

EUROMETAUX CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT NEWS



**“If precious metals had been abundant,
they would not have been precious.”**

Henry Hazlitt

Table of Contents

EU COMMISSION	3
COMMISSION	3
EU AGENCIES	3
EUROPEAN CHEMICALS AGENCY (ECHA)	3
ECHA COMMITTEES	3
ECHA OTHER ACTIVITIES	4
EUROMETAUX CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT	5
CLASSIFICATION	5
WATER	5
SOIL	6
INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS	6
TOOLS	7
OUTREACH	8
OECD	8
OTHER	8
KAMILA’S SUSTAINABLE CORNER	9
CALENDAR	10
GENERAL INFORMATION & ACRONYMS	10

Dear All,

31st October: vampires, mummies and ghosts found the house I was in, despite its location at the extremity of a small, dead-end street of a modest Normand village. From the window on the first floor, I observed their slow progression, noticing their silhouettes in the shivering lights, the deep complaints (trick or treat in the EU?). And then, just before they were close enough to cast a spell, I managed to deploy a protective bubble, wrapped in a deep fog, rendering me rather...opaque. A manoeuvre that allowed me to convoke directly the Great Halloween Butternut and tell him that he would only get sweets after successfully passing my Spirit & Soul by Design framework. He looked puzzled for a second but then regained his composure and encouraged me to explain what I was expecting.

I told him it would start with a scoping analysis to contextualise the inspiration to which the SSbD framework would be applied: what lifecycle step, what would be the initial system, why and where to add an additional inspiration, how would maturity be measured and finally which actors would be involved? What kind of system would he apply: a full one defined by the detail and confines of reality or an ill-defined, but conservative one?

Once this is clear, he would migrate to the safety assessment and characterise the environmental and toxicological impacts of the Halloween event, the related products, and their associated chemical releases. Taking a pumpkin as test case, he would focus on the analysis of the intrinsic properties to understand its hazard profile in combination with the exposure pattern throughout the lifecycle, including the production and downstream uses processes (as well as end of life) and final application.

Still, this would not spare him from the pains of the sustainability assessment, addressing both the environmental and socio-economic impacts of the processes (frightening and threatening after having left graves and old castles open, tweaking the spiders' biodiversity, emptying the make-up shops, dispersing magic, etc.). What about fairness, costs and benefits, (supply chain) vulnerabilities, co-creation of knowledge-intensive employment?

I handed him over the dashboard, to identify trade-offs between different aspects and uncertainties of the assessment, reminding him that documenting each step was also a must.

But he did not hold out his hand to pick up the template.

It became very silent.

I paused in my explanations and looked up. To realise he had gone very, absurdly pale for a butternut and that his limits were becoming vague. He seemed completely thwarted and uttered, eyeballing: "How do you dare? You promised us to cut red tape and reduce the burden! But how can I inspire without sacrificing my best elements, asking them to spend their FTEs on ticking boxes? How much time do you think you still have?"

He turned abruptly on his heels (bottom?) and left me without uttering another word; but removing simultaneously the fog, making me realise I was in the middle of angry creatures staring and frowning at me...

Oh no...

Sweets anyone?



Violaine Verougstraete

EU COMMISSION

COMMISSION

REACH Revision: update

It remains quiet around the REACH revision. Originally slated for release this year after a prolonged delay, the revision suffered a fresh setback following a negative opinion from the Commission's Regulatory Scrutiny Board (RSB) in September. The file was not included in the Commission's 2026 Work Programme, and no formal timeline has been communicated. This initially heightened suspicions that it may be shelved again. However, a source close to the Commission services said the revision proposal's omission from the Work Programme does not rule out its publication in 2026. Delayed initiatives do not appear in the following year's Work Programme, even when it is clear the Commission will not meet the original timeline, as including them in the programme would amount to prematurely confirming their delay.

Commissioner Roswall has stated her team is working hard on the revision, and we've been told informally that a proposal would still be coming, possibly by the end of 2025 or early 2026. We were also made aware that certain stakeholders have been actively pushing back on the revision. Overall, signals remain mixed (more information: Sophia Verbrugghe and Violaine Verougstraete).

