MSC/M/78/2022
16 June 2022

Minutes of the 78th Meeting

of the Member State Committee

(MSC-78)

Wednesday 15 June
to Thursday 16 June 2022

Summary Record of the Proceedings and Conclusions and action points

Chair's opening address

The Chair, Katinka van der Jagt, welcomed all participants to the 78th MSC meeting. In her welcome she expressed her delight in seeing such a strong turnout in this first physical meeting after over two years, and also welcomed those connected remotely. While looking forward to a lively meeting she mentioned as few of the highlights of the meeting the discussion on the substance evaluation case that is to be agreed at this meeting and as another one the new tasks about a request for an MSC opinion in accordance with REACH Article 77(3) c on endocrine-disrupting properties of some bisphenols.

Agenda point	
Conclusions / agreements / adoptions	**Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)**
Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda	
The Agenda (MSC/A/78/2022) was adopted.	**SECR** to upload the adopted Agenda to Interact and the ECHA website as part of the MSC-78 minutes.
Item 3 – Declaration of specific interests to items on the Agenda	
No potential conflicts of interests were declared by the Chair, Deputy Chair, any members, experts, or advisers with any item on the agenda of MSC-78.	
Item 4 – Administrative issues	
• Outlook for MSC-79 • Interact: collaboration tool and security rules	
The Chair presented an outlook on the potential length of the virtual MSC-79 (October 2022) meeting, noting that MSC 80 is planned as a face-to-face meeting again. The Chair thanked MSC for adoption of the MSC opinion on the draft CoRAP update for 2022-2024 in written procedure in February and noted that it enabled smooth progress with the CoRAP update and timely start of evaluation of the substances assigned for this year. SECR informed MSC of the ongoing testing exercise of Interact Collaboration and of its plans to use the tool in the future. In addition, the latest Interact security rules approved by ECHA Management Board were introduced.	
Item 5 – Minutes of the MSC-76	
SECR informed the Committee that the minutes of MSC-76, adopted at that meeting, are published on Interact and on ECHA's website.	
Item 6 – Substance evaluation	
SEV-DE-001/2020: Bis(2-propylheptyl) phthalate (DPHP, EC 258-469-4) ***Session 1 & 2 (open & closed)*** A representative of the Registrants and an expert participated in the initial discussion. In the absence of specific confidentiality concerns in the draft decision (DD), an open session was held.	

The evaluating MSCA presented the case to the MSC, summarising the proposals for amendment (PfAs) received from MSCAs and ECHA. The PfAs submitters confirmed that their proposals were sufficiently addressed in the draft decision by the evaluating MSCA.

The Registrants had submitted written comments on the PfA and MSC duly considered them in its discussion.

The representatives of the Registrants restated their position that the requested amphibian metamorphosis assay (AMA) will not provide meaningful results and is technically not feasible due to the physico-chemical properties of the DPHP. They reiterated their view that the addition of acetone to the Sera Micron® powder will alter the consistency, therefore making the dissolution of DPHP difficult. According to them, it will not be possible to create a homogeneous DPHP-spiked food, and to maintain the nutritional quality of the food. Furthermore, they questioned the request of analytical measurement of metabolites MPHP and OH-MPHP. They reiterated their view that was expressed in their PfA comments that metabolism of DPHP in *Xenopus larvae* is not well understood, is not comparable to higher vertebrates including mammals, and that there is uncertainty as to whether the metabolites defined in the draft decision would occur or be relevant. They also referred, for the first time in the decision-making process, to an existing fish early-life stage (FELS) toxicity test (OECD TG 210) on DPHP where no adverse effects were observed but clarified that this FELS test did not investigate any endocrine disruption parameters. ECHA commented that since this FELS test did not investigate parameters for endocrine disruption, the data are not relevant to clarify the concern for endocrine disruption, especially in relation to the thyroid modality, which the request in the decision is aimed at addressing.

