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

14 June 2012, 10:00 – 16:30
Radisson Blu Park Lane Hotel (Villa d'este)
Van Eicklei 34, 2018 Antwerp (Belgium)

Minutes
AP refer to Action Points listed at the end of the minutes
Decisions are highlighted in **bold blue**
Post-meeting notes are highlighted in *italic grey*

1. Welcome and introduction

1.1. Confidentiality and Competition Law. *Cf. slides 2-3 of Annex 3*

Participants (Annex 2) were reminded on their obligation to comply with confidentiality and Competition Law rules. A tour de table allowed all participants to introduce themselves to the floor. 33 Members out of 47 are present or represented at the meeting, therefore reaching a quorum of 70% and validating all meeting decisions.

1.2. Approval of the Agenda. *Cf. slides 4-6 of Annex 3*

The Agenda was approved. The slides presented at the meeting are available in Annex 3.

1.3. Actions agreed at and approval of the minutes of the last meeting (Brussels, 6 December 2011).

A table summarising the status of the actions agreed at the last meeting was circulated before the meeting. All actions are done or on-going and if so, addressed during the meeting. Pending actions have been added to the list of actions agreed at the meeting in the table at the end of these minutes (**AP1**, **2**, **5**, **8** and **14**).
No comments have been made on the minutes following their circulation or at the meeting; the **minutes were approved**. Participants were informed that by signing the Attendance List, they formally approve the minutes of the past meeting.

2. Status and progress of PMC Projects

2.1. Ag

- **Scope, dossier update and remaining registrations** *(Cf. slides 9-11 and 19-22 of Annex 3)*:
  - Silver, disilver oxide and silver nitrate have been registered in 2010 and updated in Feb 2012 following a review of the testing proposals by ECHA. PMC has not received any feed-back from ECHA on the updated testing proposals (adjusted soil testing, using results from on-going study programme on silver acetate and nanoAg at US level, and waiver for 2-Gen study), which should be assessed by ECHA before the end of 2012. Co-registrants of the above substances should have been notified on the submission of an update by ECHA directly in their REACH IT mailboxes. This was just for information and does not require any specific action (e.g. update of the individual dossier) by co-registrants.
  - Disilver sulphate and silver carbonate were registered in early 2012.
  - Dilsiver sulphide was removed from the scope of work following changes in PMC Members' Substance and tonnage band declarations but may be tested in the scope of the larger Ag project to strengthen the on-going aquatic bio-availability research.
  - Silver chloride and silver bromide are now substances in 100-1000 t/a and silver iodide has been added as a substance in the 1-10 t/a band. The registration of these three halides is particularly important for the photographic sector who has agreed to collaborate with PMC in preparing these dossiers, by using the same consultants (EBRC and WCA) but their own scientific manager, allowing oversight by PMC secretariat without imposing excessive burden on the already constrained resources available. **PMC Members supported this proposed collaboration.** Although the concerned companies will not join the Consortium but co-register via the purchase of a Letter of Access, one of them has

agreed to act as Lead Registrant for the three silver halides and to sign the LR Declaration of Commitment of the PMC to formalise their role. **PMC Members agreed to deviate from the Consortium Agreement and elected Agfa Gevaert, Belgium as LR for the three silver halides** (**AP11**); the LoA Agreement will have to reflect the conditions under which this particular collaboration takes place (**AP12**).

