Chairman: *Guy Ethier* (Umicore)
Co-Chairman: *Mark Raffray* (Johnson Matthey)

12 June 2014, 10:00 – 17:00
Kongress + Kursaal Bern (Vivace 1 & 2 meeting rooms)
Kornhausstrasse 3, CH-3000 Bern 25, Switzerland

Minutes
AP refer to Action Points listed at the end of the document

1. Welcome and introduction

1.1. Reminder on Confidentiality and Competition Law. Participants were reminded on their obligation to comply with confidentiality and Competition Law.

1.2. Tour de table, apologies and quorum. The list of participants is available in Annex 1. The minimum quorum was reached and the meeting was hence quorated and the decisions taken valid.

1.3. Approval of the Agenda. The agenda (Annex 2) was approved. Under item 5, REACHLaw was invited to present item 5.4 before items 5.1 to 5.3, right after lunch time. The slides presented during the meeting are available in Annex 3. A list of acronyms was made available to the participants.

1.4. Status of the actions agreed at 4 Dec 2013 Assembly meeting. All actions were finalised, addressed during the meeting, or on-going (AP5, 9, 11 and 12) except action 11 (Identify LR for remaining PM CN-). Though this action is not urgent (a sample provider is available and the registration dossiers are not yet ready for submission) it should not be left aside as it is associated with a number of administrative and communication steps (e.g. formal approval of LR in PMC, in the SIEF, and notification to ECHA) which may take several months.

1.5. Approval of minutes of 4 Dec 2013 Assembly meeting. The minutes were approved.

2. PMC Membership news

2.1. PMC Chairmanship. Cf. slide 9 of Annex 3. The members of the Management Committee were invited to propose nominees for the (co-)chairmanship of PMC (AP1).

2.2. A zoom on nanomaterials under REACH. Cf. slides 11-13 of Annex 3. Nanomaterials are on the radar screen of various discussions and initiatives at EU level. The recommended definition by the Commission is subject to review (by JRC), the Commission is collecting views via a public consultation on the best possible approach to collating and sharing nanomaterials information with the public at EU level (e.g. EU inventory?), and ECHA and the Commission are developing a proposal to clarify how nanomaterials must be registered under REACH. PMC is following the three matters via Eurométaux and CEFIC and has participated in two public consultations already (AP6). Next milestones are to be expected as from Sep 2014, when the relevant EU bodies issue final proposals for vote.

2.3. Classification updates, CLP notification updates, and TSCA 8(e) notifications. Cf. slides 14-16 of Annex 3. PMC reviews and updates as necessary the classifications of all substances and intermediates in scope. The reviews are done using the output of the literature searches and testing programmes. Updated classification or effects assessments are notified to the CLP inventory and TSCA, to cover both EU and US notification obligations. Members were reminded that notification obligations in other jurisdictions are to be handled by companies themselves.

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – B-1150 Brussels
E-mail: info@epmf.be Website: www.epmf.be

Chairman: *Guy Ethier* (Umicore)
Co-Chairman: *Mark Raffray* (Johnson Matthey)

12 June 2014, 10:00 – 17:00
Kongress + Kursaal Bern (Vivace 1 & 2 meeting rooms)
Kornhausstrasse 3, CH-3000 Bern 25, Switzerland

3. Overall PMC project management

Cf. slides 17-25 of Annex 3. R. Nicolay, project manager of PMC, presented the improved approach taken by PMC towards project management using Microsoft Project. Although the output appears to be complex and burdensome to prepare and keep up to date, the Secretariat confirmed that the tool is used in a pragmatic, cost-effective, and proportionate manner in order to keep track of key developments, interdependencies, and possible bottlenecks, to anticipate resource (human and money) and time needs in each project and across projects, as well as to handle and mitigate risks.
The tool aims at better controlling the projects and communicating about project progress, and is hence designed to make PMC Members' involvement in and follow-up of PMC activities simpler. Printouts of the highest levels of the project plan (including budget tracking) of each project will be made available to PMC Members regularly (AP3) while detailed versions will be used by the project managers themselves to keep track of more specific tasks.
Although participants acknowledged the lack of firm timings and the absence of concrete decision/influence power of PMC on these projects' progressions, it was agreed to produce similar project plans for the Ag, Refinables, and Authorisation projects (AP2).

