

# 1 Sherpa Group Meeting Report, EIP for Raw Materials

This document provides a detailed report of the third meeting of the Sherpa Group held on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2013 in support of the European Innovation Partnership for Raw Materials

## 1.1 Meeting details

### 1.1.1 Venue

Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2013, 10am to 4pm, European Commission, DG-Enterprise and Industry, Room BREY 12/A, Avenue d'Auderghem 45, 1040 Brussels.

### 1.1.2 Attendees

The following is a list of the expected attendees to the Sherpa Group Meeting of Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2013. A full list of attendees will be confirmed by Cefcoforma, based on the signed attendance sheets.

#### European Commission

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| Mattia Pellegrini (DG-ENTR)               | Sean Mclaughlin (DG-ENTR) |
| Soledad Blanco/Herbert Aichinger (DG-ENV) | Renzo Tomellini (DG-RTD)  |
| Additional European Commission officials  |                           |

#### Sherpas to Ministers

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| SWEDEN  | GERMANY |
| GREECE  | POLAND  |
| AUSTRIA | FRANCE  |
| SPAIN   |         |

#### Research Organisations

|                      |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| ENEA                 | EGS-EU            |
| ETP-SMR              | ERA-MIN & ERA-NET |
| UNIVERSITY OF LEOBEN | GTK               |

#### NGOs

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| EPE |  |
|-----|--|

#### Industry

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOKIA             | SODRA         |
| SAICA             | WEEE RE-MEDIA |
| LKAB              | UMICORE       |
| NEHLSON AG        | AKZO NOBEL    |
| MICHELIN          | ATLAS COPCO   |
| SUEZ ENVIRONMENT  | ERAMET        |
| AURUBIS AG        | IBL SPA       |
| KGHM POLSKA MIEDZ | SIBELCO       |

#### Extra Sherpa Members

|                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| PORTUGAL       | IGAG            |
| WALLONIA       | FLANDERS        |
| ITALY          | SLOVAK REPUBLIC |
| CZECH REPUBLIC | EIB             |

### 1.1.3 Sherpa Group Meeting agenda



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
ENTERPRISE AND INDUSTRY DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
Resources Based, Manufacturing and Consumer Goods Industries  
Raw materials, Metals, Minerals and Forest-based industries

## AGENDA

### EUROPEAN INNOVATION PARTNERSHIP ON RAW MATERIALS

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> Sherpa Meeting

5 June 2013, 10.00-16.00

Venue: DG Enterprise and Industry  
Avenue d'Auderghem, 45 - 1000 Brussels  
Room: BREY 12/A

Chair: Mr Gwenole COZIGOU, Director, DG Enterprise and Industry

#### 10.00 – 10.15 WELCOME AND OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING

Mr Gwenole COZIGOU, Director, DG Enterprise and Industry  
Ms Soledad BLANCO, Director, DG Environment  
Mr Renzo TOMELLINI, Head of Unit, DG Research and  
Innovation (tbc)

#### 10.15 – 10.30 PRESENTATION OF STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN VERSION 1 AND PRIORITISATION CRITERIA

Mr Gwenole COZIGOU

#### 10.30 – 12.30 DISCUSSION ON APPLICATION OF CRITERIA TO ACTIONS (PART II)

#### 12.30 – 13.30 LUNCH BREAK

#### 13.30 – 14.45 DISCUSSION ON APPLICATION OF CRITERIA TO ACTIONS (PART II)

#### 14.45 – 15.00 COFFEE BREAK

#### 15.00 – 15.50 DISCUSSION ON APPLICATION OF CRITERIA TO ACTIONS (PART II)

#### 15.50 – 16.00 CONCLUDING REMARKS AND NEXT STEPS

## 1.2 Meeting minutes

The following document provides a detailed summary of the Sherpa Group discussions held on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2013. These minutes are grouped by theme and follow the structure of the meeting, but it is not intended that these minutes reflect verbatim the discussions.

### 1.2.1 Welcome and objectives of meeting

Mr Mattia Pellegrini welcomed the meeting participants. He introduced the purpose for the meeting, which was to discuss the revised Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP). He thanked in particular the hard work of his unit at DG-Enterprise and Industry to make substantial improvements to the text. He also acknowledged the contributions made by Sherpa members and by DG-Environment and DG-Research in the preparation of the SIP.