A stakeholder observer considered that there was no need to request an additional study on DPHP since the available information was already sufficient to conclude that DPHP is an endocrine disruptor for both human health and environment. The observer instead suggested to use read-across to DEHP and to a read-across and grouping approach with other phthalates. The representatives of the Registrants argued that in this case the use of the read-across and grouping approach is not necessary as there is sufficient data on the substance itself.

The MSC agreed that the available mammalian data raised a concern as to whether the Substance may act as an endocrine disruptor in the environment, and that further data was needed to clarify this concern. Furthermore, the MSC agreed that an AMA conducted with dietary exposure, including the additional test parameters introduced by the PfAs, was the most appropriate and least onerous approach to provide information to further clarify whether the Substance shows endocrine activity and related adverse effects in the environment via an interaction with the thyroid.

MSC agreed unanimously to the DD without further amendment at the meeting.

MSC reached unanimous agreement on the following ECHA draft decision without further amendment at the meeting: SEV-DE-001/2020: Bis(2-propylheptyl) phthalate (EC 258-469-4)	**SECR** to upload on Interact the agreed decision in the respective case agenda points. The registrants will be informed via email after MSC-78.

6.3. General topics

SECR presented learnings from the Substance Evaluation (SEv) written procedure and meeting cases, specifically:

- Highlighting the inclusion of a reflection on the Xenopus Eleutheroembryonic Thyroid Assay (XETA, OECD TG 248), which was not present in SEv draft decisions previously referred to MSC.
- The challenges experienced with addressing the Registrant(s) written comments on the proposals for amendment (PfAs) with regards to identifying the relevant PfA associated

with each comment and ensuring that all relevant comments are addressed within the appropriate sections of the draft Decisions.
- Reminder to structure Proposals for Amendment (PfAs) according to the recommendations provided in ECHAs Instruction's for MSCAs (version 1.4) available in S-CIRCABC.
- Informed on ECHAs recent launch of Interact collaborations to support the evaluating MSCAs during their initial 12-month evaluation of the CoRAP 2022 cases and invited feedback on use of the tool.

MSC took note of the learnings and recommendations.	

Item 7 – Dossier evaluation[1]

7.3. General topics

2. Suggestions from members
    a. Mutagenicity testing strategy: Re-examination of the *in vivo* follow-up for chromosomal aberration *(Partly closed session)*

In this meeting, MSC continued the discussion on the proposal on the use of the Chromosome Aberration (CA) test under REACH initiated in MSC-74.
At MSC-74, the DK MSC member gave a presentation introducing the topic. The MSC was supportive of the tentative proposal. The DK MSC member agreed to prepare a discussion paper for MSC-75, in collaboration with experts volunteered by MSC members and regular stakeholder observers.
At MSC-75 DK MSC member presented the main points from the discussion paper, prepared with the assistance of the *ad hoc* working group formed after MSC-74. The paper proposed to remove the option to request for CA test *in vitro* and to reconsider the use of CA test *in vivo* in ECHA decisions under REACH. The paper proposed to request in most situations the combined *in vivo* comet and micronucleus (MN) assay, when a CA concern is the only identified concern.
At MSC-75, MSC supported, in principle, the options presented in the document.
With regards to *in vitro* MSC supported the removal of the option to request for CA test *in vitro* in ECHA decisions. SECR was given the task to perform an analysis to the test results for substances in ECHA database for which reliable data for both *in vitro* MN test and *in vitro* CA test are available, to substantiate further the decision.

At this meeting, MSC re-confirmed the support expressed at the MSC-75, concluding the *in vitro* discussion.

The discussion at this meeting focused on which *in vivo* test would be appropriate to request when a CA concern is the only identified concern from the *in vitro* studies under Annex VII and VIII. The DK MSC member presented the main points from a paper titled "Re-examination of the *in vivo* follow-up for chromosomal aberration". The document is supported by participating experts of the *ad hoc* working group (from ECHA, EFSA, Norway, Austria, Germany, Sweden, and the Netherlands). As a generic principle, the DK MSC member proposed for ECHA to request the combined *in vivo* comet and MN assay as a follow-up for substances with exclusively a CA concern, with 2 exceptions:

1. If it is established that the substance is not aneugenic, the comet assay can also be requested as an acceptable alternative, as MN data is not strictly needed to clarify the concern.

