



Chairpersons: E. Broekaert (Umicore, Belgium) & D. Cholakova (Aurubis, Belgium)
Secretariat: K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)

Metals Conference Centre - Aluminium Room
Rue du Duc 100 - 1150 Brussels (BELGIUM)

DRAFT MINUTES

AP refer to Action Points listed at the end of this document.

1. Welcome & Introduction

1.1. Reminder on Confidentiality and Competition Law.

Participants were reminded on their obligation to comply with confidentiality and Competition Law rules.

1.2. Tour de table and apologies

The list of participants and apologies is available in Annex 1.

1.3. Approval of the agenda

The agenda is available in Annex 1. No remarks/additions; agenda approved.

1.4. Approval of the minutes of the last meeting (5 November 2013) - including status of action points

The minutes of the meeting were approved. The status of actions is reported in slides 5-6 of Annex 2.

2. Update on activities Eurométaux REACH intermediate task force: Feedback from workshop with ECHA on inorganic UVCB assessment (Cf. Annex 3 and slides 8-19 in Annex 2)

On 22 January 2014, Eurométaux (EM) had a meeting with ECHA experts from the Substance Identification (SID), Classification, Evaluation and Computational units to explain the proposed CSA flow for inorganic UVCBs:

- The approach was illustrated by a pilot case on Cu slimes (it was agreed that one pilot case would be sufficient and hence the most advanced case was presented).
- In general, the presented approach appeared acceptable to ECHA but several areas for improvement were identified:
 - The need to be very explicit on our approach and properly justify any deviation from the REACH guidance was stressed.
 - A qualitative assessment (considering emission and hazard potential) was proposed for those constituents where no DNEL is available / there is no data access. ECHA considers this to be a data gap and indicated we have to derive a surrogate value in this case to demonstrate safe use (even for those constituents where a dossier will only be submitted in 2018). It is noted that the REACH guidance does allow a qualitative assessment in certain cases.
 - Another challenge is the consideration of combined toxicity (both for human health and the environment). For human health, we could use the sum of the RCRs of all constituents as a first filter / placeholder. For the environment, a possible way forward is to add up the RCRs by species, as not always the same species is the most sensitive. A joint way forward / placeholder to include in the dossiers will be developed with the different commodities / consultants.
 - We will need to reflect on the validation of the proposed approach (validation testing). However, it will be difficult to select a representative sample (impossible to select 'worst case' for all constituents + difficult to predict combined toxicity).
 - ECHA's feedback on substance identity for inorganic UVCB is further discussed under agenda point 4.2.
- ECHA stressed the need to submit the 'upgraded' dossiers by the 22 April deadline but realised that these dossiers will not have solved all identified improvement issues (e.g. combined toxicity; no current guidance available). It was hence suggested to assess what we can by the deadline and indicate what actions will be undertaken after the deadline (which actions will we carry out, how, what is their priority and timing). After the 22 January meeting, EM has sent a roadmap of actions with short, medium and long-term actions to ECHA.
- ECHA was invited for a site visit in Finland on 14 February 2014 to check the reality of metallurgical refining and to improve common understanding on UVCB intermediates processes and variability.

AP1-7

(Post-meeting note: A summary of the roadmap and feedback from the site visit can be found in Annex 3.4.)



3. PM Refinables - scope, substance identification, classification (Cf. slides 21-25 in Annex 2)

3.1. Scope

14 Refinable dossiers were submitted in 2010 of which two remain SCC and one is actually REACH exempt as by-product (hence, $14 - 3 = 11$ upgrades). From the remaining, one has been split into 2 (hence $11 - 1 + 2 = 12$ upgrades). Depending on the outcome of the splitting exercise for PM slimes & sludges, this means we anticipate submitting 12 or more upgrades in April 2014.