Mr Pellegrini then summarised the next steps for the SIP drafting. He said that today's meeting was the last Sherpa meeting scheduled before the adoption of the SIP by the High Level Steering Group (HLSG). It was therefore too late to propose new actions now, but instead focus on refining the text and actions listed. The following dates were outlined for the on-going process:

- Opportunity to receive comments from Sherpas until the 18<sup>th</sup> June
- Version 2 of the SIP would be ready for end of June, with only minor adjustments expected thereafter, such as when subject to Cabinet approval
- The final version of the SIP will be ready for 12<sup>th</sup> July
- The HLSG may be rescheduled for 16<sup>th</sup> July to adopt the SIP
- The Call for Commitment would follow in September, and it may be appropriate to restructure the groups around the actions of the SIP.

Ms Soledad Blanco, Sherpa to Commissioner Potočník, expressed her full support for the European Innovation Partnership on Raw Materials (EIP-RM) initiative. She said that the full services of DG-Environment had been made available in the preparation of the SIP, and that she fully supported the content of the draft SIP. She highlighted linkages between the SIP and DG-ENV's activities by saying it was fully in line with EU Environmental Policy. This includes the Roadmap for a Resource Efficient Europe Flagship Initiative and 7<sup>th</sup> Environmental Action Programme (currently undergoing European Parliament and Council adoption). It also complements the European Resource Efficient Platform (due for delivery on the same day of the SIP), and the continuing of the work of the International Resource Panel.

Ms Blanco concluded her speech by saying that the work must go beyond just looking at competitiveness, but also address societal challenges. For example, public money must leverage public good and not crowd out private finance. It must complement and not replace or weaken existing legislation, including environmental impact assessments. Access to raw materials is key, but so is sustainability along the value chain. Environmental legislation helps meet these sustainability objectives, although it must avoid putting burdens on SMEs and fit in with privatisation. There is an upcoming and diverse review of EU waste policy, legislation and targets. The public consultation opened yesterday and all stakeholders are encouraged to participate, with the results to be presented in 2014.

### 1.2.2 Presentation of SIP Version 1 and Prioritisation Criteria

#### Introduction

Mr Pellegrini introduced by asking what is the role of the SIP and European Commission? He stated that the SIP provides the recommendations of the industry stakeholders to which the European Commission would then respond in its later EC Communication. He then summarised the structure of the SIP, which has now been divided into two parts:

- Part 1: statement of the challenge, objectives and targets
- Part 2: detail of the priorities and action areas:
  - 3 action areas for the technology pillar
  - 3 action areas for the non-technology pillar
  - Finally the International Pillar.

Mr Pellegrini continued by saying that a qualitative assessment of all of the actions has been conducted, as directed by the Sherpa members. A Sherpa sub-group had advised three criteria: economic, innovation and sustainability. Lots of comments had been received, including on the consensus decision to make the assessment only qualitative at this stage. Some had suggested that the economic criterion as being most important and the others could be disregarded if it was not met. However, others disagreed, so all three criteria have been assessed in the end.

He said that the economic criterion has been scored a bit higher giving it 40 points out of 100 (with 30 each for the other two criteria). The scoring has been given as high, medium or low for each action for each criterion. This has then been used to prioritise the actions by rating them overall as very high, high, medium or low. None of the actions has been scored as low, but some have been scored as medium. These actions rated as medium should be discussed today – whether to keep them or drop them.

Mr Pellegrini concluded his introduction by responding to some of the comments he had received by email, including those relating to structure, criteria and scope. He was not surprised that it was a minerals centric plan, given its history. He clarified that he cannot reopen the scope to include plastics or raw materials other than metals, minerals, wood, paper and rubber (i.e. non-energy raw materials) – this was decided in February 2012. Mr Pellegrini then opened the floor for general discussion of the SIP and the prioritisation scoring.

### **General comments**

The SIP draft was described as drastically improved and streamlined with many actions having already been pruned or grouped on both primary and secondary raw materials, as previously requested. It was agreed that it was an important document, with Part I being the most important part. Many speakers appreciated the effort, governance and hard work conducted by the Unit. It was noted that the Unit could not have worked harder on preparing the document and evaluation, including working late and at weekends – even if there had been some delays in the process at times.

