

22 November 2016

SEAC/A/32/2016 FINAL

Final

Minutes of the 32nd meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

6 - 15 September 2016

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-second meeting of SEAC. The Chairman informed the participants that one member has resigned. The Chairman also informed the Committee that apologies had been received from eight members on week one and eleven members on week 2 of the meeting.

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-32. The agenda was adopted with minor modifications (under Agenda Item 7, AOB). The final agenda is attached to these minutes as Annex III. The list of all meeting documents is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

3) Declarations of conflicts of interest to the Agenda

The Chairman requested members and their advisors participating in the meeting to declare any conflicts of interest to any of the specific agenda items. Two 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-31 action points, written procedures and update other ECHA bodies

The Chairman informed the participants that all action points of SEAC-31 had been completed or would be followed up during the on-going SEAC-32 meeting. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the final minutes of SEAC-31 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-31 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/32/2016/01).

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

b) Annual update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)

The Secretariat presented a report on the participation of stakeholder organisations in the work of SEAC since SEAC-28 and a proposal for an update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list. SEAC agreed on the annual update of SEAC stakeholder observers as presented by the Secretariat. The Chairman informed the Committee that the Secretariat will publish the updated list on the ECHA website.

c) Letters from the Commission to ECHA on the AfA process

The Chairman informed the Committee that in summer ECHA received two letters from the Commission regarding the authorisation process. The representative of the Commission observer introduced the content of the letters to SEAC. Furthermore, the Secretariat provided an update from the AfA Task Force, regarding practical guidance to applicants.

After presentations, SEAC discussed aspects related to the opinion development process for applications for authorisation. The Secretariat will organise a written consultation on the AfA Task Force practical guidance modules in RAC and SEAC during the second half of September 2016 and will report on the progress at the next plenary meeting.

5) Restrictions

5.1) Restriction Annex XV dossiers

a) Conformity check

1. DMF – Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitter's representative from Italy. He informed the participants that the restriction dossier had been submitted by Italy on 15 June 2016. The conformity check process was launched on 17 August and the SEAC commenting round finished on 22 August (there were no comments received from SEAC members).

The dossier submitter representative provided a brief introductory presentation on the dossier. The restriction proposal proposes a restriction on the uses of N,N-dimethylformamide (DMF) on its own or in mixtures in a concentration equal to or greater than 0.3%. The proposal is to use worker based harmonised DNEL values for long-term inhalation exposure (3.2 mg/m³) and DNEL for long-term dermal exposure (0.79 mg/kg bw/day). The substance is used as aprotic solvent able to dissolve a wide range of substances. DMF is used in many applications in the chemical industry. It is used, for example, in manufacturing of fine chemicals, pharmaceuticals, polymers,

textiles, non-metallic mineral products, perfumes and fragrances, in the petrochemical industry and it is used in laboratories.

The rapporteur presented the outcome of the conformity check and informed the Committee that they do not consider the dossier to be in conformity due to the lack of information on costs (only summarised data on costs and only for three uses) and lack of information on the proportionality to the risk (only costs between three RMO compared). The Committee agreed that the dossier does not conform to the Annex XV requirements. In addition, the rapporteurs presented their recommendations to the dossier submitter and these were supported by the SEAC members. As the Committee has considered the dossier not to be in conformity, the Secretariat will inform the dossier submitter about the reasons of non-conformity.

b) Opinion development

1. TDFAs – first 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 two week RAC and SEAC written consultation on the first draft opinion was launched on 4 August and finished on 25 August with one comment received from a SEAC member. 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.

The rapporteurs then presented their first draft opinion. Overall, the SEAC rapporteurs agreed with the qualitative approach taken by the dossier submitter and also agreed that the costs of this restriction will not be significant for the consumers or the industry. The SEAC rapporteurs, challenged, though, the assumption of 330-660 cases per years, suggesting that data from poison centres indicate much lower values (8.5 cases per year). The rapporteurs supported the view that action is required on an Union wide basis. Regarding the conclusion by the rapporteurs on proportionality and their comment on a precautionary approach, the Commission, supported by the Chairman, advised the rapporteurs not to enter into policy discussions and to focus on their assessment of the socio-economic impacts of the measure.

In general, SEAC members supported the scope proposed but suggested some further refinement of the draft opinion. In addition, SEAC members were of the view that the reformulation costs from D4/D5 restriction proposal could be a starting point for the rapporteurs' assessment of reformulation costs. SEAC members also agreed that ranges for benefit estimations should be narrowed down. A SEAC member suggested to contact national poison centers to confirm the occurred incidents. The Secretariat confirmed, that this issue was also included as a question in public consultation but some further contacts could be made. To enhance the efficiency of the public consultation (and yield more info/data of socioeconomic nature), as suggested by the rapporteurs, ECHA will

organise a more targeted consultation with associated European companies during October. Another SEAC member suggested the rapporteurs to further clarify health effects for the impact assessment.

The Chairman concluded that in general the Committee supports the rapporteurs' views and the initial assessment as presented. The rapporteurs were asked to take the SEAC-32 discussion into account in the second draft opinion (which is due by end of October 2016).

2. 4 phthalates – first draft opinion

The Chairman welcomed the dossier submitters' representatives from ECHA and Denmark, an industry expert accompanying a regular stakeholder observer and the RAC rapporteurs. He informed the participants that the dossier had been submitted in April 2016 and had been considered in conformity by SEAC in June 2016. 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 at SEAC-32, the Committee is invited to discuss the first draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs.

The rapporteurs presented their first draft opinion. They noted that this is a well elaborated and structured dossier and that it is instigated on the basis of Article 69(2) for the four phthalates on Annex XIV whose sunset date has passed. The dossier builds on the previous proposal by Denmark from 2011 for which SEAC adopted an opinion not supporting the proposal and presents new information based on DEMOCOPHES biomonitoring study and additional information on hazard. Furthermore, it includes additional information on costs, trends, benefits (avoided health impacts are assessed) and takes into account comments for better targeting of the proposal as well as adjusts the baseline. The rapporteurs informed the Committee that in the first draft opinion they had focussed on the scope and costs of the proposal, while the benefits and proportionality will be addressed further in the next version of the opinion to be discussed at the next plenary meetings.

