

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Firefighting foams conflicting answers and specific meetings with the MoDs of the MSs
Date: 07 September 2021 13:21:56
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Dear [REDACTED]

Unfortunately I will not have time to make a summary of all MoD's positions but there are basically the ones (in EU and outside the EU) which are already using alternatives or planning to do so in a relatively short time (e.g. NO, DK, AUS, US) and the ones which claim for long transitional periods, up to 12 years or even exemption. I'd like to have a better understanding of the rationale from a technical feasibility point of view for these discrepancies.

Hope tomorrow's call will help.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Scientific officer
European Chemicals Agency
PO Box 400 / Telakkakatu 6
00121 HELSINKI, Finland
Tel: [REDACTED]
Mob: [REDACTED]

<http://echa.europa.eu/>



The above represents the opinion of the author and is not an official position of the European Chemicals Agency. This email, including any files attached to it, is intended for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you have received this message in error, please notify the author as soon as possible and delete the message.

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 03 September 2021 14:23
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]>
Subject: Firefighting foams conflicting answers and specific meetings with the MoDs of the MSs

Dear [REDACTED] dear colleagues

It is my first day back to work after Summer Break and Friday it is not my favourite day .

I am a bit confused with the expression "answers from MSs MODs are conflicting .

If I am not mistaken, FR +DE agreed to the need of the extra derogation periods.

Belgium does not agree due to political reasons based on the political problem in Antwerp area by the legacy PFAS. In addition, not any deeper analysis of the need is done due to this political decision.

Thus in order to understand, please [REDACTED] can you prepare a summary of the conflicting answers reaching you . As I am not so much involved on the conflicting information.

I see from the answers that issues in the military are not clearly defined in which sector for each MS.

In my opinion, there are army forces, air forces, naval forces.

It is obvious that the Naval needs more derogated time.

I would not try to cut into pieces the MoDs. (I would apply the derogation for all the military forces). Just to be on the safe side.

Then it depends also on the MS. Some MSs have got a lot of army , some others not. So their replies in the questionnaire are not representative or very elaborated as they may not have army.

For example, I was trying to find the navy ships of Belgium and most of them have been sold to Bulgaria.

In other words, in the military area I would not go with the worst scenario of RMOs. If a MS needs this derogation because of the use in case of any emergency , we should granted it.

The Commission can always put a review clause as I believe that in 5 years , the USA and others would have moved usually faster than us to the specifications and therefore the need at that time would be much more clear.

PS: Now that I am back I am each day busy with meetings and discussions so I am not so sure that I can attend your meetings. However, I would appreciate if I receive a short memo of the most important points.

Thank you very much colleagues

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]