

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: PFAS in AFFFs and military use
Date: 15 January 2021 17:19:00

Good, I will involve you in the call.

Have a good week-end too,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 15 January 2021 17:17
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: PFAS in AFFFs and military use

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.

Thanks [REDACTED]

I had the same thought, it seems that DOD is sending different messages in different fora. I also agree that in PFHxA restriction the full derogation for defence is not justified. I would be happy to join the call with DOD.

Have a nice week end

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 4:04 PM
To: [REDACTED] (ENV) <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] (ENV) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: PFAS in AFFFs and military use

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for sharing this. I will forward it to [REDACTED] who is charge of the PFHxA restriction.

It is still unclear to me why the US DOD is pushing this exemption considering that the recent US law will ban in 2024 the use of PFAS foams for defence (except marine defence), see attach extracts. I will try to organise a call with them in the coming weeks to better understand this law and their work on alternatives. If you are interested to join just let me know.

In our case I do not see why defence should be permanently exempted under REACH for using PFAS foams. A reasonable transitional period should suffice and MS have always the possibility to opt-out if need be.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 15 January 2021 16:47
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: PFAS in AFFFs and military use

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]

The attached comment to the CARACAL essential uses paper contains some information on military uses of PFAS. I hope that SEAC will discuss if military uses are substantially different from civil uses for PFHxA restriction.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]