Priority question for written answer P-003902/2025
to the Commission
Rule 144
Cristina Guarda (Verts/ALE), Estelle Ceulemans (S&D), Lena Schilling (Verts/ALE), David Cormand (Verts/ALE), Anja Hazekamp (The Left), Per Clausen (The Left), Murielle Laurent (S&D), Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE), Sebastian Everding (The Left), Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE), Benedetta Scuderi (Verts/ALE), Jonas Sjöstedt (The Left), Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE), Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE), Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE), Sara Matthieu (Verts/ALE), Katrin Langensiepen (Verts/ALE), Kai Tegethoff (Verts/ALE), Christine Singer (Renew), Pierre Jouvet (S&D), Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE), Majdouline Sbai (Verts/ALE), Ignazio Roberto Marino (Verts/ALE), Sigrid Friis (Renew)

Subject: Conflict of interest and regulation of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)

Recent journalistic revelations[1] have highlighted a potential conflict of interest concerning the consultancy firm Ramboll, which allegedly worked simultaneously for the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) and for major PFAS-producing companies.

According to these reports, in 2020, Ramboll recommended to the European institutions that petrochemical companies be granted ten years to replace PFAS in firefighting foams; this transitional period was incorporated into EU legislation, with a further derogation until December 2025.

Considering that PFAS are persistent, toxic and bioaccumulative chemicals, with serious effects on health and the environment; the EU has launched a universal restriction proposal on PFAS under REACH[2], which requires maximum transparency and scientific independence; and the credibility of European institutions could be undermined if decision-making processes are influenced by consultants linked to the industry concerned:

1. What measures does the Commission intend to adopt to verify the contractual relationships between Ramboll, the ECHA and PFAS-producing companies and how does it intend to ensure independent scientific assessments in PFAS regulation?

2. Does it confirm its commitment to the universal restriction proposal, in line with the precautionary principle and the ‘zero pollution’ objective[3]?

3. Was it aware that the ECHA’s recommendation on firefighting foams was also based on the opinions of experts and consultants, including Ramboll, and how does it assess this circumstance in light of potential conflicts of interest?

Submitted: 3.10.2025

---

1 ‘EU hired ‘forever chemicals’ adviser that lobbied for industry’, Alice Hancock, Financial Times, 24 September 2025.
2 https://echa.europa.eu/hot-topics/perfluoroalkyl-chemicals-pfas.
3 Commission communication of 12 May 2021 entitled ‘Pathway to a Healthy Planet for All EU Action Plan: ‘Towards Zero Pollution for Air, Water and Soil’’ (COM/2021/400, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0400).