2. it is established that the concern is only aneugenic, a MN test is the only valid test for *in vivo* follow-up as discussed in the open session document.

With the caveat that substance specific reasons could justify deviating from the generic principle.

[1] No cases were for discussion at the meeting. The list of cases agreed in MSC Written Procedure is available in the Appendix at the end of the Agenda

To guide the discussion the document posed three questions to the MSC members:

1. Should ECHA request the combined MN and comet study as a follow-up for substances with a CA concern (with the two mentioned exceptions)?

2. Should centromere staining be requested in case of positive results in the *in vivo* MN tests when:
   - The CA mode of action is unknown or,
   - Both modes of action (clastogenicity and aneugenicity) are possible?

3. When requesting an *in vivo* MN test in an ECHA decision, should ECHA request evidence of exposure of target tissue (blood samples taken at appropriate times and measurement of the substance/metabolites if exposure cannot be demonstrated through other means)? If so, should this also apply to requests for an *in vivo* MN test that is combined with a comet assay?

In vitro MSC took note of the findings from the data analysis for *in vitro* tests data in ECHA database and supported the consideration of the SECR that the analysis does not have an impact on the further discussions on this topic. MSC re-confirmed the support expressed at MSC-75 to: • Remove the choice between the *in vitro* chromosomal aberration (CA) test and the *in vitro* micronucleus (MN) test from ECHA decisions, and request solely the *in vitro* MN test. • Request two positive controls using known clastogenic and aneugenic substances. • Request, the assessment of the aneugenic potential of the tested substance. by **using a centromere staining** in case of a positive ***in vitro*** MN test result. MSC noted that valid data from CA *in vitro* tests, if available, will still be in line with the REACH Regulation information requirements. *In vivo* MSC noted the proposals for *in vivo* testing strategy to follow-up the different scenarios where the concern is solely for CA. With regards to the first exception referred above, MSC concluded that if it is established that the substance is not aneugenic, the comet assay alone will not be requested as an alternative. In such cases, the combined MN and comet study was considered the most	**SECR** to implement the agreed approaches for *in vitro* and *in vivo* testing in the text of new DEv draft decisions to be sent to the Registrants from September 2022 and disseminate this new approach via the ECHA's website.

appropriate. The combined comet and MN study may identify more genotoxic substances than a comet assay performed alone, and the comet assay, being only an indicative/ genotoxicity test, would have less weight for CLP assessment. MSC agreed: - To request an *in vivo* MN assay if a substance is only aneugenic - To request the combined *in vivo* comet and MN assay when clastogenicity is identified as a concern, either alone or in combination with aneugenicity, or if the mode of action is unknown. - That substance specific reasons could justify deviating from the generic principle above. - That a request for an *in vivo* MN assay, alone or combined with comet assay, shall include: • Centromere staining, in case of a positive result, when CA mode of action is unknown or both CA modes of action are possible • Investigation of exposure of target tissue (with blood samples taken at appropriate times and measurement of the substance/ metabolites if exposure cannot be demonstrated through other means, as described in the OECD 474 test guideline). MSC agreed that these general principles are also applied when a Testing Proposal is submitted to follow-up on an exclusively CA concern. MSC agreed that the new approach will be applied to future cases.	
Item 9 – ECHA's recommendations of priority substances to be included in Annex XIV and opinion of MSC	
1. Invitation for volunteers for the Rapporteurship in drafting the opinion of the MSC on ECHA's draft 11th recommendation for inclusion of substances into Annex XIV • Draft Terms of Reference and appointment of the Rapporteur and Co-Rapporteur • Possible establishment of a MSC Working Group to support the Rapporteur 2. Summary of the comments received during the consultation of the 11th draft recommendation of priority substances and the next steps	
Under sub-item 2 SECR presented some highlights from the comments received during the consultation of interested parties (2 February - 2 May 2022) on ECHA's draft 11th recommendation for 8 substances: – Ethylenediamine (EDA)	

