

The FPP4EU proposed decision tree (food for thought)

Marleen Pauwels

Executive Director Halogens Industry Sector,
European Chemical Industry Council (Cefic)



FPP4EU covers a complex sector

To group or not to group


The decision tree

Warm call for collaboration



FPP4EU covers a complex sector

We are dealing with hundreds of substances with diverging properties, used in many applications across an extended value chain.



FPP4EU covers a complex sector



We are dealing with hundreds of substances with diverging properties, used in many applications across an extended value chain.

We wish to be a valued partner in the wide PFAS REACH restriction

- From the manufacturers' side:
Which (type of) data are lacking? Are there questions for us?
- From the users' side:
How can we assist in completing the value chain mapping?

We started our own reflection

- How could PFAS be grouped in the context of a REACH restriction?
- What elements could be useful in the process of granting derogations?



FPP4EU covers a complex sector


To group or not to group

The decision tree

Warm call for collaboration



Can grouping work for the wide PFAS REACH restriction?



Can grouping work for the wide PFAS REACH restriction?

Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)

Perfluoroalkyl acids and perfluoroalkylether acids (PFAA), e.g.

perfluoroalkyl carboxylic acids (PFCA), $C_nF_{2n+1}-COOH$, e.g. PFOA
 perfluoroalkane sulfonic acids (PFSA), $C_nF_{2n+1}-SO_3H$, e.g. PFOS
 perfluoroalkyl phosphonic acids (PFPA), $C_nF_{2n+1}-PO_3H_2$
 perfluoroalkyl phosphinic acids (PFPIA), $(C_nF_{2n+1})(C_mF_{2m+1})-PO_2H$
 perfluoroalkylether carboxylic acids (PFECA), e.g. $C_2F_5OC_2F_4OCF_2COOH$
 perfluoroalkylether sulfonic acids (PFESA), e.g. $C_6F_{13}OCF_2CF_2SO_3H$

Precursors to PFAA, e.g.


perfluoroalkane sulfonyl fluorides (PASF)
 perfluoroalkanoyl fluorides (PACF) and their derivatives, $C_nF_{2n+1}SO_2-R$ / $C_nF_{2n+1}CO_2-R$
 n:2 fluorotelomer-based substances $C_nF_{2n+1}CH_2CH_2-R$
 per- and polyfluoroalkylether-based substances
 e.g. $C_nF_{2n+1}OC_mF_{2m+1}-R$
 some hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs, e.g. $C_nF_{2n+1}-C_mH_{2m+1}$), hydrofluoroethers (HFEs, e.g. $C_nF_{2n+1}OC_mH_{2m+1}$) and hydrofluoroolefins (HFOs, e.g. $C_nF_{2n+1}-CH=CH_2$);
 perfluoroalkyl ($C_nF_{2n+1}C(O)C_mF_{2m+1}$) and semi-fluorinated ($C_nF_{2n+1}C(O)C_mH_{2m+1}$) ketones;
 perfluoroalkyl alcohols ($C_nF_{2n+1}OH$)

side-chain fluorinated polymers
 e.g. (meth)acrylate, urethane, or oxetane polymers with non-fluorinated backbones and fluorinated side-chains
 non-polymers
 R = NH, $NHCH_2CH_2OH$, etc.

Fluoropolymers, e.g.


polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE), $-(CF_2CF_2)_n-$
 polychlorotrifluoroethylene (PCTFE), $-(CF_2CFCl)_n-$
 polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF), $-(CF_2CH_2)_n-$
 fluorinated ethylene propylene (FEP), $-(CF_2CF_2)_n-(CF_2C(CF_3)F)_m-$

Perfluoropolyethers, e.g.




Other PFAS*, e.g.


perfluoroalkanes, e.g.



perfluoroalkylethers, e.g.



perfluoroalkylamines, e.g.



* These PFAS have been less discussed in the public domain, but they meet the definition of PFAS as recommended in Buck et al. (2011) and OECD (2018). They are primarily PFAS with limited chemical reactivity.