EU AGENCIES

EUROPEAN CHEMICALS AGENCY (ECHA)

ECHA COMMITTEES

MSC-91: two intense (virtual) days confirming among others, Eurometaux' status as STO

The Member States Committee had a 2-day meeting, alternating, as usual, open and closed sessions with a short briefing of the stakeholder observers after the end of the meeting. One of the key topics was the identification of 1,1'-(ethane-1,2-diyl)bis[pentabromobenzene] (DBDPE) as Substance of Very High Concern (SVHC) for very Persistent very Bioaccumulative (vPvB) properties. This substance is used as flame retardant and substitute for DBDE. Its evaluation was started by the UK and was transferred to Sweden post-Brexit. Sweden concluded the Substance Evaluation in October 2024 and suggested identifying the substance as vPvB as fulfilling REACH Article 57 (e). This was now the last step, with Sweden explaining how it considered the comments submitted during the Public Consultation. Industry experts were asked to focus their comments on the support document and Response to Comments (RCOM) as they stood at the time of the meeting. One Member State and industry had commented that a CLH process should take place first for the sake of regulatory efficiency, but this argument fired back, with MSC recalling that Article 37 of the revised CLP empowers the Commission to include in Annex VI of CLP the substances that have been identified as Persistent, Bioaccumulative and Toxic Chemicals (PBTs)/vPvBs under Article 59 of REACH and included in the Candidate List before 11 June. Industry commented on several issues including the very low solubility of the substance (and hence bioavailability), the suitability of the models used, considering that DBDPE was not in the applicability domain of the model and the administration route in some of the studies used. MSC considered that the extensive weight of evidence carried out by the Dossier Submitter covered these issues and voted unanimously for the identification as SVHC.

It was confirmed that MSC had adopted ahead of the meeting its opinion on the 12th recommendation for Annex XIV. The opinion was adopted by consensus with 3 abstentions related to melamine, for which the justification of the abstaining Member States was that authorisation is not the most appropriate regulatory tool or Risk Management Measure for melamine. The ECHA secretariat presented the prioritisation results for the 13th list. This prioritisation was carried out according to the prioritisation approach agreed on earlier this year and the usual (current REACH legal text's) criteria of hazard, volume and wide-dispersiveness of use for scoring. Grouping and other ongoing EU activities towards restrictions were considered as well. MSC were able to further comment until 27 October and a first discussion on the draft opinion prepared by ECHA will take place at the next MSC meeting in December. Most substances with the top scores have PBT or vPvB properties.

MSC also reviewed the stakeholder organisations' participation in their work and decided to reinstate the current regular MSC stakeholder observers with the exception of one stakeholder observer representing sectoral industry. Finally, participants received an overview of pending appeal and court cases and recent judgements on Evaluation and SVHC identification.

The learnings from the MSC meeting will be further discussed during the Registration Compliance Taskforce meeting scheduled for 13 November (more information: Violaine Verougstraete).

ECHA OTHER ACTIVITIES

ECHA - Industry: *monthly meeting on Friday 24 October*

ECHA has released updated statistics on REACH submissions based on data collected up to the end of September 2025. Overall submission levels remain six percent below forecast, with initial submissions fifteen percent lower than expected and dossier updates two percent below projections. In contrast, Product and Process Oriented Research and Development (PPORDs) have shown strong growth, increasing by eighteen percent compared to the forecast. Around 123.000 submissions have been made through REACH-IT so far this year, of which approximately eighty-eight percent are CLP notifications and nine percent are REACH registrations.

On 21–22 October, ECHA hosted the second workshop with certified research organisations (CROs), following last year's focus on human health studies. This year's event addressed environmental testing under REACH and gathered around fifty participants from twenty-eight CROs representing Europe, the UK, Switzerland, India, Japan, Ukraine, and the United States. Discussions centred on regulatory requirements for environmental testing, analytical data needs, Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) compliance, and new test guidelines on bioaccumulation and biomagnification. Challenges linked to testing complex substances such as UVCBs and low-solubility materials were also discussed, along with approaches to reduce animal testing through non-vertebrate methods. A high-level summary of the workshop will be published on ECHA's website.