With regard to the costs, the rapporteurs were interested to hear the views of other SEAC members whether they agree with their approach on the material substitution costs; R&D, reformulation, process and plant modification costs; testing costs as well as costs to the recycling sector. With regard to the material substitution costs, the rapporteurs informed SEAC that they will confirm the figures derived by the dossier submitters or propose a range and best estimate of costs taking into account the confidential information and non-phthalate substitution. For the R&D, reformulation, process and plant modification costs, the dossier submitters have stated that these costs are minor and addressed in the estimation of substitution costs, however, the rapporteurs would like to check this further. In addition, the rapporteurs would like to verify the illustrative calculations of the testing costs done by the dossier submitters and clarify if these costs can be considered highly uncertain and largely not attributable to the proposed restriction as stated in the dossier. For the costs to the recycling sector, it is mentioned in the dossier that these costs will mainly be borne by producers of boots and wellingtons and will be in the order of €1.1million/year, but the rapporteurs would

like to verify it further. Several SEAC members agreed with the approach of the rapporteurs and admitted that further scrutiny of costs is required.

The rapporteurs also discussed the dossier submitters' analysis of other impacts of the proposed restriction. They concluded that the analysis does not contain major gaps and they tend to agree with the conclusions in the dossier. An industry expert accompanying a stakeholder observer informed the Committee that industry has submitted extensive comments in the ongoing public consultation and will still provide more information before the end of the consultation. Finally, the rapporteurs briefly described the points for future assessment and discussion identified by them in relation to benefits.

The Chairman concluded that the rapporteurs have support for their approach by other Committee members. The rapporteurs were asked to take the discussion into account in the preparation of the second draft opinion. At the next SEAC-33 plenary meeting, the Committee will focus its discussion on concluding on economic costs of the proposed restriction and benefits.

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

The Secretariat informed the Committee that following the new entries to the Registry of Intentions, a call for expression of interest to act as (co-)rapporteur for the Diisocyanates as well as for Lead and its compounds dossiers was launched on 4 July 2016 and closed on 22 August 2016. As a result of the call, there were two volunteers who came forward for the rapporteur and co-rapporteur positions for the Diisocyanates restriction dossier and four volunteers for the Lead and its compounds restriction dossier.

A restriction proposal on Diisocyanates is expected to be submitted in October 2016 by Germany. The dossier proposes a restriction on diisocyanates; the placing on the market as substances on their own, as a constituent in other substances or in mixtures for industrial and professional uses. In October 2016, ECHA, on request of the Commission, will also submit new dossier on lead and its compounds on the placing on the market and use of lead compounds to stabilise PVC and of the placing on the market of PVC articles stabilised with lead compounds. Depending on the outcome of the assessment, the scope of the restriction might be broad or targeted specifically to articles or article groups that are the main contributors to the risks targeted by this proposal.

The pool of (co-)rapporteurs, as outlined in the restricted room document SEAC/32/2016/03, was agreed by SEAC.

6) Authorisations

6.1) General authorisation issues

a) Update on incoming/future applications

The Secretariat informed the Committee that for the 21 new applications for authorisation on 30 uses of substances of very high concern received during the May submission window invoicing has been delayed for three months, as the Secretariat informed the Committees earlier in the year. The applications will be put for the RAC and SEAC consultations, and the public consultations in early November 2016. The Secretariat expects about two more new applications to be submitted during the November submission window.

In addition, the Secretariat informed the Committee about the paper drafted by the Commission for the CARACAL June 2016 meeting. It concerns cases when applicant is requesting a review period which is longer than 12 years. The Secretariat explained that in order to reach harmonised approach across these cases, further criteria need to be developed and agreed upon. The Commission representative presented the elements of the paper and the rationale behind it and reported that at the CARACAL meeting the representatives of the Member State Competent Authorities broadly supported the Commission's paper. The SEAC Members, which contributed to the discussion welcomed the standardised text proposed by the Secretariat. They also stressed that granting authorisation for such very long review periods would require applicants to provide arguments demonstrating extraordinary and exceptional issues linked to the particular uses the Annex XIV substance. In addition, some Members of the Committee reminded that one of the goals of the REACH Regulation is substitution of substances of very high concern. One of the stakeholder observer representatives spoke in favour of using the current criteria for setting a review period as a basis for further possible extension. Another stakeholder observer representative doubted inability of applicants to find suitable alternative within 12 years review period. The Committee considered the discussion and acknowledged necessity for further criteria development for these exceptional cases. The presented standardised text will be used by the Committee as a transitional approach.

b) The social cost of unemployment

The Chairman introduced a draft note on the social costs of unemployment. The Chairman reminded that the first version of the draft note had been discussed at the previous SEAC plenary meeting. The updated version of the note was put for consultation prior to the SEAC-32 plenary meeting.

SEAC discussed and agreed on the draft note prepared by the Secretariat on the SEAC's approach for valuing job losses in restriction proposals and applications for authorisation (SEAC/32/2016/04), requesting the Secretariat to do the final editing of the agreed document and publishing it on the ECHA website.

c) Willingness-to-pay values for various health endpoints associated with chemicals exposure

The Chairman introduced a draft note on reference values for monetising health impacts. The Chairman reminded that the first version of the draft note had been discussed at the previous SEAC plenary meeting. The updated version of the note was put for consultation prior to the SEAC-32 plenary meeting. Considering the high number of comments received, some of which were submitted after the official consultation

deadline and concerned the approach taken in the note, the Chairman proposed to discuss the identified issues in a breakout group.