- **On-going scientific work** *(Cf. slides 12-18 of Annex 3)*:
  - Terrestrial toxicity work. Soil toxicity studies on silver performed in 2009-2010 delivered results which would have resulted in a PNECsoil < natural background concentrations of Ag. PMC has hence embarked into a larger research programme aimed at measuring available silver in soil from which a more realistic PNECsoil could be derived. This 2-year programme run at CSIRO (Australia) has been delivering according to schedule (feasibility phase); preliminary results indicate that only a fraction of the Ag amounts added to a soil system is available. The project is likely to run till end 2013.
  - Aquatic toxicity work.
    - T/D testing. The results of the T/D tests performed on massive Ag and used to conclude on a non-classification of massive Ag in 2010 required further attention to ensure their robustness and validity. Recent experiments indicate that the epoxy resin which was used to "coat" the silver wire in the T/D test system may have influenced the release of Ag ion in the T/D solution (did not happen for other metals). More inert resins have hence been identified and are in the course of being validated before a T/D test on massive silver is repeated with the proper resin. The results could indicate either that massive Ag should indeed not be classified, or that it should be classified as an environmental toxicant, therefore imposing reporting, permitting and transport obligations on all companies (including e.g. banks) handling e.g. silver bars. An *ad hoc* communication will be made to PMC Members as soon as preliminary results are available (**AP13**).
    - Removal from the water column/PBT/vPvB assessment: KLAUS TO ADD POST-MEETING UPDATE FOR COMPLETENESS OF THE MINUTES
- **Substance Evaluation** *(Cf. slides 23-30 of Annex 3)*:
  - NL has been appointed as "Rapporteur" of the Substance Evaluation of Ag and have indicated to be particularly interested in "*substance characterisation/nanoparticles, toxicity of different forms of the substance*". Their particular focus will not prevent them from looking at the entire Dossier content in order to evaluate its scientific soundness, scope/coverage of uses and general conclusions and arguments used in the risk assessment exercise.
  - In order to prepare for the Evaluation phase, in addition to what has already been updated in Feb 2012, the Ag WG recommend to perform a literature search to identify any new relevant information, update the man via the environment and waste exposure scenario, and prepare for nanoAg-specific expectation on the NL (cf. slide 26 of Annex 3) (total timeline 9 months maximum, starting in Jun 2012; maximum budget excluding additional testing needs ~ 105.000 €). **PMC Members approved the proposed work programme unanimously.** As regards the cost-sharing, two Members objected to sharing the nanoAg-related costs in preparing the Evaluation of the Ag Dossier across all Ag co-registrants whereas 19 (majority) Members were in favour of doing so. The actual invoicing related to this additional budget needs is addressed under item 4.2 below.
  - As regards the nanoAg-related work programme (cf. slide 29 of Annex 3), the following suggestions were made (**AP16** and **AP17 - 20**):
    - EBRC and WCA to assess endpoints which are at risk of being challenged by regulators
    - Possibility of involving additional consultancy experienced with risk assessing nanomaterials in other contexts, e.g. biocides
    - Liaise with relevant representatives participating in GAARN, SiO2 Evaluation, etc.
    - Find out more about the expectations from NL on nanoAg

  - If high tier/cost nanoAg-specific testing requirements are needed for nanoAg, review PMC cost-sharing formula in order to arrive at a fair and proportionate cost-sharing and data-access solution
- No decision was reached as to whether nanoAg and Ag should be registered in one same or two separate Dossiers under REACH. **PMC Members agreed to decide on this matter after the work by EBRC and WCA is progressed/finalised** (**AP21**). *Post-meeting note: a Member suggested including the manufacturing process of Ag versus nanoAg to the pros and cons document circulated before the meeting* (**AP15**).

- **Non-REACH Regulatory topics** *(Cf. slides 31-33 of Annex 3)*:
  - PMC Members were reminded on the obligation of reporting substantial new risk information under TSCA 8(e) in the US. This has been done by one Member company with silver data but applies to all substances manufactured and/or imported in the US. Members were further reminded that as PMC Members they have a right to use PMC-generated information under other (regulatory) contexts than REACH for no additional cost as long as PMC Secretariat is informed and can report back the relevant (anonymous) information to Members.
  - Notwithstanding the fact that some Member States have removed silver from their priority/watch list implemented under the Water Framework Directive, silver remains appearing in the scope of a number of scientific and/or (semi)regulatory initiatives in the EU, usually because of nanoAg. PMC is monitoring such initiatives via Eurométaux and sharing experience and recommendations when relevant, e.g. with JRC.