ECHA and industry continued discussions on IUCLID format developments, confirming that beta testing of the next format update will take place ahead of the April 2026 release (February/March), while the October release was considered of minor impact for beta testing. A technical issue was reported in the cloud version of IUCLID, where the dossier creation wizard incorrectly imports documents restricted to the lead registrant into co-registrant dossiers. Companies encountering this issue are encouraged to open a Helpdesk ticket (and inform us) for follow-up. ECHA will not host a webinar following the autumn IUCLID release but will share a short video summarising the updates.

Following the summer meeting, an industry sub-group was formed to work on ECHA CHEM developments and to monitor updates for the dissemination website. Eurometaux and members have raised specific concerns about the treatment of metal forms and the classification of inorganic UVCBs, and further exchanges with ECHA are planned. ECHA also announced plans for two dossier update campaigns scheduled for February and March 2026 to enhance compliance in REACH registrations. The first campaign will focus on ensuring that dossiers reflect the latest harmonised classifications under the CLP Regulation, with around thirty substances expected to be affected (a much smaller number than in previous campaigns). The second campaign will address cases where a lead registrant has withdrawn or ceased manufacture, leaving joint submissions without valid lead dossiers. Around 150 such cases have been identified. ECHA will contact affected registrants through REACH-IT. Once again Industry associations shared the challenges of finding replacement lead registrants and the lack of supporting legal provisions for co-registrants and asked to use the campaign to further identify possible solutions.

The next ECHA–Industry meeting will take place on 5 December, followed by a hybrid meeting for industry associations and members on 15 December at the Cefic offices (more information: Federica Iaccino).

ECHA Webinar: *U-PFAS SEAC Public Consultation*

The purpose of this event was to start preparing the ground for next year's Public Consultation (PC) on the SEAC draft opinion on the universal PFAS restriction. This is the last opportunity for stakeholders to submit relevant input and for the regulators to gather new information to address current data gaps and uncertainties. The first PC on the PFAS restriction resulted in a very large volume of information being collected, not all of which has proved useful. Hence ECHA is taking a different approach with this 2nd PC and is using a structured and targeted survey which is intended to: clarify what information is needed; ensure consistency across different PFAS sectors of use; and give SEAC better access to well-organised data.

The ECHA webinar started with 40 minutes of pre-recorded presentations giving the background, outlining what the SEAC draft opinion includes, and explaining what the consultation is about and how it will be conducted. This was followed by 80 minutes of Q&A using Slido. Around 100 questions were submitted in advance of the webinar, with another 300 questions coming in during the session. Some questions have been answered by ECHA, others may still be answered in future. Only questions on topics within the scope of the SEAC PC will be answered. Many of the relevant questions submitted were on the 8 sectors of use added to the restriction earlier in 2025 e.g., technical textiles. These sectors and uses will not receive a full assessment by RAC and SEAC but are still within

scope of the restriction and will feature in the SEAC PC under “general issues” (cross-cutting). Topics raised by stakeholders include how to submit information on these sectors, how SEAC will handle the assessment (out of scope of the PC), and how the regulators will draw conclusions (also out of scope). Clearly there is great concern amongst stakeholders and widespread dissatisfaction about contradictory messages from the regulators on the 8 sectors. The meeting video, presentations and list of questions are all available on the ECHA website [here](#) (more information: Simon Cook).

EUROMETAUX CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT

CLASSIFICATION

Particles: a successful workshop and follow-up actions

The issue of classification of poorly soluble particles (PSLTs) exceeds the TiO₂ case, reason why a cross-industry Particles Platform was set up, bringing together EU industry associations representing manufacturers of materials in the form of particles. Cefic assures the secretariat. More information on the platform activities can be found [here](#). A workshop (also sponsored by Eurometaux) was held on 2 October with the aim to advance regulatory science on particles through new evidence on inhalation toxicity. Industry, experts, NGOs and regulators exchanged on key issues such as whether the ability of a particle to cause lung overload (physical phenomenon) should be considered an intrinsic property, whether current methods recognised to determine toxicity and carcinogenicity of substances are suitable for particles and whether CLP is the correct vehicle through which to regulate particles overall. ECHA also participated in the workshop as they are currently doing a scoping study in the context of a possible Occupational Exposure Limit (OEL) (as a next step) for PSLTs.