4. Update on PMC registration projects

4.1. Ag: REACH vs Biocides, Substance Evaluation (SE), and Ag Financials

- **REACH vs. Biocides:** Ag is registered both under the Biocides Regulation and REACH in the EU. The effects dataset are different due to the scope of dataset that was used in each case (Biocides dossier is ~ 10 years older than the REACH dossier), and the interpretation of the results made by each team. The Biocides Ag dataset is currently under review by KEMI (Swedish Competent Authorities) while the REACH Ag dataset is under review by RIVM (Dutch Competent Authorities). KEMI is looking at both ENV and HH effects while RIVM seems to be focussing more on ENV effects. KEMI has submitted an intention to propose a harmonised classification for Silver Zinc Zeolite as Carc 2, Repr 1B, and STOT RE, among others. This classification could from there onwards, be applied to other silver materials and compounds. A conference call with the Ag Biocides Task Force representatives in order to compare datasets, and anticipate/collaborate on a response to the possible release of a CLH proposal from KEMI (AP7). Meanwhile, both Eurométaux have been informed on the need to monitor developments around Ag at RAC and MSC levels, and the PMC Secretariat monitors the CLH inventory on a weekly basis, using the ECHA Press Release as the main source of links to the various REACH and CLP lists and inventories.

- **Ag SE:** A second informal meeting between RIVM and PMC was held on 27 May 2014. The scope of the SE by RIVM does no longer include consumer uses and is clearly focussed on nanoAg and its relative ion and particle effect compared to other forms of Ag. The draft decision by RIVM may be shared informally with PMC in Jan 2015, before it is formally submitted to MSC in Mar 2015. Before that, PMC Secretariat does not anticipate any further work except responding to some homework questions from RIVM by e-mail. As from 2015, the need for additional information should become clearer, and may require PMC to launch further research, with or without other partners' collaboration (e.g. Ag Biocides TF, Unilever, etc.), though this will probably not commence effectively before receiving a final decision from RIVM/MSC/ECHA, hence not before 2016 (AP8).

- **Ag Project financials:** The preparation of the Ag dossier update required much more work that could be originally anticipated and planned budget-wise. Though the dossier could be prepared and submitted in time and reflecting latest recommendations on best practice to register nanomaterials under REACH, it resulted in an overspending of around 150.000 €,

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – B-1150 Brussels
E-mail: info@epmf.be Website: www.epmf.be

corresponding to ~ 5% of the total Ag expenses between 2007 and 2013. This informed PMC on the need to 1) determine for each post-registration project, a minimum reserve to be kept in-house, and 2) implement a better budget management system from consultancy proposal generation to P&L tracking (AP18). PMC Members agreed to retain 7,5 % of the total Ag project registration budget as a minimum reserve for this project. Because 2014 will be relatively calm, it was agreed to charge Ag members the 2013 budget surplus, 2014 expenses, and minimum reserve (~ 570.000 €) in an *ad hoc* invoice in Spring 2015 (cf. slide 37 for share per PMC Member), in addition to the regular invoices for 2015 (AP19).

4.2. Au & PM CN-: Update on project progress

Au:

- **Scope:** Two substances > 10 t/a; a survey will be conducted to determine whether or not nanoAu should be registered (AP9).
- **Testing programme ENV:** Only one study remains to be conducted (adsorption/desorption).
- **Testing programme HH:** Some grey areas around genotoxicity tests have recently been clarified (AP10) and allow the launching of the final steps of the HH testing programme (anticipated completion mid-2015).
- **(E-)TRV:** Will be calculated upon finalisation of above testing programmes, initial PNECs and DNELs anticipated by end 2014 and mid-2015, respectively.
- **Exposure assessment:** Needs PNECs and DNELs to be performed but in order to keep momentum and buffer time before registration deadline intact, use and exposure/emission data questionnaires will be circulated right after the relevant consultants have been identified and formally appointed (~ late summer/early autumn 2014).
- **Registration submission window:** Starting mid-2016 (AP4).