3.2. Composition

- Both the LE specific and generic composition (and classification specific compositions if relevant) should be reported in IUCLID 1.2 with LE specific reported first.
 - Typical and concentration ranges should be reported for all compositions, with the typical composition ideally adding up to 100%.
 - The LE specific composition is the composition across year(s), excluding outliers (properly / mathematically defined) and should match the analysis data in IUCLID 1.4 (AP8).
 - PMC Members agree to define the generic composition (across industry) as follows:
 - Typical concentration = average of LE typical concentrations
 - Minimum concentration = minimum of LE typical concentrations
 - Maximum concentration = maximum of LE typical concentrations
- ID cards will be updated accordingly (AP9).

• Doré:

- It is noted that both Ag and Au concentrations are high, which may prompt ECHA to consider it over-grouped. It may therefore be needed to further split Doré after the April submission deadline. (AP10-11)
- ECHA has indicated that substances with one of the constituents > 80%, should be registered as a mono-constituent substance, meaning Doré with > 80% Ag should be registered under the Ag dossier (which currently only covers pure Ag - if impure Ag profiles are included in the Ag dossier, additional classifications, ESSs, ... should also be added, plus this may trigger double registration fees for Doré registrants). However, for the Refinables, we are claiming UVCB status based on process considerations (i.e. different process leads to different substance).

3.3. Classification

Since the last PM Ref WG meeting:

- In MeClas, the output sheets have been improved based on ECHA's recommendations (showing 'in-between-calculations') and these should be included in IUCLID section 13.
- A new cluster analysis has been done for the PM slimes & sludges (see also agenda point 4.2).

AP12-14

4. Splitting of PM slags and slimes & sludges (Cf. slides 27-52 in Annex 2)

4.1. Splitting of PM slags: status and way forward

- At the last PM Ref WG meeting, it was agreed to split the PM slags dossier in 2 dossiers. We may need to request 2 new EC numbers for these dossiers because the existing EINECS entries may not be suitable and ECHA has indicated EINECS entries should not be changed.
 - 1) Slags produced as by-products in the production (smelting, reduction, converting, and refining processes) of doré: EC entry 266-975-1 ('slags, doré furnace') may be suitable but then we would need to change the description (principal components incorrect).
 - 2) Slags produced as a by-product in the smelting of PM bearing feeds to produce a PM containing material other than doré subject to further refining: EC entry 308-515-5 (the original EC entry for PM slags) may be used but then we would need to update the description that was previously proposed and the EC name (too broad).
- It is further noted that:
 - A new registration fee will have to be paid for new dossiers resulting from the splitting exercise.
 - In case of an upgrade to an Art. 10 dossier, the full fee needs to be paid (and not just the difference between an Art. 10 dossier and the previously submitted Art. 17/18 dossier).

AP15-19



Chairpersons: E. Broekaert (Umicore, Belgium) & D. Cholakova (Aurubis, Belgium)
Secretariat: K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)

Metals Conference Centre - Aluminium Room
Rue du Duc 100 - 1150 Brussels (BELGIUM)

4.2. Splitting of PM slimes & sludges: status and way forward

At the EM/ECHA meeting of 22 January, ECHA gave some feedback on substance identity for inorganic UVCBs: cf. slides 30-33 in Annex 2. Further comments:

- It is noted that the variability in concentration ranges of elements/constituents is not entirely driven by sources and processes; because of the complexity of inorganic refining, concentration ranges can vary with similar source and same process. In a distillation process for organics, the variability in concentration is much lower. Furthermore, the ECHA guidance on substance identity mentions refining as a process whereas there are many processes in PM refining. This is not comparable to petrochemical refining. It is suggested to explain this complexity to ECHA, by comparing petrochemical and metallurgical refining. **AP20**

(Post-meeting note: An example was developed showing output variability when the process is the same and the source is not (cf. Annex 7). It is important to explain to ECHA why the source changes and in particular why we cannot:

- Split sources of primary and secondary nature, where they all go through the same smelting channel; and
- Split sources of secondary nature per type, because of the same reason.

This is less valid for other process steps than the first/initial and repeated smelting ones.)