2.2. Au *(Cf. slides 35-38 of Annex 3)*

The scope of the Au project remains unchanged; all registrations are under preparation and currently undergoing Phase III, the testing programme on TCA (reference read-across substance for all Au substances). All physico-chemical and ecotox tests are finalised and mammalian toxicity tests are on-going. *Post-meeting note: Micronucleus test with TCA was positive and further investigation (literature search, expert review and ad hoc testing) to confirm and demonstrate the mechanism of genotoxic action of Au 3+ is required. This outcome means that a CSA/CSR will probably be required for TCA and that the read-across strategy from TCA to the other Au compounds in scope may need to be reviewed.*

Next step is to launch the collection of use, exposure and emission data in order to complete the IUCLID 5 files and prepare the CSA/CSR + Exposure Scenario exercise in due course. *Post-meeting note: although Au does not require a CSA/CSR as such, in order to ensure consistency across projects, and considering CSA/CSR have been prepared for Ag and will be prepared for PGM, a CSA/CSR-type of document will also be prepared for Au, in order to be used as a comprehensive set of information relative to Au.*

If the data collection is launched in 2012, the Dossiers should be ready by the end of 2013. *Post-meeting note: Considering latest developments, Dossiers will not be finalised before 2014.*

2.3. PM CN- *(Cf. slides 40-43 of Annex 3)*

Potassium tetrakis (cyano-C)aurate was removed from the scope, which now lists three substances for registration by 2018, two of which still require a Lead Registrant (**AP1**). The testing programme is on-going for these three compounds.

For the purpose of CLP, the classification was read-across directly from the classification of Salts of hydrogen cyanide with the exception of complex cyanides such as ferrocyanides, ferricyanides and mercuric oxycyanide listed in Annex VI of CLP: Acute Oral Tox. 2, Acute Dermal Tox. 1, Acute Inhalation Tox. 2, Aquatic Acute 1, Aquatic Chronic 1. This was done with the intention of refining the classification and the overall assessment as part of the preparation of the REACH Dossiers, considering that the counter-ion of the precious metal actually influence the solubility and toxicity of the PM CN- compound overall. In light of this context, additional testing is minimised and performed only where read-across or modelling is not appropriate or

requires validation.
Whereas eco-toxicity could be modelled for silver cyanides, due to the lack of precise knowledge on the speciation/oxidation state and/or complexes formed by Au in aqueous solutions, toxicity could not be modelled for gold cyanides and hence testing is required.
The mammalian toxicity testing programme will be launched as soon as the eco-toxicity testing programme and modelling has been finalised and assessed.
Subsequently or in parallel, the collection of use, exposure and emission data will be launched in order to prepare the CSA/CSR + Exposure Scenario exercise. Dossiers are unlikely to be finalised before 2014.

2.4. PGM

- **REACH project** *(Cf. slides 46-71 of Annex 3)*:

The scope of the PGM project is the largest of all PMC projects and is also the one showing the most frequent number of changes (in substance, substance status, tonnage band, etc.), which adds a level of complication to an already complex project. Many Lead Registrants are still required for this project (**AP1**).
Three of the > 60 substances and intermediates require registration by 2013, including one substance in the 10-100 t/a band (Diamminedichloropalladium or DDP) which requires an Annex VII+VIII Registration Dossier.
The testing programme of the PGM project is divided in two: a fast-track or DDP testing programme, and a full testing programme. In each case, a series of enabling tests (water solubility, oxidising properties, bio-elution, dustiness, corrosion/irritation, etc.) are performed in order to inform the subsequent steps of the testing programme (genotoxicity, sensitisation, acute toxicity, etc.). All enabling tests have been finalised for DDP and the remaining reference substances of the PGM project.
The DDP testing programme is progressing well; it allows gathering a number of learning lessons which will be utilised in the full testing programme. The eco-toxicology programme is finalised and PNEC are being derived. The toxicology programme is on-going; in order to gain time and save test animals, the repeated dose and reproduction/developmental toxicity screening studies are performed in a combined manner (OECD 422). ***Post-meeting note:*** *following the Assembly meeting and although none of the preliminary tests had indicated any evidence of toxicity, signs of toxicity have been observed in the combined oral repeat dose study. Further investigation (revision of the administered doses and formulations, repetition of tests, etc.) to confirm and understand the observed effects is required. The outcome of this test may hence not be available in-time for registration in 2013 (the remainder of the Dossier will be complete and the data-gap would be properly justified).*
The testing programme of the other PGM is on-going and in-time for the 2018 registration deadline.
The collection of use, exposure and emission data will be launched in July 2012 for Pd and Pd substances in order to prepare the CSA/CSR + Exposure Scenario for DDP in time for the 2013 registration deadline. **PMC Members agreed to add K. Arijs (ARCHE)**, who is already familiar with the data collection exercise which took place as part of the Refinables project, to the existing team in order to coordinate this task for the PGM project too.
Other dossiers requiring a CSA/CSR are unlikely to be finalised before Q3 2014. The key bottle neck is usually the combined acute oral + repeat dose test which takes several months to set-up, conduct and report.