PM CN -:

- **Scope:** Still two LR missing (AP11).
- **Testing programme ENV:** Only one study remains to be conducted (adsorption/desorption), and read-across from Ag ion information will be used as justified.
- **Testing programme HH:** Some stability and homogeneity issues, and risk of HCN liberation during testing, have slightly delayed programme over the last months. Now these have been addressed and testing is ready to continue (anticipated completion second half 2015).
- **(E-)TRV:** Will be calculated upon finalisation of above testing programmes, initial PNECs and DNELs anticipated by end 2014 and mid-2015, respectively.
- **Exposure assessment:** Needs PNECs and DNELs to be performed but in order to keep momentum and buffer time before registration deadline intact, use and exposure/emission data questionnaires will be circulated right after the relevant consultants have been identified and formally appointed (~ late summer/early autumn 2014).
- **Registration submission window:** Starting mid-2016.
- The dates given above are based on the presented project plan. However, the project plan is to be updated and these dates may be postponed (AP4).

4.3. PGM: Update on project progress and bottlenecks

- **Scope:**
  - A survey will be conducted to determine whether or not nanoPt, nanoPd, etc. should registered (AP12).
  - One SID/Sameness discussion is pending for Diammonium hexachlororuthenate, which is the reference substance for the Ru testing programme (AP13).
  - One substance of interest to two consortia: Karstedt Catalyst. Requires setting

relevant collaboration agreements between PMC and Reconsile (Jun-Jul 2014, AP14). UVCB, not included in testing programme, but will make use of relevant Pt (compounds) dataset.
  - The classifications were updated to reflect the new testing results (available on EPMF website).
- **Testing programme Phys-Chem:** Outstanding tests will be initiated in summer 2014.
- **Testing programme HH:** Acute and repeated dose tests are ongoing in two laboratories (CiToxLab and LPT) for all PGM (not only DDP). As discussed above, the testing of Ru compounds is delayed (no definitive reference substance is available yet (AP13). A range of technically challenging supporting studies had to be conducted, such as analytical method development/validation, stability confirmation, dose-range-finding studies, etc. Detailed Gantt charts were set up for the repeated dose testing programme. Also, weekly study monitoring conference calls (cc) were set up with study monitors and laboratories. And regular decision-making meetings (e-mail and cc) with PGM tox experts were set up to manage this.
- **Testing programme ENV:** The DDP testing programme has been completed and the PNECs are currently being derived based on the test data. The testing programme on the other PGMs (5 substances; 10 tests) has started. Tests are scheduled to be completed in 2014.
- **(E-)TRV:** Will be calculated upon finalisation of the above testing programmes. Initial PNECs and DNELs are anticipated in early 2015 and mid-2016, respectively.
- **Exposure assessment:** Final PNECs and DNELs are required for a full assessment to be performed. We are currently conducting all work at this stage, in order to keep the momentum and buffer time before registration deadline intact:
  - Use and exposure/emission data questionnaires will be circulated after the Assembly meeting.
  - An environmental emissions monitoring programme to demonstrate safe use in sites at risk (by modelling) will be launched with WCA in Jul 2014.
  - An existing workplace exposure dataset has been shared by IPA and will be assessed by EBRC.
- **Registration submission window:** Starting mid-2016, with Pd and Pd compounds.
- The presented project plan is based on an optimistic completion of the testing programme; it will be updated to reflect a realistic completion of this programme (AP4).

4.4. Re: Recent activities and cost overview

- **Recent activities:** All dossiers but one (finalised but not required yet) were successfully submitted to ECHA. A spontaneous update of all dossiers is being prepared in order to respond to a compliance check request on Substance Identity (SID) from ECHA. Since no relevant findings were identified in the recent literature search for Re, the remainder of the dossiers can remain unchanged. MSDS contents have been prepared and will be discussed with the Re WG for finalisation in summer 2014.

- **Cost overview:** The cost overview, the 2015 budget, the 2016-2020 cost projection and the available reserves of the Re registration project indicate that:
  - 2015-2020 Re specific costs will be limited to permanent budget items corresponding to ~ 10.000 €/year.
  - The 2013 Re reserves will not be able to cover for the 2015-2020 Re budget needs (neither generic nor Re-specific).
  - The Re reserves cannot be credited back to Re members endlessly in order to ensure that 5% of the total Re registration project cost is retained as a minimum reserve in-house.