A breakout group was held on 7 September 2016 and the Secretariat subsequently reported back to SEAC about these deliberations. During the plenary discussion SEAC members made further suggestions mostly of editorial nature, e.g. a number of SEAC members were in favour of rounding the reference values in the document. One of the stakeholder organisation observers expressed his support to the initiative of the Committee to produce the note on Willingness-to-pay reference values, and urged the Committee to communicate it to those involved in the preparation of applications for authorisation. The Secretariat together with a small drafting group of SEAC will consider the discussions both in the breakout group and in the plenary in finalising the note.

SEAC agreed to start using the Willingness-to-pay values in the document (SEAC/32/2016/05) and formed a drafting group to finalise the note with contextual information. SEAC tasked the Secretariat to finalise the document and to agree on the text within the drafting group. The reference values for various health outcomes associated with exposure to hazardous substances are attached to the minutes as Annex IV.

6.2) Authorisation applications

a) Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues

1. Diglyme_Merck

The Secretariat in cooperation with the respective SEAC rapporteurs provided general information regarding the application for authorisation. In the presentation of the case, the Secretariat outlined issues which would need further clarification by the applicants and asked the Committee for comments and further suggestions.

SEAC agreed on the conformity of the application for authorisation. The Committee also discussed the key issues identified by the rapporteurs in the applications. The Secretariat will inform the applicants about the outcome of the conformity check and, where needed, will request further clarifications on the issues identified and discussed by the Committee.

b) Agreement on draft opinions

1. Chromium trioxide_SNECMA (1 use) (CT_Snecma)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee had a brief discussion on the type of articles produced by the applicant. The Committee supported the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application for authorisation.

2. Chromium trioxide_MTU (2 uses) (CT_MTU)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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 opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions.

The Committee had a discussion on the profit loss assessment. The Committee supported the draft opinions as proposed by the rapporteurs. The draft opinions were subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing to be done by the rapporteur together with the Secretariat in relation to the profit loss related issues identified during the discussion. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application for authorisation.

3. Chromium trioxide_ABLOY (1 use) (CT_Abloy)

The Chairman 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 this plenary.

The Chairman invited the RAC rapporteurs to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The RAC rapporteurs briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first version of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee discussed some issues related to the socio-economic analysis (potential loss of consumer surplus). The Committee supported the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on this dossier.

4. Chromium trioxide_HOOGOSENS Court Roll Surface Technologies (1 use) (CT_Hoogovens)

The Chairman 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 this plenary.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first version of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee discussed some issues related to the Analysis of Alternatives and the socio-economic analysis (profit loss, investment cycle). The Committee supported the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteur together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on this dossier.

5. Chromium trioxide_TOPOCROM GmbH (1 use) (CT_Topocrom)

The Chairman 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 this plenary.

The Chairman invited the RAC rapporteurs to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The RAC rapporteurs briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first version of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee discussed some issues related to the Analysis of Alternatives. The Committee supported the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on this dossier.

6. Chromium trioxide_FN HERSTAL S.A. (2 uses) (CT_Herstal)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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 opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the approach taken by the applicant to monetise the health-related impacts, and differences in requested lengths of a review period between the two of the uses. The Committee supported the draft opinions as proposed by the rapporteurs. The draft opinions were subsequently agreed by consensus. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application for authorisation.

7. Chromium trioxide_GERHARDI KUNSTOFFTECHNIK GmbH (1 use) (CT_Gerhardi)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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 opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteur then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on availability and feasibility of alternatives, namely of Cr(III), the need for differentiation between exterior and interior use and in relation to that on the proposed review period. The Committee supported the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteur, but with a review period different than that initially recommended. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteur together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteur for the work on the application.

After agreement on the draft opinion the Commission representative intervened and suggested that in cases like this when an issue was not sufficiently assessed, SEAC may consider taking the necessary time to do that and only then agree on the draft opinion as appropriate, instead of dealing with the uncertainty through adjusting the review period.

8. Chromium trioxide; Potassium dichromate; Sodium dichromate_SOURIAU SAS (7 opinions) (CT_PD_SD_Souriau)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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 opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat / RAC rapporteur briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteur then presented the SEAC draft opinions.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the exposure of workers and a clarification was provided by the Secretariat on the exact calculations. The draft opinions were agreed by consensus. The Chairman thanked the rapporteur for their work on the application.

9. Chromium trioxide_HAPPOC (4 uses) (CT_HAPOC)

SEAC took note of an oral update by the rapporteurs on the progress of the translations from German to English and on the opinion development on the application for authorisation CT_HAPOC.

10. Ammonium dichromate_VECO BV (1 use) (AD_Veco)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee briefly discussed availability of the alternatives. The Committee supported the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application for authorisation.

11. Sodium dichromate_TOTAL RAFFINERIE MITTELDEUTSCHLAND GmbH (1 use) (SD_Total)
12. Sodium dichromate_JACOBS DOUWEE EGBERTS DE GmbH (1 use) (SD_Jacobs)

The Chairman introduced the applications for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC agreed on the conformity of the applications 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-37. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first versions of the SEAC draft opinions. The Committee supported the draft opinions as proposed by the rapporteurs, making some suggestions in relation to investment cycle. The draft opinions were subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteur together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on these dossiers.

13. EDC_BASF SE (2 uses) (EDC_BASF_2)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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 opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions. The Committee discussion mainly focused on the profit losses and whether these are distributional or not, as well as on the non-use scenario. Summarising the discussion, the Chair noted that the conclusions are robust, however the rapporteurs would need to qualify the cost estimates.

The draft opinions were 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. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

14. EDC_ELI LILLY S.A. (1 use) (EDC_Eli_Lilly)

The Chairman introduced a state of the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the alternatives analysed by the applicant, on the distributional nature of profit losses loss, as well as on the non-use scenario and the length of the review period. The rapporteurs will clarify these pending issues with the applicant and the draft opinion will be updated and tabled for discussion and agreement at the November plenary meeting.

