

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 08 March 2021 10:14
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Scope definition FFF

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]

Yes, that helps a lot! Thank you very much for your response and explanation.

Your explanation during the meeting was also very clear on that, so it was really to check whether I misunderstood. It was also clear from your and [REDACTED]'s explanation that it is not a final scope definition.

Since I am working on the scope definition for the "universal" restriction (in work package 2), I wanted to think about how these scope definitions may complement each other best. That was the actual reason of my question. As soon as I prepared some ideas about that (and discussed internally) I will contact you and [REDACTED] so we can further discuss.

Hope that is fine to you.

Have a good day!

Best regards,

On 8 Mar 2021, at 08:18, [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks for your question. The "PFSAAS" is a typo, and I would suggest you to take the SID definitions in the text otherwise not black and white because the document is only a draft.

What should rather stay in the SID -part is something I mentioned in the meeting: a PFAS which has an ionic moiety; and fluorinated C moieties sufficient to make the substance persistent (would mean in our AFFF project either at least two fluorinated carbons in a row or located in such a way that the moieties don't have to reduce the persistence, e.g., an ether bond).

Hope this helps?

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 05 March 2021 13:54
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Scope definition FFF

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 started to study your preliminary PFAS hazard assessment of FFF, and I have a question that shows that I am a little confused 😊.

My questions is:

The PFAAS as indicated in the scope definition (C≥4 for PFSAAS + precursors), is that referring to Perfluoro Sulfone Amides Acids?

And is it referring to Perfluoro Sulfone Amides Acids only, meaning that a PFAS without sulfonic group is out of the currently proposed scope?

The answer to my question would really help me in reading and interpreting the document.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Have a good weekend!

Best regards,

[REDACTED]