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – B-1150 Brussels
E-mail: info@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

Chairman: *Guy Ethier* (Umicore)
Co-Chairman: *Mark Raffray* (Johnson Matthey)

12 June 2014, 10:00 – 17:00
Kongress + Kursaal Bern (Vivace 1 & 2 meeting rooms)
Kornhausstrasse 3, CH-3000 Bern 25, Switzerland

4.5. Refinables: Recent activities and cost overview

- **Recent activities:** All dossiers updates for Refinables not fulfilling SCC were prepared on the basis of the multi-metallic approach developed under the umbrella of EM, and submitted to ECHA in Apr 2014. No feed-back from ECHA has been received since but it is anticipated from earlier discussions with ECHA that they will revert with questions and requests to refine SID, combined toxicity, indirect exposure or exposure of man via the environment, and potentially also validation testing. While ECHA reverts formally with such requests, consortia continue to prepare internally and in collaboration with other consortia.

- **Cost overview:** The cost overview, the 2015 budget, the 2016-2020 cost projection and the available reserves of the Refinables registration project indicate that:
  - 2015-2020 Ref specific costs can only be predicted at this stage, since the nature and timing of ECHA's actual requests is unknown today. Hence, Ref specific costs currently contain place-holders and are calculated as percentages of budgets of the previous years of work.
  - The 2013 Re reserves should in principle be able to cover for the 2015-2020 Ref budget needs, unless massive amounts of additional work (i.e. > 500.000 € worth of validation testing) is requested by ECHA.
  - The Ref reserves will be retained in-house to cover for the upcoming years' Ref budget needs + 7,5% minimum reserve retained in-house.

5. PMC & Authorisation

5.1. RCF: Update on latest status

With the withdrawal of the 5th recommendation list for Authorisation (which included Refractory Ceramic Fibres (RCF)), the use of RCF is temporarily out of risk of being actually subject to Authorisation. However, this temporary situation can only be sustained further if the best risk management option (RMO) for RCF is identified via a voluntary exercise from the manufacturers and users of these materials. As users of RCF, PMC Members will support the RMO exercise via Eurométaux and ECFIA, together with other user groups, and continue monitoring developments around RCF and Authorisation.

5.2. Hydrazine: Update on latest status

Post-meeting note: Though the flaws of the 5th recommendation list for Authorisation have not been resolved, ECHA insisted in generating a 6th list, which includes a batch of 21 substances of the Candidate List. Among these, hydrazine. In light of some evident opposition by Member States to repeat the mistakes of the 5th list, user groups should ideally mobilise the suppliers of the listed substances to prepare a comment to be submitted during the public consultation to be launched early September 2014. Because PMC represents only a small fraction of the amounts of hydrazine used in the EU, and because the PM-specific use of hydrazine is very much controlled, RMO, advocacy, and other initiatives would not carry a sufficient weight if they were carried on by PMC alone. Instead, the registrants of hydrazine and major user groups of hydrazine should be mobilised to identify and recommend an alternative to Authorisation. This needs to be done in summer 2014, before the public consultation on the 6th list is launched (AP15).

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – B-1150 Brussels
E-mail: info@epmf.be Website: www.epmf.be

Chairman: *Guy Ethier* (Umicore)
Co-Chairman: *Mark Raffray* (Johnson Matthey)

12 June 2014, 10:00 – 17:00
Kongress + Kursaal Bern (Vivace 1 & 2 meeting rooms)
Kornhausstrasse 3, CH-3000 Bern 25, Switzerland

5.3. PMC SVHC tracking initiative: Reminder

Though Authorisation has been on the REACH landscape since 2010, most of industry experts have focussed on Registration obligations and tend to forget that Authorisation affects industry from a completely new angle: users of substances are targeted under Authorisation. In order to assist PMC Members, PMC Secretariat is:

- Recommending its Members to keep track of the substances they manufacture, import, and use as such or in mixtures; and
- Tracking the various REACH & CLP initiatives which may result in substances of interest to the PM sector to become SVHC, be proposed for Authorisation, be listed for Authorisation, and be subject to Authorisation Application.

