Minutes of public meeting of the PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel on Teams

10:00 on 26 June 2025

Panel Members present:	Dr Steve Hajioff – Independent Chair
	Dr Tony Fletcher – PFAS and Health member
	Professor Ian Cousins – PFAS and Environment member
In attendance:	Standing Observer (Regulation) - Kelly Whitehead - Group Director of Regulation, Infrastructure and Environment Department
	Programme support team from I&E

Welcome:

The Chair welcomed everyone to the Panel meeting and reminded people the meeting was being recorded.

Introductions

The Chair and Panel members introduced themselves.

Dr Steve Hajioff, Independent Panel Chair: A retired Director of Public Health from an area of London with two major international airports and a variety of other environmental hazards and challenges, with 35 years in clinical medicine. An expert on translating science into policy, he has worked with Nice, the Greater London Authority, the EU, WHO and World Bank, several UK government departments and several international governments. Dr Hajioff has also worked extensively in the pharmaceutical industry.

Dr Tony Fletcher, PFAS and Health Panel Member: Environmental Epidemiologist at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, working on PFAS since 2006 and member of the panel with experience of epidemiological studies on the health effects of PFAS in contaminated communities in West Virginia in the United States, in the Veneto region, in Italy, and in Ronneby, and is the health expert on the panel.

Professor Ian Cousins, PFAS and Environment Panel Member: A Professor in Environmental Chemistry at Stockholm University, an expert on PFAS, appointed as the environmental expert on this Panel and whose expertise on PFAS is on the sources, transport, fate, and exposure of PFAS.

Kelly Whitehead, Group Director for Regulation in the in the Infrastructure and Environment Department, leading on the Water Quality and Safety Programme, coordinating Government's response.

Declaration of Interests

- No new interests declared.

Minutes

- Minutes from 30 April 2025 meeting approved as a true and accurate record by the panel following these changes:
- Page 7
    - **First line**: The Netherlands is said to use different percentages, but they actually use **similar percentages**.
    - **Fourth paragraph**: A phrase says, “I question the rationale,” but it should be “**query the rationale**.”
    - **Fifth paragraph**:
        - “Ion exchange shows signs of saturation” should be “**slower signs of saturation**” to contrast with GAQ.
        - “Immunotoxin effects” should be “**immunotoxic effects**.”
        - A sentence about RPF and PFAS mixtures is unclear: “The RPF takes account of the possibilities of the numerous PFAS can cause an effect.” It should clarify **that individual PFAS in mixtures can have different effects**.
- Top of page 8
    - A sentence claims the RPF method accounts for a maximum of 23 PFAS, but this is uncertain. It was suggested to **remove the sentence** due to lack of clarity or necessity.
- It was noted that the minutes from 29 May 2025 meeting are delayed because we are waiting for the expert consulted to confirm the accuracy of their statements. These will be available in July.

Matters Arising

- For those observing the meeting, all subject matter expert content will be shortened and reviewed by the experts for accuracy. The full summaries will be included in both the interim report (to be published in a few months) and the final draft report (to be released for Islander input later in the year).

Additional Findings Since the Last Meeting

Engagement with Islanders

- Held side meetings with Islanders and others who had:
    - Concerns about their well-being.
    - Questions about how to engage with the panel or interpret its work.
- Provided clarifications and offered follow-up contact opportunities.
- Responded to emails from Islanders seeking to understand:
    - The panel’s processes.

    - Its terms of reference.
    - Its ways of working.
- Offered meetings with himself or the panel to those interested.

Household Water Treatment & PFAS

- A letter was received asking about household-level water treatment for PFAS.
- Clarifications provided:
    - The panel is currently focused on mains water.
    - In-home and borehole treatment will be addressed after July/August.
    - Previous responses included publicly available information on PFAS water treatment, but the panel:
    - Has not formally reviewed this information.
    - Cannot vouch for its scientific rigor.
    - Is willing to share it with a caveat.
- A review by the Environmental Working Group (US) was mentioned:
    - Focused on American market products.
    - May not fully reflect UK availability.
- A subject matter expert has offered to contribute insights on this topic.
    - Will be invited to the August panel meeting.
    - The panel is beginning to identify experts to invite.

