

EUROMETAUX CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT NEWS



In June please join us on GoToMeeting for:

- MISA – Catch-up call: 16 June
- Chemicals Management Steering Committee meeting: 17 June

Contents

COMMISSION – EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT	3
ECHA REACH & CLP.....	3
OTHERS.....	3
EUROMETAUX CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT	3
EM FUNCTIONING.....	3
CHEMICALS STRATEGY FOR SUSTAINABILITY	4
ENVIRONMENT	5
EVALUATION	5
RISK MANAGEMENT	6
INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS/ WATER	6
INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS.....	7
WATER.....	7
TOOLS.....	8
METALS & INORGANICS SECTORIAL APPROACH (MISA)	9
OUTREACH.....	10
COMMUNICATION.....	11
CALENDAR.....	11
ACRONYMS	12

Dear All,

'Time' - 15 minutes: I'm running in circles around my computer, checking the calendar and the link I received. Are we on 'Z', 'GTM' or 'S' today? Are we going visio or for a black screen? Should I get rid of that floppy-shirt, wear shoes?

'Time' - 5 minutes: I'm getting a bit agitated. Do I have enough water? It is so sunny outside. The room I promised not to leave/not be 'entered' by anyone else is already starting to feel like a (Belgian) sauna.

Why am I so tense? My experience in calls should allow me by now to run for the 'Miss Remote' contest. I'm not really shy of saying hello to a screen or be (a fake) Madonna with a headset.

I know most of the people on the other sides of the 'ether' -or at least I believe I know them -COVID has changed us! I can more or less control the impulsiveness of my voice and tone, usually know where to 'raise the hand', and play mute/unmute when my neighbour's (horribly annoying) dogs start barking.

Still, I'm restless, move things around.

Apprehension...I'm most probably not the only one struggling, I'm keep telling myself. What about the host getting messages that links do not work, the IT guy making sound checks, that participant shouting repeatedly 'Can you hear me?' (yes, we **can** hear you)

The call starts, and after 5 minutes of hesitation, the rhythm starts to flow. Slides are uploaded and everyone -except the presenter and chair maybe- is re-joining his/her "comfort" zone: a bit more slumped in their chair, taking notes or making drawings, eyes switching between screen and window (and the bare toes).

20 minutes later: the voices transmitted by the computer compose a purring, time seems a little 'suspended'. My mind tends to wander, instead I force it to stay active by frenetic note-taking. I'm wondering: what about the other participants? Do they manage to remain in active thinking mode? The alternance in voices is a bit limited (I cannot avoid counting the 'do you hear me?') and some interventions are so long that they seem to rather contribute to the overall haze. Feeling lonely at your home desk maybe?

30 minutes later: a poll wakes everyone up. I'm not allowed to participate; I just see the seconds flowing away in a corner of the screen. In one silent minute, more than 30 people have expressed an opinion, a consensus was reached. What's the sound of that silence?

Did we actually have a discussion, an exchange of thoughts, replies to questions posed or no replies to questions posed and replies to not posed questions? Was this a scientific debate? What will be reported?

I feel a bit dizzy and frustrated but try to keep 'things in perspective'. Because I could also participate in the 'hoping for a fair debate but it was not' contest after 15 years of Eurometaux work. What is actually different now, due to the remote setting?

The proximity with other people of course. The 'being all in one place to solve one issue' feeling. The possibility to send an alarmed glance at the person sitting a bit further away (or draw his/her attention), the screening of who is actually listening or who does not really care, the 1001 details you unconsciously notice, but that give a context: a frowning eyebrow, an impatient movement of hands, a shrug. You see what your comments generate, you adapt to the atmosphere, you modulate.

This remoteness is much worse than 1.5 m social distancing with masks and the fear of COVID.

Of course, we all do what we can and the rules (including on the web calls) are there with good intentions. As these rules are regularly changing, it is also normal that we are still trying and failing.

We will get used to it and better with time, they say! Really? Is that the objective?

Then we need to think and reconsider some of the modalities: being it the report of the meeting to confirm the human presence or the interactions between participants. Some thinking should be given to what we would dare to name a quality – dynamic decision (even if we don't like the outcome).

"Hope you can hear & see me?"

