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

4 December 2013, 10:30 – 16:00 CET
Metals Conference Centre – Rooms Copper & Aluminium
Rue du Duc 100, B-1150 Brussels, Belgium

Minutes

AP stands for Action Points listed at the end of the minutes

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 and apologies

The list of participants and apologies is available in Annex 2. The minimum quorum of 2/3 was reached and the meeting was hence quorated and the decisions taken valid. R. Drieselmann informed the participants that this would be the last PMC meeting in which he would participate as EPMF Treasurer, as this role has been transferred to Mark Bedford (who will be assisted by Robert Cleverley) (Johnson Matthey) as from 1 Jan 2014.

1.3. Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda (Annex 1) was approved. 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 actions agreed at and approval of minutes of the last meeting (Stockholm, 14 June 2013)

All actions were finalised, addressed during the meeting, or on-going (AP10, 11, and 19) except action 1 (PMC Members to clarify reasons for insufficient evidence of added-value of PMC membership vs LoA purchase). PMC Secretariat has received no feed-back on this item to date, but a brief reminder on the key differences between LoA and PMC Membership was provided under item 2.4 below.

2. PMC Membership news

2.1. Presentation of new colleague R. Nicolay, Project Manager

Following the approval of the proposal to increase the PMC Secretariat by an additional officer by the PMC Members in June 2013, R. Nicolay was hired and joined the Secretariat on 2 September 2013.

R. Nicolay introduced himself to the PMC Members, who welcomed him on board. R. Nicolay's key role will relate to Authorisation and PMC Project Management. Project plans should aim at providing sufficient overview on the project progress, resources allocation, critical paths, anticipated meeting of deadlines/possible plan diversions and their impacts. Additionally, he will act as secretariat for two PMC Registration projects, namely the Au and PM CN- projects.

The updated organogram of the PMC Secretariat is available in slide 8 of Annex 3. Further resource needs are not anticipated in the short term as the workload and competences/responsibilities are well distributed among the current PMC Secretariat

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

officers.

2.2. Nominations for the PMC Management Committee 2014-2017

The nominees listed on slide 10 of Annex 3 were formally elected as members of the Management Committee for the 2014-2017 mandate. Though G. Ethier and M. Raffray have agreed to remain as Chair and Co-Chair of the Mgmt Cttee during 2014, they aim at inviting other Mgmt Cttee members to step-up for that position as from 2015 (AP2).

2.3. New Members List

The latest version of the PMC Membership list is available in slide 12 of Annex 3. PMC membership has decreased from 47 to 45 Members following the mergers of the membership of: 1) Heimerle und Meule and SEMPSA, 2) Xstrata and Glencore. This will have an impact on the share of generic costs to be paid by each Member as from 2014 (as per the definition of 'Affiliate' provided in the Consortium Agreement).

Post-meeting note: *A similar situation may occur for KGHM Polska Miedz and KGHM Ecoren, which may result in a further decrease of total PMC membership from 45 to 44 Members (and the related impact on the share of the generic costs in 2014 too).*

2.4. PMC Cost-sharing formula

PMC Members were informed of a decision taken by the Management Committee in relation to a request from three PMC Members to:

1) modify the PMC cost-sharing formula → decision was taken to leave it unchanged as it remains fair, transparent and non-discriminatory
2) clarify the advantage of PMC Membership vs LoA purchase → cf. slide 15 of Annex 3.
3) review the LoA price → will be done by PMC Secretariat in Q1 2014, for approval by PMC Assembly in Jun 2014 (AP3).

Members had no objections to the decision of the Mgmt Cttee but suggested the following:

- Predict status of generic costs of PMC between 2014 and 2020 and present to the Assembly for discussion/approval (AP6)
- Ensure dossier update-related costs can be enforced onto LoA purchasers in that the right of PMC to issue additional invoices is explicitly mentioned in the LoA Agreement (AP4) and a token security number system should be available for dossier updates too (and not only for first time submissions) (AP5).

2.5. LoA sold in 2013

Slide 17 of Annex 3 shows the status of the LoA sold by PMC between 2010 and 2013 versus the anticipated number of LoA calculated on the basis of the 2018 LoA intentions surveys circulated to the SIEFs in 2009.

It was emphasized that LoA incomes are not anticipated every year, but rather around the three registration deadlines of REACH. Next comparable LoA incomes should not be expected before 2018.