15. EDC_DOW ITALIA S.R.L. (1 use) (EDC_Dow)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee supported the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs, making some suggestions in relation to the environmental impacts. One SEAC member raised concerns about possible different treatment between the similar applications. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

16. EDC_LANXESS Deutschland GmbH (2 uses) (EDC_Lanxess)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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 opinions at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions.

The Committee supported the draft opinions as proposed by the rapporteurs, making some suggestions in relation to the profit loss. The draft opinions were subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

17. EDC_H&R OLWERKE SCHINDLER GmbH (1 use) (EDC_Olwerke)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee supported the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs, making some suggestions in relation to the environmental impacts. Summarising the discussion, the Chair noted that a sentence on the environmental impacts should be removed from the draft opinion as suggested by one Member. The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteur together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

18. EDC_GRUPPA LOTOS S.A. (1 use) (EDC_Lotos)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the proposed review period. Summarising the discussion, the Chairman noted that a sentence on the environmental impacts should be removed from the draft opinion as suggested by one member.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

19. EDC_GE HEALTHCARE Bio-Sciences (1 use) (EDC_Bio-Sciences)

The Chairman introduced a state of the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, 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-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee supported the draft opinion as proposed by the rapporteurs, making some suggestions in relation to the profit loss. The draft opinion was subsequently

agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

20. Technical MDA_POLYNT COMPOSITES France (2 uses) (MDA_Polynt)

The Chairman 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 at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first versions of the SEAC draft opinion.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the applicant's Analysis of Alternatives the possibility to use other waste management system as proposed by the applicant and the length of the review period. The members asked the rapporteurs to add to the draft opinion the clarification they presented during the discussion on the length of the review period. SEAC members asked the ECHA Secretariat to consider developing guidance and an approach on how to handle approval by national authorities and how it influences the length of proposed review period.

The Committee supported the rapporteurs' assessment. The draft opinions were subsequently agreed by consensus and the Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application. The rapporteurs were asked to necessary post-editing of the draft in line with the committee's request.

After agreement on the draft opinion one stakeholder observer intervened, supporting the request for guidance and consistent approach on how a need for approval by the national authorities influences the length of the review period.

21. EDC_EURENCO (1 use) (EDC_Eurenko)

The Chairman 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 at this plenary.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the first versions of the SEAC draft opinion. During the discussion on the draft opinion SEAC asked rapporteurs to incorporate in post-editing profit-loss issue discussed earlier by SEAC also in this case.

The Committee supported the rapporteurs' assessment. The draft opinions were subsequently agreed by consensus and the Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on the application.

22. Sodium dichromate-Brenntag (3 uses) (SD_Brenntag)
23. Potassium dichromate-Brenntag (2 uses) (PD_Brenntag)
24. Dichromium tris(chromate)-Henkel (2 uses) (DtC_Henkel)
25. Strontium chromate-Akzo Nobel (2 uses) (SC_Akzo)
26. Potassium hydroxyoctaoxodizincatedichromate-PPG (2 uses) (PH_PPG)

The above five applications for authorisation were submitted by the same consortium (CCST) and bore strong similarities, therefore they were considered together for discussion at this plenary meeting. Four uses have been applied for: formulation (by all five applicants), surface treatment (by three applicants), painting and coating (by two applicants) and electrolytic passivation of tin plated steel (by one applicant).

The Chairman introduced the applications for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the Committee discussed the draft opinions and the rapporteurs received guidance from the Committee. A trialogue has been held on 21 June 2016, where the rapporteurs reiterated to the applicants their concerns on the broad scope of the uses applied for in the applications.

Following the trialogue discussion, the rapporteurs prepared the draft opinions, which went for consultation with SEAC members during the summer. Based on the comments received from members, the rapporteurs have updated the draft opinions.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion and RAC's concerns on the exposure assessment and the RMMs and OCs in the exposure scenarios.

The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the SEAC draft opinions. With regard to alternatives, the Committee discussed and agreed with the conclusions of the (co-)rapporteurs on the non-availability, by the sunset date and for all applications, of technically and economically feasible alternatives, as described in the respective opinions.

SEAC discussed the length of the review period and SEAC agreed by consensus on the proposals of the rapporteurs. The draft opinions were subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further minor post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on these applications.

27. Potassium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (2 uses) (PD_Gentrochema)
28. Sodium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (3 uses) (SD_Gentrochema)

SEAC took note of an oral update by the rapporteurs on the progress of the opinion development on the applications for authorisation PD_Gentrochema and SD_Gentrochema.

29. Chromium trioxide-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (1 use) (CT_Circuit)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC discussed the first version of the draft opinion focusing on the analysis of alternatives undertaken by the applicant.

At this meeting the rapporteurs updated the Committee on the changes done after two rounds of SEAC consultations. During the discussion SEAC members supported the rapporteurs' proposal but some members were of the opinion that the justification text contained some inconsistencies that needed to be addressed.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by consensus, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on this application.

30. Arsenic acid-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (1 use) (AsA_Circuit)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, SEAC discussed the first version of the draft opinion focusing on the economic feasibility of alternatives including the issue of re-qualification, its cost, and the influence of the applicant's customers' decisions.

At this meeting the rapporteurs updated the Committee on the changes done after two rounds of SEAC consultations. Then the discussion focused on the technical and economic feasibility of alternatives, the conditions for the authorisation and for the review report, and the length of the review period. One member expressed his concerns on the analysis of the economic feasibility and the proposed length of the review period. Based on the discussion the rapporteurs proposed a review period with the condition (for authorisation) that the applicant sticks to the timelines for substitution activities proposed in the application.