Several Sherpas offered their continuing support in the drafting and text polishing process. It was highlighted that while the content of the SIP was generally good, there were some issues with particular text. One speaker suggested that Sherpas can still make a large contribution to the final version, but asked how this should be done before its adoption by the HLSG. The HLSG would have to adopt both the general challenge of the SIP, as well as the specific actions and the text of the document. Major issues could be raised bilaterally and detailed comments could be sent in track changes. Possible suggestions for Sherpa continuing involvement were to have some sort of teleconference or meeting was possible for adoption by Sherpas or Sherpa sub-groups to continue the work of drafting the SIP. A meeting with third countries was suggested once the SIP had been finalised.

A few Sherpas requested some more time to consult with their cabinet, nationally or with members before making final decisions. For example, the documents and prioritisation had been received late and they had not had chance to consult internally before attending the meeting. The meeting would therefore have the mandate to agree the principles of which (medium) actions to drop by recommending rather than finalising the prioritisation. There would be time to comment further until the 18<sup>th</sup> June.

### **Scope**

One member raised the question of the EIP scope, and in particular to include ethylene and propylene, used in the production of plastics. She had wanted to introduce these materials earlier, but the scope seems to have been fixed since 2011. Whilst these materials are derived from oil, they are not used for energy purposes and the EU is 90% import dependent. She highlighted that there is rising demand from China for oil, and that these materials are involved in lots of value chains including construction, transport and ICT. The industry is looking for alternative bio-based sources, which are also attractive from an environmental perspective.

Other speakers noted that some of the recycling actions are relevant for plastic such as under construction, and that plastics could be relevant for funding calls under Societal Challenge 1. A compromise was suggested and supported. This would mean that a wider range of raw materials should

be mentioned in the introduction of the SIP. This would include those raw materials relevant for the chemical sector (notably plastics and phosphates), which face similar supply issues, so that these are not ignored. Relevant initiatives should also be mentioned.

### **Prioritisation and scoring**

Clarification was sought on several aspects of the prioritisation and scoring of specific actions. For example, was it the aggregate or individual scores that mattered? However, none of the actions scored low on any of the prioritisation criteria. One speaker challenged this assertion – he said that there were too many actions – so he wondered how some might be cut.

Mr Pellegrini responded by saying he was not surprised by the scoring. He added that the medium actions may all be dropped today. These medium actions were mostly from OG4 and OG5. This was because OG1 and OG2 had drawn from extensive preparatory work conducted by initiatives such as ETP-SMR, ERA-MIN and others, which had started preliminary work for the EIP. OG3 had drawn ideas from intensive from an earlier Ad-hoc Working Group report. However, OG4 and OG5 had not previously had such discussion groups, so had started their ideas more from scratch. All action areas had been supported by the OGs, but it was the role of the Sherpa to prioritise the individual actions.

On the qualitative assessment, there was some debate about whether certain actions should be listed as 'very high' rather than 'high'. Mr Pellegrini said that the assessment would not be published and was only for guidance. Therefore the focus should be on whether the actions scored as medium should be dropped – an on/off threshold. He would receive comments on each action and the scoring only if major weaknesses were identified. Actions listed as high would not be dropped, so the distinction between high and very high was so important. The scoring would not be included within the SIP, although may be a useful tool for project evaluation in work programmes at a later date or determining ease of implementation.

### **Funding and project evaluation**

It was asked whether the first stage of the SIP might further prioritise the actions. For example, would there be a further stage to assess the various projects within the calls? One speaker highlighted the Ramintech study criteria that could be used in evaluating specific projects.

Members were reminded that the EIP was not a funding body, and that Horizon 2020 was a separate entity. The SIP would help inform, as it was a document where stakeholders gave their view on the importance of different actions (alongside other programmes such as ETP-SMR). The DG-ENTR unit was involved in preparing the annual work programme for Horizon 2020, including for 2014/15. However, calls would be much broader than the specific actions. As for project evaluation, separate evaluation criteria would be used, and projects would be subject to the quality of proposals and consortium etc.