As indicated under item 2.4 above, the prices of the LoA will be reviewed in Q1 2014. For the Re project, for which Registration (and MSDS, cf. item 4 below) work will be finalized by Q1 2014, the LoA price will be based on precise figures + contingency rather than on

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

predicted figures.

3. Preparing for Evaluation of Ag

3.1. Evaluation process

In preparation of the Substance Evaluation (SE) of Ag by The Netherlands REACH Competent Authorities (RIVM) in 2014, participants were briefed on the three evaluation processes under REACH and the key differences between these: examination of Testing Proposals, Compliance Check, and Substance Evaluation. The key messages were:

- Dossier Evaluation processes (examination of Testing Proposals and Compliance Check) may result in information requirements foreseen in the REACH regulation whereas Substance Evaluation may result in information requirements beyond typical REACH requirements.
- Registrants have only 30 days to react on draft decisions and proposals for amendments by ECHA, the evaluating MS, or MSC, in times which usually coincide with Winter and Easter holidays.
- For the Ag case, key timings are (AP8):
  - March – Jul 2014: period during which RIVM will be assessing the Ag risk assessment and potentially reverting with a request for a second informal exchange (first one took place on 20 Sep 2013)
  - Jan 2015: timing of release of RIVM's Draft Decision (DD) after it has been reviewed by ECHA; the deadline for registrants to comment on this DD will be 30 days after the release of the DD
  - Apr 2015: tentative timing of release of RIVM's reviewed DD, taking into account (or not) the registrants' comments, and MSC's Proposals for Amendments (PfA); the deadline for registrants to comment on this (reviewed DD) and PfA will be 30 days after the release of the reviewed DD and PfA
  - Jun 2015: tentative timing of release of RIVM's and MSC's Final Decision (FD) (to be ratified by ECHA and/or Commission)
  - > Jun 2015: tentative launch of generation of additional information requirements as per the FD
- All registrants of Ag should be actively monitoring their REACH-IT inboxes as ECHA may be actioning some information- or dossier update requests as part of a pre-SE compliance check procedure. ECHA's request may relate e.g. to the provision of sufficient characterisation information to demonstrate the nano or non-nano size of the registered Ag.

3.2. Joint dossier update

In preparation of the SE of Ag starting in March 2014, the Ag WG has been working on the preparation of the update of the joint dossier, in order to include nanoAg in the scope of the assessment, as well as the recent REACH-relevant information generated or identified in the literature. This has resulted in specific updates to the various sections of the IUCLID 5 file, as well as updating the exposure assessments, and finally the CSR and its annexes. A description of the content of this update work is available in slide 30 of Annex 3.

In addition to the update work, a review of the dossier update content by external reviewers (V. Verougstraete for human health sections, and H. Waeterschoot for environmental sections) has been launched too. The Silver Institute experts in the US have also been invited to provide their views on the dossier update content. This external

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

review aims at anticipating questions from the RIVM, by using experts who have not been involved in the preparation of the dossier or its update as closely as the Ag WG, the PMC Secretariat and its consultants. This external review should allow to include the relevant clarifications in the dossier update before the SE commences, and make RIVM's SE more efficient.

Furthermore, the PMC Secretariat is liaising with the Ag Task Force in charge of the Ag Biocide Dossier in order to: 1) agree on the scope of each dossier (REACH vs Biocide) and ensure no use is left out without a justified reason, 2) compare underlying environmental datasets and resulting PNECs, and 3) anticipate possible synergies between evaluation of Ag Biocide Dossier by the Swedish Competent Authorities (KEMI) and SE of the Ag REACH Dossier by RIVM. Ideally, a dataset approved by RIVM (considering that the SE is a quicker process than the evaluation of a Biocide Dossier) should not be questionable by KEMI.

Some work may not be available in time for the joint dossier update, because it involves longer-term research. The Ag WG has agreed on 'must have' and 'nice to have' items. All 'must have' items will be in the joint dossier update planned in February 2014 and available to RIVM for the SE starting in Mar 2014.

3.3. Individual dossier updates

The SE by RIVM may encompass a review of both the joint Ag dossier and the registrant-specific or individual Ag dossiers. The success of the Ag SE hence lies with all members of the Ag joint registration, who were all recommended to submit an individual dossier update before 1 March 2014 too.