The draft opinion was subsequently agreed by simple majority with one member having minority position, with some further post-editing (to address the issues discussed) to be done by the rapporteurs together with the Secretariat. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs for their work on this application.

c) Adoption of final opinion

1. Chromium trioxide-Kromatek 1 (1 use) (CT_Kromatek)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meeting, the rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the second version of the SEAC draft opinion. The Committee agreed on the draft opinion by consensus. 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 in the summer.

The Chairman invited the Secretariat to inform SEAC about the discussion held at RAC-38. The Secretariat briefly presented the main points of the discussion. The SEAC rapporteurs then presented the draft SEAC final opinion.

The Committee discussion mainly focused on the comments made by the applicant. The final opinions were subsequently adopted by consensus. The opinions 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. Chromium trioxide 1 (6 uses) (CT_Lanxess)

The Chairman introduced the application for authorisation. At the previous meetings, SEAC discussed and agreed on the six SEAC draft opinions. The draft opinions were sent to the applicant, who made their comments on the documents. The draft final opinions together with the comments by the applicants were sent for a SEAC consultation prior the plenary meeting.

The rapporteur reviewed the applicant's comments, noting that there were many comments on the review period and on the application for authorisation process in general. The rapporteur also noted that there was no new information related to the SEAC assessment provided in the applicant's comments. The rapporteurs proposed to introduce minor changes of clarifying nature in the SEAC opinions.

The rapporteur presented changes for the SEAC final opinions, and responses to the applicant's comments. During the discussion the SEAC Members supported the approach taken by the rapporteur. Few SEAC Members noted general nature of the applicant's comments with no reference to specific sections of the draft opinions. The final opinions were subsequently adopted by consensus. The opinions will be sent to the applicant, the European Commission and the Member States. The Chairman thanked the rapporteurs and Secretariat for their work on the application for authorisation.

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/32/2016/06, was agreed by SEAC.

7) AOB

a) Update of the workplan

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

b) Update on the Article 95(3) request to RAC

The Secretariat provided an update from the Article 95(3) request to RAC regarding the RAC/SCOEL Joint Report. The aim of the request is for RAC and SCOEL to resolve the differences in scientific opinion as regards exposure levels for NMP. More particularly, RAC/SCOEL should jointly assess their previous opinions, in particular: the choice of critical adverse health effect(s), the use of a weight of evidence approach, the use of assessment factors and their scientific relevance, and with the objective to agree, if possible, on these parameters for the specific case to recommend a common health-based reference value.

c) Report from the SEA Workshop and OECD Workshop on CBA

The Secretariat reported back from the workshop, organised jointly by ECHA and Commission on socio-economic analysis in applications for authorisation and restrictions under REACH, which took place in Brussels in June 2016.

Furthermore, SEAC was updated regarding the OECD Workshop on Socioeconomic Impact Assessment of Chemicals Management, which took place in July 2016. The aim of the workshop was to identify the current status of practice and methodologies for cost-benefit analysis of risk management measures and frameworks addressing the human health and environmental impacts of chemicals in OECD Member Countries.

8) Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-32

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

II. Main conclusions and action points

SEAC-32, 6-15 September 2016

(Adopted at SEAC-32 meeting)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)
2. Adoption of the agenda	
The agenda was adopted with minor 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-31 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies</i>	
SEAC was informed on the status of the action points of SEAC-31. Furthermore, SEAC took note of the report from other ECHA bodies (SEAC/32/2016/01), including the oral report from the Commission on SEAC related developments in the REACH Committee and in the CARACAL.	
<i>b) Annual update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)</i>	
SEAC agreed on the annual update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (SEAC/32/2016/02 restricted meeting document).	SECR to publish the updated list on ECHA website.
<i>c) Letters from the Commission to ECHA on the authorisation process</i>	
SEAC discussed the two letters sent by the Commission to ECHA in July 2016 regarding the authorisation process. Furthermore, SEAC was presented with an update from the AfA Task Force, regarding practical guidance to applicants.	SECR to organise a written consultation on the AfA Task Force practical guidance modules in RAC and SEAC during the second half of September 2016 and to report on the progress at the next plenary meeting.
5. Restrictions	
5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers	
a) Conformity check	
1) DMF – outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues	

<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 S-CIRCABC IG.</p> <p>SECR to inform the dossier submitter on the outcome of the conformity check.</p>
b) Opinion development	
1) TDFAs – first draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the second draft opinion, taking into account the SEAC-32 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the end of October.</p>
2) Diisobutyl phthalate (DIBP), Dibutyl phthalate (DBP), Benzyl butyl phthalate (BBP), Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) – first draft opinion	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the first draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to prepare the second draft opinion, taking into account SEAC-32 discussions and the results of the public consultation, by the end of October.</p>
5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers	
<p>SEAC agreed on the pool of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers on Diisocyanates and Lead and its compounds (as presented in the restricted room document SEAC/32/2016/03).</p>	
6. Authorisation	
6.1 General authorisation issues	
a) Update on incoming/future applications	
<p>SEAC took note of the update on the incoming/future applications for authorisation.</p>	
b) The social cost of unemployment	
<p>SEAC discussed and agreed on the draft note prepared by SECR on the SEAC's approach for valuing job losses in restriction proposals and applications for authorisation (SEAC/32/2016/04).</p>	<p>SECR to do the final editing of the paper and publish it on ECHA website.</p>
c) Willingness-to-pay values for various health endpoints associated with chemicals exposure	