A summary report of the workshop is under preparation.

In follow-up the Particles Platform hosted a meeting on 23 October to discuss possible follow-up actions. Eurometaux suggested to ask Commission for the possibility to set up an ECHA Expert Group to discuss further the particle issues, away from the CARACAL policy context and to be able to make the link with the CLP Guidance. Further information will be provided to the Human Health Taskforce (more information: Sophia Verbrugghe and Violaine Verougstraete).

WATER

Drinking Water Directive: successful workshop

The Eurometaux workshop on the revised Drinking Water Directive (DWD), held on 2 October 2025, provided a valuable opportunity for industry representatives, regulators and national authorities to discuss the challenges associated with implementing the DWD, with a particular focus on the EU positive lists process. The meeting featured presentations from the European Commission (DG ENV), the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA), national authorities, notified bodies, and other relevant stakeholders. While it was mainly designed for the metal sector, the event attracted over 100 participants, some of which also came from the chemical sector, ranging from primary manufacturers to downstream users.

The primary goal was to share information on the current situation and raise concerns about remaining gaps to discuss solutions for achieving implementation.

The European Commission provided the policy context and outlined the rationale and timeline for the EU Positive Lists. ECHA's representative detailed the agency's role, the required standards for dossiers, and the submission process. A panel of national authorities from Germany (UBA), Italy, France and Sweden discussed how national approvals would continue during the transition period and how the move from national to EU processes would happen. Further sessions addressed scientific and technical challenges in dossier development, including migration testing and building capacity across the value chain. Notified bodies also shared their perspective on final product assessment and certification. Downstream users, represented by groups such as the European Drinking Water Alliance (EDW) and the Frit Consortium, emphasised the practical implications for the market and the support needed from upstream suppliers.

The meeting generated a high level of questions and discussion and was deemed successful by participants. A request for a similar workshop was voiced unanimously by respondents to the follow-up survey sent to participants.

A report and a Q&A document will be sent to participants in November, along with details of any follow-up activities (more information: Lara Van de Merckt).

Working Group Chemicals meeting: in Copenhagen

A hybrid Working Group Chemicals (WG Chem) meeting took place on 27 October at the offices of the European Environment Agency (EEA) in Copenhagen.

This meeting, the first to be held successfully in person for a while, was very productive and well attended (documents and presentations are available via [CIRCABC](#)). The agenda covered a wide range of topics, including the analysis of the recently agreed text of the Water Framework Directive revision and the preliminary timelines for the future prioritisation, watch list and environmental quality standard (EQS) harmonisation process for river basin specific pollutants (RBSPs) processes (with the technical work going to the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA)). Several guidance documents, such as the one on deriving environmental quality standards (EQSs), will be reviewed in **2026**, the transition year in which ECHA and the EU Commission will also be working on and training for the new prioritisation process, amongst other things.

The EEA also presented the status of some of their work, including anti-microbial resistance (AMR) monitoring indicators and mixture assessments for surface waters, which excludes metals from the assessment. The Joint Research Centre (JRC) presented a few updates, including effect-based methods (EBMs) for monitoring estrogenic effects, EU-wide EQS derivation for RBSP copper, and proposed criteria for the further selection of RBSPs for which to harmonise the EQSs (this is just a suggestion; ECHA will develop this next year). The CIS work program for 2025–2027 was discussed further with the WG Chem members to identify leads and volunteers to work on the various tasks (EM has volunteered for several of these).

More information on this meeting and the next steps will be provided to the Water Taskforce (more information: Lara Van de Merckt).

SOIL

Soil Monitoring Law: the law is adopted

Over the last few months, there has been a lot of uncertainty surrounding the adoption of the Soil Monitoring Law (SML): the text, agreed in trilogue last April, was amended once more over the summer (see the final text [here](#)).

This second version was put to a vote and approved by the Council of the EU in September, with a large majority (including one abstention from Austria and one negative vote from Germany).

A vote then took place in the ENVI committee on the second reading on Monday, 20 October. The law passed, with around one-third of MEPs rejecting it.