Key elements that co-registrants should prepare to include in their individual dossier updates, and that were probably not included in previous version of their registration dossiers, are:

- Characterisation data: Ag registrants were strongly recommended to generate and include in section 1.4 of their IUCLID 5 file the composition, particle size, specific surface area, morphology, and coating information relevant for their Ag (in whatever form, but especially if they manufacture, import or place on the market powder forms, whether nano or non-nano). A PMC recommendation is available to guide them towards the most recommended techniques to generate this information (**AP9**).
- Estimated quantities per substance form: Registration Dossiers are the source of information used by ECHA and MS to select possible candidates for SVHC identification, and subsequent Authorisation, Restriction, etc. If the Registration Dossier does not provide sufficiently granulated information on the amounts manufactured, imported, or placed on the market for each form of a given substance, the total amount (default/worst case) will be used to decide upon the need to action further risk management measures on a given substance. This means that (nano)Ag may become subject to e.g. Restriction on the basis of the full tonnage of massive, powder, and nanoAg declared by all registrants. If each registrant stipulates the amount of nanoAg separately from the amount of other powders or massive Ag, and only small amounts of nanoAg are actually registered, the proposal to have a restriction on nanoAg may not proceed. This is valid for all substances where different forms, or classifications, or uses (intermediates, in articles without intended release, etc.) exist: the quantities per form, classification or use should be provided in the Registration Dossier.
- Information on mixtures: now that nanoAg has been included in the Ag Dossier, and knowing that nanoAg is more often used in mixture-type of products, this will require

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

registrants of nanoAg to pay specific attention to this section, which may not have been that relevant back in 2010 when nanoAg was not included in the Dossier.

4. Update on other PMC Registration Projects: Au, PM CN-, PGM, Re, and Refinables

- **Au**

With the addition of R. Nicolay to the PMC Secretariat, the Au project is now progressing with the same level of attention and speed as the other PMC projects.
Following the finalisation of the environmental toxicity tests, WCA is now deriving the PNECs that will scope the environmental exposure assessment needs.
The mammalian toxicity testing is on-going and required a few methodology developments with input from the Au Chemistry and Toxicology experts + feed-back from ECHA before the actual REACH tests could proceed (cf. slide 38 of Annex 3 for more technical details). These mammalian toxicity tests should be finalised by the end of 2014, following which DNELs will be calculated.
The exposure assessment is anticipated to start in 2015, and the dossier submission is currently scheduled to take place in late 2015/early 2016, ahead of the formal 2018 registration deadline applicable to the Au substances.
It was clarified that though Au metal is not hazardous, because it is registered in a tonnage band above 10 t/a, the registration of Au metal will include a CSR (but no ES). TCA however, because of its hazardous profile, will require a CSR and ES.
Based on the experience and learning lessons of the Ag project, the Au WG will be invited to consider whether nanoAu should be included in the registration dossier or not (AP10). The annual literature searches performed for this project will include nanoAu among the search items to capture possibly relevant information to assist with 1) the Au WG decision-making, and 2) the assessment of nanoAu should it be included in the dossier.

- **PM CN-**

With the addition of R. Nicolay to the PMC Secretariat, the PM CN project is now progressing with the same level of attention and speed as the other PMC projects.
Following the finalisation of the environmental toxicity tests, WCA is now deriving the PNECs that will scope the environmental exposure assessment needs.
The mammalian toxicity testing is on-going. The results of the skin sensitisation test is positive for potassium dicyanoaurate; although this unexpected result is currently being checked by the test house and the consultants to avoid confusion with irritation, this new hazard is subject to a TSCA 8(e) notification to the US EPA (AP12).
The next steps of the testing programme require an EHS check with the test house (and input from the PM CN Chemistry and Toxicology experts) before the actual REACH test could proceed (cf. slide 40 of Annex 3 for more technical details). These mammalian toxicity tests should be finalised by the end of 2014, following which DNELs will be calculated.
The exposure assessment is anticipated to start in 2015, and the dossier submission is currently scheduled to take place in late 2015/early 2016, ahead of the formal 2018 registration deadline applicable to the Au substances.