- **Non-REACH regulatory topic** *(Cf. slide 73 of Annex 3)*:

PMC Members were informed that one PMC Member needs to refer to Pt dinitrate information collected in the REACH Dossier in order to fulfil their registration obligations under China REACH (Order 7 of China's MEP). In this specific case, all relevant information is not PMC owned but proprietary of PMC Members. Data-sharing in this case needs to be resolved directly between the concerned PMC Members.

- **Data-sharing with IPA** *(Cf. slide 75 of Annex 3)*:

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

14 June 2012, 10:00 – 16:30
Radisson Blu Park Lane Hotel (Villa d'este)
Van Eicklei 34, 2018 Antwerp (Belgium)

PMC Members were informed that on-going research conducted by the International PGM Association (IPA) could be useful for the risk assessment of chloroplatinates to be registered by PMC. Likewise, part of the information produced by PMC could be relevant for the IPA's research. Since most of the members of IPA are members of PMC, and that both structures aim at complying with regulatory initiatives of relevance for the PGM sector, it is hence proposed to set-up a data-sharing framework between the IPA and PMC, in order to allow a free exchange of data and right to refer to information useful to achieve each purpose. **PMC Members agreed with the proposal.** A data-sharing agreement was circulated for comment in order to formalise the data-sharing framework (**AP22 - 23**).

2.5. Re *(Cf. slides 77-80 of Annex 3)*

The scope of the Re project is the most stable one, with close to no changes since the set-up of the project in 2008. All data gaps have been completed with the exception of one, the combined repeated dose and reproduction/developmental toxicity screening study on APR (reference read-across substance of the Re project), which is on-going and should be finalised in late summer 2012. Depending on the outcome of the combined study, an acute oral toxicity test may require repetition (existing information showing no hazard used a dosing vehicle which did not allow producing a stable solution for the OECD 422 study).
So far no hazard has been identified in any of the (eco-)toxicity tests; hence a CSA/CSR + ES may not be required. The collection of use information has been launched already, but the exposure and emission data collection will be launched only if hazard is identified in any of the remaining studies.
If no hazard is identified and no CSA/CSR + ES is needed, the dossiers would be finalised by end 2012/early 2013. If hazard is identified, dossier finalisation may be delayed until early 2014.