Clarification on this was sought on whether these Horizon 2020 technology calls would be made open for third countries to participate. This was confirmed as normally being possible, such as through association agreements. Horizon 2020 may probably include cross-cutting international cooperation opportunities and policies, but these details are still being worked out by DG-RTD.

### **On-going process**

Several members asked questions on the on-going process. Sherpas requested to be consulted in the next steps, including the Call for Commitment and implementation stages. Mr Pellegrini commented that Sherpas would be consulted on its terms of reference, but probably there was not a need for a meeting. A meeting for the Sherpa on the monitoring scheme would be more useful. He expected that there would be Sherpa and HLSG meetings next year.

On speaker asked would the SIP be a living document and when will it be revised? Her comment was that new technologies could change the situation. Mr Pellegrini replied by making reference to the Monitoring Scheme. He reminded Sherpas of the plans for their on-going participation – not just for the next four years, but all the way to 2020 to monitor the actions of the SIP.

### 1.2.3 SIP Part II: prioritisation – technology pillar

For the technology pillar, only one action was assessed as medium – **the substitution of titanium dioxide**. It was said that titanium dioxide was not a critical raw material, with neither high economic importance nor high supply risk. Its production was spread all around the world and was therefore widely available. It was noted as an environmentally friendly material with an unclear readiness for this innovation, and its substitution could mean a loss of performance. Comparison was made to other substitution actions such as catalysts, where substitution could considerably improve access to raw materials, rated as high within the economic criteria. Members agreed that this action should be dropped.

A number of members commented on the scoring of some specific actions and the balance between the actions in the SIP Part II:

- Natural rubber was suggested should be scored as very high. It should be thought as critical – important for tyres and transport, and with lots of companies and jobs affected. The speakers said that the natural rubber projects were indeed innovative and the environmental benefits were clear. Mr Pellegrini commented that its criticality had not been previously assessed, but it was in the scope of the on-going study to revise the list, although these results should not be pre-judged.
- Metallurgy should be scored as very high in order to provide a balance between the different stages of the value chain (geology, exploration and mining were all listed as very high, but metallurgy was not despite its importance to downstream users). The examples of rare earths and the dangers of having a missing link were noted. Additional text was promised to better cover all of the broad areas of innovation for metallurgical systems. Mr Grohol responded by commenting that he felt the technological breakthroughs needed for metallurgy and recycling were not as large compared to those needed for geology and mining.
- Deep sea mining was suggested as being a very high action. More information was suggested within the SIP, including mention of the International Seabed Authority. Greater EU engagement was suggested in this forum, as few countries were participating compared to Asia. Poly-metallic nodules should be specifically mentioned in the action.
- Grouping of actions: it was suggested that geo-models, recycling, construction and demolition and deep sea exploration should be separated out to provide a better balance between the actions. Mr Grohol commented that deep sea exploration had been regrouped and mentioned within exploration, although deep sea mining was still a separate action.
- Recycling of end-of-life products, substitution of catalysts and alternative mining techniques were suggested as being very high priority actions rather than just high.

Mr Pellegrini reminded members that the focus should be on the medium actions, which may be dropped, rather than whether actions were very high or high. He commented that each action should be evaluated on its own merit, rather than on whether they provided balance to the document.

### 1.2.4 SIP Part II: prioritisation – raw materials regulatory framework

For this section no actions were listed as medium. Most of the ideas were drawn from the EC Ad-hoc Working Group Best Practice report. Others ideas came from OG3 members, who had provided additional brainstorming. Some ideas might be revisited in other forums. Links between some of the actions were identified between Pillar I and II.

One speaker commented that some new actions seemed to have appeared – some of which were already in progress or did not seem to be particularly innovative and he also questioned the application of the economic criteria:

- **2.1.6: Mining Waste Directive guidance** – this action is happening anyway and the industry has already had to wait six years for guidance, which has caused some delay for projects.
- **2.1.9: Regulation and granting** – there is an issue of wording here – the link to Hydrocarbons Directive is unhelpful and could be harmful for the mining industry, which is different. Also would it need a Directive or guidelines to be implemented?
- **2.3.1 & 2.3.4: Communication schemes** – these are not innovative. The voluntary codes are already being adhered to, but not likely to boost production and jobs.