- Sometimes it is simply not realistic to split different processes or sources e.g.:
 - All PM flue dusts are collected together because of good occupational hygiene practice.
 - Different sources are often put together in the same furnace to undergo the same process.
- ECHA stressed that EINECS entries are fixed and cannot be changed. The EINECS inventory is used as a tool to confirm phase-in status, ECHA confirmed that a substance for which a new EC number is requested will not be automatically considered as a non-phase-in substance.

Splitting of PM slimes & sludges:

- It was previously suggested to split the PM slimes & sludges in 5 sub-groups based on source and process (cf. slide 34 in Annex 2). PMC members were asked to assign their slimes & sludges to these sub-groups and report composition. Ideally, the sub-groups should allow refining the composition / reducing the variability.
- The scope of each sub-group (highest tonnage band, type of dossier needed, number of registrants) is summarized on slide 37 in Annex 2.
- The following differences/similarities were observed between the 5 sub-groups:
 - **Speciation:** the speciation in sub-groups 3, 4 and 5 was very and equally variable and no distinct differences in speciation were observed between them. It will be difficult to defend a large variability in speciation for 1 UVCB, as ECHA may consider this to be an indication of multiple processes being grouped. On the other hand, it is difficult to predict / refine the speciation and therefore there would be a need to declare a mixture of speciations to be on the safe side.
 - **Elemental composition:**
 - Sub-group 1: high in Ag and Au (with Ag > Au), relatively high in Cu and Pd and relatively low in other metals.
 - Sub-group 2: high in Au and Ag (with Au > Ag) and relatively low in other metals (but only 1 sample in this group).
 - Sub-groups 3, 4 and 5: relatively low in Ag and Au compared to sub-groups 1 and 2 and relatively high in other metals, but no significant differences between the 3 sub-groups.
 - **Classification** (not a criterion for splitting but used as validation of the proposed approach): a lot of overlap between classification of samples in sub-group 1, 3, 4 and 5, classification of sub-group 2 different from classification sub-groups 1, 3, 4 and 5.
- The recommendations from the Task Force that was set up for the Refinables splitting was 1) to register the sub-groups as 1 UVCB by April, to ensure a consistent approach for substance identification across all Refinables, and 2) to come up with a general set of rules / decision tree for the Refinables' identification after April, when another possible splitting exercise would be implemented across all Refinables in a consistent manner (**AP21**).
- However, the WG agreed sub-group 1 and sub-group 2 were clearly and sufficiently different from sub-groups 3-4-5 from a source and process viewpoint (i.e. ECHA Guidance on the identification and naming of UVCB) and that it was diligent to register them separately by the April deadline. For sub-



Chairpersons: E. Broekaert (Umicore, Belgium) & D. Cholakova (Aurubis, Belgium)
Secretariat: K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)

Metals Conference Centre - Aluminium Room
Rue du Duc 100 - 1150 Brussels (BELGIUM)

groups 3-4-5, where there is not (yet) such a clear view on actually distinct source and process, or an improvement of the variability in the group, it was agreed to document the efforts made to further split in the dossier (indicating where the decision has been influenced by guidance/ECHA), and further splitting will be considered/discussed after April ([AP21-22](#)).

- It is therefore suggested to update the descriptions of the 3 PM slimes & sludges as follows:
 - 1) Slimes obtained/produced during the electrolysis of Ag.
 - 2) Slimes obtained/produced during the electrolysis of Au.
 - 3) Sludges obtained/produced from the hydro-metallurgical refining of precious metals containing materials.

Furthermore, to be in accordance with the ECHA guidance on the identification and naming of UVCB, the typical constituents should be added to the descriptions (should mention source / process / main constituents).

- It is noted that we may not have sufficient time to generate the phys-chem data for these 3 sub-groups but it should not be an issue to update the dossier with these data at a later stage. In terms of generating CSRs/ESs for the 3 groups, it is considered feasible by EBRC and WCA.