International Developments

- Australia released new drinking water guidelines:
    - These are higher than many other international standards.
    - Will be discussed further under agenda item 9.
- The UK Parliamentary Office for Science and Technology:
    - Issued a report on PFAS on 2 June.
    - Contains a useful summary and literature references.
    - However, the international standards table is outdated (e.g., old Danish standards).
    - The report will be linked in the meeting minutes.

Firefighting Foam Contamination (Bentham Angus Fire Plant, Yorkshire)

- Renewed public interest in PFAS contamination from firefighting foam.

- A public meeting and TV news coverage occurred.
- ITV is planning a documentary on the issue.
- Key points:
    - High contamination in the ground.
    - Water supply is clean (sourced from a reservoir).
    - Exposure scenario differs from airport-related foam use.
    - Foam is produced and tested at the site, leading to runoff.

Public Engagement by Ministers

- Ministers held a quarterly public Q&A session last Wednesday.
    - Part of a commitment to regular public engagement.
    - Islanders could ask questions directly.
- Minutes of the session are being prepared:
    - Will be approved at an upcoming board meeting.
    - Will be published on the government website.

Discussion Papers for Approval

1. **Environmental Behaviour of PFAS from Firefighting Foams**

Steve Hajioff introduces the context, explaining that this section—along with others—is designed to help readers better understand the findings of the report by providing essential background. Although the content extends beyond the immediate focus on mains water quality, it is being developed now to avoid duplication and to build toward the final report. The team will later decide which parts are relevant enough to include in the interim report.

Steve notes that the section aims to provide a broad overview of how PFAS behave in various environmental media—soil, surface and groundwater, air, plants, animals, and the built environment. He emphasises that PFAS persistence is not only due to their behaviour in water but also due to their slow release from materials like concrete and asphalt, which can prolong contamination. The section also touches on adsorption and desorption processes, and the persistence and mobility of PFAS compounds, particularly those found at elevated levels in Jersey.

Steve acknowledges his limited background in environmental chemistry and credits Ian Cousins for correcting technical inaccuracies in the draft. Ian responds positively, noting that while the topic could easily span hundreds of pages, the plain-language approach taken by Steve is appropriate for the intended audience. Ian confirms that he has ensured the technical accuracy of the content and supports the decision to keep the section concise to avoid overshadowing the panel's deliberations and expert testimony.

Tony Fletcher contributes a specific correction regarding the half-life values of PFOS and PFHxS cited in the draft. He points out that the ranges used (4–8 years and 5–7 years, respectively) are inconsistent with what he considers the most reliable data from a Swedish study (Lee et al., 2020), which suggests 3–8 years for PFOS and 4–7 years for PFHxS. Steve agrees to update the figures and requests the reference for accuracy.

The group then discusses whether this section should also be included in the interim report on water quality. Kelly Whitehead supports its inclusion, and Tony suggests adding a brief introductory note to clarify that the section is broader in scope and anticipates content from both the interim and final reports. Steve agrees and commits to incorporating the changes and formatting the section accordingly.

2. **Chemistry of AFFF**

The panel convened to review and refine the section of the report concerning the chemistry of AFFF, particularly in relation to PFAS contamination in Jersey. Steve Hajioff introduced the item, noting that most of the content was previously published in Report 2, based on a presentation by Ian Cousins. However, recent insights—especially from Arcadis—revealed that the contamination profile in Jersey is more complex than initially understood, prompting the addition of three new bullet points to the section.

These additions clarify the presence of multiple types of AFFF used in Jersey:

1. Legacy AFFF, notably 3M Lightwater, which was linked to the primary contamination plume.
2. A more modern formulation, associated with contamination in a different area near Pont Marquet.
3. A general note that all AFFF products are complex mixtures of PFAS compounds, each with a unique chemical “fingerprint” that can help trace contamination sources through environmental analysis.

Ian Cousins supported the inclusion of these distinctions and emphasised two key points:

- Telomer-based AFFF was available and used in parallel with 3M products as early as the 1970s, despite 3M’s market dominance.
- Formulations of AFFF have evolved over time, with subtle or significant chemical changes introduced regularly. Multiple manufacturers produce telomer-based AFFF, each with distinct formulations. Ian suggested that Jersey authorities have been documenting these formulations via Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS), which could inform future reporting.

Steve agreed to revise the section to reflect these nuances and confirmed that data collection and environmental sampling for the final report is already underway. This includes identifying which formulations were used and when, to support broader environmental assessments beyond mains water.