- **PGM**

The PGM project is the largest project of the PMC. Due to the large amount of substances/ tests involved, it is inevitable that a number of unexpected and sometimes time-critical issues arise, for example related to collection of confidential information, sameness discussions,

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

substance behaviour, testing method development, exposure monitoring needs, etc. Though registration is not due before 2018, this project in particular benefitted from having had an early start.
Sameness of PGM nitrates (presented as critical issue at June 2013 PMC Assembly meeting) has been resolved at a final ad hoc expert meeting in Aug 2013. This experience resulted in a proposal by the concerned companies to streamline the sameness discussion process by agreeing to share their spectra more freely. PMC Members approved this recommendation and it was agreed to use Sharepoint rather than e-mails for making substance spectra available to the experts participating in the sameness discussions (**AP1**).
As for sameness, the collection of information relevant for the ID Cards (which set the boundaries of each registration) suffers from significant delays. The chairpersons emphasized the need to timely provide this information upon request so all ID Cards can be finalised ASAP (**AP7**).
The PMC Assembly also approved the new LR for Dihydrogen hexahydroxyplatinate, compound with 2-aminoethanol: BASF.
Now that the enabling tests have been completed and the sameness/ chemistry issues have been addressed the testing programme has been launched: the mammalian toxicity testing started in 2013 with 81 tests launched, and environmental toxicity testing (ten tests) commencing in 2014. CLP testing has also been performed in 2013 to refine the skin corrosion classifications of some of the PGM which in consequence led to a refine the associated transport classification (in most cases to less stringent conditions).
Monthly updates tracking the progress of each test are circulated to the PGM WG.
For a number of endpoints, Testing Proposals (TP) will need to be submitted to ECHA before the test can be conducted. Three PGM registrations will include TP for genotoxicity endpoints. The TP will be submitted together with the final dossier. No actual testing work can start before then.
Timing: once the environmental tests are finalised, PNECs can be derived (probably around Q1 2015). The DNELs will be derived in 2015, when the repeated dose tests are finalised too.
Definitive exposure scenarios can only be derived once the hazard assessment is completed and final PNECs and DNELs are available. However, in preparation for the exposure assessment phase, even though DNELs and PNECs are not available, PMC will do all preparatory work that is possible (identify uses, collect existing monitoring data, potential additional monitoring work, etc.). As regards occupational exposure, before requesting exposure data for Pt from PMC Members, EBRC will consider the available Pt exposure dataset shared by the IPA under the PMC-IPA data-sharing agreement.
Considering the above, registration dossiers will be submitted in a phased manner, commencing with Pd substances (some of which were originally subject to registration in 2013) in late 2016. If the current speed is kept, all dossiers should be finalised in 2017, ahead of the formal 2018 registration deadline.
Some PGM registrations (where PGM compounds show respiratory sensitising properties) will be submitted later than in 2017 in order to allow potential Risk Management Option (RMO) analysis information to be included in the Registration Dossiers before submission. Should any of these PGM be considered for RMO analysis, the relevant MS, who has no obligation to request information that it cannot find in the Dossier and that is relevant to conduct a robust RMO from registrants, would then have all relevant information in the Dossier.

- **Re**

Four of the six Re substances in scope have been successfully REACH registered (joint dossier submitted to ECHA, registration number received by LR, and company-specific file + greenlight to submit sent to co-registrants). The registration dossiers of the two remaining ones are completed as far as possible and in the hands of the LR (who are also unique

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

registrants) who are reviewing their Registration intentions before submitting the dossier.
Except for some MSDS work (AP14), and light dossier maintenance work, no further work is anticipated to be required for the Re project. Because of the size of its scope, the profile of the substances, and the early registration submission, this is the first PMC registration project which allows calculating a precise LoA price (Re-specific costs will only include permanent budget items) (AP3 and 15).

- **Refinables**

Following the registration of 14 inorganic UVCB intermediates (called Refinables in the PM industry) in 2010, all dossiers had to be reviewed to ensure their compliance with the Dec 2010 ECHA Guidance on intermediates. This has resulted in a number of post-registration/registration update steps or actions:

- Checking compliance with SCC: this was done in 2011 and resulted in only one Refinable to remain a SCC intermediate among the 14 ones originally registered in 2010.
- Checking REACH registration needs vs waste/by-product route: this was done in 2011 and resulted in only one Refinable not requiring REACH registration anymore.
- Checking Substance Identity determination for each one of the remaining 13 UVCB (one SCC and 12 non-SCC) to ensure variability does not result from over-grouping of streams and can be justified on the basis of source and process for each Refinable: this was done in 2013 through a splitting exercise, that has so far resulted in two registration dossiers instead of one for slags, precious metals refining (hence back to 14 refinable registration dossiers), and possibly more than two registration dossiers instead of one for slimes and sludges, precious metals refining (splitting exercise is on-going).
- Generating phys-chem data that was not required for (the 2010) Article 17 and 18 registrations but is required for (the 2014) Article 10 registrations (so-called 'upgrades'): and where registration dossiers are split, phys-chem information needs to be generated for additional dossiers (currently 13 non-SCC or Article 10 dossiers excluding the outcome of the splitting of slimes and sludges, precious metals refining).
- Developing an alternative approach to testing or modelling for the hazard and exposure assessment of each Refinable, on the basis of its constituents, in collaboration with other consortia under Eurométaux, and ECHA experts: at least three case studies (from Pb, Cu, and PM), four workshops with ECHA experts, and several EM Intermediates TF meetings to elaborate a robust 'read-across' approach to fulfil the information requirements of the inorganic UVCB by using the information available on each one of its (driving) constituents, and collating the site-specific exposure data from PMC Members into a exposure database.
- Agreeing on data-sharing conditions and accessing Refinable-specific constituent datasets: one year to develop a data-sharing agreement to be used by all 'constituents' consortia to ensure an equal sharing of the same data across registrants of inorganic UVCB. It resulted in around eight consortia agreeing to share their data extract for free, and a few consortia refusing to proceed on this free basis and either 1) charging a symbolic data-sharing fee, or 2) charging a regular LoA or LtU fee.

Since the Refinable dossier upgrades will be finalised with the monies/reserves available for the Refinables project and will not result in any invoice in 2014 (cf. item 6.2 below), the 'exceptional cost-sharing condition' proposed for KGHM is not applicable and was hence not decided upon.

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

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

4 December 2013, 10:30 – 16:00 CET
Metals Conference Centre – Rooms Copper & Aluminium
Rue du Duc 100, B-1150 Brussels, Belgium

5. PMC & Authorisation

5.1. Authorisation Process

In addition to Registration and Evaluation processes presented above, REACH also includes a third title relative to Authorisation. Authorisation is a risk-control regulatory mechanism aiming at ensuring the progressive implementation of substitution substances or technologies to Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC) for uses where technically and economically viable alternatives exist.
Whereas Registration applies to manufacturers and importers (M/I), Authorisation applies to users who must either file their own Authorisation Application (AA) or be covered by the AA of their M/I (and not of 'any' M/I). In the absence of precious metals and rhenium and their compounds on the SVHC or Candidate List, the PMC monitors the process and guides its Members from the perspective of users, rather than the perspective of M/I.
Authorisation is a young REACH process on which not much practical experience has been gathered yet. Three key recommendations can however already be made to companies using substances listed on the Candidate List (cf. Annex 4):

1) Though some M/I may file AA, some M/I may not! And even when they do, they may not cover all uses at all or in sufficient detail.
2) Users need to be much more involved under Authorisation than they have ever been involved under Registration. Indeed, various scenarios can occur and in each, users must have a more or less involved role and be ready to gather, generate, and share information as well as deploy human and financial resources too.
3) Time is critical. Once a SVHC is moved from the Candidate List (list of substances eventually eligible for Authorisation) to the Authorisation List (list of substances actually subject to Authorisation), the M/I and/or (all) users of the SVHC in question have less than three years to organize their cooperation (if a joint AA is intended) and prepare their AA.

Even if an Authorisation has been granted, it will be granted for a specified period of time. The standard review period is 4 years but can be much shorter (6 months) or longer (12 years), depending on the case. After this period, either an alternative has been found and implemented, or a new AA (with its associated fee) must be submitted. As long as no alternative is identified, there is no limit to the number of times an Authorisation for the same SVHC and use can be (re)granted, but users must each time demonstrate and report on the outcomes of their research work to identify and develop better alternatives to the SVHC for the given use.
As regards substitution to an alternative to the SVHC, this will be very case-specific. A substitute may e.g. be technically viable for the use but only economically viable or known for a subset of users. This may result in competitive/image-related (dis)advantages that should be considered by each applicant.
As regards the definition of the 'use' that is applied for under the AA, there is no golden rule to guide applicants in that definition. The description of the use will be very case-specific too and, as such, can be very broad for a certain SVHC and its application and very specific for another SVHC and its application. The following elements can be considered, among others, when defining the use for which an AA is submitted:

- Function or performance the SVHC is aimed to achieve
- Availability of alternatives for (subsets of) the use
- Authorisation fees

Overall, PMC Members were recommended to start tracking the SVHC (Candidate List) versus their product portfolio (both purchased and produced materials) and start raising awareness on Authorisation up and down their supply chains.

