



6 May, 2015

IPEN Intervention on PFOS Evaluation

Given by Mariann Lloyd-Smith, Former IPEN Co-Chair and National Toxics Network, Australia

The PFOS evaluation revealed how little data is available on the quantities of PFOS manufactured and used and how little information Parties have regarding products that may contain PFOS. The evaluation also highlighted the vastly inadequate information on the identity and toxicity of PFOS alternatives. For example, of the 54 alternatives identified, 31 substances are included in *Class 3* 'Substances that are difficult to classify because of insufficient data.' In the case of 11 substances, only a brand name was available. This lack of information needs to be addressed urgently, and we urge countries to address unacceptable commercial secrecy regimes that are the cause of much of this lack of information. Adopting the POPRC labeling recommendation would also assist this.

Nevertheless, the PFOS evaluation does demonstrate that there are alternatives for nearly all acceptable purposes, (many of which are non fluorinated). There was only one use, photo resist & anti reflective coatings, where no country identified an alternative. Importantly, the evaluation has identified two alternatives to PFOS as meeting or possibly meeting Annex D criteria and we urge Parties to consider nominating these two, octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4) and chlorpyrifos, to the POPRC for consideration as new POPs.

Finally, we would like to draw the delegates' attention to the Madrid Statement of Fluorinated Chemicals. Over 200 scientists from 38 countries have reached consensus: the entire class of highly fluorinated chemicals are extremely persistent, potentially toxic, and should be replaced with safer alternatives. The Madrid Statement documenting this scientific consensus was published last Friday in *Environmental Health Perspectives* (EHP), a peer-reviewed scientific journal.