

Chris Barrington

From: Chris Barrington [ipia@pigiron.org.uk]
Sent: 06 April 2010 18:03
To: 'Adriano Clary'; 'Armando Correa'; 'Augusto Mendonca Lessa'; 'Erik Scholten'; 'Gerard Tor'; 'Hans Butter'; 'Joaquim Eleuterio'; 'Lee Preziosi'; 'Leonardo Wilken'; 'Magnus Tottie'; 'Nikolay Zaboлев'; PEZENNEC Eric; 'Pier Guiseppe Perini'; Rob.Versfeld@corusgroup.com; 'Ronald Jonckbloedt'; 'Sue Hubbard'; 'Ursula Eriksson'; 'Yuri Mishin'
Subject: Minutes of conference call March 24th 2010

Present:

Rob Versfeld -Corus [in the chair] - RV
Armando Correa -ArcelorMittal - AC
Joaquim Eleuterio - ArcelorMittal Mines Canada - JE
Sue Hubbard - Rio Tinto - SH
Ursula Eriksson - LKAB - UE
Yuri Mishin - Metalloinvest - YM
Eric Pezenneec - ArcelorMittal - EP
Gerard Tor - Corus - GT
Maria Beatriz Vieira - Vale - MBV
Chris Barrington - Secretariat - CB

1. RV welcomed those present and asked for approval of the **proposed agenda** - it was accepted. There were no comments on or amendments to the **minutes of the meeting** of the Pellets Sub-group on December 4th which had been circulated by email.
2. GT summarised the paper prepared by Corus "RCS in Iron Ore Pellets - worst case scenario/a pragmatic approach," the conclusion of which was that, based on the test work to date and an empirical approach, even in the worst possible case the RCS in pellets is less than the 1% threshold for a classification. AC then summarised the proposal for further testing developed by Vale and ArcelorMittal. After discussion it was agreed that no **further testing** on pellets is needed and that the Corus paper should be redrafted to include an "Armageddon Scenario" for a pellet with a the highest known silica content and very high fines generation - for which it can be calculated that the 1% threshold would not be breached **[action: RV, GT, AC, CB]**.
3. SH advised that IMA is maintaining it's position that RCS is classified as a STOT Cat 1 Repeated dose so that where RCS is present >10% the substance should be STOT Re Cat 1. Where RCS is 1-10% the substance should be STOT Re Cat 2. Although there are activities that may force the classification to a Carcinogen Cat 2 this situation will be addressed in the future if the need arises and will be challenged vehemently. The scientific position paper that is supporting STOT is currently being finalised.
4. RV noted that exposure data had been provided by LKAB [at the port and pellet plants] and Corus [at the grinding and pellet plant]. In both cases, the dust level was below the OEL of 0,075mg.m⁻³. He asked if there was any further data available: JE advised that ArcelorMittal Mines Canada does have data, but not yet in a suitable form - this will be provided in due course **[action JE]**. SH thought that similar data should be available from IOC **[action: SH]**. As far as collection of further exposure data, EP proposed that the Dunkirk steel works had been identified as the most suitable steel mill location, but the question was: is further data needed? After discussion, the consensus was that with three sets of existing data, further work is unnecessary. In the CSR, no exposure scenarios will be included, just the three sets of data from LKAB, Corus and AM Canada/IOC.
5. On the issue of **pellet fines** [also known as chips or screenings], it was agreed that each company selling this substance in the EU market should measure [1] the percentage of fines generated and placed on the market and [2] the minus 10 µm fraction of these fines and report the data to the Secretariat for neutral compilation **[action: all, CB]**. The approach would then be to assume that the RCS content of the minus 10 µm fraction of the pellets fines is the same as that for pellet dust, perhaps with some level of "safety factor" and then derive the RCS content of the pellet fines in the same manner as done for pellets.
6. EP raised the question of whether pellets should be registered as an intermediate. RV commented that Corus's preference was for a full registration - the registration dossier will be prepared on this basis. The discussion revolved around what constitutes "strictly controlled conditions" for a non-hazardous substance - this question

would be put to the Eurometaux REACH Forum meeting the following day **[action: CB, SH]**. The conclusion of the discussion was that pellets would have a full registration dossier, but in the end it would be up to each registrant to make its own decision on the intermediate issue.

7. RV closed the meeting with the request that all action points be completed by April 30th at the latest. A further conference call would be arranged in May if needed.

Best wishes

Chris Barrington

Iron Platform Services Ltd.

on behalf of The Iron Platform

Tel: +44 1276 686279

Mobile: +44 7932 603163

Reply to ipia@pigiron.org.uk

www.iron-consortium.org

This message and any attached files may contain information that is confidential and/or subject of legal privileged intended only for use by the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this message in error and that any dissemination, copying or use of this message or attachment is strictly forbidden, as is the disclosure of the information therein. If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately and delete the message. All care has been taken to ensure that this message and any attachments are virus free. No responsibility is accepted for any virus infections caused by receipt of this message.