[AP15 & AP33](#)

4.3. UVCB identification rules for other Refinables

A decision tree will be developed to define Refinable dossier scope / substance identity ([AP21](#)).

5. CSR human health and occupational sections (Cf. slides 54-79 in Annex 2)

Occupational Exposure Scenarios (ESs) - methodology

- Developed on a workplace-by-workplace basis, providing specific information on RMMs for different tasks/activities (= activity classes) in a workplace.
- Currently taking into account all constituents classified for human health and handled in a workplace.
- Inhalation exposure assessment based on pooled monitoring data. The generic exposure assessment (GEA) table allows determining an exposure estimate for each constituent across activity classes.
- Bio-monitoring data (blood Pb levels): a risk assessment was conducted on an industry-wide scale, assessed to be representative for the involved European companies. The 90th percentile values for all provided data were well below the DNEL for lead.
- Dermal exposure assessment based on exposure estimation tool MEASE. It is noted that several tools (including MEASE) are currently being evaluated, depending on outcome more details on methodology may be needed in the CSR. [AP23](#)

Company-specific occupational ESs

- First drafts sent to companies end December 2013.
- Include derivation of exposure estimates for each activity class in a workplace.
- Respiratory protective equipment (RPE) is assigned based on the worst case RCR for all constituents. The RPE currently used in the workplace may be different.
- It is noted that the occupational risk characterization table will be significantly shortened, only including rows with hazardous substances and routes of exposure for which an assessment is required.
- Comments on the first drafts are summarized on slides 67-68 in Annex 2.
- PMC Members agree to have a workplace specific occupational ES and not a substance specific one, with an introduction to explain the approach.
- Second drafts of the site-specific occupational ES will be available by 17 February 2014. Final drafts will be available by mid March 2014 (about 22 March 2014).
- Since the generic occupational sections in the CSR will not be sufficient for ECHA's understanding, companies are advised to attach their site-specific occupational ES to their individual dossier, although it is not strictly required.

[AP24-27](#)

Risk characterization table

- Generated based on GEA table and DNEL table.
- Where DNELs are missing, the DNEL table should be further completed with 'surrogate values' to be



Chairpersons: E. Broekaert (Umicore, Belgium) & D. Cholakova (Aurubis, Belgium)
Secretariat: K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)

Metals Conference Centre - Aluminium Room
Rue du Duc 100 - 1150 Brussels (BELGIUM)

derived. It is noted that these surrogate values are only to be used for the purpose of UVCB intermediate dossier upgrades, and may therefore be quite different to DNELs which are (to be) developed for the metal/constituent itself. [AP6](#)

CSR/IUCLID human health

- EBRC is currently adapting the Eurométaux IUCLID template human health sections for the individual Refinables.
- Data access for the different constituents is currently being requested.
- It is suggested to include a generic methodology section in chapter 9 of the CSR.
- A first draft CSR for Doré will be circulated by early March 2014 for commenting. [AP28](#)

6. CSR environmental sections (Cf. slides 82-99 in Annex 2)

Exposure assessment - methodology

- Based on constituents with environmental classification, assessed separately without consideration of additivity.
- Local environmental concentrations estimated according to R16 guidance.
- Use of SpERCs will need to be justified. [AP29](#)

Generic Exposure Scenario (GES)

- Cf. Annex 4 and slides 84-92 in Annex 2.
- Includes 2 environmental ESs: discharge to freshwater via STP (ES1) and direct discharge (to freshwater and marine) (ES2). Inclusion of another ES to cover discharge to marine waters via STP is not strictly required but it is suggested to include it to cover LoA purchasers.
- Based on compiled dataset. Covers all Refinables and all aspects of Refinables processing (production and use).
- Several refinements to the GES were made since the last PM Ref WG meeting.
 - o ES1: RCR < 1 for all compartments (except stack emissions of Ni and Cr to air).
 - o ES2: Msafe approach used for Ag, Ni, As, Cd and Cu. RCR < 1 for all compartments (except stack emissions of Ni and Cr to air).[AP30](#)
- It is noted that we will not be able to account for combined toxicity on a GES basis because of the conservatism in the GES, and it is anticipated that this will most probably be best addressed on a site-specific basis in future updates. [AP1](#)
- For the April deadline, the GES will be included in the CSR, meaning companies do not have to attach their site-specific environmental assessment to their dossier.
- In the uncertainty analysis, STP removal rates will need to be taken into account. [AP2](#)