2.6. PM Refinables *(Cf. slides 82-87 of Annex 3)*

Fourteen UVCB intermediates have been registered as part of this project in 2010. No changes to the scope have been made since. However, although all these intermediates were originally registered as SCC intermediates, following the release of the Dec 2010 ECHA Guidance on intermediates some PMC Members require some of their REACH Articles 17 and 18 'light' intermediate dossiers to become REACH Article 10 'full' ones. Very soon, it became clear that testing a complex UVCB for the purpose of data-filling under REACH would not be either scientifically sound or robust, i.e. would be challenging.
Indeed, after close to two years of exchanges with ECHA, requesting the Guidance on intermediates to be re-opened, NFM-specific examples of rigorous containment (RiCo) and strict control (SCC) to be considered, among others, ECHA clarified to Eurométaux that none of the examples presented so far were clear self-evident examples of SCC (which consist of a series of measure which should apply simultaneously over the entire lifecycle/supply chain of the intermediate).
In order to complete the RiCo and SCC assessment, which can be demonstrated using exposure and emission data as supporting evidence, an exposure and emission data collection was launched in early 2012. Soon, it became evident that the approach to assess the exposure resulting from complex UVCB had deviate from the one used for regular mono-constituent substances in that: 1) several mono-constituent substances (i.e. the constituents of the UVCB) had to be assessed in parallel and from a combined exposure viewpoint, and 2) from all constituents present in the UVCB, those identifying the risk posed by exposure had to be identified in an objective and sound manner.
The same applies when it comes to preparing a 'full' dossier for a complex UVCB substance: the effects, exposure and risk assessment needs to cover all driving constituents selected in an objective and sound manner. Whatever the approach or tool used to identify the driving constituent(s), there is a need to have access to information ((E-)TRV, assessment factors, justifications, mode of action, etc.) on all the constituents of the UVCB.
Eurométaux is currently engaging into a data collection exercise inviting those consortia holding

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

14 June 2012, 10:00 – 16:30
Radisson Blu Park Lane Hotel (Villa d'este)
Van Eicklei 34, 2018 Antwerp (Belgium)

information on potentially driving constituents present in complex UVCB of various consortia (e.g. PMC, Cu, Pb, Zn) to share this information in an ad hoc multi-metallic (E-)TRV database, which will be accessible to all Eurométaux members. The use of the information in any context will however be subject to a specific data-sharing agreement (letter of access, licence to use, etc.), for which PMC is encouraging a pragmatic and simple format.
As soon as the information is collected and legal/cost issues resolved, the information will be used by consortia experts to prepare case-studies illustrating how complex UVCB substances can be registered in a 'full' dossier without following the typical REACH Annexes VII-X testing but instead, reading across from the information available on the constituents.
Meanwhile the information above is collected, the tools developed and fine-tuned, and the case-studies finalised for presentation to ECHA in late 2012/early 2013, all companies are required to perform a RiCo/SCC assessment of all their intermediates, in order to distinguish those requiring further work (e.g. exposure assessment or 'full' registration) from those fulfilling the latest ECHA Guidance on intermediates (**AP9**).

2.7. Hydrazine *(Cf. slides 89-93 of Annex 3)*
Although in 2011 several experts had predicted the chances for hydrazine to be prioritised for Authorisation to be high, hydrazine was not added to the 4th Priority List of substances requiring Authorisation under REACH. However, hydrazine will remain on the Candidate List and as such, could be prioritised any time in future.
Considering the above risk and the fact that P. Zarogiannis and M. Postle (RPA), authors of the REACH Annex XIV Dossier on hydrazine, may not be available in future, the hydrazine task force proposed to launch a scoping study allowing to gather information on alternatives and factors relevant to exposure/emission risk mitigation arguments for an approximate cost of 35 000 € (scenario 2). The scope of this exercise should ideally cover all types of hydrazine compounds which could be used for reduction purposes in the refining of PM (e.g.: hydrazine sulphate, chloride, hydroxide (?)). **PMC Members supported the task force's proposal.** RPA will be invited to prepare a revised proposal in light of this alternative choice (**AP24**).

3. PMC organisation

3.1. PMC Membership *(Cf. slide 97 of Annex 3)*
Slide 97 of Annex 3 contains a list of the PMC membership following the exclusion of SEKOM and the merger of the Xstrata Zinc and Xstrata Nickel.

3.2. PMC Management Committee and (Co-)Chairmanship *(Cf. slide 99 of Annex 3)*
PMC Members were informed that SFPZ is no longer represented in the MC; the MC remains quorated and valid.

3.3. Sample management protocol *(Cf. slide 101 of Annex 3)*
Considering the value and number of samples which need to be requested, prepared, tested and recovered from the testing programme, and the number of test houses involved, it was suggested to summarise all information relevant to sample management in an *ad hoc* protocol. The protocol was circulated to sample providers and Carl Hafner, refiner for all PMC samples, and all comments were included in the version circulated to PMC Members, who **approved the document (Annex 5)** (**AP3**).