The PMC SVHC tracking list aims at combining the two tasks above into one source of information which would allow an efficient reach-out to those companies with direct interest and/or expertise in the use of substances which are not PM, and which may hence not be picked up by the PMC Secretariat alone. Members were once more reminded on their role to inform PMC Secretariat on the SVHC which are used/essential in the PM refining and production processes, and which hence require some level of monitoring and participation in collective initiatives and public consultations by PMC Secretariat (**AP16**).

5.4. Authorisation Application for industrial use of As2O3: Case-study

In recent Assembly meetings, Members have expressed concern about the lack of transparent and general understanding there is around Authorisation under REACH. Following the submission of first Authorisation Applications, including one by a PMC Member (Boliden), REACHLaw (Authorisation expert consultants working with Boliden) kindly agreed to present Boliden As2O3's case-study to PMC, in order to materialise the 'myth' of Authorisation into a more concrete work programme and deliverable.

Key takeaways from REACHLaw's courtesy presentation include:

- The submission of the Authorisation Application is only the start of the process as it is followed by numerous questions from RAC and SEAC.
- An Authorisation Application should be as clear and concise as possible; although all the supporting data and evidence should not be included in the Application as such, it should be carefully prepared and remain available in case it is requested.
- The exposure assessment done under a Registration is too generic to be used under Authorisation, which needs to nail down specific exposure conditions and measures for the applying entity(ies).
- The existence of an alternative does not infer on the legitimacy of an Authorisation Application: an alternative must meet the same technical function, be available, and economically feasible for the using company (company cases may differ here).
- If properly justified and demonstrated (no speculation and consistency in level of conservatism applied on each side of the balance), socio-economic benefits are truly given as much weight as (monetarised) health and environmental risks in the decision-making.
- The preparation of an Authorisation Application requires time and various sets of technical and business skills and expertise, ranging from R&D and production to REACH/EHS and top management.
- There is not 'one-fits-all' approach or cost to preparing an Authorisation Application; it will depend on the number of uses, the specificity or generality with which the use is described in each case, the complexity of the supply chain involved or affected, the number of applicants submitting jointly, etc.
- Key recommendations include: starting early, involving the top management, and engaging the supply chain.

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – B-1150 Brussels
E-mail: info@epmf.be Website: www.epmf.be

Chairman: *Guy Ethier* (Umicore)
Co-Chairman: *Mark Raffray* (Johnson Matthey)

12 June 2014, 10:00 – 17:00
Kongress + Kursaal Bern (Vivace 1 & 2 meeting rooms)
Kornhausstrasse 3, CH-3000 Bern 25, Switzerland

The Chair thanked REACHLaw and Boliden to share their experience and recommendations with PMC Members.

6. Financial items

6.1. Status of 2013 payments, accounts and reserves

- 2013 Payments: All received; one Member paid very late (Jun 2014).
- 2013 Accounts: Closed and audited successfully in March 2014 (circulated to PMC Members before the meeting).
- 2013 Reserves: Actual reserves calculated (following tentative prediction in Dec 2013) in March 2014 and partially credited back to PMC Members in 2014 invoices.

PMC Members approved the 2013 accounts status.

6.2. Status of 2014 invoices

- Invoices sent on 27 March 2014; by 2 Jun still 10 invoices remained unpaid (PMC Secretariat chasing remaining payments since (AP17)).
- 2014 expenses by 30 Apr basically reflect expenses in Mar and Apr only since some 2013 accounts received and paid in Mar were included in 2013 accounts.

6.3. Proposed 2015 budget for approval

- Proposed 2015 budget is available in slide 113 of Annex 3 (with total of 2.398.790 €). No objection was raised by the Assembly, which will finally vote on the budget at the next Assembly meeting (Dec 2014). The proposed 2015 PMC budget can be used for companies' internal budget planning, by considering the individual figures circulated before the Assembly meeting as a worst case amount.
- For those companies involved in Ag, their total 2015 share should be calculate as the 2014 *ad hoc* Ag invoice + the 2015 PMC.

A separate mail will be sent by PMC Secretariat with the anticipated amounts for 2015 per company (AP19).