Ms Spiliopoulou-Kaparia reminded the Sherpas that there was no EU framework for minerals policy, which is left to Member States (MS). She commented that greater guidance would be helpful, such as Committee Level decisions on potential mineral deposits of 'Community Importance', which could be listed in the Official Journal. One speaker commented that whilst various laws existed around Europe, this was also the case in major mining countries (Canada and Australia) where each province/state had laws, with no federal laws in operation. It was agreed that the reference to the Hydrocarbons Directive should be avoided. However, the idea of streamlining the processes should be better elaborated instead.

It was explained that the other ideas had a high degree of readiness, even if they weren't necessarily innovative. Slightly different criteria had therefore been applied between Pillar I and II. The actions were aimed at improving communication and linked to public acceptance, and therefore should not be dropped. Exchange of best practice could have a large economic impact and preparedness, to address critical raw materials and avoid other raw materials becoming critical through reduced access. The action was not just proposed by OG3, but also by MS authorities and the Ad-Hoc Working Group.

Voluntary codes were viewed as useful and internationally accepted codes already existed. Some wording concerns were identified and there was a need to get the text right. 'Social license' was identified as unhelpful terminology – replace with 'public acceptance' or stakeholder engagement. It was also felt that there was not a need for a new sustainable mine label. In summary, it was decided to keep these actions because of their link to public acceptance and their high readiness to implement. However, it may be necessary to re-group and merge some actions, as well as revisit the text and make reference to on-going work. Later decisions would be made on how exactly to implement them.

### **1.2.5 SIP Part II: prioritisation – waste management regulatory framework**

The afternoon session started by discussing the actions from OG4 of the SIP document. Some of the EIP actions were noted to be linked with those in the recommendations of the European Resource Efficiency Platform. This consistency was acknowledged, as were links with other actions. Six actions were identified as scoring as medium and falling below the prioritisation threshold. However, even if all were dropped the five action areas would still all be kept. Each of the medium-scoring actions was discussed in turn:

**2.4.2: product lifetimes research** -this was discussed under other actions in a previous version. An interesting idea, but questions of whether there would be concrete results before 2020 and a top score did not seem merited. One speaker defended the idea and its link to the circular economy – a major theme of innovation and transformation of industry. Further comments might be received, but the action is likely to be dropped.

**2.4.3: CRMs in EPDs** - this may give benefits but concerns were raised over the admin/compliance costs. On the positive side this would provide more information to recyclers and help facilitate greater raw materials recovery by raising the awareness on the content of products. It also would move the market beyond waste regulations and environmental impact. However, it would need to be acceptable to the industry in terms of compliance costs, and avoid placing burden on SMEs. Further questions were raised on it needing to be revised every four years with the definitions of critical raw materials, and that it's not just about product composition, but also about where in the product and uses within alloys etc. It may have a high readiness of implementation and link in with another action on complex recycling processes. One speaker noted the links to the successful WEEE Trace project, and suggested that the action might be better redrafted around this topic rather than being dropped completely or merged elsewhere.

**2.5.1: sophisticated targets** - this was scored as medium, but the EC was having second thoughts here. The essence of this idea was to look at specific materials rather than just weight. There could be environmental and economic advantages to this, although there is scepticism on how possible it would be to implement or how effective setting MS targets was in achieving policy. There could be a very long list of targets as there are lots of products with CRMs, which would vary over time – how specific could you be? It was noted that a consultation was opened yesterday in the on-going revision of waste targets.

The general consensus was to keep the action, as it was seen as useful in complementing other actions, even if it was not so mature and ready to implement. For example, if landfill bans were introduced lots of other targets would be useful such as on source separation, quality and recovery targets to help improve readiness for that action. A question was raised on whether material targets were appropriate or whether product or waste stream targets would be better. Other issues were whether the industry was ready for such targets or whether recovery technologies existed yet. Links to other activities by DG-ENV and EREP were highlighted, as was an interface between technology, product design and recycling levels. It was suggested that the text be redrafted to make it well-defined and more implementable, avoiding the current focus on critical raw materials.