3.4. Revised LoA costs (for internal reference) *(Cf. slides 102-105 of Annex 3)*
In order to enable non PMC Members to join the joint registrations prepared by PMC under REACH, a Letter of Access (LoA) Agreement has been used. The original cost of the PMC LoA was calculated on the basis of confirmed expenses up to 2009 and predictions for 2010-2020. In light of the regular unexpected changes to the PMC REACH programme, the LoA Agreement and

cost is revised before every registration deadline and adjusted where necessary, in order to update the Agreement so it reflects the latest lessons learned and to update the cost to make sure it remains fair across all registrants.
The LoA Agreement was revised in follow-up of the exchanges held with the I&P association (cf. item 2.1 - Scope, dossier update and remaining registrations and **AP12**) in order to clarify the role of PMC in matters related to SIEF communication, for instance. The cost of a Ag LoA was also revised in order to include the additional costs incurred to update the dossiers following the revision of the testing proposals, to prepare the remaining registrations, and to prepare the Evaluation phase, among others. Other project-specific cost predictions were revised in light of the experience gathered with the Ag project.
The updated LoA costs are available in Slide 105 of Annex 3. **PMC Members approved these revised LoA costs** and again, they will be kept for internal reference only (benchmarking PMC membership versus LoA purchase) until the dossiers are ready for submission to ECHA. For example, the LoA cost for a Au compound will not be announced before the dossier for that Au compound is finalised and all expensed incurred have actually been added to the excel tool used to calculate the LoA cost.
Those entities having purchased a LoA at a lower cost before 2012 will not be requested to pay the difference in LoA cost before 2020, when all joint registrants have been identified and the cost-sharing can be checked on the basis of real costs. However, a clause in the LoA Agreement allows PMC to charge for additional costs should a registrant have paid a LoA cost inferior to the final amount resulting from the '2020 reality-check' (**AP4**). In the event LoA were sold at a cost which is superior to the final amount, fairness will be ensured by proceeding either with a refund (could pose accounting/VAT issues to some entities) or by creating a research fund which would be used to fill remaining science gaps on the substances associated to each project (e.g. excess of monies available from Ag LoA and PMC memberships would be used to fund Ag-related scientific research).

4. Expenses, reserves, budget forecasts and invoicing

4.1. Final 2011 accounts and reserves *(Cf. slides 107-110 of Annex 3)*

All information relative to the EPMF/PMC 2010 and 2011 accounts and audit were circulated before the meeting and all comments received by e-mail were addressed by e-mail (mainly linked to re-conciliating the several accounting reports). Real expenses are below budgeted ones, which results in reserves available for on-going and future work and/or to be partially credited PMC invoices (50% of 2011 reserves were credited from 1st 2012 invoices as agreed at 6 Dec 2011 Assembly meeting). 2010 and 2011 accounts were audited successfully by an external independent auditor. PMC Members received copies of the audit reports and **approved the 2010 and 2011 accounts**.

4.2. Deviations to the original 2012 Budget and 2nd 2012 invoices *(Cf. slides 111-113 of Annex 3)*

Following the approval of the 2012 budget in Dec 2011, 1st 2012 invoices were circulated for the total budget – 50% of 2011 reserves in May 2012 (payment due in Jul 2012). Meanwhile, additional work became necessary (update the Ag dossiers following the revision of the testing proposals, preparation for the Evaluation phase, kick-off of hydrazine project, etc.) and hence, additional resources too. Indeed, although 2010 registrations should have been fully finalised in 2012, the preparation of a registration dossier has proven to require almost as much work than to follow-up and maintenance of a submitted dossier. This requires PMC secretariat to increase its human resources, temporarily with consultants (e.g. Katrien Arijs), before identifying and hiring an additional full-time PMC secretariat officer.
Instead of presenting a revised 2012 budget for approval, the MC recommended presenting deviations from the original 2012 budget and indicating whether these deviations would require a second 2012 invoice or whether available 2011 reserves would be sufficient to cover these