6.4. Cost projection for 2015-2020

As requested by PMC Members at their Dec 2013 Assembly meeting, PMC Secretariat made an attempt at projecting 2015-2020 costs for the following budget items:

- Generic costs: it assumes the human resource requirements of PMC remain unchanged until 2018 and that in 2019-2020 the support from the project facilitator will no longer be required. As regards the cost/Member/year, it will remain more or less static between 2015 and 2018, and should decrease with the decrease of the Generic costs and possibly income of LoA costs as from 2019
- Re-specific costs: Cf. item 4.4 above.
- Ref-specific costs: Cf. item 4.5 above.

For projects for which Registration Dossiers are still under preparation, such a projection will be prepared by each Project Manager (AP20), once a proper budget management tool is developed and implemented with the support of the Mgmt Cttee (AP18).

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – B-1150 Brussels
E-mail: info@epmf.be Website: www.epmf.be

Chairman: *Guy Ethier* (Umicore)
Co-Chairman: *Mark Raffray* (Johnson Matthey)

12 June 2014, 10:00 – 17:00
Kongress + Kursaal Bern (Vivace 1 & 2 meeting rooms)
Kornhausstrasse 3, CH-3000 Bern 25, Switzerland

6.5. LoA prices as from Jul 2014 for approval

The original LoA price calculation approach in PMC (dated 2009) depended on a number of budget predictions which appeared to be inaccurate with time and experience. Though this approach was inevitable at the beginning of the REACH process, after close to eight years of experience, the approach was improved: predictions are replaced by confirmed budgets only; for immediate next years, the budget proposal is used; and for the years beyond blank are used instead of inaccurate predictions.

The improved approach was used to review the LoA prices for 2014 and resulted in unchanged amounts for all project-specific LoA, but an increased LoA price for generic costs (from 38.500 € to 68.750 € per legal entity). This reflects the generic costs invested by PMC Members per company since 2007.

It was agreed to:
AP21) Keep LoA prices as per 2012 for all projects and update the LoA price for generic costs to the price calculated in 2014, and
AP22) Let past LoA purchasers know about the increase of LoA price for generic costs, but inform them that the LoA price difference will not be charged retroactively yet, but in 2020, if when comparing the exact LoA price vs PMC Membership cost, a cost difference remains.

7. AOB[1], next meetings and closing remarks

- **AOB 1:** PMC Members were informed on situation faced by various consortia where non-Consortium Members or LoA purchasers are copying information from joint registration dossiers on the ECHA dissemination portal and submitting their own registration dossier to ECHA. Better enforcement of REACH OSOR principle by ECHA (REACH-IT) and national competent authorities has been requested by industry via various media. The issue should be resolved in 2016 but if it is not, PMC Members may want to retain their registration dossiers in-house until the actual applicable registration deadline instead of actioning an earlier dossier submission.
  Another issue to be considered before submitting a dossier is whether the dossier contains as much information as possible to assist a possible RMO exercise where the classification triggers a SVHC status. If there is sufficient time between the dossier finalisation and actual applicable registration deadline, the in-between time can be used to generate and put in format information that will be used to determine the best approach to control the remaining risks of the SVHC, including CLH, OEL, Restriction, Authorisation, etc.

- **AOB 2:** PMC continues to select the testing houses with which it works very carefully, ensuring that none of these are known to have questionable animal welfare practices, neither in the past or currently. Should a testing house be known for such practices:
  - For already commenced studies: terminate ASAP and conclude commercial relationship with testing house of concern
  - For not yet commenced studies: move work to another testing house

- **Next meetings:**
  - Brussels, 3 Dec 2014
  - Milan, 4 Jun 2015

- **Closing remarks:** The Chairmen announced the resignation of C. Braibant from her position in the

[1] Only items which do not require decision are allowed under AOB

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – B-1150 Brussels
E-mail: info@epmf.be Website: www.epmf.be

Chairman: *Guy Ethier* (Umicore)
Co-Chairman: *Mark Raffray* (Johnson Matthey)

12 June 2014, 10:00 – 17:00
Kongress + Kursaal Bern (Vivace 1 & 2 meeting rooms)
Kornhausstrasse 3, CH-3000 Bern 25, Switzerland

EPMF and PMC. C. Braibant was thanked for her dedication and hard working since 2007, and her pivotal contribution to the solid progress made to date by the Consortium. The Mgmt Cttee and EPMF Board will ensure that a temporary Secretariat and Trustee role is defined and implemented with the other officers of the EPMF/PMC, until a replacement is identified and recruited (expected to be in 2015).