Site specific risk assessments (SSRAs)

- Sent to companies preparing upgraded submissions.
- Based on monitoring data where available or SpERC release factors applied to estimated tonnage.
- RCR < 1 for all constituents in all aquatic compartments (freshwater, marine water and sediments) and soil.
- RCR > 1 for MvE from stack emissions of Ni and Cr at some sites. [AP30](#)
- Only 1 company indicated to have monitoring data available for stack emissions of relevant constituents. Other companies had no or only partial data available.

CSR sections to be clarified / to find common wording for with Eurométaux / other consortia

- Man via environment (MvE) exposure: a MvE assessment will not be included in the April updates. A waiving statement / justification will be required, which will need to be consistent with other UVCB intermediates dossiers.
- Combined toxicity: this will be addressed by a holding statement prepared by Eurométaux, who have also included a number of (short, medium and long term) actions on assessment of combined toxicity for UVCB intermediates in the roadmap sent to ECHA.
- Secondary poisoning: considered relevant for metal constituents with known bioaccumulation potential. A secondary poisoning assessment will be conducted for these constituents and justification text will be added to explain which constituents have been assessed, this will be based on the text



Chairpersons: E. Broekaert (Umicore, Belgium) & D. Cholakova (Aurubis, Belgium)
Secretariat: K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)

Metals Conference Centre - Aluminium Room
Rue du Duc 100 - 1150 Brussels (BELGIUM)

that is being included in other UVCB intermediates dossiers.

- Waste stage: a waiving statement will be provided by Eurométaux.

[AP31](#)

7. CSR generic and other sections

A number of introduction sections will be generated by the PMC secretariat and Eurométaux and will be added manually to the CSR. See slide 101 in Annex 2.

8. Timing of submission upgraded PM Refinables dossiers (Cf. slides 103-106 in Annex 2)

8.1. Status data-sharing agreements

- Data-sharing agreements have been signed with Pb, Cu, Ni, Zn, Cd and As and will be signed with Sb shortly.
- Data-sharing agreement requests have been sent to B, Co, Mn, Mo, Se, Te. Some consortia (e.g. Co and Mn) will charge an administrative fee for the data ([AP32](#)).
- Some further clarifications are needed on other constituents where data access may be needed.

8.2. Status testing for PM Refinables with phys-chem data gaps

Cf. slides 104-105 in Annex 2. [AP33](#)

8.3. Timing over next 2 months to achieve 22 April deadline

- The proposed timing is summarised on slide 106 in Annex 2.
- LR's will need to submit their dossier updates first, followed by the co-registrants. It is noted that for a spontaneous dossier update, the LR does not need to wait for confirmation from ECHA that the dossier was successfully submitted before the co-registrants can submit. It is therefore suggested to take 17 April as submission deadline for the LR's. Note that new dossiers (i.e. some of the slags and slimes & sludges) will need to be submitted earlier by the LR. [AP34-36](#)

9. Next steps, AOB, next meetings/calls and closing remarks

It is proposed to have the next Refinables meeting end of March / early April. [AP37](#)