Can grouping work for the wide PFAS REACH restriction?



OECD, 2021


Series on Risk Management No. 61

<https://www.oecd.org/chemicalsafety/portal-perfluorinated-chemicals/terminology-per-and-polyfluoroalkyl-substances.pdf>


Can grouping work for the wide PFAS REACH restriction?

Take a glance at this hypothetical situation

Chemical class A



Chemical class B



- Non-persistent, no specific hazards identified
- Acute Tox 4, Persistent, Aquatic Chronic 2
- STOT RE 2, Mobile, Acute Tox 4
- Acute Tox. 4, Skin Corr. 1A, Aquatic Chronic 3

There are combinations of properties
(not just one property) to be considered


Our conclusion :
Grouping in chemical classes does not help



Can grouping work for the wide PFAS REACH restriction?


Take a glance at this hypothetical situation

Science-based class X



- Non-persistent, no specific hazards identified
- Acute Tox 4, Persistent, Aquatic Chronic 2

Science-based class Y



Our conclusion :

Science-based classes are too complex to be clearly defined



FPP4EU covers a complex sector


To group or not to group

The decision tree


Warm call for collaboration



FPP4EU supports the idea of a decision tree



FPP4EU supports the idea of a decision tree



-
- The tree follows the definition of PFAS used in the EU REACH restriction process.
 - Breakdown products will also run through this process.
 - Should certain categories of PFAS, either or not combined with specific uses, be covered by their own concept/ decision trees via other associations, we refer to those instead of our proposal.




FPP4EU supports the idea of a decision tree



- Here we refer to the decision taken by authorities on whether restriction prevails, within the spirit of Better Regulation and 'One Substance One Assessment' principles.



FPP4EU supports the idea of a decision tree



In the industrial setting, process-related controls exist:

- focus on industrial emissions (current and future IED-BREF),
- focus on workers' safety (current and future OSH/ REACH).


Examples of industrial use (non-exhaustive list) may include:

- intermediates only,
- processing aids,
- PFAS used in equipment (pipes/gaskets/membranes etc.),
- etc.

Such industrial use PFAS are not intended to end up in consumers products/articles.



FPP4EU supports the idea of a decision tree




When is a safety dossier considered to be 'complete'?

- Company/ consortium prepares the dossier according to EU REACH requirements (including data, data waivers, read-across proposals, testing proposals etc.).
- 'Completeness' will to be confirmed/ rejected by authorities during compliance checks.



FPP4EU supports the idea of a decision tree




Risk assessment

- As per the EU REACH legal text, it must be assessed whether the substance poses any unacceptable risk to human health or the environment.
Risk assessments are linked to function/ use/ exposure patterns and are based on important properties/ features:
 - Physico-chemical properties, incl. size/molecular weight, physical state, Kow, etc.
 - Presence in the environment (different media)
 - Official status of PBT, CMR , ED, ...
 - Human data, New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) for risk assessment and read-across proposals
 - Potential emissions throughout life cycle (involving DUs)
 - Circularity and end-of-life considerations; appropriate disposal



FPP4EU supports the idea of a decision tree




Use 'vital' for society

- Socio-economic value of the substance in its use and the costs of substitution, evaluated ECHA's Committee for Socio-Economic Assessment, well-informed by the downstream user community → no assessment of 'essentiality for society'.
- Over time, the word 'vital' may need to be replaced by the word 'essential' or 'critical'.



FPP4EU supports the idea of a decision tree



Conditions for derogations

- Companies/ downstream users can include assessments of (absence of) alternatives. Potential practical implementation timelines will also need to be considered.
- Societal debates will guide on how to deal, case by case, with (groups of) substances that may pose a health/ environmental risk but remain vital/ essential/ critical for society.



FPP4EU covers a complex sector

To group or not to group

The decision tree

Warm call for collaboration



Collaboration is our route to piecing together the puzzle



The FPP4EU proposed decision tree (Let's think together!)



Marleen Pauwels

Executive Director Halogens Industry Sector,
European Chemical Industry Council (Cefic)