints	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier

Final Agenda

26th meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

9-13 March 2015

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

9 March: starts at 9:00

13 March: ends at 13:00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/26/2015
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-25 action points, written procedures and other ECHA bodies

SEAC/26/2015/01
For information

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 General restriction issues

SEAC/26/2015/03
SEAC/26/2015/04
For discussion and agreement

5.2 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) Opinion development

- 1) Cadmium and its compounds in artist paints – final opinion

For adoption

- 2) Chrysotile – final opinion

For adoption

- 3) Isopropylidenediphenol (Bisphenol A) – revised draft opinion
For agreement
- 4) Ammonium salts – revised draft opinion
For agreement
- 5) DecaBDE - first draft opinion
For discussion
- 6) Perfluorooctanic acid (PFOA) – key issues document
For discussion

b) Conformity check

- 1) Methanol
For agreement
- 2) Dimethylformamide
For agreement

5.3 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC/26/2015/05
(restricted document)
For agreement

Item 6 – Authorisations

6.1 General authorisation issues

SEAC/26/2015/06
For discussion and agreement

6.2 Authorisation applications

a) Authorisation applications – first version of SEAC draft opinion

- 1. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *Microporous GmbH* (Trichloroethylene 1):

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

- 2. Five uses of trichloroethylene submitted by *DOW Deutschland Anlagengesellschaft mbH* (Trichloroethylene 2a):

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

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

Use 3: Use of trichloroethylene in packaging

Use 4: Use of trichloroethylene in formulation

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

3. Two uses of trichloroethylene submitted by *Richard Geiss GmbH* (Trichloroethylene 2b):

Use 1: Use of Trichloroethylene in formulation

Use 2: Use of trichloroethylene in packaging

4. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *ROQUETTE Frères* (Trichloroethylene 3):

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

5. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *Parker Hannifin Manufacturing Netherlands (Filtration and Separation) bv* (Trichloroethylene 4):

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

6. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *ENTEK International Limited* (Trichloroethylene 6):

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

7. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *RAG Aktiengesellschaft* and *RAG Anthrazit Ibbenbüren* (Trichloroethylene 7):

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

8. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *DOMO Caprolactam GmbH* (Trichloroethylene 8):

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

9. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *Grupa Azoty S.A.* (Trichloroethylene 9):

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

10. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *Spolana, a.s.* (Trichloroethylene 10):

Use 1: Use as an extraction solvent in caprolactam production

11. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *A.L.P.A.-AZIENDA LAVORAZIONE PRODOTTI AUSILIARI S.P.A.* and *CAFFARO INDUSTRIE S.P.A.* (Trichloroethylene 11):

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

12. The use of trichloroethylene submitted by *Chimcomplex SA Borzesti* (Trichloroethylene 12):

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

For discussion/agreement

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

1. Lead chromate 1:

Use 1: Industrial use of lead chromate in manufacture of pyrotechnical delay devices contained into ammunition for naval self-protection

For agreement

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

SEAC/26/2015/07

(restricted room document)

For agreement

Item 7 – AOB

- a) Update of the work plan
- b) Report from the Dutch PBT project
- c) Introduction to Secure CIRCABC Project by ECHA Secretariat
- d) NGO concerns on the SEA process under authorisation

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-26

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-26

For adoption