<p>SEAC discussed the draft note prepared by SECR on reference values for evaluating health impacts (SEAC/32/2016/05).</p> <p>SEAC agreed to start using the willingness-to-pay values in the document.</p> <p>SEAC formed a drafting group to finalise the note with contextual information.</p>	<p>SECR to finalise the document and to agree on the text within the drafting group.</p> <p>SECR to add the willingness-to-pay values to the minutes of the SEAC-32 meeting.</p>
<p>6.2 Authorisation applications</p>	
<p>a) Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues</p>	
<p>1. Diglyme_Merck</p>	
<p>SEAC agreed that the application is in conformity and discussed the key issues identified in the application.</p>	<p>SECR to inform the applicant about the conformity of the application for authorisation.</p> <p>Rapporteurs to take the discussions into account in the preparation of the first version of the draft opinion.</p>
<p>b) Agreement on draft opinions</p>	
<p>1. Chromium trioxide_SNECMA (1 use) (CT_Snecma)</p>	
<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 draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>2. Chromium trioxide_MTU (2 uses) (CT_MTU)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions on Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>3. Chromium trioxide_ABLOY (1 use) (CT_Abloy)</p>	
<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 draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
<p>4. Chromium trioxide_HOOGOSENS Court Roll Surface technologies (1 use) (CT_Hoogovens)</p>	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinion.</p>

SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by consensus.	SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
5. Chromium trioxide_TOPOCROM (1 use) (CT_Topocrom)	
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 draft opinion. SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
6. Chromium trioxide_FN HERSTAL S.A (2 uses) (CT_Herstal)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions. SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
7. Chromium trioxide_GERHARDI KUNSTOFFTECHNIK GmbH (1 use) (CT_Gerhardi)	
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 draft opinion. SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
8. Chromium trioxide; Potassium dichromate; Sodium dichromate_SOURIAU SAS (3 opinions) (CT_PD_SD_Souriau)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions for Uses 1, 2 and 3 by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions. SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
9. Chromium trioxide_HAPOC (4 uses) (CT_HAPOC)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented an update on the progress with the opinion development.	
10. Ammonium dichromate_VECO BV (1 use) (AD_Veco)	
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 draft opinion. SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
11. Sodium dichromate_TOTAL RAFFINERIE MITTELDEUTSCHLAND GmbH (1 use) (SD_Total)	

<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 draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
12. Sodium dichromate_JACOBS DOUWEE EGBERTS DE GmbH (1 use) (SD_Jacobs)	
<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 draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
13. EDC_BASF SE (2 uses) (EDC_BASF_2)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
14. EDC_ELII LILLY S.A. (1 use) (EDC_Eli_Lilly)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs to take the discussions into account in preparing the next version of the draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to table the draft opinion for agreement at the next plenary meeting.</p>
15. EDC_DOW ITALIA S.R.L. (1 use) (EDC_Dow)	
<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 draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.</p>
16. EDC_LANXESS Deutschland GmbH (2 uses) (EDC_Lanxess)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.</p>	<p>Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the draft opinions.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.</p>
17. EDC_H&R OLWERKE SCHINDLER GmbH (1 use) (EDC_Olwerke)	
<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 draft opinion.</p> <p>SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant</p>

	for commenting.
18. EDC_GRUPPA LOTOS S.A. (1 use) (EDC_Lotos)	
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 draft opinion. SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
19. EDC_GE HEALTHCARE Bio-Sciences (1 use) (EDC_Bio-Sciences)	
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 draft opinion. SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
20. Technical MDA_POLYNT COMPOSITES France (2 uses) (MDA_Polynt)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions for Uses 1 and 2 by consensus.	Rapporteurs together with SECR to do the final editing of the SEAC draft opinions. Rapporteurs to revise the draft opinions following the agreement on the draft opinions in RAC (if needed). SECR to send the draft opinions to the applicant for commenting.
21. EDC_EURENCO (1 use) (EDC_Eurenco)	
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. Rapporteurs to revise the draft opinion following the agreement on the draft opinion in RAC (if needed). SECR to send the draft opinion to the applicant for commenting.
22. Sodium dichromate-Brenntag (3 uses) (SD_Brenntag)	
SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions. SEAC agreed on the draft opinions on Uses 1, 2 and 3 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.
23. Potassium dichromate-Brenntag (2 uses) (PD_Brenntag)	

<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions on Uses 1 and 2 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>
24. Dichromium tris(chromate)-Henkel (2 uses) (DtC_Henkel)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions on Uses 1 and 2 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>
25. Strontium chromate-Akzo Nobel (2 uses) (SC_Akzo)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions on Uses 1 and 2 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>
26. Potassium hydroxyoctaoxidizincatedichromate-PPG (2 uses) (PH_PPG)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinions.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinions on Uses 1 and 2 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>
27. Potassium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (2 uses) (PD_Gentrochema)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented an update on the progress with the opinion development.</p>	
28. Sodium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (3 uses) (SD_Gentrochema)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented an update on the progress with the opinion development.</p>	
29. Chromium trioxide-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (1 use) (CT_Circuit)	
<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>
30. Arsenic acid-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (1 use) (AsA_Circuit)	
<p>SEAC rapporteurs presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC draft opinion.</p> <p>SEAC agreed on the draft opinion by simple majority. Minority view will be reflected in the</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>

minutes.	
c) Adoption of final opinion	
1. Chromium trioxide-Kromatek (1 use) (CT_Kromatek)	
SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinion. SEAC adopted the final opinion 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.
2. Chromium trioxide 1 (6 uses) (CT_Lanxess)	
SEAC rapporteur presented and SEAC discussed the SEAC final opinions. SEAC adopted the final opinions for Uses 1 to 6 by consensus.	Rapporteurs , together with SECR, to do the final editing of the adopted opinions. SECR to send the final opinions to the Commission, Member States and the applicant.
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/32/2016/06 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 S-CIRCABC IG.
8. Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-32	
SEAC adopted the action points and main conclusions of SEAC-32.	SECR to upload the action points and main conclusions to S-CIRCABC IG.