- 2-(4-tert-butylbenzyl) propionaldehyde
- Lead
- Glutaral
- 2-methyl-1-(4-methylthiophenyl)-2-morpholinopropan-1-one
- 2-benzyl-2-dimethylamino-4'-morpholinobutyrophenone
- Diisohexyl phthalate
- Orthoboric acid, sodium salt

MSC was also informed that non-confidential comments have been published on the ECHA website. Vast majority of the comments were on lead, from many different sectors, and half of the substances did not receive any comments. Comments were presented in a brief summary format grouped to priority and general issues, comments on dates and exemption requests. As regards the next steps, SECR will provide its draft responses, updated prioritisation table and LAD assignments to MSC by end of October, enabling MSC opinion-development with the target of having the first discussion on the draft opinion at MSC-80.

MSC adopted the mandate and the tasks of the rapporteur and appointed one member as the Rapporteur and another member as the Co-Rapporteur for drafting the opinion of the MSC. The absence of any specific interests will be confirmed in writing as part of the appointment process. MSC established a working group with a defined mandate to support the rapporteurs and appointed [two] members to it, in addition to the rapporteur and co-rapporteur. MSC took note of the highlights presented and the planned next steps.	**SECR** to send the appointment letters to the Rapporteur and the Co-Rapporteur after the meeting. **Rapporteur** to plan the work with the Working Group. **SECR** to share the outcome of its assessments of the comments and registration updates with MSC by end of October 2022.

Item 11 - Item 11 – Request to MSC for an opinion in accordance with Article 77(3) c of REACH Regulation

a. Introduction of the ECHA's Executive Director's request for an MSC opinion to RAC on endocrine disrupting properties of some bisphenols

b. Time plan for the MSC opinion development

c. Task for the Rapporteur in drafting the opinion of MSC and appointment of Rapporteur

d. Presentation on assessment of endocrine disrupting properties for environment of bisphenol F, bisphenol AF and eight BPAF salts.

Two members were appointed as the Rapporteur and the Co-rapporteur for the MSC opinion development on endocrine disrupting properties for environment of bisphenol F, bisphenol AF and eight BPAF salts. A third member will provide support, where needed. Time plan for the MSC opinion development was agreed by the MSC. The MSC opinion is foreseen to be adopted at MSC-80.	Actions to SECR, the dossier submitter, the Rapporteur and the MSC as described in the time plan for the MSC opinion development.

Item 12 – Any other business

3. Update on appeals and court cases of relevance to MSC

SECR gave an update of the judgements of the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in Case C-876/19 P and of the General Court in Case T-636/19 dismissing actions challenging ECHA SVHC identification decisions of Bisphenol A and 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propionic acid, its salts and its acyl halides. SECR also gave an overview on new and pending appeal and court cases on SVHC identification and Evaluation. SECR further gave a short summary on its approach towards provision of substantial new information (in particular tonnage band updates) during the compliance check process. A brief update on a new court case and appeal case was provided in a closed session to the members only.	
3. Update on One Substance One Assessment SECR gave a progress update regarding the One Substance, One Assessment approach which is aimed at a more coherent and transparent safety assessment of chemicals across all relevant legislations. Several coordination mechanisms and the CLP revision enhancing centralised hazard assessment were mentioned as steps towards this. It was mentioned that re-attribution of tasks could also contribute to that aim. A legislative proposal on data to better streamline the flow of chemical data between EU and national authorities would also play an important role.	
Item 13 – Adoption of summary record of the proceedings and conclusions and action points	
Table with summary record and conclusions and action points from MSC-78	
MSC adopted the Summary Record of the Proceedings and Conclusions and Action points by consensus at the plenary meeting.	**SECR** to upload the Summary Record of the Proceedings and Conclusions and Action points from MSC-78 on Interact as well as ECHA website without undue delay.

