

One Molecule, Three PFAS Numbers

Trifluoroacetate in 2026: Why Food, Drinking-Water and Surface-Water Compliance Cannot Be Read from the Same Laboratory Result

José M. López, Research Director

ABSTRACT

Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA), generally present as trifluoroacetate in water, has become a revealing test of the limits of contaminant governance. In 2026, three European decisions converged without producing a single interchangeable limit: mandatory drinking-water PFAS monitoring began in January; Directive (EU) 2026/805 introduced TFA into a potency-weighted group of 25 PFAS for surface-water environmental assessment; and EFSA revised the acceptable daily intake for dietary TFA to 0.014 mg/kg body weight/day. These instruments address different matrices, endpoints and legal duties. A compliant sum of 20 specified PFAS does not establish absence of TFA, while an environmental PFOA-equivalent concentration is not a food maximum level or a drinking-water standard. This article develops an evidence-based framework for food manufacturers to connect source water, agricultural inputs, processing operations, finished products and exposure, without mistaking analytical non-detection for toxicological reassurance. A proposed research programme tests whether matrix-resolved TFA mass balances can improve supplier qualification, targeted monitoring and process design.

KEYWORDS: *trifluoroacetic acid; trifluoroacetate; PFAS; drinking water; food contaminants; exposure assessment; analytical chemistry; water regulation.*

CATEGORY: Food Safety & Regulatory Affairs

SEO SLUG: trifluoroacetate-pfas-food-water-regulation-2026

META DESCRIPTION: A critical 2026 analysis of trifluoroacetate across food, drinking and surface water, exposing PFAS testing gaps and proposing a practical evidence framework.

INTERNAL TAGS: PFAS; TFA; Food Safety; Water Quality; Analytical Methods; Regulatory Affairs; Process Water; Emerging Research.

1 | A 2026 convergence that must not be confused with regulatory harmonisation

The most consequential feature of the 2026 trifluoroacetate debate is not a single new limit. It is the simultaneous appearance of three different kinds of numbers that are easily mistaken for one another. On 12 January 2026, the European Union's recast Drinking Water Directive reached its PFAS monitoring and compliance milestone. On 20 April, Directive (EU) 2026/805 was published, updating surface- and groundwater policy and including TFA in a group of 25 PFAS for surface-water assessment. On 20–22 July, EFSA published and communicated new health-based guidance values for dietary TFA. [1–5]

A drinking-water parametric value, an environmental quality standard (EQS) and an acceptable daily intake (ADI) do not answer the same question. The first addresses water supplied for human consumption; the second addresses the ecological status and protection objectives of water bodies; the third estimates chronic human intake from all relevant dietary sources. Their units, analyte sets, assumptions, exposure pathways, addressees and enforcement mechanisms differ.

The industrial risk is a category error: a procurement certificate reports a PFAS sum, a quality manager interprets it as a TFA result, and a regulatory team treats that number as evidence of food compliance. Every step may be made in good faith, but the resulting assurance can be false. The correct question is not merely whether a sample “passes PFAS”. It is: which PFAS, measured by which method, in which matrix, for which legal or toxicological purpose?

2 | What TFA is, and why its chemistry changes the monitoring problem

Trifluoroacetic acid (CF_3COOH ; CAS 76-05-1) is a highly persistent, very small fluorinated carboxylic acid. At the pH of most natural and process waters it occurs predominantly as the trifluoroacetate anion (CF_3COO^-). Its high water solubility, low molecular mass and strong polarity distinguish it from many longer-chain PFAS that dominate public discussion and legacy monitoring. Atmospheric degradation of certain fluorinated gases, transformation of some plant-protection active substances, industrial activities and other precursor pathways can contribute to environmental inputs. [6–8]

These properties have three implications. First, TFA can travel with water through catchments and industrial supply chains. Second, conventional analytical workflows designed around a finite list of longer-chain PFAS may not quantify it. Third, treatment performance cannot be extrapolated reliably from removal of PFOA or PFOS: molecular size, membrane characteristics, resin selectivity, competing ions and process conditions matter.

Persistence does not by itself quantify toxicity; ubiquity does not prove that any particular sample is unsafe. Equally, a relatively low potency weight in one environmental mixture method does not mean that a substance can be ignored at higher concentrations or under different exposure assumptions.