Tony Fletcher raised a question about whether Angus Fire products were used in Jersey, given their prominence in PFAS-related contamination elsewhere, such as at the Bentham Angus Fire site. Steve responded that the primary products used were 3M Lightwater and some telomer-based

foams, but deferred to Ian for confirmation. Ian noted that Angus Fire products were used, but clarified they were telomer-based and did not contain PFOS. However, contamination at Bentham likely resulted from testing other PFOS-containing foams, not from Angus's own formulations.

The discussion then turned to the interpretive challenges of contamination data. Tony cautioned against taking manufacturer claims at face value, citing conflicting reports about PFOS presence near Angus Fire's training site. Ian agreed, suggesting that high PFAS levels likely stemmed from testing external products rather than Angus's own.

To resolve these complexities, Steve proposed making the section manufacturer-agnostic for now, omitting specific brand names until more definitive data is available. This approach would allow the section to remain relevant and accurate for the interim report, with the option to add manufacturer-specific details in the final report once the MSDS analysis is complete.

The panel agreed with this approach, and Steve confirmed he would revise the section accordingly and include it in the interim report. No further comments were raised.

3. **Testing for PFAS**

The panel engaged in a comprehensive and technically nuanced discussion about the challenges and considerations involved in testing for PFAS environmental samples. This section was prompted by the realisation that key analytical concepts—such as limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantification (LOQ)—were being referenced in expert discussions but had not yet been clearly explained in the report. Steve Hajioff initiated the drafting of this section to provide a foundational understanding for readers, especially in anticipation of upcoming deliberations on appropriate regulatory thresholds.

The draft outlines the sampling process, including how samples are collected, stored, extracted, and analysed. It introduces LOD as the threshold at which a lab can detect the presence of a substance, and LOQ as the level at which the quantity of that substance can be reliably measured. Steve emphasised the importance of aligning regulatory standards with measurable thresholds, noting that setting limits below detection capabilities would be impractical.

Ian Cousins reviewed and heavily edited the draft to ensure technical accuracy, appreciating its accessibility for non-specialist readers. He suggested a final review and possibly sharing it with a specialist in analytical chemistry for further validation. Tony Fletcher added that the concept of reporting level, used in Jersey Water reports, should also be defined. This level is typically higher than both LOD and LOQ and may reflect stricter criteria for data reliability.

The panel also discussed the different approaches to summing PFAS concentrations, including:

- Summing individually named PFAS compounds (e.g., EU's list of 20 or 48 PFAS).
- The broader concept of total PFAS, which aims to capture all PFAS compounds, including those not individually identified.

Ian explained that while the total organic fluorine approach is conceptually valuable, it is methodologically inconsistent. Techniques like extractable organic fluorine (EOF) and adsorbable

organic fluorine (AOF) rely on combustion and ion chromatography, but results vary significantly depending on the extraction method, solvent used, and lab protocols. He noted that short-chain PFAS, which are often present in high concentrations, are particularly difficult to capture reliably. Steve proposed summarising this complexity in a brief paragraph acknowledging the lack of consensus on a standardised method.

The conversation then shifted to sampling integrity and independence, prompted by public concerns raised in a recent meeting. Kelly Whitehead highlighted the issue of who conducts the sampling, questioning whether government officers are sufficiently independent and whether potential conflicts of interest are adequately mitigated. Steve acknowledged the tension between ensuring independence and maintaining efficiency, noting that outsourcing sampling to third parties would significantly delay reporting. He expressed confidence in the professionalism of government staff and suggested that transparency and adherence to strict protocols could provide sufficient reassurance.

Ian elaborated on the protocols required by accredited laboratories, including the use of specific sampling containers and procedures. He noted that Jersey's environmental staff follow these protocols rigorously, and that labs supply the necessary equipment and enforce strict standards. Tony added that transparency is key, especially under the polluter pays principle, which holds that entities responsible for contamination should also fund monitoring and remediation. He emphasised that clear documentation of sampling procedures, equipment, and lab processes can help build public trust.

The panel agreed that while the issue of independence is important, it falls outside their primary scientific remit. Nonetheless, they decided to include a brief explanation of traceability protocols—akin to chain of custody in forensic contexts—to clarify how sample integrity is maintained. Steve concluded by thanking the team for the thoughtful discussion and confirmed that the section would be revised to reflect these insights.