II. List of attendees

Members/Alternate members
ALMEIDA, Inês (PT)
ATTIAS, Leonello (IT)
BARTHELEMY-BERNERON, Johanna (FR)
BALCIUNIENA, Jurgita (LT)
CONWAY, Louise (IE)
DUDRA, Agnieszka (PL)
ELLUL, Nathanael (MT)
FERNANDEZ SANCHEZ, Raquel (ES)
FINDENEGG, Helene (DE)
FILIPOVA, Hristina (BG)
GYMNAOU, Panagiotis (CY)
HJORTH, Rune (DK)
JANTONE, Anta (LV)
KOUTSODIMOU, Aglaia (EL)
KOZMIKOVA, Jana (CZ)
KULHANKOVA, Pavlina (CZ)
KUROVA, Martina (SK)
LOVRIC, Zdravko (HR)
MALKIEWICZ, Katarzyna (SE)
MENARD SPRČIČ, Anja (SI)
MIHALCEA UDREA, Mariana (RO)
RISSANEN, Eeva (FI)
SAKSA, Jana (EE)
STOCKER, Eva (AT)
TÁRNOCZAI, Timea (HU)
TEKPLI, Nina Landvik (NO)
TREZZI, Jean (LU)
VAN BERLO, Damien (NL)
VANDERSTEEN, Kelly (BE)
Representatives of the Commission:
KOBE, Andrej (DG ENV)
CERIDONO, Mara (DG ENV)
Observers
ARROYO, Jesus (Cefic)
BERNARD, Alice (ClientEarth)
CINGOTTI, Natacha (HEAL)
DROHMANN, Dieter (ORO)
DREVE, Simina-Virginia (FECC)
ENGELBRECHT, Vera (PETA)
LENNQUIST, Anna (ChemSec)
LOONEN, Helene (EEB)
NIEMELÄ, Helena (Concawe)
PROCHAZKA, Erik (CFE)
WAETERSCHOOT, Hugo (Eurometaux)
ECHA staff
AJAO, Charmaine
ANAGNOSTAKIS, Konstantinos
ANASTASI, Audrey Anne
BOUHIFD, Mounir
BROERE, William
CARLON, Claudio
HERBATSCHEK, Nicolas
JOHANSSON, Matti
JUTILA, Arimatti
KARKOLA, Sampo
KIMERSTORFER, Karin
LE CURIEUX, Frank
LUOMA, Leena
PELLIZZATO, Francesca
RÖNTY, Kaisu
SOBANSKI, Tomasz
VAHTERISTO, Liisa
VAN DER JAGT, Katinka
VIEIRA LISBOA, Duarte
WALKER, Lee
WOOD, James

Apologies
GRIZELJ, Romana (HR)
PALEOMILITOU, Maria (CY)
SPURIENE, Otilija (LT)
STOYANCHEVA, Galya (BG)

Proxies
-

Experts and advisers to MSC members
ALIVERNINI, Silvia (IT) (Expert to ATTIAS, Leonello)
ARABI, Azadeh (SE) (Expert to MALKIEWICZ, Katarzyna)
ARNING, Jurgen (DE) (Expert to FINDENEGG, Helene)