III. List of Attendees

SEAC-32

SEAC members
ALEXANDRE Joao
ALEXANDROPOULOU Ioanna
BERGS Ivars
BRIGNON Jean-Marc
CASTELLI Stefano
COGEN Simon
CSERGÓ Robert (co-opted)
DELCOURT Benjamin
DRAKE Lars (co-opted)
FANKHAUSER Simone
FOCK Lars
FURLAN Janez
GEORGIOU Stavros
GRANDI Silvia (via WebEx)
HENNIG Philipp (co-opted)
JONES Derrick (co-opted)
KAJIĆ Silva
KIISKI Johanna
KNOFLACH Georg
KRAJNC Karmen
LOČS Jānis
LUIT Richard
LUTTIKHUIZEN Cees
LÜDEKE Andreas
MEXA Alexandra
NARROS SIERRA Adolfo
NICOLAIDES Leandros
NORING Maria

Advisors, invited experts, observers & dossier submitters (DS)
BERNHEIM Teresa (via webex to Hennig Phillip)
BUHARU Irina (via webex to Lars Fock)
CARFI Francesca (to CASTELLI Stefano)
DOMINIAK Dorota (advisor to I. Rydlewska-L.)
JONGENEEL Rob (advisor to R. Luit)
MARTINUSSEN SNEVE Marie (advisor to T.M. Sletten)
RAMOS Sergio (via webex to Adolfo Narros)
SIGNE Anton (via WebEx to Lars Fock)
THEODORI Demi (via WebEx to Richard Luit)
Winthers Toke (dossier submitter for DK agenda point 5.2a-1 TDFAs)
GRANDI Silvia
RAC (co-)rapporteurs
SCHULTE Agnes
VARNAI Veda
BARANSKI Boguslaw
CHIURTU Elena
MULLOOLY Yvonne
KAPELARI Sonja
PRONK Marja
HAKKERT Betty
BJORGE Christine
RUCKI Marian
UŽOMECKAS Žilvinas
DUNAUŠKIENE Lina
TOBIASSEN Lea-Stine
SANTONEN Tiina
MOELLER Ruth
VAN DER HAAR Rudolf
VIEGAS Susana
KADIKIS Normunds
SOGORB Miguel A.
STASKO Jolanta
HOPLAND Eivind
CARVALHO Joao
SCHLUETER Urs
JANKOWSKA Elzbieta
Stakeholder observers & accompanying experts
BUONSANTE Vito (ClientEarth)
JANOSI Amaya (CEFIC)
HAIDER Sonja (ChemSec)
WAETERSCHOOT Hugo (EUROMETAUX)

SEAC members (cont.)
OLTEANU Maria
SCHUCHTAR Endre
SLETTEN Thea Marcelia
SMILGIUS Tomas
STOYANOVA-LAZAROVA Elina
THORS Åsa
THIELE Karen
URBAN Klaus
Commission observers
BENGYUZOV Manol (DG GROW)
BERTATO Valentina (DG GROW)
CEIJAS NOGUERA Carolina (DG ENV)
GALLEGO Matteo (DG ENV)
PIRSELOVA Katarina (DG ENV)
PROKES Pavel (via WebEx)

SARGINSON Nigel (CEFIC expert)
ROMANO Dolores (EEB)
HOLLAND Mike (EAERE) (on 06/09)
KROESCHE Christoph (CEFIC expert)
ECHA staff
BERGES Markus
BLAINY Mark
DVORAKOVA Dana
JACQUEMIN Katline
KANELLOPOULOU Athanasia
KIVELÄ Kalle
ORISPAA Katja
MAJOROS Laszlo
TSIFOUTIS Vasileios
GILIOLI Roberto
KOSK-BIENKO Joanna
KOULOUMPOS Vasileios
MAZZOLINI ANNA
LOGTMEIJER Christiaan
LUDBORZS Arnis
MARQUEZ-CAMACHO Mercedes
MERKOURAKIS Spyridon
MOTTET Denis
NICOT Thierry
ORISPÄÄ Katja
ÖBERG Tomas
PELTOLA Jukka
PILLET Monique
KARJALAINEN Antti
HENRICHSON Sanna
REGIL Pablo
RHEINBERGER Christoph
ROGEMAN Maarten
SADAM Diana
AJAO Peter
SIHVONEN Kirsi
SIMPSON Peter
SOSNOWSKI Piotr
STOYANOVA Evgenia
VAINIO Matti
VAN HAELEST Anniek
KIOKIAS Sotirios

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
- ANNEX IV. Reference values for various health outcomes associated with exposure to hazardous substances (Appendix to the document SEAC/32/2016/05)

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

Document	Number
Final Draft Agenda	<i>SEAC/A/32/2016</i>
Report on SEAC-31 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies	<i>SEAC/32/2016/01</i>
AfA: Capacity Building The social cost of unemployment	<i>SEAC/32/2016/04</i>
AfA: Capacity Building Willingness-to-pay values for various health endpoints associated with chemicals exposure	<i>SEAC/32/2016/05</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for authorisation applications (closed session)	<i>SEAC/32/2016/06</i>
Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers (closed session)	<i>SEAC/32/2016/03</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>
FOCK Lars	5.2b-2 phthalates	Participation in the preparation of the restriction dossier
FOCK Lars	5.2b-1 TDFAs	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
CASTELLI Stefano	5.1.a-1 DMF	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier
CARFI Francesca	5.1.a-1 DMF	Working for the MSCA submitting the restriction dossier

Final Draft Agenda
32nd meeting of the Committee for Socio-economic Analysis

6 - 15 September 2016

ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)

6 September starts at 10.00
9 September breaks at 13.30
13 September resumes at 14.00
15 September ends at 12.00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

SEAC/A/32/2016
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-31 action points, written procedures and update on other ECHA bodies

SEAC/32/2016/01
For information

- b) Annual update of SEAC accredited stakeholders' list (closed session)

SEAC/32/2016/02
(restricted document)
For agreement

Item 5 – Restrictions

5.1 Restriction Annex XV dossiers

- a) Conformity check
 - 1) DMF – outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues
For agreement
- b) Opinion development
 - 1) TDFAs – first draft opinion
 - 2) 4 phthalates – first draft opinion
For discussion