Violaine Verougstraete, Chemicals Management Director Eurometaux

COMMISSION – EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Implementing Regulation on Dossier Updates: *status, enforcement activities and industry guidance*

The upcoming Implementing Regulation on Dossier Updates was discussed in the REACH Committee in May and the vote is expected in June. According to information received from the European Commission, the draft text submitted to the REACH Committee (not yet seen by industry) contains significant changes compared to the version presented at CARACAL. A number of new articles were introduced, including timelines for further testing activities. At the May REACH Committee meeting, ECHA presented a paper providing an overview of how ECHA is supporting dossier updates: guidance documents, centralisation of the info on ECHA's website, IUCLID support and update of the REACH IT to give more transparency in the joint submissions and alerting of events impacting the joint submission. According to ECHA, in 2021, registration dossier screenings will be conducted; besides inviting/alerting registrants to update their dossiers, implementation/enforcement actions will be discussed in the REACH Enforcement Forum and with national enforcement bodies.

Currently, Eurometaux is cooperating with Cefic to draft a best practices document to support both registrants and co-registrants in the REACH registration dossiers updating process (more information: Caroline Braibant, Sandra Carey, Lorenzo Zullo).

ECHA REACH & CLP

OTHERS

ECHA-Industry exchanges: *2nd call covered data enquiry flows, only representatives and extended deadlines*

The periodic informal discussions between ECHA and industry, that kicked off in April, are proceeding. The 2nd call took place on 20 May. ECHA is working on the definition of a workflow to request and receive access to data older than 12 years but more discussions are still needed to address some technical aspects before it will be integrated in REACH-IT. An additional change related to the REACH-IT is about the integration of a functionality for Only Representative to declare the name of their respective non-EU manufacturers. ECHA is also working on the implementation of the IT systems for the notifications to the Poison Centres; due to time pressure, work on this has already started despite the fact that the amendment to the CLP Annex VIII has not been approved yet. Based on the feedback received from the Registration Taskforce, Eurometaux asked whether it was possible, due to the disruption caused by Covid-19, to extend the deadline also for Technical Completeness Check (TCC) failures for which the 4-month deadline starts between March and May 2020 (currently the two-month extension only applies to the deadlines expiring between March and May 2020). ECHA indicated that for the moment no further generic extensions are foreseen and suggested to contact ECHA in case of specific problems to be dealt on a case by case basis (more information: Violaine Verougstraete and Lorenzo Zullo).

EUROMETAUX CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT

EM FUNCTIONING

Slags: *a project to meet Green Deal objectives*

The status and the use of final slags are in the focus of several regulatory activities like ECHA's mapping of the chemicals' universe, 2030 Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability under the Green Deal or discussions on the Chemicals Products Waste Interface. In addition, the final slags issue is strongly related to the concept of secondary raw materials and their use as construction material under the Circular Economy objectives. The topic was debated by the Eurometaux Management Committee who confirmed that final slags are a highly important topic for sustainability, chemicals management and trade issues and that there is the need to increase joint activities. In follow-up, calls were organised with interested members and Terms of Reference for a 'Final Slags Project' were drafted, including the mission, structure and timeframe, and

governance and resources for such a project. The project would aim at increasing acceptance on slags, by market participants & policy makers, at European and national/regional levels by realising the necessary activities in the fields of legislation (advocacy), communication, analysis, research & innovation. How to make it work in practice, considering the current socio-economic context and the limited resources, will be further discussed on 5 June, so as to provide a status update to the Management Committee on 10 June (and to the respective Sustainability and Chemicals Management Steering Committees on 11 and 17 June) (more information: Guy Thiran, Kamilla Slupek and Violaine Verougstraete).

CHEMICALS STRATEGY FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability: roadmap published!

The European Commission finally published its long-awaited Roadmap on the Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability (CSS). A Roadmap is a generic document describing the problem to be tackled and objectives to be met, explaining why EU action is needed, outlining policy options, and describing the main features of the consultation strategy. Interestingly, the Roadmap seems to have been heavily edited to include references to the COVID-19 crisis and recovery. For instance, it stresses the urgency to promote EU's strategic autonomy for those chemicals essential to society. Among other things, it positively acknowledges that chemicals can play an important role to develop and deploy technologies necessary to achieve a circular and climate-neutral economy. The timing of the publication of the CSS remains unchanged, and we should see it published in September despite the COVID-19 outbreak. The Chemicals Management department did an extensive issue mapping on the draft strategy, based on presentations provided by Commission and the roadmap and is preparing a draft position paper that will be circulated soon (more information: Violaine Verougstraete, Noam El Mrabet).