Annexes

1. Agenda & list of participants
2. Slides presented at the meeting
3. Meeting Eurométaux/ECHA 22 Jan 2014 on UVCBs assessment
 - 3.1. Mail with feedback from meeting (Eurométaux, 27 Jan 2014)
 - 3.2. Presentation complex inorganic UVCB Chemical Safety Assessment (Eurométaux, 22 Jan 2014)
 - 3.3. Presentation substance identification of complex inorganic UVCBs (ECHA, 22 Jan 2014)
 - 3.4. Presentation feedback and alignment on UVCB dossiers from REACH Intermediates Task Force call 24 Feb 2014 (Eurométaux, 24 Feb 2014)
4. Refinables environmental GES narrative (WCA, 5 Feb 2014)
5. Inorganic UVCB dossier updates from 2010 to 2014 (PMC, 14 Feb 2014)
6. MeClas reference sample codes (ARCHE, 6 Jul 2013)
7. Petrochemical and metallurgical refining process examples (Dave Boyd, 19 Feb 2014)



Chairpersons: E. Broekaert (Umicore, Belgium) & D. Cholakova (Aurubis, Belgium)
Secretariat: K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)

Metals Conference Centre - Aluminium Room
Rue du Duc 100 - 1150 Brussels (BELGIUM)

Actions

Table 1. Actions resulting from the 6 February 2014 PM Refiners WG meeting in Brussels

Action	Who?	Timeline
1. Show that we have considered the risks of combined toxicity in dossier 'upgrade' and indicate way forward / actions to be undertaken after 22 April 2014	EBRC & WCA led by EM	By Mid Mar 2014
2. Explain claimed 'conservatism' and limited or controlled 'uncertainty' in uncertainty analysis	EBRC & WCA with EM	By Mid Mar 2014
3. If further updates are announced in the dossier submitted in April, indicate the date of the update	PMC Sec, EBRC & WCA	By Mid Mar 2014
4. Check schedule of dossier updates with other metal consortia for dossiers where the use phase of the ES is in another dossier (e.g. Cu electrolytic slimes & sludges used in the production of Doré) to align update frequency and strive towards parallel updates	PMC Sec with EM	Q2 2014
5. Explicitly explain monitoring data and programme's limitations	WCA with EM	By Mid Mar 2014
6. Investigate need to derive surrogate values to function as DNEL for those constituents where no DNEL is available	EBRC with EM	By Mid Mar 2014
7. Explain industry's position on possible need for validation testing as part of the uncertainty analysis	EBRC & WCA led by EM	By Mid Mar 2014
8. Develop LE specific composition (typical + concentration range) with the typical composition adding up to 100% and excluding extreme outliers (properly / mathematically defined)	All PM Ref registrants	By End Mar 2014
9. Update the generic composition in the Refinables ID cards as follows: • Typical concentration = average of LE typical concentrations • Minimum concentration = minimum of LE typical concentrations • Maximum concentration = maximum of LE typical concentrations + Indicate where further splitting may be needed (e.g. Doré)	PMC Sec	By End Feb 2014
10. Check > 80% metal contents in Doré and get explanation from relevant companies	PMC Sec	By End Feb 2014
11. Consider splitting exercise for Doré	PM Ref WG	After Apr 2014
12. Review classifications of the PM Refinables taking into account: • New information in MeClas • Updated composition information received from some companies (and excluding those companies that are no longer registering) • Splitting of slags and slimes & sludges + Include updated classifications in ID cards	ARCHE/PMC Sec	By End Feb 2014
13. Review classifications of the PM Refinables and submit updated classifications if necessary	Review by ARCHE, submission by LRs	Nov each year
14. Recirculate MeClas reference sample codes for PM Ref Members to derive their own classification	PMC Sec	Done; cf. Annex 6
15. Produce new ID Cards for PM slags (2) and PM slimes & sludges (3) and circulate for comment/finalization	PMC Sec	By End Feb 2014
16. Once the dossiers have been finalized, review the LoA price to reflect the additional work done since the first submission in 2010	PMC Sec	After Apr 2014
17. After the separate dossiers have been submitted, inform the SIEF, together with the LoA Agreement/price announcement	PMC Sec	After Apr 2014
18. Inform LoA purchaser of slag dossier about splitting and possible consequences (+ composition, etc.)	PMC Sec	ASAP
19. Develop example of impossibility to change EINECS description on registration updates and upgrades and pass through EM for discussion with ECHA; use PM slags scenario	PMC Sec with EM	By End Feb 2014
20. Develop example of typical organic process versus inorganic process of refining for presentation at ECHA's site visit with EM on 14 Feb 2014	PMC Sec to send to EM	Done
21. Prepare the following sections to be included in each Refinable dossier (CSR Chapter 1 on substance ID): • Justifications for deviating from ECHA's warning messages (cf. slide 33 in Annex 2) • Commentary to explain effort to refine substance ID based on ECHA Guidance, PM refining industry reality (8 precious metals in 3 families; more sources; more iterative	PMC Sec; review by PM Ref WG	By Mid Mar 2014