5.2 Appointment of (co-)rapporteurs for restriction dossiers

SEAC/32/2016/03
(restricted document)
For agreement

Item 6 – Authorisation

6.1 General authorisation issues

- a) Update on incoming/future applications
For information
- b) The social cost of unemployment
SEAC/32/2016/04
For agreement
- c) Willingness-to-pay values for various health endpoints associated with chemicals exposure
SEAC/32/2016/05
For agreement

6.2 Authorisation applications

- d) Outcome of the conformity check and presentation of the key issues
 - 1. Diglyme_Merck
For agreement
- e) Agreement on draft opinions
 - 1. Chromium trioxide_SNECMA (1 use) (CT_Snecma)
 - 2. Chromium trioxide_MTU (2 uses) (CT_MTU)
 - 3. Chromium trioxide_ABLOY (1 use) (CT_Abloy)

4. Chromium trioxide_HOOGOSENS Court Roll Surface Technologies (1 use) (CT_Hoogovens)
5. Chromium trioxide_TOPOCROM GmbH (1 use) (CT_Topocrom)
6. Chromium trioxide_FN HERSTAL S.A. (2 uses) (CT_Herstal)
7. Chromium trioxide_GEHARDI KUNSTOFFTECHNIK GmbH (1 use) (CT_Gerhardi)
8. Chromium trioxide; Potassium dichromate; Sodium dichromate_SOURIAU SAS (7 opinions) (CT_PD_SD_Souriau)
9. Chromium trioxide_HAPPOC (4 uses) (CT_HAPOC)
10. Ammonium dichromate_VECO BV (1 use) (AD_Veco)
11. Sodium dichromate_TOTAL RAFFINERIE MITTELDEUTSCHLAND GmbH (1 use) (SD_Total)
12. Sodium dichromate_JACOBS DOUWEE EGBERTS DE GmbH (1 use) (SD_Jacobs)
13. EDC_BASF SE (2 uses) (EDC_BASF_2)
14. EDC_ELI LILLY S.A. (1 use) (EDC_Eli_Lilly)
15. EDC_DOW ITALIA S.R.L. (1 use) (EDC_Dow)
16. EDC_LANXESS Deutschland GmbH (2 uses) (EDC_Lanxess)
17. EDC_H&R OLWERKE SCHINDLER GmbH (1 use) (EDC_Olwerke)
18. EDC_GRUPPA LOTOS S.A. (1 use) (EDC_Lotos)
19. EDC_GE HEALTHCARE Bio-Sciences (1 use) (EDC_Bio-Sciences)
20. Technical MDA_POLYNT COMPOSITES France (2 uses) (MDA_Polynt)
21. EDC_EURENCO (1 use) (EDC_Eurenko)
22. Sodium dichromate-Brenntag (3 uses) (SD_Brenntag)
23. Potassium dichromate-Brenntag (2 uses) (PD_Brenntag)
24. Dichromium tris(chromate)-Henkel (2 uses) (DtC_Henkel)
25. Strontium chromate-Akzo Nobel (2 uses) (SC_Akzo)
26. Potassium hydroxyoctaoxidizedichromate-PPG (2 uses) (PH_PPG)
27. Potassium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (2 uses) (PD_Gentrochema)
28. Sodium dichromate GENTROCHEMA BV (3 uses) (SD_Gentrochema)
29. Chromium trioxide-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (1 use) (CT_Circuit)
30. Arsenic acid-Circuit Foil Luxembourg (1 use) (AsA_Circuit)

For discussion and agreement

f) Adoption of final opinion

1. Chromium trioxide-Kromatek (1 use) (CT_Kromatek)
2. Chromium trioxide 1 (6 uses) (CT_Lanxess)

For adoption

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

***SEAC/32/2016/06
(restricted room document)
For agreement***

Item 7 – AOB

- a) Update of the work plan
- b) Update on the Article 95(3) request to RAC
- c) Report from the SEA Workshop and OECD Workshop on CBA

For information

Item 8 – Action points and main conclusions of SEAC-32

Table with Conclusions and Action points from SEAC-32

For adoption

Reference values for various health outcomes associated with exposure to hazardous substances (Appendix to the document SEAC/32/2016/05)

Health outcome	Value (in 2012 €) ^a
Premature death (generic) ^b	€3,500,000 (lower value) €5,000,000 (higher value)
Cancer morbidity (generic) ^c	€410,000/case
Statistical pregnancy ^d	€21,600/case (lower value) €40,700/case (higher value)
Very low birth weight ^e	€126,200/case (lower value) €405,500/case (higher value)
Birth defect, minor ^e	€4,300/case (lower value) €41,800/case (higher value)
Birth defect, major external ^e	€25,700/case (lower value) €329,800/case (higher value)
Birth defect, major internal ^e	€128,200/case (lower value) €711,800/case (higher value)
Mild, acute dermatitis (two weeks) ^f	€227/case
Severe, chronic dermatitis (periodic flare ups) ^f	€1,800/year (lower value) €12,000/year (higher value)

Table notes:

^a 2012 is used as baseline year because the survey studies were conducted then. It should be noted though that the values need to be inflation-adjusted when used in applications for authorisations or restriction proposals;

^b This value represents the marginal trade-off between survival probability and income (also known as "Value of Statistical Life" or "Value of a Prevented Fatality"). Notably, the VSL values obtained in ECHA (2014c) are consistent with recent meta-analyses of VSL studies, see Section 4 of ECHA (2016) for references;

^c This value expresses the WTP to avoid any disutility caused by the cancer morbidity in addition to premature death, see ECHA (2014c) and Section 4 of ECHA (2016) for more details;

^d This value reflects the WTP of couples with infertility problems to conceive, see ECHA (2014b) and Section 3 of ECHA (2016) for more details;

^e Detailed descriptions of the symptoms evaluated are given in ECHA (2014b);

^f Detailed descriptions of the symptoms evaluated are given in ECHA (2014a).