European Parliament on CSS: Eurometaux gathers more support and organises a debate

Eurometaux continues to advocate for the specificities of metals to be considered in the ongoing work of the European Parliament on the Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability (for a refresher, see CM News N° 98 and 100). We have been successful in obtaining the so-called draft compromise amendments. These are a first attempt to find consensus among all political groups. After carefully analysing them and gaining the support of partner organisations (e.g. Cefic, CII), we reached out to key Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) and their assistants to gather their support. The clock is ticking as the vote is now expected on 25 June. Please note that Eurometaux will organise on 10 June a virtual debate on the CSS with MEP Maria Spyraiki, ECHA's Executive Director Bjorn Hansen and Guy Ethier, Senior Vice President at Umicore (more information: Chris Heron, Laura Fazio Bellacchio and Noam El Mrabet).

Combined toxicity: need for an action plan

The European Commission had already identified in 2012 the need for comprehensive and integrated assessment of cumulative effects of different chemicals via different routes of exposure. In June and November 2019, the Environment Council also called upon Commission to present options to introduce requirements in the relevant pieces of EU chemicals legislation to ensure that the combination effects of chemicals and the combined exposure of humans and the environment from all relevant sources are properly and consistently addressed in the risk assessment/management processes. Finally, the topic was highlighted as one of the priority issues in the Green Deal and the upcoming CSS. Commission is preparing a Staff Working Document to be issued soon. The outcomes of a workshop hosted by Kemi and RIVM on "Towards a pragmatic procedure to regulate the risks of exposure to unintended combinations of chemicals in the EU" were summarised and submitted to CARACAL. CARACAL was asked to express support for the outcomes of the workshop and the need to act urgently, but also to share its views on the application and magnitude of a Mixture Assessment Factor under REACH as a feasible and efficient method to address the issue.

Eurometaux submitted some comments in follow-up of a lively conference call with the members, asking for the approach to be developed to focus on what matters (defined and agreed scope), avoiding over-simplification, making the best use of available data and striving to achieve the most effective regulatory measures with coordination across legislation and scientific bodies or agencies. Refinement of a possible default approach should be made possible; to consider data but also substance specificities relevant for risk assessment (e.g. natural background concentrations for metals). Finally, the approach should be evaluated for unintended socio-economic impacts against the anticipated health and environmental benefits derived. These comments were also discussed and shared with other industry sectors. Important now is to prepare

some concrete proposals on the refinements we would like to see for metals and on the identification of 'what matters'. The secretariat will come back to the taskforces with a proposed action plan (more information: Hugo Waeterschoot, Noam El Mrabet, Nathalie Kinga Kowalski and Violaine Verougstraete).

ENVIRONMENT

Environment Taskforce: *classification of metals workshop*

The aim of the workshop organised on 7 May was to have an open industry discussion to clarify and align the strategies on environmental classification, and primarily on the Rapid Removal (RR) and the classification entries related to the physical form (massive, powder) aspects. Achieving a common understanding and coherence across metals is essential now that certain concepts and agreements on how to carry out the environmental classification for metals are being challenged. The workshop participants agreed on a series of actions, also identified several potential deliverables, namely an industry guidance on how to assess/implement/justify Rapid Removal, an industry note on the exemption of the massive form from the labelling requirements and clarifications on some of the conditions required to have split classifications (massive/powder) like special processes, crystallography, condition related to the generation of powders from the massive and the role of articles. The draft minutes were circulated on 13 May and work is starting on the identified actions. A follow-up workshop on the Ecotoxicity Reference Values (ERVs) will be organised after summer (more information: Stijn Baken, Jelle Mertens, Hugo Waeterschoot, Violaine Verougstraete).

EVALUATION

Evaluation Taskforce meeting (19 May): *focus on experience with dissolution of nanos*

The Evaluation Taskforce reviewed the progress made with the nanomaterials dissolution assessments, key for the environmental hazard assessment and classification of metals. ARCHE presented the state of play on the upcoming OECD guidance that proposes a complex strategy whereby the metals Transformation Dissolution test (TDp) and especially the OECD Dispersion Stability on nanos' tests (OECD 318) play a key role. IZA presented their recent experience with both tests given they developed datasets for the running Substance Evaluation of ZnO in nanoform. The results of this test programme that have been so far confirmed are that the suggested environmental assessment strategy as proposed by the OECD on demand of Germany, is too complex and weighs too heavily on the OECD 318. A strategy based on the TDp seems at least as predictive and much more cost effective. It was therefore concluded to continue contesting the OECD strategy and to organise a workshop session with the OECD by the end of the year when all data on ZnO and other metals are available. The overall aim is to prevent this elaborated strategy from being adopted by the OECD to ensure that other metal sectors would not have to conduct extensive and costly dispersion stability testing without value for the environmental hazard assessment of metals in nano forms (more information: Noömi Lombaert, Hugo Waeterschoot).