The next day, a coalition led by German MEPs proposed an amendment to reject the law altogether, which was signed by over 30 EPP/centre-right MEPs. In parallel, two extreme right-wing groups, the P/E and the ESN, also submitted an amendment to reject the law.

But then, on 23 October, the plenary vote took place, and, against all odds, it was passed!

The law will now be adopted within 20 days of publication in the Official Journals, after which Member States will **have three years to transpose it into national law**.

Now, as stated by the EU Commission: “Turning the law into practice will require collaboration and mutual learning”. They are planning a **launch event in early 2026** in Brussels, bringing together representatives from all Member States, we will investigate whether this event could be opened to other Stakeholders.

An EM workshop on Soil will be organised on 4 December to discuss the new law, its implications and implementation, and areas where EM needs to engage (more information: Lara Van de Merckt).

INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS

Investment gap for the transformation of the installations covered by the IED 2.0: towards a clean, circular and climate neutral industry

On 1 October 2025, Logika group hosted a hybrid meeting to present a draft study which aims to assess the investment gap for the transformation of the installations covered by the IED 2.0 Annex 1 to achieve carbon neutrality, zero pollution and a circular economy ambition.

In the study were reported several innovative techniques identified as common across most sectors, for example: CCUS (Carbon capture, utilisation and storage), the use of alternative energy (hydrogen, electrification and bioenergy) and the increase of recycling and use of recycled material.

The study contains an estimation of the total investment needed to meet decarbonisation and circularity and it is expected to be in the range of 3.8 – 4.9 trillion over the next 25 years, with ongoing costs being more significant than capex (more information: Sebastiano Fornasari and Andrea Pellini).

Landfill BREF: KoM Sevilla

From 6 to 9 October 2025, Eurometaux Secretariat attended in person the Landfill (LAN) BREF Kick-off Meeting (KoM). During the 4-day meeting, representatives of Member States, European Industries Associations, and NGOs exchanged their views on the scope of the LAN BREF, key environmental issues (KEIs) for emissions to the environment, resource efficiency, and circular economy.

On 24th October 2025, EU-BRITE published in BATIS the Conclusions of the KoM meeting.

From the KoM Conclusions, topics to mention for the non-ferrous metal sector:

1. **Distinction of landfill sub-categories**, landfills associated with the NFM installation have specific characteristics which do not present the same environmental impacts as municipal waste landfills. In this regard it was stated that data will be collected on *“the type(s) of waste disposed of in the landfill, including information on any prior treatment”*;
2. **After-care phase**, it was decided to collect data on after-care activities and determine at a later stage whether related Best Available Techniques (BATs) can be defined;
3. **PFAS** are Key Environmental Issues (KEI) for emissions to water and information will be gathered on monitoring methods, meanwhile for emissions to air data will only be collected in the presence and monitoring of PFAS in landfill gas and on abatement techniques.

A detailed report of the KoM meeting was shared with Eurometaux LAN BREF sub-group.

Next steps:

- EU-BRITE will circulate the KoM Report by December 2025 tentatively. The Technical Working Group (TWG) will be given sufficient time to review and comment. The final version of the draft report will be shared in early 2026 through BATIS.
 - The Questionnaire development will begin Q1 of 2026 together with the identification of well-performing landfills for data collection.
 - Eurometaux Secretariat will draft the list of candidate well-performing plants to be proposed for inclusion.
- (more information: Lorenzo Ceccherini and Andrea Pellini).

INCITE workshop: on cement, lime and magnesium oxide sectors

Eurometaux Secretariat attended the INCITE sectoral workshop dedicated to innovation in the cement, lime and magnesium oxide (CLM) sectors, in particular in relation to decarbonisation, depollution, and circularity. The event took place on 30-31 October 2025.

The following points were discussed during the workshop:

- Current state of innovation in the CLM sectors to identify opportunities for further growth and development;
- Provide a platform for industry and technology providers to illustrate innovative technologies and solutions to achieve climate neutrality and resource efficiency;
- Debate among stakeholders on the degree of maturity, environmental performance, cross-media effects, financing aspects of innovative techniques;
- Motivate stakeholders to actively engage with INCITE.