4. **Treatment Technologies for Removing PFAS from Drinking Water**

This draft paper reviewed a summary of mature technologies for removing PFAS from drinking water, with a particular focus on their applicability in Jersey. The document, originally much longer, was condensed to around seven pages to ensure accessibility while retaining technical accuracy. It draws on both published literature and insights from subject matter experts and is intended to inform future decision-making rather than prescribe specific solutions.

The technologies are grouped into two main categories: adsorption technologies and membrane technologies. Adsorption technologies include granular activated carbon (GAC) and ion exchange resins (IX), while membrane technologies encompass nanofiltration (NF) and reverse osmosis (RO). A third method, foam fractionation, is also discussed, typically used as part of a treatment train—where multiple technologies are combined sequentially to enhance performance.

Granular activated carbon is a well-established method, particularly effective at removing long-chain PFAS such as PFOS, which are of primary concern in Jersey. However, GAC has limitations. Over time, it becomes saturated, leading to breakthrough, where PFAS begin to pass through untreated.

At this point, the GAC must be either reactivated or replaced. Reactivation is environmentally preferable but requires off-island transport, as Jersey lacks the necessary facilities. Disposal of spent GAC on-island is possible but raises regulatory and logistical challenges. Additionally, GAC requires long contact times, necessitating large treatment vessels, which may be impractical in space-constrained settings.

Ion exchange resins offer a broader spectrum of PFAS removal, including some short-chain compounds. They require shorter contact times and smaller vessels than GAC, making them more space-efficient. However, they too experience breakthrough and must be regenerated or replaced. Like GAC, regeneration facilities are not available on Jersey, and disposal of spent resin presents similar challenges. IX systems are also susceptible to fouling from organic matter, often necessitating pre-treatment with GAC. These technologies can be used in tandem to improve performance and resilience.

Membrane technologies, including nanofiltration and reverse osmosis, are highly effective at removing both long- and short-chain PFAS. Nanofiltration is generally more water-efficient and less costly than RO, while still achieving strong removal rates. Reverse osmosis, although the most comprehensive in terms of contaminant removal, is also the most expensive and energy-intensive. It results in significant water loss—up to 25%—which is a serious concern in water-scarce regions like Jersey. RO also removes beneficial minerals, requiring costly remineralisation of the treated water. Both NF and RO produce a stream of highly contaminated reject water, which must be managed carefully. A recent study raised concerns about fluoropolymer membranes potentially leaching PFAS, though this is likely minimal with modern materials.

Foam fractionation is a less common but promising method that exploits PFAS's surfactant properties. By bubbling air through water, PFAS are concentrated in the resulting foam, which can be skimmed off. While effective, this method generates a highly contaminated foamate that requires further treatment or disposal, adding complexity and cost.

The panel emphasised that no single technology can be recommended without site-specific testing. Jersey Water is already conducting pilot-scale trials of various combinations, such as GAC followed by NF or IX. These trials are essential to determine which configurations are most effective under local conditions. Waste management is a critical consideration, as both solid and liquid waste streams must be handled within Jersey's limited infrastructure. Incineration is possible for solids but not for liquids, and the disposal of reject water and foamate remains a significant challenge.

Upgrade pathways were also discussed. Technologies like GAC and IX offer flexibility to transition to novel sorbents, such as bentonite-based materials like RemBind, as they become commercially viable. These newer materials may offer broader PFAS removal, including short-chain compounds, and can often be used in the same infrastructure. In contrast, membrane systems require entirely new builds, limiting adaptability. The panel noted that future regulations may impose stricter limits on short-chain PFAS, making it important to choose technologies that are both effective now and adaptable in the future.

Strategic considerations include water loss, physical space constraints, cost, environmental impact, and public health implications. For example, RO's removal of essential minerals could have

unintended health consequences unless properly managed. The panel agreed that while specific recommendations are premature, the review provides a strong foundation for future discussions. Ian will expand the section on reject water and foamate disposal, and the panel will revisit the topic in the next meeting to align technical feasibility with Jersey's unique constraints.

5. **Review of International Regulation of PFAS in Drinking Water**

Tony began by acknowledging the challenge of balancing conciseness with the complexity of the topic. He noted that historically, many regulatory standards were based on animal toxicity data or practical feasibility, which tended to yield more lenient thresholds. In contrast, more recent and stringent standards—such as those adopted in parts of Europe and the United States—are increasingly based on human epidemiological data, particularly immunological effects.