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

5.2. Hydrazine

Hydrazine is the first Authorisation experience of the PMC; it is used in the Ag and PGM industry as a reducing agent, which fully decomposes during use and does not result in emissions or exposure.
Due to its Carcinogenic classification and the volumes of Hydrazine used across various sectors (which are much larger users of hydrazine than the PM sector), it has been added to the Candidate List. It is not subject to prioritisation for Authorisation in the short-term (to be confirmed on the basis of the reviewed prioritisation scoring method applicable from January 2014) but has already been assessed by authorities (score calculated) for being recommended for inclusion on the authorisation list. It is therefore in the pipeline for authorisation on the mid-term.
Because the PM sector is such a small user of Hydrazine compared to other use sectors, and because the use of Hydrazine in the PM sector is so unique and confidential, the PM sector agreed to lead the preparation of an AA for the use in the PM sector. This has been done in full transparency with the M/I, who have collaborated to this exercise by sharing their CSR, among others.
A preliminary Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) has been performed with an external expert consultant (RPA) and discussed by the Hydrazine TF at a dedicated workshop on 20 Nov 2013 in Brussels. According to the preliminary AoA, done for those specific uses generally relevant to PMC Members (not niche type of uses), it currently appears that no publicly-known alternative is feasible; an AA would hence be worthwhile to submit in this case.
The preliminary AoA exercise allowed to learn the following lessons:

- Registration Dossiers do not contain the information that is relevant for Authorisation work under REACH.
- There is a need to involve many specialists and departments, including management, in the information collection exercise of each using company.
- Coordination at each company level requires awareness-raising and is very time-consuming. Time aspects are directly dependant on the number and availability of individual information contributors, company-specific internal dynamics, organisation and confidentiality requirements, and the number of uses to be addressed.
- Though Authorisation can be submitted individually or jointly, in the case of Hydrazine, due to the sensitivity around certain uses and confidentiality in general, the submission of an Authorisation Application will as a minimum be composed of confidential annexes, and probably require separate submission in the end.

PMC has regular exchanges with the M/I of Hydrazine, as well as with other use sectors, such as the aerospace sector, which has filed an exemption request with the Commission (the use of hydrazine by the aerospace sector seems to fulfil exemption criteria).

5.3. RCF

RCF (Refractory Ceramic Fibres) is the second Authorisation experience of the PMC; it is used in both insulation applications such as heating equipment and furnaces (not precious metals-specific, represents 68% of all uses of RCF), and catalytic converters (precious metals-specific, representing only 8% of all uses of RCF).
Two RCF have been recommended for ECHA's 5th Priority List (on Agenda of MSC 9-13 Dec 2013 meeting in Helsinki). In light of this, a monitoring RCF TF was set-up, to act as a liaison point between Eurométaux (in direct contact with M/I), the precious metals-sector, and the automotive sector.
Several industry sectors, including PMC, submitted a set of joint comments to the public consultation on ECHA's recommendation. In addition, PMC submitted precious metal-specific comments to the public consultation. Among the comments made, industry

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

signalled the unclear substance identification (two entries different from unique entry registered under REACH), and the incorrect volumes/wide dispersive use claimed (many forms of RCF on the EU market are articles and are as such, exempt from Authorisation and should not be taken into consideration to calculate the total volume of the substance forms). Several Member States supported these comments and the final MSC recommendation was anticipated to support 1) cancelling the 5th Priority List, or 2) postponing the decision on the 5th Priority List until entries were more fully assessed and recommended.
As regards the precious metal-specific use of RCF in autocatalytic converters, alternatives do not appear to be readily available, either due to the temperature the material should resist against, or due to the mechanical role of the RCF as such.
As regards the 'user' role of the precious metals sector, it appears that some companies could be regarded as users of RCF but others not. The need for an active RCF TF at PMC level and its degree of involvement will depend on whether 1) any PMC Members is potentially directly subject to Authorisation work for RCF, 2) the number of PMC Members that will be subject to this work and 3) whether any other association of which PMC Members are also members, becomes directly involved in the Authorisation work.
In any case, until the 5th Priority List is approved, the RCF TF will retain a monitoring/information collection role in order to act as contact point for PMC Members on the topic, and point of liaison with other associations which may become more actively involved/organised around RCF in due course.