Evaluation Taskforce meeting (19 May): *exchange on learnings from group evaluations and ECHA's annual report on the Integrated Regulatory Strategy*

Eurometaux summarised ECHA's annual report on the Integrated Regulatory strategy. The strategy aims at speeding up the mapping of the chemicals universe in the EU into 1) substances for which further data is needed, through Testing Plans, Dossier and Substance evaluations, 2) those that require regulatory risk management and 3) those that seem safe and complete at this stage for the checked endpoints. The report concluded that while the speed of dossier assessments has been increasing, it will be far from being sufficient to meet the targets set by ECHA, Commission and the European Parliament to screen all high-value substances in one year from now. Grouping and combined assessments are assumed to provide the biggest contribution to increase the assessment 10-fold. Eurometaux further noted two interesting key messages in the report: 1) the reference to MISA and other sectorial approaches as constructive tools to increase the quality and completeness of the registration files and 2) much more attention and recognition for the role of Risk Management Option assessment (RMOa) as a critical first step to define the need for and most relevant regulatory risk management programme(s). One of the first group evaluations was on antimony and a series of antimony compounds. I2a representing the antimony sector, explained their experience and learnings from this group evaluation and expressed disappointment with regard to the evaluation decisions and associated testing requirements received from ECHA (based on the assessment by

Germany). Although ECHA seems to acknowledge some the timing difficulties for the testing, the decisions did not recognise the sector's read-across justification that would have allowed a more focussed and cost-effective testing programme. I2A will consider what they will do now and will keep the rest of the sector informed (more information: Noömi Lombaert and Hugo Waeterschoot).

RISK MANAGEMENT

RoHS: Industry raised concerns on the RoHS restriction process ahead of the upcoming RoHS review.

On 25 May, Eurometaux, on behalf of a cross industry group of organisations representing the producers and importers of raw materials that are used, amongst others, in electric and electronic equipment, submitted a joint letter to the European Commission to raise concerns about the RoHS restriction methodology. This letter follows several attempts made by the associations over the past months to point out a number of procedural and scientific flaws that potentially compromise the quality of the substance assessment and prioritisation activities under RoHS, impacting the overall robustness and scientific quality of the process. The industry group reiterated its concerns but also gave some constructive suggestions, referring to the most recent experience on "Pack 15" (Study to support the review of the list of restricted substances and to assess a new exemption request under RoHS 2) and asked the European Commission to take them into account as part of the wider review of RoHS. The key aspects contained in the letter include: i) Scientific robustness and consistency as key elements to support regulatory decision-making; ii) Application of Better Regulation to the restriction process, ensuring coherence across legislations and the application of the 'one substance, one assessment' principle defended by the Commission in its recent European Green Deal communication; iii) Improved governance, management and communication/transparency (for more information: Caroline Braibant, Violaine Verougstraete and Lorenzo Zullo).

Risk Management Taskforce: webinar meeting 12 May

On 12 May, the EM Secretariat held its third Risk Management Taskforce meeting of 2020, and its second since the Covid-19 outbreak. Discussions included an update on the Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability (CSS) on two fronts: 1) the European Commission, which recently published its Roadmap on the CSS, and 2) the European Parliament, which is busy drafting its non-binding wish list for the CSS. Other hot topics were discussed, such as substitution activities in ECHA and at OECD level, the RoHS General Review and the definition of intermediates. The latter focused on the long-awaited CARACAL paper analysing how the 2017 European Court of Justice (ECJ) acrylamide judgment interprets the definition of 'intermediate' under Article 3(15) of the REACH Regulation and how this may impact the requirements related to registration and to authorisation. This paper will be discussed at the next CARACAL meeting (end of June) and comments can be submitted by 12 June. As the paper was made available just before the RM Taskforce meeting, only a preliminary discussion was held. After the meeting, the paper was examined in detail and a follow-up call organised with interested members. A CARACAL reply will be prepared and circulated soon. The minutes were circulated on 29 May (more information: France Capon, Klaus Kamps, Hugo Waeterschoot, Noam El Mrabet).

INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS/ WATER

Water & Industrial Emissions Joint Meeting: webinar 26 May

At the end of May, the Co-Chairs and Eurometaux invited the Industrial Emissions (IE) Taskforce (TF) and the Water Taskforce to a joint webinar. The first part concentrated on the most important aspect under the Water files, the last relevant activities covered by the IE TF, whilst the middle part focused on the diverse issues encountered during the recent updates of the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) permits, due to the implementation of the NFM Best available technology Reference document (BREF). The group identified and discussed several issues: because of the enforced Corona-related confinements several Member States will not meet the implementation deadline end of June, not only are there difficulties because of the strict implementation of the non-deterioration principles of the Water Framework Directive (WFD), but also due to the phase-out of Priority Hazardous Substances (PHS). The latter is required by the WFD 20 years after its adoption. Cadmium, Lead, Mercury and Nickel are amongst the PHS listed. It was agreed to first evaluate whether other associations are also having difficulties in receiving permits based on the

PHS out-phasing obligation, and in continuing the exchange on the Weser-Ruling, but most importantly are working towards a bilateral exchange with the Commission to address the complexity of the interactions of WFD and IED (more information: Nathalie Kinga Kowalski).

INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS

Under the Industrial Emissions Directive: *expert Interview on Circular Economy*

In February 2020, DH ENV C4 started a new study on the wider environmental impacts of industry decarbonisation. This study also covers an assessment on the potential of IED plants to contribute to Circular Economy, which originally was not part of the overall study but was added “last-minute”. Following this, the assigned consultant (IEEP) contacted Eurometaux for an expert interview in March. After an in-depth preparation based on a long set of questions received from the IEEP the interview finally took place beginning of March. The interview itself didn’t strictly follow the questions but focused rather on main topics -based on experience from previous interviews- such as the overall regulatory context, waste management, the market for materials and permitting processes... Overall, we concluded that the consultant agreed to our general concerns on the possibilities for IED to contribute to the Circular Economy (e.g. no Best Available Techniques-Associated Environmental Performance Level (BAT-AEPLs) for waste amounts). Furthermore, there was a big interest in the specific problems prohibiting further use of discarded materials. For such or similar cases we are welcomed to share more detailed information throughout the summer. A first draft report is only planned for autumn this year (more information: Nathalie Kinga Kowalski and Kamila Slupek).

2nd BREF review cycle planning: *call for comments*

Mid-April DG ENV C4 invited the Article 13 Forum members and related stakeholders to answer and in-depth questionnaire on planning of the review of some remaining horizontal BREFs and the 2nd BREF review cycle. An activity which was decided to be undertaken before the IED Evaluation started. The questionnaire demanded positioning on several proposed criteria based on the first outcomes of the IED Evaluation (circular economy, decarbonisation or similar potential) but also some general positioning on horizontal BREFs, as already done a year ago.

While drafting our answers, Eurometaux stayed in contact with the other associations and exchanged on the interpretation of the questions. The Industrial Emissions Alliance (IEA) concluded to prepare a statement asking to focus only on the remaining BREFs during the upcoming webinar. Then, at a later stage of the year, to organise a face-to-face meeting where the next review cycle will be discussed. Mainly we agree that a one-day webinar cannot replace a previously planned two-day long workshop.

The filled in questionnaire was sent back mid-May to the Commission. Based on the answer the Commission is planning to send a background paper as basis for discussion. Next week (12th June) the Commission will host a day-long webinar to discuss the comments and most important points of the questionnaire to define a way forward and proposal to the next Art. 13 Forum meeting for its opinion (more information: Nathalie Kinga Kowalski).

WATER

Priority Substances Update and Review

The week before Easter, we finalised and sent a letter to the Commission on the Priority Substances Update & Review signed by Concawe, ECPA, Eurofer, Euromines and, of course, Eurometaux. The letter was addressed to the Head of Unit Water Quality Bettina Doeser and requested to maintain a process under fair and transparent conditions for all the stakeholders. Most importantly to clarify how the Commission wishes to go forward, so that we can prepare for the process. Though we never received an answer, we have been informed by Commission -via WG Chemicals- to “be assured that we (DG ENV) are not trying to finalise the work before the summer, and that we will still call on you to nominate your relevant experts. [...] will send further details regarding the process as soon as they can.” Such precise information has not yet been sent to the WG Chemicals (more information: Nathalie Kinga Kowalski).

