



Chairman: *D. Boyd (Consultant, United Kingdom)*
Secretariat: *K. Rothenbacher (EPMF, Belgium) & K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)*

24 June 2014, 10:00 - 11:00 CET

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1.	Angela Alderman	Johnson Matthey	<i>United Kingdom</i>
2.	Katrien Arijs	ARCHE	<i>Belgium</i>
3.	Rafael Armbruster	Heraeus	<i>Germany</i>
4.	Roland Brasch	Heraeus	<i>Germany</i>
5.	Dave Boyd	Johnson Matthey	<i>United Kingdom</i>
6.	Becky Marks	WCA Environment	<i>United Kingdom</i>
7.	Graham Merrington	WCA Environment	<i>United Kingdom</i>
8.	Klaus Rothenbacher	EPMF	<i>Belgium</i>
9.	Michael Shepherd	Vale Europe	<i>United Kingdom</i>
10.	Ed Stutt	WCA Environment	<i>United Kingdom</i>
11.	Carole Wilson	Vale Europe	<i>United Kingdom</i>

APOLOGIES

Barbara Badiello	Pamp	<i>Switzerland</i>
Heike Kinz	Umicore	<i>Germany</i>

MINUTES

1. **Welcome & Introduction** (*D. Boyd*)
 - 1.1. Confidentiality and Competition Law reminder by the chair
 - 1.2. The agenda was approved
2. **PGM site-specific monitoring programme** (*Ed Stutt, WCA*)
 - o Rationale for site-specific monitoring PdEd Stutt presented the reasons for the STP monitoring programme and the site-specific monitoring programme (cf. slides 6-19). It was explained that a stepwise approach had been taken,
 - Starting with the standard approach outlined in the ECHA guidance using default assumptions
 - As safe use could not be demonstrated by the standard approach for all sites, a refined approach with site-specific assessments was carried out
 - Safe use could not be demonstrated by this refined approach for all sites and it was decided to refine the PNEC by conducting additional chronic ecotox tests
 - However, this approach - even after having refined the PNECs - could not demonstrate safe use for all sites either. An update site specific assessment was presented, based on newly revised PNECs
 - Therefore, it is now recommended that a site-specific monitoring programme is conducted by those sites that are at potential risk based on the site-specific assessment (ca. 50% of the sites)

Another reason for conducting site specific measurements based on the latest standards is that many currently available data are based on emission measurements with a relatively high limit of detection (LOD). This has a serious downside since, even if no Palladium was detected in the measurements, the guidance requires us to use half of LOD in the exposure scenarios. This could result in situations where,



Chairman: D. Boyd (Consultant, United Kingdom)
Secretariat: K. Rothenbacher (EPMF, Belgium) & K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)

24 June 2014, 10:00 - 11:00 CET

despite no Pd being detected, a potential risk is identified.

Decision: all participants agreed with the need to carry out such a site specific monitoring programme.

It was noted that not all companies that currently are at a potential risk were participating in this conference call. PMC confirmed that all companies did receive specific reminders on their situation and were invited to participate in the programme and received invitations to this call.

Action: PMC to again remind companies, that are at a potential risk, to participate in the programme

As agreed at the previous PGM WG meeting, the costs of the programme will be distributed as follows:

- PMC will cover the costs of the STP monitoring programme
- Individual sites will cover their own costs for sampling/ analytics
- PMC will cover consulting expenses for project monitoring (done by WCA) and data evaluation

Action: PMC to re-circulate proposals containing cost calculations

2.2 Rationale for STP monitoring programme Pd

It was questioned why there is a need to monitor municipal STPs rather than internal STPs. WCA explained that for the purpose of the ES, a retention factor for STP needs to be used in the (EUSES) calculations. This is standard practice and is required by the ECHA guidance. Currently no robust value is available and therefore it is suggested to generate measured data on this. It is not the intention to pinpoint individual sites, but to generate a robust value that can be used in the overall dossier. Practically, this means that the average of retention factors measured at 3 different STPs will be used. The retention factor will be determined by simply measuring how much Palladium enters the STP and how much leaves the STP (i.e., no connection to contributing sites)

Practicalities:

Action: Participating sites to nominate a company “champion” who will be the point of contact for wca by the end of next week (add date)

Action: companies to confirm if they are able to handle sampling in-house or if support by a consulting company is needed

- WCA will help with practical support and provide to the company champion the sample bottles, filters, syringes, labels needed for the sampling campaign
- wca will forward a pro-forma to the company champion. A similar form was used previously for silver sampling campaign, which will document all necessary sampling parameters (date, location, etc.)
- The company champion will receive the sample bottles, filters and syringes, will take the samples, fill in the pro-forma, and will ensure that the samples are appropriately packed under ice bags and shipped to the analytical lab

Sampling duration:

- It was recommend to conduct the aquatic monitoring over a period of 12 months to cover seasonal variations. It was recommended to start the programme in the summer (of 2014): this would make sure that the programme starts under worst-case conditions (e.g., under low flow



Chairman: D. Boyd (Consultant, United Kingdom)
Secretariat: K. Rothenbacher (EPMF, Belgium) & K. Arijs (ARCHE, Belgium)

24 June 2014, 10:00 - 11:00 CET

- conditions of the receiving rivers).
- It was agreed for WCA/PMC to regularly review the measured data. This will allow to adjust the scope accordingly. If, e.g., no emissions have been measured for 2 consecutive months under worst case conditions (i.e., in summer) then there may be no need to complete a full 12 months of monitoring.
 -
 - 1. Way forward for other PGMs
 - a. Sites participating in the Pd site specific monitoring programme
 - It is likely that the freshwater and sediment PNECs for other precious metals may be similarly low as for Pd. Testing is currently ongoing to determine this. It is therefore reasonable to assume that some sites will also need monitoring for other PGMs
 - As the main cost of a monitoring programme is for sampling and study monitoring, only minimal additional costs would be incurred by analyse for additional precious metals within the frame of the ongoing programme. It was therefore agreed to add additional precious metals (Rh, Pd, Ag, Pt, Au, etc. as appropriate for the site concerned) to the programme
 - As no definitive ES have been conducted for other PGMs, it was agreed that the individual sites judge themselves which PGMs will be relevant for their situation

Action: participating sites assess current situation and add other PGMs to the scope as appropriate

- b. Other sites not flagged for Pd but at possible risk for other PGMs
 - The same considerations as above also apply to these sites. It was therefore agreed that the individual sites judge themselves which additional sites (and which PGMs) will be relevant for their situation

Action: PMC to alert other companies to evaluate the need to participate in the programme for sites not identified in the Pd programme

- c. Supporting parameters
 - it was recommended to determine a range of supporting parameters (e.g., DOC, pH, hardness, AVS, etc.). This might be required in case after this programme there would still be a need for refinement. In that case these parameters might allow for a bioavailability correction

AOB, next meetings/calls and closing remarks

It was agreed to schedule the next meeting/ call on an ad-hoc basis.