BAUMBUSCH, Angelika (NO) (Expert to TEKPLI, Nina Landvik)
BOLWIG, Asger (DK) (Expert to HJORTH, Rune)
CATONE, Tiziana (IT) (Expert to ATTIAS, Leonello)
CIESLA, Jacek (PL) (Expert to DUDRA, Agnieszka)
COPOIU, Oana (RO) (Expert to MIHALCEA UDREA, Mariana)
DANNENBERG, Carl (DE) (Expert to FINDENEGG, Helene)
DE KNECHT, Joop (NL) (Expert to VAN BERLO, Damien)
DOBRAK-VAN BERLO, Agnieszka (BE) (Expert to VANDERSTEEN, Kelly)
EINOLA, Juha (FI) (Expert to RISSANEN, Eeva)
GÜNDEL, Ulrike (DE) (Expert to FINDENEGG, Helene)
HÖLZL, Christine (AT) (Expert to STOCKER, Eva)
HORSKA, Alexandra (SK) (Expert to KUROVA, Martina)
HOULIHAN, Margarete (IE) (Expert to CONWAY, Louise)
JÖHNCKE, Ulrich (DE) (Expert to FINDENEGG, Helene)
KAARTINEN, Tomi (FI) (Expert to RISSANEN, Eeva)
KASSNER, Franziska (DE) (Expert to FINDENEGG, Helene)
KOZMIKOVA, Jana (CZ) (Expert to KULHANKOVA, Pavlina)
LUNDBERGH, Ivar (SE) (Expert to MALKIEWICZ, Katarzyna)
MARTIN, Nellie (DK) (Expert to HJORTH, Rune)
MÜHLEGGER, Simone (AT) (Expert to STOCKER, Eva)
REHRL, Anna-Lena (AT) (Expert to STOCKER, Eva)
UNKELBACH, Christian (Expert to FINDENEGG, Helene)
VOLUJEVIC, Beata (LT) (Expert to BALCIUNIENA, Jurgita)
WAGENER, Alex (LU) (Expert to TREZZI, Jean)
ZELJEZIC, Davor (HR) (Expert to GRIZELJ, Romana)

III Final Agenda

Final Agenda
78th meeting of the Member State Committee

15-16 June 2022
ECHA Conference Centre
Telakkakatu 6, in Helsinki, Finland

15 June: starts at 10:00 am
16 June: ends at 4:00 pm

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

MSC/A/078/2022
For adoption

Item 3 – Declaration of specific interests to items on the Agenda

Item 4 – Administrative issues

- Outlook for MSC-79

For information

Item 5 – Minutes of the MSC-76

- Adopted minutes of MSC-76

MSC/M/76/2021
For information

Item 6 – Substance evaluation

Closed session for 6.2

1. **Introduction to and preliminary discussion on draft decisions on substance evaluation when amendments were proposed by MS-CA's/ECHA *(Session 1, open session)*:**

MSC code[1]	Substance name	EC/List number / Documents
SEV-DE-001/2020	Bis(2-propylheptyl) phthalate	258-469-4 ECHA/MSC-78/2022/006-7 ECHA/MSC/I/2022/003

For discussion

2. **Seeking agreement on draft decisions when amendments were proposed by MS-CA's/ECHA *(Session 2, closed)***

Cases as listed under 6.1

For agreement

3. General topics

Learnings from SEV Written procedure cases

For information

Item 7 – Dossier evaluation

Partly closed session for 7.3

1. Introduction to and preliminary discussion on draft decisions on compliance checks and testing proposals when amendments were proposed by MS-CA's *(Session 1, open session)*

No cases[2]

[For information and discussion]

2. Seeking agreement on draft decisions on compliance checks and testing proposal examinations when amendments were proposed by MS-CA's *(Session 2, closed)*

No cases

[For agreement]

3. General topics

1. Learnings from DEv Written procedure cases *(Partly closed session)*

For information

2. Suggestions from members:

Mutagenicity testing strategy: Re-examination of the *in vivo* follow-up for chromosomal aberration

ECHA/MSC-78/2022/008, 011
(Partly closed session)
For discussion and agreement

Item 8 – SVHC identification - Seeking agreement on Annex XV proposals for identification of SVHC

1. Seeking agreement on Annex XV proposals for identification of SVHC

No cases

[For discussion and agreement]

Item 9 – ECHA's recommendations of priority substances to be included in Annex XIV and opinion of MSC

3. Invitation for volunteers for the Rapporteurship in drafting the opinion of the MSC on ECHA's draft 11th recommendation for inclusion of substances into Annex XIV
   - Draft Terms of Reference and appointment of the Rapporteur and Co-Rapporteur

     ECHA/MSC-78/2022/004
     For decision
   - Possible establishment of a MSC Working Group to support the Rapporteur

     ECHA/MSC-78/2022/005

[2] List of cases agreed in MSC Written Procedure is available in the Appendix of this document.