**2.5.3: waste collection systems** - this action is linked to existing provisions in the Waste Framework Directive for separate versus comingled collection. There is a preference for separate collection, but some MS and local authorities don't want it due to the investment and consumer costs needed to switch systems. Comment was made by one speaker that comingled reduces quality and exports materials that could be recycled to Asia rather than staying in Europe. Another speaker suggested that the focus should not be separate versus comingled, but rather in collecting well-defined mixed recycling fractions that can be easily sorted. It was suggested that this action be redrafted and merged with action within 2.5.4 on principles and sharing best practices on EPR, for which there is currently an on-going study (for the EU27 + Croatia on packaging, WEEE, batteries etc.). The action could then be retitled accordingly to ensure the distinctions between household waste and EPR.

**2.5.5: business models** - this is a promising action, but at a relatively early stage, which could be challenging to implement in the current economic situation. DG ENTR explained that its impact on CRMs could be over the long term (not by 2020), but if stakeholders are sufficiently engaged for a joint venture it could carry it through and achieve the economic and environmental benefits. Initial research study work would be required stage – as would be the case for other actions. There are lots of possible ideas albeit all at early stages. Support was noted for this action within the European Parliament. There was a general consensus to keep the action.

**2.8.1: RM partnerships** - the need for better dialogues along the value chain was recognised, i.e. not just primary versus secondary raw materials, but also manufacturing and downstream users. However, concerns were raised by DG ENTR who asked who would organise, what it would achieve, how to reach agreement, how to involve all of the relevant actors, which raw materials to look at and what level would be targeted. The example of the phosphates platform was given – multi-stakeholder and at both MS and EU platform levels. This illustrated the concept and it was seen as a breakthrough idea to accelerate transformation along a value chain. It had to move beyond just business-to-business but be truly multi-stakeholder. Lots of comments and suggestions were made on this action and further would be sent in track changes.

## 1.2.6 SIP Part II: prioritisation – knowledge base and skills

There was a short discussion on the **EU Knowledge Base (EUKB)** and the possible Knowledge and Innovation Community (KIC). It was explained that the individual actions of the EUKB had not all been assessed separately, as many were consecutive. However, the overall EUKB action area had achieved high support overall and was agreed as being a very important action area. It was noted the text on the EUKB had been improved. One speaker mentioned that it was important that details on its infrastructure and systematic way to update data should be included.

The possible **Knowledge and Innovation Community (KIC)** would be evaluated at a later date by the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT) using different criteria. Some textual changes needed were identified on the recommendation, including removing reference to certification and adding references to exploration and substitution in order to cover the whole value chain. The action of certification of recycling plants was already covered, both in the EU and particularly overseas, and did not need mentioning under the KIC. The action had been rated as a high priority action, which would be material specific, although it was not seen as a magic cure for stopping illegal export, and it may have trade and competitiveness implications for Europe's recycling industry.

### 1.2.7 SIP Part II: prioritisation – international pillar

Mr Zaleski explained that this horizontal pillar covers all action areas, but there is a need to merge and group the actions to make them more focused. Many of the medium actions are already covered elsewhere. We have already made an attempt to merge and group the actions.

As a general comment, it was mentioned to explore what cooperation can be done vis-à-vis Latin American countries. This should be more explicitly mentioned in action area 1.

- **3.1.3: thematic networks** - these can help promote market penetration – useful example of CYTED and the valuable experiences learnt, but the idea is too specific on its own and already covered in the technology pillar. This action will be redrafted and included in another activity.
- **3.3.4: best practices** - already mentioned elsewhere – agreed to drop this
- **3.3.5: Basel Convention** - reference to recent meeting on environmentally sound management and hazardous waste. However, its promotion is not viewed as a particular priority and hard to enforce. It was noted that the US is not a member and there was a link to certification schemes. It has been agreed to drop this action.
- **3.3.6: technical standards**: this is covered in EU Knowledge Base and has problematic wording such as on standardising technology – agreed to drop it.
- **3.3.7: international organisations** - there are already things being done, and it is similar to actions covered elsewhere such the Study Groups, G20, UNEP and OECD. There are some issues to address such as on mining and environmental regulations and encouraging EU companies to adopt these standards in Africa. It would be better to have EU engagement on these issue rather than parallel actions. However, the action is poorly placed in document and is not clear on what to do to address it. Consensus to drop unless concrete suggestions are received on it.
- **3.4.2: travelling lectures** - merge with other similar actions in that section of the SIP.
- **3.4.5: UN organisations** - this is too broad and general – agree to drop it. Move reference needs to be added concerning the international study groups on copper, lead&zink, nickel as well as a possibility to have a iron ore study group, elsewhere in the document.