Post-meeting note: *The 5th draft recommendation list has been fully adopted by the MSC on its Dec 13 meeting, including the two RCFs. Industry comments have been included in the MS final recommendation, but either waived or considered not relevant at this stage. Although this 5th list will most probably be adopted by the European Commission (EC), considering the multiple valid comments by industry and supported by several MS, the EC explicitly said that the authorisation prioritisation process is not working in its current state and should be improved for the next recommendations.*

5.4. Other?

Participants were reminded on the importance to monitor the Candidate List and announced Recommendation Lists for Authorisation. Though these do not (currently) contain any precious metal or rhenium substance, they may contain substances which are used by the precious metal and rhenium sectors and are essential to specific processes.
The PMC Secretariat will continue to send reminders every time ECHA publishes (intentions for) an updated Candidate List, with the expectation that concerned companies will inform PMC Secretariat on those substances that are relevant for precious metals processes, and should be monitored by PMC.
The following three tips were shared with PMC Members:

- Do not assume the supplier of a substance will submit either an Authorisation for the company's relevant use, or an Authorisation at all
- Raise awareness on Authorisation with other departments than those involved in REACH in the company ASAP
- Implement a centralised system to track/alert on the 'SVHC/Authorisation' status of each substance and formulation in the company's purchase/product portfolio ASAP

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

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

4 December 2013, 10:30 – 16:00 CET
Metals Conference Centre – Rooms Copper & Aluminium
Rue du Duc 100, B-1150 Brussels, Belgium

6. Financial items

6.1. 2013 expenses by 30 Sep

The status of the expenses by 31 Oct 2013 is available on slide 80 of Annex 3. The situation is healthy in that all expenses are anticipated to be within budget.
LoA for an amount of 925.513 € have been sold in 2013, which coincides with a REACH registration deadline. It is not expected to have similar LoA incomes before the next registration deadline.
As regards generic costs, it is anticipated that a significant portion will remain unspent upon the closure of the year, among other reasons due to the fact that R. Nicolay's contract commenced in Sep 2013 rather than at the beginning of the year.
For most metal-specific costs, major invoices are still to be received from the consultants and testing houses (PGM project in particular), as per the applicable payment schedules.
As regards the refinables project, a big portion remains unspent by 31 Oct, but will be used to prepare the dossier updates to be submitted to ECHA by 22 Apr 2013. Once updates are finalised and submitted, PMC Secretariat will calculate the total cost of the exercise, which will be reported at the next PMC Assembly meeting (**AP17**).
The 2013 accounts will formally closed in March 2014, under the supervision of the accountant, teasurer, financial controller, and auditor of the EPMF.

6.2. 2014 Budget and invoices

The preliminary 2014 budget proposal presented to the Assembly in June 2013 was reviewed by the Mgmt Cttee in order to arrive at a refined 2014 budget, which was circulated before the December 2013 Assembly meeting.
Main changes made to the Jun version of the budget include:

- Decrease of the Ag budget: place-holders were removed after identifying (co-)sponsorship opportunities and request from the Mgmt Cttee to prepare a more complete business case for any research item which is not strictly a REACH requirement
- Decrease/removal of refinables budget: the Mgmt Cttee recommended exhausting the reserves for this project before requesting additional funds. Only the permanent budget items were left in this budget.

The use of the available reserves allows payment holidays for the Ag, Re, and Refinables budgets and reduced invoices for the other projects (except Hydrazine where there are no reserves, and RCF for which there are no external budget needs yet).
The Assembly approved the updated budget for 2014 and the proposed invoices. The full invoice amounts will be invoiced in Spring 2014, no invoice will be sent in Autumn 2014.
The Assembly made the following recommendations to the PMC Secretariat:

- Develop prospective of generic costs for 2015-2020 and present to the Assembly at next meeting (**AP6**).
- Consider possibility to reimburse (part of) remaining reserves for Refinables and Re projects or devise alternative solutions to decreasing these reserves to a reasonable level (**AP16** and **18**).