A key point of discussion was the newly finalised Australian standard, which diverges significantly from the trend toward stricter limits. Australia's regulators reviewed both animal and human data but ultimately dismissed the human epidemiological evidence as unreliable, opting instead to base their risk assessments solely on animal studies. This led to a proposed limit of 200 nanograms per litre for PFOA—substantially higher than the limits set by other countries. Tony raised the question of whether the panel should engage with the rationale behind Australia's rejection of human data, but Steve Hajioff advised against delving into the motivations of individual governments, suggesting that the panel should focus instead on summarising the regulatory levels and the types of evidence they are based on.

The discussion also touched on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which has proposed extremely low limits based on presumed carcinogenicity and human epidemiological data. These limits are significantly lower than those derived by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), despite both agencies reviewing similar datasets. The discrepancy arises from differences in benchmark dose modelling and the application of uncertainty factors. Tony asked whether such methodological differences should be explored in the report, but the consensus was to avoid excessive technical detail that might obscure the report's clarity and purpose.

Steve suggested standardising all concentration units to nanograms per litre to improve readability and consistency, a recommendation Tony agreed to implement. Ian Cousins supported the current level of detail in the paper and did not see a need for further elaboration.

Tony then explained the structure of the paper, which begins with health-based guidance values derived from EFSA's work. These values typically translate to target concentrations in the range of 2–4 nanograms per litre, depending on assumptions about water consumption, body weight, and the proportion of PFAS exposure attributed to drinking water. For example, regulators often assume a daily intake of 2 litres of water and attribute 10–20% of total PFAS exposure to water. These assumptions vary slightly between countries, leading to differences in regulatory thresholds.

Germany's approach was highlighted as particularly pragmatic. Although German authorities accepted EFSA's data, they concluded that the resulting thresholds were so low that most people would already exceed them through food alone. As a result, Germany set a higher, more achievable limit of 20 nanograms per litre, which Tony described as not really a health-based standard. He

noted that he had contacted German specialists for clarification but received only cautious responses.

The Netherlands' use of Relative Potency Factors (RPFs) was also discussed. While the Dutch guidance is not legally binding, it introduces a method of weighting different PFAS compounds based on their relative toxicity. However, the panel expressed scepticism about recommending RPFs due to their complexity, variability over time, and the difficulty of applying them consistently. Steve noted that the panel would formally discuss the merits of RPFs in the next meeting.

Tony summarised that health-based goals derived from immunological data generally support very low PFAS limits (2–4 ng/L), while higher limits, such as Germany's, are based on feasibility. The U.S. EPA's limits are even lower but are subject to political change, and the UK's current guidance is in flux. The UK currently uses a tiered advisory system, recommending investigation above 10 ng/L and action above 100 ng/L, now applied to the sum of 48 PFAS compounds rather than individual ones. However, most of these compounds are typically undetectable, and the few that are detectable account for the vast majority of total PFAS levels.

The UK's Committee on Toxicity (COT) is conducting a detailed review of EFSA's data and is expected to issue updated guidance in early 2026. Meanwhile, the European Union has set a binding limit of 100 ng/L for the sum of 20 PFAS compounds, with a secondary goal of 500 ng/L for total PFAS, although the latter is not yet enforceable due to the lack of a standardised analytical method.

Tony also mentioned Canada's standard of 30 ng/L for the sum of 20 PFAS, which he plans to elaborate on further. The paper concludes with a comprehensive table comparing international standards and a breakdown of which PFAS compounds are included in each jurisdiction's regulatory framework.

The panel agreed that the paper provides a solid foundation for the next meeting, where they will decide whether to recommend a specific PFAS limit, whether to use RPFs, and whether any recommendations should be mandatory or aspirational. Tony also clarified that he had intentionally excluded the diverse and evolving standards of individual U.S. states, citing their limited relevance and the availability of detailed summaries elsewhere.

In closing, the panel acknowledged the complexity and diversity of international PFAS regulations and agreed to defer any recommendations until all evidence had been reviewed and discussed collectively in the following session.

6. Modelling Blood Concentrations from Drinking Water

The panel discussed a modelling exercise aimed at estimating PFAS blood concentrations in Jersey residents based on drinking water exposure. The model serves two primary purposes: first, to estimate background PFAS levels in the general population—particularly those living outside known contamination plumes—and second, to assess the relative contribution of drinking water to overall PFAS body burden. This modelling is intended to inform both the interpretation of blood test results and the potential impact of regulatory standards on public health.