TOOLS

Bioelution: special meeting of the OECD Testing Guidelines Working Group (WNT) on 27 May

No decision was taken in April by the OECD WNT on the development of a test guideline for the gastric bioelution test, a project submitted by Commission/EURL ECVAM. On 21 and 24 April, the WNT group heard from various countries either in support or in opposition to the incorporation of such a test guideline into the 2020 workplan programme. As the decision to develop a test guideline is taken by consensus, a single 'no' vote can stop the whole process. The Chairperson proposed to defer the discussion to the end of May to allow Commission and the opposing countries to find an acceptable way forward and consult the respective experts. Calls and exchanges on the project proposal and the associated bioelution test protocol took place, allowing to identify on both sides what would represent (un)acceptable changes. On 26 May, the opposing countries sent a letter reiterating their concerns and a long list of technical details/comments to be addressed. Some of these comments are recurring ones from discussions held in other EU forums (PARERE, Bioelution Expert Group, ...) but considered as insufficiently addressed. The discussion on 27 May was thus anticipated to be tense. At the meeting, progress was made in that the opposing countries agreed that having a standardised test to measure metal release would be useful. However, they wanted to strip all references to applications even the simple or non-regulatory ones like comparison of metal substances for grouping read across and assessing matrix effects in alloys. Commission, BIAC but also ECHA and other National Coordinators supported to further work on a parallel track: having a robust, scientific test protocol for measuring metals release at OECD level, and discussing the applications in the CARACAL Subgroup that will start its activities in September. At the end of 2.5 hours of discussion, the Chair proposed to accept the project proposal with an attachment containing the comments from the three countries and with a series of questions to be posed to the OECD Expert Group that would start working on the test guideline. This is the best possible outcome that we could realistically have expected: If the protocol had been stopped at OECD, then the CARACAL discussions would not have had the chance to advance. Next steps will be further discussed with Commission and EURL ECVAM (more information: Adriana Oller and Violaine Verougstraete).

GHS guidance on metals Environmental Classification: Eurometaux updated the guidance for discussion at UN level

The present UN-GHS environmental classification guidance on metals does not include the chronic classification schemes. It is therefore neither in line with the EU-CLP metals guidance, nor with the common practice. Since 2013, ICMM have been leading an activity to update the relevant sections (Guidance: section 9.7; and the Transformation Dissolution protocol (TDp) section 10). This work needs to be finished by the end of 2020. Early May, the Eurometaux secretariat, helped by Stijn Baken, provided an extensively revised version which ICMM will now take forward to the UN level by re-establishing the activities of a technical correspondence group. In general, the suggested update aligns the UN version to the EU guidance (except for sections not relevant for the EU) to ensure we can maintain using it as a framework and referencing it. The update further allows industry to challenge the relevancy of the default classification system as Chronic 4. Overall, the activity helps to show that the GHS Annexes are useful and can help to defend against a recent suggestion that they should be removed in their entirety (more information: Stijn Baken, Hugo Waeterschoot).

NEXPO SPERC Project: Member States are evaluating the quality of Specific Environmental Release categories (SPERCs) actors developed by industry

As previously announced, a group of Nordic countries has taken the initiative to evaluate the quality of SPERCs developed by various industry sectors, in a project called NEXPO SPERC, where NEXPO stands for Nordic Exposure Group. In Q1 2020 a pilot phase was initiated, with focus on a couple of SPERCs as a basis for developing a consistent method for evaluation. At the end of May, the steering group of the NEXPO SPERC project discussed the pilot phase results. The project group will continue working with the same concept applied during the pilot phase after selecting the representative SPERC factsheets (30 to 40) for the test evaluation. The steering group also emphasised the need to keep the objectives of the project clear: the purpose is to test the quality criteria tool (i.e. quality criteria developed by the industry SPERCs TF in cooperation with ECHA and MSs) and see how it fits for purpose for different type of SPERCs from different life cycle stages. The project does not aim at any approvals or disapprovals of SPERC factsheets based on test validations. A phone conference with the cross industry SPERCs TF will take place around the middle of June to ensure synergies with ongoing industry activities related to quality check and SPERCs revision.

Regarding metals, Eurometaux has appointed an external consultant to assess the quality of the set of SPERCs that were developed in the past for metals; this activity is expected to be completed in June (more information: Frederik Verdonck, Lorenzo Zullo).

Update: Metal Toolbox and Metal Portal Websites



Numerous **tools** and **guidelines** have been developed to enable regulators and stakeholders to deal with **metal-specific aspects in hazard identification and risk assessments**, some of which have been incorporated into guidelines and regulations at local, regional, and **international levels** (e.g. EU, US, OECD). For the past months we, together with the industry, have been **compiling** these tools and guidelines to develop an **online Metal Toolbox**, providing further insights and details to be considered when **assessing metal substances**.

Designed to be easy and intuitive, this website will support the users **step by step** from Hazard identification to Risk assessments/Management for **Human Health** and the **Environment**.

Following content's approval, we are currently in the **web developing stage** and are looking to **launch the website** for the beginning of **July 2020**.