(more information: Eleonora Tosi and Andrea Pellini)

TOOLS

REACH Metals Gateway: update of the website

Since the summer, we have been working on the [REACH Metals Gateway](#) and are pleased to announce that the REACH and GHS & CLP parts have been thoroughly updated to reflect all the recent developments and changes. You can also find plenty of interesting material under “Useful information”, which contains Consortium Information (updated once a year), the list of acronyms, etc. And our calendar is kept up to date with not only the Chemicals Management meetings, but also the main meetings at ECHA and those of our members. We invite you to check it out, and any feedback would be valuable to keep this tool updated and efficient for all (more information: Violaine Verougstraete and Ailsa Lee).

OUTREACH

OECD

OECD Working Party Risk Management: *annual meeting in Paris*

The annual meeting of the OECD Working Party on Risk Management took place in Paris from 30 September to 2 October. Risk Management of PFAS received considerable attention as there are ongoing activities on banning / phasing out PFAS in many non-EU countries. Generally, there is the recognition that the issue is complex due to the number of substances and uses. Most actors are using a targeted / phased approach e.g., starting with aqueous firefighting foams (AFFF); focusing on PFOS and PFOA; excluding fluoropolymers from the scope. This is different to the EU Universal PFAS restriction that attempts to deal with (nearly) all substances, uses, and lifecycle stages in one. The OECD global PFAS group has further activities planned for 2025-2028. Six workstreams have been prioritised including suitable and available alternatives in specific sectors and uses – AFFFs, metal plating, batteries, semiconductors, sealing applications, technical textiles, anti-foaming agents, medical devices. There is also an ongoing project on suitable analytical methods for PFAS, and a draft project scope on methods and approaches on remediation of PFAS contamination. The Commission gave an update on the U-PFAS restriction – the likely outcome is a ban on consumer uses including food contact materials, combined with actions to allow continued use in certain (unspecified) key industrial uses e.g., measures to reduce emissions from industrial sites.

The topic of safe and sustainable by design (SSbD) was also covered. There are several ongoing workstreams in EU Member States that are complementary to SSbD as proposed by the Commission:

- Germany: the HARMLESS early warning system for advanced materials risk governance.
- Germany: the ChemSelect tool to support downstream users in their evaluation of the sustainability of substances and mixtures that they use.
- Austria: the Insight project (which is aligned with SSbD) to address fragmentation in current approaches.
- The OECD Substitution and Alternatives Assessment Toolbox ([SAAToolbox](#)) also had several new tools added in recently.

Under the topic of Risk Management tools and approaches, Eurometaux presented some learnings from the recent industry RMOa on lithium salts and went on to outline subsequent ongoing work to revise the Eurometaux RMOa guidance to improve ease of use and make it more widely applicable for all actors. During this discussion the representative from France confirmed that the Member State RMOa on lithium salts will be finalised in Q4 2025.

There were other useful learnings from the meeting: some countries are looking at using AI for efficient collection of data e.g., from survey responses; there are two useful projects from OECD that are likely to go forward – key considerations for setting limit values for restricted chemicals; improving public engagement during the risk management decision-making process (more information: Violaine Verougstraete and Simon Cook).

OTHER

PARC: *Stakeholders Forum meeting on 2 October*

The stakeholders from NGOs and industry involved in the PARC project came together early October for a joint meeting with the PARC Management Board. This allowed to discuss aspects like the overall vision of PARC, the link between research and regulatory needs (WP2), the dissemination and communication of the PARC outcomes (WP3), and, with ANSES who is in charge of the coordination and management of the project, how to start building a strategy for the phasing-out of PARC, as we are now in the second half of this huge EU project. This was followed by a useful Project Bazaar, during which the WP leaders provided status updates on the work and the variety of projects they are doing on exposure (WP4), hazard (WP5), innovation in regulatory risk assessment (WP6). Stijn Baken, now with VITO, presented the work done by WP7 on FAIR data.

The meeting co-chaired by the Austrian UBA and Eurometaux, also included a discussion on indicators related to stakeholders. Industry stressed the importance of having research outcomes linked to the regulatory field, as the amount of information delivered in PARC is huge and difficult to assess. Whilst it is clear that several projects running in parallel are connected and that the results will end by aggregate, for now stakeholders still do a bit of a pick and choose according to their interests (e.g., Mixture Allocation Factor (MAF), Safe & Sustainable by Design (SSbD) etc.).

