Thank you very much, very useful and clear. The article you shared on PFASs is very interesting.

All the best,

---

Dear [Name],

Many thanks for taking the time to get back to us. Our members across Europe expect a lot from this strategy and very much see more protective and efficient chemical regulation as an important way to contribute to disease prevention in Europe. They really look towards the health directorate of the Commission to contribute to the delivery of a strong strategy.

On your question specifically, in HEAL’s view, the strategy provides a unique opportunity to question our current approach to chemicals across the lifecycle:

- PFASs are not the only problematic compounds. Other chemicals, such as flame retardants and endocrine disruptors, also pose serious health threats.
  - out of scope
- [Additional points or considerations]

---
In our view, the paper brought forward by a group of scientists on the concept of “essential uses” for PFAS compounds, and reflecting on what already exists under the Montreal Protocol, is an interesting starting point for this discussion. We are not necessarily saying that the exact categories proposed in their paper must be adopted, but their approach has the merit to allow opening this necessary debate. Considering the scientific evidence about the health impacts of numerous individual and groups of chemicals, it is high time to open this debate and operationalise categories of uses that can orientate decision-making in a way that truly allows to shift to a clean circular economy and rewards the industry players that innovate to keep people safe.

I hope that these elements can be useful. I would be happy to discuss further on the phone at your convenience if this can help clarify remaining questions or if there are other issues you would like to exchange on.

With kind regards,
Dear [Name],

out of scope.

[Text redacted]

best and thanks again,

[Name]
out of scope