For decision

4. Summary of the comments received during the consultation of the 11th draft recommendation of priority substances and the next steps

For information

Item 10 – Opinion of MSC on ECHA's draft update of the Community Rolling Action Plan

Not relevant for this meeting

Item 11 – Request to MSC for an opinion in accordance with Article 77(3) c of REACH Regulation

e. Introduction of the ED request for an MSC opinion to RAC on endocrine-disrupting properties of some bisphenols

ECHA/MSC-78/2022/001, 009, 010
For information and discussion

f. Time plan for MSC opinion development

ECHA/MSC-78/2022/002
For information

g. Task for the Rapporteur in drafting the opinion of MSC and appointment of Rapporteur

ECHA/MSC-78/2022/003
For discussion and decision

Item 12 – Any other business

Partly closed session

1. Update on appeals and court cases of relevance to MSC

(Partly closed session)
For information

2. Progress update on One Substance One assessment

For information

Item 13 – Adoption of summary record of the proceedings and conclusions and action points

- Table with summary record and conclusions and action points from MSC-78

For adoption

Outside plenary activity

Capacity building activity on NAMs

INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

Information documents are not allocated a specific agenda time but the documents are available on Interact MSC Meetings module before the meeting. Based on the listed documents and the meeting agenda, if any MSC member considers that information documents may merit a discussion under any agenda point, they should inform MSC Secretariat.

- Written procedure report on seeking agreement on draft decisions on substance evaluation (For members only)
- Written procedure report on seeking agreement on draft decisions on dossier evaluation (For members only)

APPENDIX to the MSC-78 agenda:
List of evaluation cases agreed by MSC in written procedure in advance of the MSC-78 meeting:

Substance evaluation

MSC code	Substance name	EC/List number
SEV-2-FR-017/2012	Octocrilene	228-250-8

Dossier evaluation

Compliance checks

MSC code	Substance name	EC/List No.
CCH-033/2022	Cashew (Anacardium occidentale) Nutshell Extract, Decarboxylated, Distilled	700-991-6
CCH-047/2022	Reaction mass of disodium 4-amino-3-[[4-[(2,4-diaminophenyl)azo]phenyl]azo]-5-hydroxy-6-(phenylazo)naphthalene-2,7-disulphonate and disodium 4-amino-3-[[4-[(2-amino-4-hydroxyphenyl)azo]phenyl]azo]-5-hydroxy-6-(phenylazo)naphthalene-2,7-disulphonate	916-632-3
CCH-065/2022	Di-tert-butyl 1,1,4,4-Tetramethyltetramethylene Diperoxide	201-128-1

Testing proposal examinations

TPE-044/2022	(octahydro-4,7-methano-1H-indenediyl)bis (methylene) diacrylate	255-901-3
TPE-051/2022	3-(isodecyloxy)propylammonium acetate	249-166-8

List of evaluation cases agreed by MSC in written procedure for MSC-77 round:

Compliance checks

MSC code	Substance name	EC/List No.
CCH-241/2021	Alkenes, C11-12, hydroformylation products, distn. residues	292-427-6
CCH-242/2021	Alkenes, C11-12, hydroformylation products, low boiling	932-235-8
CCH-243/2021	Alkenes, C13-14, hydroformylation products, distn. residues	292-429-7
CCH-244/2021	Alkenes, C13-14, hydroformylation products, low boiling	932-284-5
CCH-245/2021	Decene, hydroformylation products, low boiling	938-875-4
CCH-246/2021	Decene, hydroformylation products, high boiling	935-454-7
CCH-280/2021	N,N'-(methylenedi-p-phenylene)bis (aziridine-1-carboxamide)	231-034-6
CCH-281/2021	4,4'-methylenedi-2,6-xylenol	226-378-9

SVHC identification[i]

No cases

[i] SVHC proposal for N-(hydroxymethyl)acrylamide (EC No. 213-103-2, Cas 924-42-5) was not referred to MSC but is added to the Candidate List without MSC involvement.