

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Meeting this morning with EEB/ClientEarth on firefighting foams
Date: 08 March 2022 13:38:00
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Dear [REDACTED]

Please see the link and password for the meeting today below:

[Click here](#)

Password: SEAC5408032022

In case you join from another device (e.g. a video codec or a tablet), you may need the information below:

Site: <https://echa.webex.com>

Meeting number: **27449715173**

Password: **SEAC5408032022**

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 08 March 2022 12:12
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: FW: Meeting this morning with EEB/ClientEarth on firefighting foams

Hi,

Would somebody be able to send [REDACTED] the WebEx link to SEAC please this afternoon.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Senior Scientific Officer / Restriction Process Coordinator
Risk Management I / D3
European Chemicals Agency
P.O. Box 400, FI-00121 Helsinki, Finland
Tel. [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: 08 March 2022 12:11
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

<[REDACTED]>

Subject: RE: Meeting this morning with EEB/ClientEarth on firefighting foams

CAUTION: This email originated from outside ECHA. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Check the email address of the sender. It is possible that the name of the sender is known to you (e.g. a colleague), but the actual sender is someone else.

I find your approach as the most appropriate.

Send me please the link

I am in a meeting right now

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 11:08 AM
To: [REDACTED] (GROW) <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] (GROW) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Meeting this morning with EEB/ClientEarth on firefighting foams

Hi [REDACTED]

We agree with you. EEB and Client earth think that we should have assumed that the PFHxA will be implemented.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] will follow this afternoon.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Senior Scientific Officer / Restriction Process Coordinator
Risk Management I / D3
European Chemicals Agency
P.O. Box 400, FI-00121 Helsinki, Finland
Tel. [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: 08 March 2022 12:01
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Meeting this morning with EEB/ClientEarth on firefighting foams

CAUTION: This email originated from outside ECHA. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Check the email address of the sender. It is possible that the name of the sender is known to you (e.g. a colleague), but the actual sender is someone else.

No I do not have it.
But I cannot understand .

It is up to the Commission to decide how it will go ahead.

I have not discussed with [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 10:58 AM
To: [REDACTED] (GROW) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Meeting this morning with EEB/ClientEarth on firefighting foams

RAC is next week, but SEAC is this afternoon.

This time SEAC is before RAC. Do you have the meeting details?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Senior Scientific Officer / Restriction Process Coordinator
Risk Management I / D3
European Chemicals Agency
P.O. Box 400, FI-00121 Helsinki, Finland
Tel. [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: 08 March 2022 11:54
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Meeting this morning with EEB/ClientEarth on firefighting foams

CAUTION: This email originated from outside ECHA. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Check the email address of the sender. It is possible that the name of the sender is known to you (e.g. a colleague), but the actual sender is someone else.

Dear [REDACTED]

I m lost.

RAC is next week according to my files.

The plenary this afternoon ?

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 10:43 AM

To: PEDERSEN [REDACTED] (ENV) <[REDACTED]>
(GROW) <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] (GROW)
<[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] (ENV)
<[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] (ENV)
<[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] (ECHA) <[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED] (ECHA) <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] (ECHA)
<[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] (ECHA)
<[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] (ECHA)
<[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] (ECHA)
<[REDACTED]>
Subject: Meeting this morning with EEB/ClientEarth on firefighting foams

Dear [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (all)

As you are attending SEAC this week I wanted to brief you all on a call this we had this morning on the proposed restriction of PFASs in firefighting foams (an ECHA Dossier) with EEB and ClientEarth.

EEB and ClientEarth are concerned that the ECHA restriction overlaps with the proposed restriction of PFHxA and, as such, attempts to ignore and 'overwrite' it in relation to FFF. They consider that this is introducing unnecessarily delay to the risk management of PFASs in these foams in the event that RAC and SEAC opinions supported the PFHxA restriction, and that there are alternative available etc etc.

We explained that we could not take the PFHxA proposal and opinions as part of the baseline for the analysis as this restriction is not yet agreed by COM/MS and that by doing so we would have pre-empted a policy decision that is outside of our mandate. We also explained that as RAC had not supported the proposed restriction of PFHxA at industrial installations as the most appropriate measure and that therefore it was important that our proposal also addressed these uses (as recommended by RAC). They had not interpreted the RAC opinion as such, which led to some tense exchanges.

I don't think that we managed to persuade them that the approach we took is reasonable and we think that they could mention this in the plenary this afternoon where the conformity of the dossier is discussed. If you think it could be useful perhaps somebody from the Commission could intervene on the 'PFHxA as part of the baseline issue'.

We will add a sentence or two to the Annex XV before we publish explaining this to avoid possible misinterpretation by others.

Thanks.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Senior Scientific Officer / Restriction Process Coordinator
Risk Management I / D3
European Chemicals Agency
P.O. Box 400, FI-00121 Helsinki, Finland
Tel. [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.