Tony explained that, in the absence of local data on PFAS contamination in food, the model uses average blood concentrations from recent European biomonitoring studies as a proxy for background exposure. These studies, which exclude known contamination hotspots, report average serum levels of 1.8 ng/mL for PFOS, 1.1 ng/mL for PFOA, and 0.4 ng/mL for PFHxS. Based on existing literature, it is estimated that 80–90% of these background levels are attributable to non-drinking water sources such as food, food packaging, dust ingestion, and inhalation of PFAS precursors.

To estimate the contribution of drinking water, Tony used historical data from Jersey Water on PFAS concentrations at the two main treatment plants, noting that levels have generally declined over time. He modelled three scenarios: (1) continued exposure at current average water concentrations, (2) a worst-case scenario based on the highest recorded concentrations, and (3) a future scenario in which water is treated to reduce PFAS levels to 4 ng/L. The model assumes average values for body weight, water consumption, and PFAS half-lives, acknowledging that individual variability introduces significant uncertainty.

The results suggest that under current conditions, the average total PFAS concentration in blood would be around 5 ng/mL. In the worst-case scenario, this could rise to 16 ng/mL, while in the improved water quality scenario, levels could fall to 3–4 ng/mL. Tony concluded that the current average in Jersey is likely somewhere between 5 and 16 ng/mL, possibly around 9–10 ng/mL, with considerable individual variation.

Steve Hajioff emphasised the utility of the model for future adjustments as more data become available, particularly regarding locally produced food and smaller-scale water supplies. He noted that the model could be adapted to estimate serum levels in residents using private boreholes or living in areas with different water quality profiles.

Tony also referenced a U.S. study that used a similar modelling approach but incorporated uncertainty analysis through Monte Carlo simulations. He included a figure from that study to illustrate the range of possible outcomes due to variability in parameters like half-life and water intake. While acknowledging the value of such uncertainty modelling, Tony opted not to include it in the current report to maintain clarity and avoid overwhelming readers with technical detail.

Ian Cousins contributed by pointing out that the model simplifies exposure pathways, omitting specific contributions from dust ingestion and inhalation of PFAS precursors. While Tony agreed that these pathways are included in the 80–90% non-water exposure estimate, Ian suggested that explicitly naming them would improve clarity. He also referenced several studies, including the A-Team project and a 2015 Dutch study, which quantified multiple exposure routes using detailed sampling and biomonitoring.

The panel discussed the importance of communicating complex concepts like “steady state” in accessible language. Ian noted that while the concept is central to the model, it is often misunderstood or confused with equilibrium. Tony agreed to consider adding a visual aid from another U.S. model to help illustrate the concept. Steve suggested that the final report include a glossary to explain technical terms and that the discussion from the meeting could be used to frame the section in a more reader-friendly way.

Finally, the panel agreed that while the model is technically sound and useful for policy planning, it should be presented with clear caveats about its assumptions and limitations. Tony committed to reviewing the text for terminology and improving clarity where possible, while also considering the inclusion of additional figures or explanatory notes to aid understanding.

Any other business

Tony Fletcher raised a query regarding the status of Report 3A, which had previously been completed and submitted. He noted that a colleague from another country had expressed interest in the report's official release, anticipating that it could prompt discussion in relation to PFAS exposure cases in their jurisdiction. Tony also mentioned he had identified a typographical error in the report and asked about the timeline for its final publication.

Steve Hajioff clarified that the report had already been finalised by the panel and does not require ministerial approval. However, in line with the panel's "no surprises" approach, the government has been given advance access to the report to prepare a response. This ensures that officials are equipped to respond to public or media inquiries upon release. Steve invited Tony to send details of the typo so it could be corrected in the master copy and confirmed he would follow up with the public health team to confirm the expected publication timeline.

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 24th July 2025. It will be held 10am - 1pm online.

The Chair thanked everyone for their contributions, those watching the meeting and those offering support throughout the whole process.

A reminder to the public that this meeting has been recorded, and the video will be available online on request by emailing the Regulation Enquiries mailbox on RegulationEnquiries@gov.je. This will take a couple of days to make sure the observers are anonymised.

There being no further business, the meeting was closed.

To note that the Panel can be emailed via PFASpanel@gov.je.

Details of meeting dates and times can be found at PFAS in Jersey (gov.je)