A report will be circulated to the Human Health Taskforce once the formal minutes have been issued (more information: Violaine Verougstraete).

Chemical Watch/Enhesa Conference: *no further information on timing but interesting learnings*

Eurometaux was invited to speak at the “Key Regulatory Updates Europe 2025” event organised by Chemical Watch/Enhesa. The session, focusing on the implementation of the REACH regulation and lessons for the future, included presentations from Paul Speight (DG ENV), Michael Warhurst (ChemTrust), Ruxandra Cana (Steptoe) and Violaine Verougstraete (Eurometaux). The panel discussion also involved Marianne Rosborg from the Rockwool Group. Eurometaux’s presentation focused on the following questions: a) will the drive for simplification and greater competitiveness result in deregulation?; b) will the planned REACH Revision drive the EU green/circular economy forward?; and c) is the ‘simplification’ of chemicals regulations likely to achieve greater regulatory coherence.

The Commission did not provide clear timings for the REACH Revision but gave some interesting perspectives, like e.g., the importance of making the difference between implementation problems and what requires a change in the legal text, that one key question is what is the level of risk we can accept and who pays for it, the importance of One Substance One Assessment (OSOA) and the link with the Circular Economy Action Plan and the Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (ESPR). The polarisation of the debates was acknowledged by the Commission, making them plea for a solid, flexible but also future-proof revised REACH.

A summary of the key learnings was circulated to the REACH 2.0 Project Group (more information: Sophia Verbrugghe and Violaine Verougstraete).

KAMILA’S SUSTAINABLE CORNER

Green-listing of waste for waste shipments: *to support the EU Circular Economy*

Eurometaux has contributed to the European Commission consultation on harmonising classification of waste under the Waste Shipments Regulation (WSR) to accelerate the transition to a Circular Economy.

The aim was to gather information from stakeholders to prepare delegated acts “green-listing” certain waste to facilitate the intra-EU waste shipments.

Eurometaux has proposed a long list of waste streams to be included as non-hazardous under the WSR and supported its requests with the position paper asking to:

- Coordinate green-listing of waste under the Waste Shipments Regulation (WSR) with the future implementing act under the Critical Raw Materials Act (Art. 26(7)) listing products, components and waste streams containing critical raw materials.
- Maintain green-listed regime for intra-EU e-waste shipments beyond 01/01/2027.
- Abstain from establishing contamination thresholds for green-listed waste.

(more information: Kamila Slupek).

CALENDAR

Please find below a list of all the meetings planned until end 2025.

For meetings at Eurometaux: most of our meetings will now be held as hybrid meetings, and **our members will be informed ahead of the meetings** (links to join will be sent ahead of the meetings).

For meetings at ECHA: this information is published on ECHA's [website](#)

- 04/11: Water Resilience Strategy Strategic Coordination Group
- ~~05-06/11: CARACAL-56~~ Postponed to 28-29/01/2026
- 04/11: MeClas Steering Committee
- 06/11: IE Alliance Plenary (Euromines)
- 11-12/11: RAC-75 DWD WG (Online only)
- 13/11: Registration Compliance Taskforce
- 17-18/11: RAC-75 REST WG
- 01-05/12: RAC-75 Plenary
- 01-05/12: SEAC-69 (I)
- 04/12: Soil Workshop
- 08/12: Water Resilience Forum
- 08-09/12: Trends in (Metals) OEL setting
- 08-12/12: SEAC-69 (II)
- 08-12/12: MSC-92 (Tentative)
- 11-12/12: ECHA MB-80
- 16/12: Chemicals Management Steering Committee
- 17/12: Risk Management Taskforce

GENERAL INFORMATION & ACRONYMS

Follow the logo and check out our Metals Gateway website.



This website is a one stop information source for regulators & risk assessors dealing with metals/metal compounds and is tailored to the specific needs of the metals industry sector.

A **continuously updated** list of acronyms is available under the [Reach Metals Gateway](#) (RMG)