Annexes:

1. Attendance List
2. Agenda
3. Slides

Table 1. Actions agreed at 12 Jun 2014 PMC Assembly meeting

	What?	Who?	When?
1.	Nominate Mgmt Cttee representatives to take on board (Co-)Chairmanship of PMC for 2016-2018 mandate	Mgmt Cttee	Q2 2015
2.	Prepare tentative project plans for Ag, Refinables and Authorisation projects of PMC	R. Nicolay with relevant managers	Dec 2014
3.	Include high-level project plan (in .pdf) of each project in bi-monthly updates circulations	A. Rondepierre	On-going
4.	Confirm realistic (versus optimistic) registration submission windows for Au, PM CN-, and PGM projects	R. Nicolay + K. Rothenbacher	Dec 2014
5.	Produce ID Cards for all PMC substances and intermediates in the order of registration, using Members' input and expertise	K. Arijs	On-going
6.	Submit PMC response to public consultation on a possible EU inventory of nanomaterials	C. Braibant	Jul 2014
7.	Compare effects datasets and anticipate/collaborate on a response to the possible release of a CLH proposal from KEMI with Ag Biocides TF	C. Braibant + K. Rothenbacher	Q3 2014
8.	Include place-holder for research work in 2016 budget, as discussed and agreed with the Ag WG and Mgmt Cttee	C. Braibant	Q1 2015
9.	Confirm scope of Au registration dossier: nano in or out? (Consult WGC if needed)	R. Nicolay	Q3 2014
10.	Document decision-making re genotoxicity testing of TCA	R. Nicolay	Q3 2014
11.	Identify LR for remaining PM CN-	R. Nicolay	B4 end 2015
12.	Confirm scope of PGM registration dossiers: nanos in or out? (Consult IPA if needed)	K. Rothenbacher	Q3 2014
13.	Update Mgmt Cttee on SID/Sameness discussions around diammonium hexachlororuthenate, progress of Ru testing programme, and overall impact on registration submission window for Ru and Ru compounds	K. Rothenbacher	Q3 2014
14.	Settle proper Memorandum of Understanding with Reconsile, in order to set legal framework to allow technical cooperation and dossier preparation	C. Braibant + A. Palmers	Q3 2014
15.	Contact and mobilise registrants of hydrazine and major user groups of hydrazine to identify and recommend an alternative to Authorisation (RMO), and prepare a collective response to the upcoming public consultation on the 6th recommendation list	R. Nicolay	Q3 2014
16.	Inform PMC Secretariat on the SVHC which are used/essential in the PM refining and production processes, and which require	PMC Members	On-going

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – B-1150 Brussels
E-mail: info@epmf.be Website: www.epmf.be

Chairman: *Guy Ethier* (Umicore)
Co-Chairman: *Mark Raffray* (Johnson Matthey)

12 June 2014, 10:00 – 17:00
Kongress + Kursaal Bern (Vivace 1 & 2 meeting rooms)
Kornhausstrasse 3, CH-3000 Bern 25, Switzerland

	What?	Who?	When?
	some level of monitoring and participation in collective initiatives and public consultations by PMC secretariat		
17.	Chase missing payments of 2014 invoices and inform Mgmt Cttee of late payers	A. Rondepierre	Q3 2014
18.	Develop and implement a better budget management system from consultancy proposal generation to P&L tracking with Mgmt Cttee	C. Braibant + A. Rondepierre	Q3 2014
19.	Circulate *ad hoc* mail to PMC Members informing them about likely 2015 invoice, including: 2014 Ag, and 2015	C. Braibant	Q3 2014
20.	Prepare budget projection for Ag, Au, PM CN-, and PGM projects	C. Braibant, R. Nicolay + K. Rothenbacher	Dec 2014
21.	Update LoA e-shop with 2014 LoA prices	A. Rondepierre	Q3 2014
22.	Prepare letter to let past LoA purchasers know about the increase of LoA price for generic costs, and inform them that the LoA price difference will not be charged retroactively yet, but in 2020, if when comparing the exact LoA price vs PMC Membership cost, a cost difference remains	C. Braibant	Q3 2014

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – B-1150 Brussels
E-mail: info@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be