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

14 June 2012, 10:00 – 16:30
Radisson Blu Park Lane Hotel (Villa d'este)
Van Eicklei 34, 2018 Antwerp (Belgium)

deviations. Slide 112 of Annex 3 summarises the situation.
In summary:

- 2012 Generic costs invoiced in May 2012 and available 2007-2011 Generic reserves will be sufficient to cover for a re-organisation of human resources of the PMC secretariat (shared by EPMF secretariat) and associated tools; **PMC Members agreed that this deviation does not require a 2nd 2012 invoice**
- 2012 Silver costs invoiced in May 2012 and available 2007-2011 Silver reserves should be sufficient considering some invoices will not be received before 2013; **PMC Members agreed that this deviation does not require a 2nd 2012 invoice**
- 2012 Hydrazine costs are currently inexistent since the project did not exist formally before approval of the proposed way forward today (cf. item 2.7 above); **PMC agreed that a dedicated 2nd 2012 invoice would be sent to those companies involved in this project** after an updated quote has been received from RPA (**AP6** - probably not before late summer or early autumn 2012).

As per slide 113 of Annex 3, 2012 expenses are within budget so far.

4.3. 2013 budget and simplified invoicing approach *(Cf. slides 114-118 of Annex 3)*

As highlighted above and further illustrated by the presentation by K. Delbeke (cf. item 5 below) REACH is only one of the several policy and scientific items a sector needs to be able to monitor, tackle and respond to. Moreover, REACH work does not end after the submission of a dossier or the last registration deadline. There is therefore continuous work and increasing workload which needs to be managed and coordinated. Although the Consortium was initially formed as a work group of the EPMF, today it absorbs more than 90% of its human resources, which makes it impossible for the EPMF to address non-REACH items in a viable manner. In order to allow both the EPMF and the PMC to continue to work in a sustainable and professional manner, in line with the objectives laid down in the Articles of Association and Consortium Agreement, the PMC MC and EPMF Board are devising a strategy to strengthen the available resources of the PM sector to ensure a long-term success in all its policy and science-related activities. A formal proposal will be presented to the PMC at its Dec 2012 meeting (**AP7 - 8**); this proposal will require a review of the 2013 budget, which could hence not be presented to PMC Members in its final form during the meeting.

An indicative 2013 budget was however made available to PMC Members (Annex 6) for information/provisional reference only. Due to its draft nature, the simplified invoicing approach was not illustrated with this version and will instead be illustrated with the formal 2013 budget proposal.

In future, budgets will be approved in June of the preceding year (e.g. 2014 budget will be approved in June 2013).

5. Presentation from Cu Consortium: REACH is here to stay *(Cf. slide 121 of Annex 3 and Annex 7)*

Annex 7 contains all slides presented by K. Delbeke, who has been working on the risk assessment of copper since it first began as a voluntary exercise under the previous Dangerous Substances Directive (67/548/EEC), or as part of the notifications submitted under the Biocides Directive (98/8/EC). From her presentation, it became clear that both regulatory and scientific frameworks addressing chemicals' risk assessment are continuously evolving. Such a fact requires industry to equip itself with the relevant human and financial resources in order to be able to deliver a scientifically robust but reasonable result to authorities. K. Delbeke's presentation confirmed the fact that work done by PMC since its set-up in 2007 is only the tip of the iceberg…

6. AOB, next meetings and closing remarks

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

14 June 2012, 10:00 – 16:30
Radisson Blu Park Lane Hotel (Villa d'este)
Van Eicklei 34, 2018 Antwerp (Belgium)

6.1. AOB

No other businesses were raised.

