



IPEN Intervention on PFOS Review  
Given by Dr. Mariann Lloyd-Smith

30 April, 2019

Thank you, Mr. President, I speak on behalf of IPEN

A decade has passed since PFOS was first listed on the Stockholm Convention with its host of exemptions and acceptable uses. During the last 10 years there have been considerable assessments of PFOS alternatives which involved input from Parties, industry and NGO stakeholders.

As a result, the POPRC made a number of recommendations which we support with some reservations. We certainly support the removal of all current specific exemptions.

In regard to PFOS acceptable purposes, IPEN considers that metal plating - if it is to be retained - should be converted into specific time-limited exemptions to aid in the phase-out of that use.

*(My colleague will/ has addressed the sulfluramid issue in his intervention.)*

In regard to firefighting foams, we have heard at this meeting from active fire fighters and other fire safety experts that alternatives to PFOS firefighting foams are available, equally efficient in terms of performance and very cost effective. There is no need to continue to expose fire fighters and communities to this very persistent toxic chemical. We do not support their replacement with foams based on short chain fluorinated compounds; rather, a move to fluorine-free foams is the only sensible option.

The decade-long story of the PFOS exemptions can teach us much, particularly as delegates consider the listing of PFOA. Not only do these lengthy exemptions and acceptable purposes require ongoing production of POPs chemicals, but they provide a source of ongoing contamination to the environment, serious impacts on public health and a legacy of liability that Parties will need to address. As in the case of PFOS, they also require years of work with significant additional costs to address decisions that are often made in haste with little justification.

Thank you.