In parallel, a **Metals Portal** will be released. This one-page website gathers and links all the **metal related websites** available on the internet. In addition, a **member's only section** is offered by log in, where specific content could be displayed and shared among members.

For more information you can contact Lara at chemtrainee@eurometaux.be

Figure 1x: Environment 'sections on the website

METALS & INORGANICS SECTORIAL APPROACH (MISA)

MISA Update: exchange with ECHA on iUVCB Reporting in IUCLID

The MISA 3 workshop focused on the risk assessment methodology for inorganic UVCBs but did not discuss the more pragmatic aspect of how to efficiently report the hazard data of the UVCB constituents in IUCLID, while being in compliance with the REACH Article 10 requirements. Several exchanges have taken place with ECHA, explaining the challenges associated with the data-richness of some constituents but also the existing data-sharing agreements and updates. The proposal discussed with ECHA is to identify a restricted number of assessment entities (AEs) for which a full robust study summaries (RSSs) report is needed. The selection of 'lead AEs' for environmental and human health assessment (and the associated justifications) would be based on an adapted "Lead Component Identification" methodology, that is under discussion for mixtures assessment. To provide ECHA with a clearer picture, the Slags, Doré furnace test case presented at the MISA 3 workshop was further worked out, focusing on the hazard assessment reporting in IUCLID, and the preparation of a series of explanatory tables to document the reasoning (e.g. : a summary table presented at the workshop making the link between composition, classification and risk assessment, including all hazard data gathered via the multi-metallic database and compared for classification and effect assessment outcomes). The lead reporting AE calculations methodology was illustrated including Excel calculation tables, the specific formula applied, and data that was utilised. An 'enhanced' IUCLID Slags, Doré furnace dossier, including all explanatory tables, lead reporting AE calculation and their specific RSSs for the environmental AE and for the human health AE was submitted to ECHA during the month of May. A preliminary exchange allowing to collect some initial feedback from ECHA has taken place and highlighted the need to further explain the approach, using for example a recorded stepwise reasoning, to compensate for the lack of face-to-face opportunities. To be continued... (more information: Federica Iaccino and Violaine Verougstraete).

MISA: status update

Eurometaux and ECHA had a 'catch-up call' in May to exchange on the status of a series of MISA-related activities. Eurometaux informed ECHA about the Environmental Classification workshop held on 7 May (see above) and on the outcomes of direct relevance for the dossiers, i.e. justifications for the demonstration of rapid removal and different classification entries for massive and powders. It was proposed to explore the opportunities along the RAC lead massive discussion (end of the year) to clarify the criteria in the CLP guidance supporting the split classification and to discuss a decision tree on exemption from labelling (CLP

Article 23). ECHA informed Eurometaux that they continue to monitor updates and react to the emails sent to the MISA functional mailbox. ECHA also explained that feedback will be provided on the comments submitted by the metal sector on the ‘chemicals universe’ published in December. With regard to the MISA activities on UVCBs, activities are ongoing, in particular with regard to the screening of work to be done to align the dossiers with agreements achieved in November and the reporting aspects (see above). Preparatory work for the MISA 4 workshop on exposure is still ongoing, with ECHA exploring the possibility to have a physical meeting in October. It has also been proposed to redefine the scope of the last MISA activity (supply chain/impurities) and possibly make the link with other ongoing activities like the Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability, the Reach Review action 3, Circular Economy, etc. All this will be further discussed in a call on 16 June (more information: Violaine Verougstraete).

OUTREACH

Workshop on SAGA with CETS: 28 May: *helping to define the meaning of Suitable Alternatives Generically Available.*

Several sectors including the CrO3 sector received letters from the Commission requesting to submit within 6 months a Substitution Plan for the applied REACH authorisation use, if no Suitable Alternatives are Generically Available (SAGA). In addition, it states that “companies can be granted an authorisation if a generic substitute exists that is not technically and economically feasible to the applicant and if the economic benefits outweigh the risks; if the applicant submits a specific substitution plan”. The Commission’s letter was a result of an ECJ court case (T-837/16). The letter created confusion given it was very unclear in its specifications and explanation and of great concern in view of the short deadline to prepare the Substitution Plans. The main “victims” of the present letters are the Cr-plating sectors for decorative uses. Eurometaux and CETS (the European Committee for Surface Treatment) has therefore facilitated a workshop for the applicants and users concerned by these measures and aimed at helping industry. More than 50 participants attended and ECHA provided support while the Commission attended as an observer. The workshop identified the status of the Applicants activities, the aspects they are struggling with and what requires clarification. A summary of the conclusions will be presented to SEAC early June to solicit clarification in preparation for a second workshop on 16 June for in-depth discussions to help the sectors resolve key hurdles and interpretation issues. While this project focusses presently on Cr, the Court outcome and Commission’s requests will apply to all applicants that cover uses for which some sub-uses can be substituted by suitable alternatives, therefore a very important issue for the metals sector in general (more information: Dave Elliott (CETS) and Hugo Waeterschoot).