6.2. Next meetings:

6.2.1. Next PMC Assembly Meeting: Brussels, 5 Dec 2012

6.2.2. Next PMC Plenary Meeting: Stockholm, 13 Jun 2013 (**AP10**)

Annexes:
1. Participants List
2. Agenda
3. Slides
4. Updated NanoAg pros and cons document
5. Sample management protocol
6. Provisional/indicative PMC 2013 budget
7. Cu Consortium presentation

Table 1. Actions agreed at the 14 June 2012 PMC Assembly Meeting

	What?	Who?	When?
Generic			
1.	Identify Lead Registrants for remaining PM CN- and PGM	PMC Members	
2.	Assess resources and mechanism to perform regular literature reviews for all projects at PMC Secretariat and/or with external consultant	Mgmt Cttee	
3.	Send sample management protocol to all consultants coordinating testing programmes for PMC so they are used by all test houses	Secretariat	
4.	Keep track of LoA versus PMC membership costs and reserves for transparency (e.g. Re)	Secretariat	
5.	Send SIEF communication for confirmed LR and 2013 registrations	Secretariat	
6.	Send 2nd 2012 invoices for Hydrazine project costs (after RPA's revised proposal has been received, discussed and agreed) to concerned PMC Members	Secretariat	
7.	Prepare proposal to strengthen PM sector resources available to PMC and EPMF as part of a 2013 budget proposal to be presented to PMC Members at the Dec 2012 Assembly meeting	Secretariat + MC	Oct 2012
8.	Illustrate application of simplified invoicing approach on the basis of the confirmed 2013 budget	CB	Dec 2012
9.	Prepare and circulate SCC survey for completion by all PMC Members having declared intermediates to PMC before Dec 2012	CB	Oct 2012
10.	Send information supporting organisation of Plenary Meeting to Boliden colleagues hosting the 2013 Plenary Meeting	Secretariat	ASAP
Ag project			
11.	Draft formal PMC resolution properly documenting the terms under which PMC Assembly has approved the collaboration of PMC and the photographic sector for the three silver halide dossiers	AP+CB	

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

14 June 2012, 10:00 – 16:30
Radisson Blu Park Lane Hotel (Villa d'este)
Van Eicklei 34, 2018 Antwerp (Belgium)

12.	Prepare LoA Agreement for photographic sector including specific clauses addressing: • Deviation from the Consortium Agreement as regards the non-member nature of the LR; • Safety net would additional (testing) work be required for the three silver halides dossiers after submission to ECHA; Responsibilities related to Dossier preparation, submission, follow-up, update, communication with SIEF and ECHA, etc.		
13.	Circulate a dedicated bulletin to PMC Members as soon as more information becomes available on the on-going T/D testing	KR	Summer 2012
14.	Submit PMC position and strategy on the preparation to Evaluation to legal compliance check in order to prepare eventual exchanges with NL	KR+CB+AP	Summer 2012
15.	NanoAg: Include manufacturing process as criteria for deciding whether nanoAg and Ag belong to the same Dossier in pros and cons document	CB	Done, cf. Annex 4
16.	NanoAg: Find out more about the exact sizes and forms of nanoAg with Ag acetate in the NTP study	KR	ASAP
17.	NanoAg: Re-launch contacts with EU Ag TF (Biocides), NIA and OECD; liaise with relevant representatives participating in GAARN, SiO2 Evaluation, etc.; and consider possibility of involving additional consultancy experienced with risk assessing nanomaterials in other contexts, e.g. biocides		
18.	NanoAg: Find out more about the expectations from NL on nanoAg		
19.	NanoAg: Assess endpoints which are at risk of being challenged by regulators		
20.	NanoAg: If high tier/cost nanoAg-specific testing requirements are needed for nanoAg, review PMC cost-sharing formula in order to arrive at a fair and proportionate cost-sharing and data-access solution		
21.	NanoAg: Decide and argument whether nanoAg and Ag need to be registered in one same or two separate dossiers under REACH once the work by EBRC and WCA is progressed/finalised	PMC Members	Dec 2012
PGM project			
22.	Send comments on data-sharing agreement template	PMC Members	Jul 2012
23.	Finalise data-sharing agreement with IPA	CB	Sep 2012
Hydrazine project			
24.	Request a revised proposal from RPA	CB	ASAP