7. AOB, next meetings, and closing remarks

Post-meeting note: *As per a recommendation from the Mgmt Cttee, the PMC Secretariat will work at streamlining and reducing e-mail communications as from 2014.*

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

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

4 December 2013, 10:30 – 16:00 CET
Metals Conference Centre – Rooms Copper & Aluminium
Rue du Duc 100, B-1150 Brussels, Belgium

No other business was raised.

The next meetings will take place on:

- Plenary Meeting: Bern, 12 Jun 2014
- Assembly Meeting: Brussels, 3 Dec 2014

The Chairman thanked the PMC Secretariat for their great work in 2013 and extended his best wishes for 2014 to the entire PMC team and membership.

Annexes

1 – Agenda
2 – List of participants
3 – Slides presented during the meeting
4 – Table summarising possible scenario of users versus Authorisation Applications (draft)

Table 1. Actions agreed at 4 Dec 2013 PMC Assembly meeting.

	What?	Who?	When?
1.	Use Sharepoint instead of e-mailing to store information that should not be circulated beyond a specific group of PMC Members/experts	PMC Secretariat	On-going
2.	Identify Chair and Co-chairperson candidates to replace them on the PMC Mgmt Cttee	G. Ethier, M. Raffray	By Dec 2014
3.	Review PMC LoA prices and present to PMC Assembly for approval	C. Braibant	Jun 2014
4.	Check update-related costs can be enforced onto LoA purchasers on the basis of the existing LoA Agreement	C. Braibant	Jun 2014
5.	Advocate with other industry associations to implement a token security number system for dossier updates, to act as a leverage for co-registrants to contribute to the updates of the joint dossier	PMC	ASAP
6.	Predict status of Generic costs over 2015-2020 and present to the PMC Assembly for discussion/information	C. Braibant	Jun 2014
7.	Produce ID Cards and keep Mgmt Cttee appraised of progress, bottlenecks, and unreasonable delays by Members to provide the relevant information	K. Arijs	On-going
8.	Safeguard/Block specific calendar periods in anticipation of Substance Evaluation milestones with RIVM, ECHA, and MSC: • First week of February: Ag Dossier finalisation • Third week of February: Ag Dossier update submission • First and second week of April: Meeting with RIVM (second informal meeting)? • Third and fourth week of Jan 2015: Prepare comments on RIVM's Draft Decision • First week of Apr 2015: Prepare comments on RIVM's (reviewed) Draft Decision + MSC Proposals for Amendments	C. Braibant & K. Rothenbacher, LR, Ag WG, Consultants	Jan 2014
9.	Produce characterisation data to be included in individual registration dossiers (on the basis of PMC recommended approach)	Ag (nano)powder registrants	By end Jan 2014
10.	Confirm scope of Au dossier (whether nanoAu will be included or not)	Au WG	Q1 2014

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be

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

4 December 2013, 10:30 – 16:00 CET
Metals Conference Centre – Rooms Copper & Aluminium
Rue du Duc 100, B-1150 Brussels, Belgium

	What?	Who?	When?
11.	Identify LR for remaining PM CN-	PM CN- WG	Q1 2014
12.	Validate 'sensitisation' result on potassium dicyanoaurate and ensure the relevant TSCA 8(e) notification(s) are sent as applicable	PM CN- WG	Q4 2013-Q1 2014
13.	Confirm scope of PGM metal dossiers (whether nanoforms will be included or not)	PGM WG	
14.	Prepare MSDS contents for each Re substance and compound in scope and circulate to Re project members to harmonise communication in the supply chain	K. Arijs	Q1 2014
15.	Report on overall cost of Re project upon finalising above task	C. Braibant	Jun 2014
16.	Anticipate next work items/budget needs of Re project after finalisation to decide upon needs for future invoices/use of remaining reserves	C. Braibant	Jun 2014
17.	Report on overall cost of Refinables dossier updates (to Article 10 registrations) upon finalisation and submission of updates	C. Braibant	Jun 2014
18.	Anticipate next work items/budget needs of Refinables project after dossier updates to decide upon needs for future invoices and reserves	C. Braibant	Jun 2014
19.	Continue monitoring SVHC lists and alert PMC on need to set-up ad hoc (monitoring) task force(s)	PMC Members	On-going

Avenue de Broqueville, 12 – BE-1150 Brussels
Tel.: +32 2 775 63 23 **Fax:** +32 2 779 05 23 **Mobile:** +32 473 52 52 73
E-mail: braibant@epmf.be **Website:** www.epmf.be