Chairpersons: E. Broekaert (Umicore, Belgium) & D. Cholakova (Aurubis, Belgium)
Secretariat: K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)

Metals Conference Centre - Aluminium Room
Rue du Duc 100 - 1150 Brussels (BELGIUM)

	process steps), and ECHA's expectations over learning curve of REACH • A decision tree to be used to define Refinable dossier scope / substance ID including source, process, composition and classification (with the two latter ones serving validation purposes and not substance ID definition ones)		
22.	Check all Refinables using the decision tree and consider further splitting of 'sludges obtained/produced from the hydro-metallurgical refining of precious metals containing materials' and other Refinables if necessary	PM Ref WG	After Apr 2014
23.	MEASE to be explained in Refinables' CSR unless a reference can be made to an externally published scientific reference	EBRC	By Mid Mar 2014
24.	Produce one workplace-specific ES across Refinables instead of a UVCB-specific ES BUT add proper introductory remark explaining why same document is used across Refinables' dossiers + guarantee that it meets uncertainty conservatism / safe use demonstration + implementation's expectations from ECHA	EBRC	- 2 nd draft by 17 Feb 2014 - Final by Mid Mar 2014
25.	Review/comment 2 nd draft company-specific ES	PM Ref WG	By 3 Mar 2014
26.	Decide if site-specific occupational ES will be attached to the dossier or not (if not, it should be indicated that they have one available on-site)	Each company	By End Mar 2014
27.	Keep site-specific ES for occupational and environmental exposure separate to facilitate longer term updates without disclosing company specificities and/or delaying occupational versus environmental work	WCA & EBRC	As needed
28.	Circulate one example CSR for comment (and next individual CSRs later, assuming less time will be required for comment)	WCA, EBRC & PMC Sec	By Early Mar 2014
29.	Justify use of SpERCs in environmental exposure assessment	WCA	By Mid Mar 2014
30.	Design recommendation for monitoring programme of stack emissions considering all constituents with environmental relevance and for which an RCR < 1 cannot be achieved using SpERCs and/or in the GES (after assessment of constituents to be included)	WCA & EBRC	After Apr 2014
31.	Develop common wording/approach across metals sector for use in the CSR of all inorganic UVCBs for the following sections: • Man via the environment exposure • Secondary poisoning • Consideration of waste stage	PMC sec with EM	By Mid Mar 2014
32.	If consortia request unreasonable payments for data-sharing agreements, invite the Ref WG to discuss, negotiate and/or approve the proposed amount	PMC Sec	As needed
33.	Perform data-gap analysis for phys-chem endpoints for the 3 new sub-groups of slimes & sludges, PM Refining and submit to the PM Ref WG to check availability of info among PM Ref Members	PMC Sec with WCA	ASAP
34.	Submission of new dossiers for PM slags and PM slimes & sludges by LRs	LRs	By 4 Apr 2014
35.	Submission of dossier 'upgrades' by LRs	LRs	By 17 Apr 2014
36.	Submission of new dossiers and dossier 'upgrades' by co-registrants	Co-registrants	By 22 Apr 2014
37.	Set date for next PM Ref WG meeting once date of EM/ECHA workshop is confirmed	PMC Sec	ASAP