Actions 3.3.1-3.3.3: were also raised as being confused actions. These were suggested to be merged together and remove the reference to a 'sustainable mining label'.

### 1.2.8 SIP Part I: suggested textual changes

Mr Pellegrini invited comments to the SIP Part I before the close of the meeting. He remarked that changes from one section of the SIP Part II would have to be replicated in the revised document. Lots of amendments were promised in track changes.

A few comments were made to the prioritisation objectives – particularly to sustainability. Perhaps a preamble might be added as an annex to the scoring, given that the assessment had been qualitative and somewhat based on marketing rather than strategic arguments. One speaker suggested that health and the circular economy be included within the text. However, another speaker commented that there was no consensus definition on circular economy. He felt that this terminology could be misleading as there would still be the need for the input of raw materials – the focus should therefore be on sustainable supply and a resource efficient economy. He also suggested that due diligence might be listed.

One speaker asked about the weighting between the pillars – in particular suggesting more weight to the technology pillar. He had identified that the international pillar had been described as overarching, but it should not be so. Cross-cutting might be more suitable wording. A balance of international participation was recommended. Another speaker suggested that the conclusions and recommendations from last week's Trilateral Conference on critical raw materials, recycling and substitution be included. However, as this is one of many dialogues and initiatives on-going, it could not simply be annexed.

Comment was made on the import dependency metrics that need to be developed (page 10). Should this be changed to 'increase availability'? However, the following discussion showed that there was a need for a 2020 target on import dependency. It was also asked who and when will these be developed? This will be done later, after the adoption of the SIP together with industry involvement.

A number of specific textual comments were received:

- References to 'bulk' raw materials is not helpful – use just raw materials or (large volume)
- Remove references to 'remote and densely populated areas' (page 6)
- Replace 'industry-led' communications to 'multi-stakeholder'. Reference 'concerning permitting procedure' might be unhelpful, although communication should happen both ways (page 16)
- Want to include countries other than just Africa and Latin America for action on skills (page 19)
- How should SIP inform/guide EU MS raw materials policy? A number of MS have policies prepared or in progress. A discussion is to be held in RM Supply Group forum
- 'Social license' – misleading terminology
- Deep exploration – mention should be made of deep sea (page 13)
- Wording of the list of ocean bed raw materials resources is a bit confused and should be non-ferrous followed by the list of relevant raw materials (page 6)
- Need mention 'wood-based products' and their possible substitution of oil-based products. Perhaps page 6 might be suitable, alongside the figures listed on wood availability.

### **1.2.9 Next steps**

There was a further brief discussion of the next steps of the EIP. The immediate priority though is to finalise the SIP. Then the Call for Commitment would be launched in September and it would be worked out how best to organise, whether there was to be a meeting or the circulation of information and the terms of reference to the Sherpa Group. The aim of the Call for Commitment is to see which other stakeholders and funding instruments are available for its implementation.

Mr Pellegrini said that he would discuss with colleagues from the other DGs in due course the experiences of other EIPs, including Active and Healthy Ageing and Water. Slightly different approaches have been undertaken so far, including screening the responses or not. It was noted that there may be a need to simplify the process for the raw materials EIP, given the number of actions/more complex structure of the SIP versus the EIP for water. He would come back to these issues later.

### **1.2.10 Close of meeting**

Mr Pellegrini closed the meeting by thanking members for their participation, attendance and contributions. This was greeted by applause in recognition of what had been achieved by the European Commission and Sherpa members on the day and in the build-up to the meeting.

Authors: OAKDENE HOLLINS, 10<sup>th</sup> June 2013

Checked: OAKEDENE HOLLINS, 10<sup>th</sup> June 2013