Business Europe Environment WG: 12 May

Business Europe has invited all members of the ENV WG, including EM who participated, to their regular meetings of the Environment Working Group. The meeting focused on Circular Economy and Industrial Emissions policy. Regarding the latter, they decided to focus their activities on the revision process. Following the policy BusinessEurope didn’t react to the Art. 13 Forum call for comments on the 2nd BREF review cycle and will most possibly not be involved specifically throughout the process. Overall, they want to focus on the upcoming IED Impact Assessment consultation and later on concentrate on occurring events related to the IED revision and step back on Art. 13 Forum involvement (more information: Nathalie Kinga Kowalski).

Industrial Emissions Alliance Meeting: 12 May

Next to more specific calls on the Art 13 Forum proposals on BREF cycle, on 5 May and 14 May the IEA also came together virtually to take time for a comprehensive overview of the issues currently on the table. Several associations complained that the current Corona confinement situation is being handled differently regarding the BREF reviews and there is much unclarity about the process and how it will evolve over the next months. Furthermore, most of the associations are focusing on the IED Impact assessment process, through which a close exchange between all should be maintained (more information: Nathalie Kinga Kowalski).

COMMUNICATION

Metals Academy: new dates in January

Due to the Covid crisis and the obligation to postpone the Metals Academy (that was initially planned for July), it has now been decided that it will be held (if governmental measures allow us) beginning of 2021, from the Tuesday 12 to the Thursday 14 January at the Priorij in Corsendonk.

To ensure a lovely winter event and to keep the momentum flowing, the organising committee and teachers are currently working on their presentations and the general organisation.

There are still places available, so if you are interested in participating or wish to receive further information, please send me an e-mail at lee@eurometaux.be (more information: Ailsa Lee).

CALENDAR

For meetings at Eurometaux

For the moment no measures have been taken to cancel our next meetings, but due to travel restrictions imposed on certain member companies/associations, it will be possible to join meetings by GoToMeeting, Skype (or remotely). Any further decisions and/or cancellations will of course be communicated in due time.

For meetings at ECHA

ECHA will keep the situation under review and will provide any further information as appropriate. This information is published on ECHA's [website](#)

Further information on the COVID-19 situation can be found on the [ECDC website](#).

- 1-5 June: SEAC-47 – ECHA (to be held virtually)
- 2-5 June: RAC-53 – ECHA (to be held virtually)
- 3 June: BREXIT REACH CLP Platform: 1st meeting (to be held virtually)
- 4-5 June: Helsinki Chemicals Forum: Postponed to 27-28 April 2021
- 5 June: ECHA Management Board Briefing session in CSS input ECHA (webinar attended by Marco Mensink for IND (Dir Gen Cefic))
- 5-6 June: Final Stakeholder Meeting HAZBREF project (Webinar)
- 8-12 June: SEAC-47 – ECHA (to be held virtually)
- 8-12 June: RAC-53 – ECHA (to be held virtually)
- 10-12 June: MSC-70 – ECHA (to be held virtually)
- 12 June ECHA Management Board Strategic planning session group (webinar attended by Guy Thiran)
- 12 June: IED 2nd BREF review Workshop – (Webinar)
- 15-16 June: WFD – CIS: Water & Marine Directors meeting – (Zagreb, Croatia)
- 15-16 June: REACH Committee
- 16 June: MISA catch-up call
- 17 June: Chemicals Management Steering Committee – (to be held virtually)
- 17-18 June: ECHA Management Board n° 58 (webinar attended by Marco Mensink for IND (Dir Gen Cefic))
- 18 June: CETS & EM Workshop (to be held virtually)
- 30 June – 1 July: CARACAL-35 (Brussels)
- **7-9 July: Metals Academy – The Priorij (Corsendonk) – Postponed, planned for 12-14 January 2021**

ACRONYMS

For a full list of acronyms, the structure of the Chemicals Management Department and a lot of other useful & relevant information from the metals industry and from authorities please follow the link to our: Reach Metals Gateway <https://www.reach-metals.eu/>

This website is tailored to the specific needs of the metals industry sector, an overview is provided on responsibilities & contact points in metal commodity groups and national metal federations and all information relative to MISA.