3 | Ledger one: the European drinking-water regime

Directive (EU) 2020/2184 introduced two alternative PFAS-related parametric constructs: “Sum of PFAS” at 0.10 $\mu\text{g/L}$, defined through 20 specified substances, and “PFAS Total” at 0.50 $\mu\text{g/L}$. The directive allows Member States to use one or both parameters in the framework established by the instrument; national implementation must therefore be checked. The Commission confirmed that the monitoring and compliance requirements applied from 12 January 2026 and issued technical analytical guidance in 2024. [1,2,9]

TFA is not one of the 20 individually named compounds in the drinking-water “Sum of PFAS”. Consequently, a report showing that this sum is below 0.10 $\mu\text{g/L}$ does not demonstrate that TFA is absent. Conversely, “PFAS Total” is intended as a broader construct, and the Commission's technical guidance explicitly addresses the potentially substantial contribution of TFA and recommends separate targeted TFA determination in the reporting approach. These are different analytical propositions, not synonyms. [2,9]

A manufacturer should request the exact analyte list, measurement method, limits of quantification, handling of non-detects and whether TFA was determined independently. A simple “PFAS compliant” statement is inadequate if the actual concern is TFA transfer into a beverage, concentrated ingredient or infant-oriented product.

4 | Ledger two: surface-water environmental quality standards

Directive (EU) 2026/805, adopted on 30 March and published on 20 April 2026, amended the Water Framework, Groundwater and Environmental Quality Standards Directives. It introduced a surface-water group of 25 PFAS, including TFA, expressed as PFOA equivalents through relative potency factors (RPFs). The annual-average water EQS is 0.0044

µg/L (4.4 ng/L) expressed as PFOA equivalents; the biota EQS is 0.077 µg/kg wet weight, also expressed as PFOA equivalents. The directive identifies the biota standard as critical for the group. TFA has an RPF of 0.002. [3,10,11]

The calculation is conceptually $\sum(C_i \times RPF_i)$, with concentration and reference potency expressed consistently. A hypothetical water containing only TFA would reach 4.4 ng/L PFOA equivalents at 2,200 ng/L TFA (2.2 µg/L), because $2,200 \times 0.002 = 4.4$. This is a mathematical illustration, NOT an autonomous EU drinking-water limit, NOT a food maximum level and NOT a declaration that 2.2 µg/L TFA is acceptable in every setting. It also does not displace the directive's biota-based requirements.

Member States must transpose the amending directive by 21 December 2027; substantive environmental compliance has additional staged deadlines and mechanisms. The obligations attach to water-policy governance and relevant competent authorities, not directly to every food batch. The regulatory importance for industry lies in catchment management, source selection, discharge conditions, upstream prevention and the direction of future monitoring. [3,10]

5 | Ledger three: EFSA's revised dietary health-based values

In July 2026, EFSA established an ADI of 0.014 mg/kg body weight/day, replacing the earlier 0.05 mg/kg body weight/day value, and an acute reference dose (ARfD) of 0.07 mg/kg body weight. The assessment considered thyroid-hormone effects among sensitive endpoints and incorporated additional uncertainty for gaps concerning long-term carcinogenicity and developmental immunotoxicity. EFSA stated that the new values would inform subsequent risk-management decisions. [4,5]

The ADI is not a concentration limit for a food, ingredient, crop, beverage or water supply. A 70 kg adult's corresponding chronic reference intake is 0.98 mg/day; for a 10 kg child it is 0.14 mg/day. These arithmetic products are NOT permissions to allocate the entire intake to one product: other foods and water also contribute, consumption varies, and exposure assessment must consider relevant populations.

For illustration, a 250 mL beverage containing 100 µg/L TFA would contribute 25 µg TFA. This hypothetical contribution is about 18% of the 140 µg/day ADI-derived reference intake for a 10 kg child, before other dietary sources. The example demonstrates how volume, concentration and body weight interact; it is not a reported product concentration or a finding of non-compliance.

The EFSA value does not establish a general EU food maximum level for TFA. Product-specific pesticide-residue or other rules may need separate assessment depending on origin and legal classification; operators must not invent a uniform TFA food limit by dividing an ADI by a guessed daily consumption.

6 | The three numbers are not exchange rates

The superficial resemblance of numerical values creates an avoidable risk. The drinking-water “Sum of PFAS” is a fixed analyte list expressed as a sum of measured masses. The new surface-water PFAS25 construct weights individual concentrations by relative potency. The dietary ADI is an intake per kilogram of body weight per day, based on toxicological evidence and uncertainty factors. One cannot convert between them without additional information about the specific analytes, exposure scenario and purpose.

Even the term “total” is method-sensitive. A targeted 20-compound LC–MS/MS result, a total-organofluorine proxy and a targeted TFA determination can yield materially different findings for the same sample. Reporting them as a single undifferentiated “PFAS value” obscures the evidence instead of simplifying it. [2,9,12]

7 | Spain: national drinking-water duties and the food operator's separate responsibilities

Spain's Royal Decree 3/2023 establishes the technical and sanitary criteria for drinking-water quality, monitoring and supply, including staged PFAS provisions. It implements the EU drinking-water framework in the national system. A manufacturer sourcing municipal water should obtain the supplier's relevant analytical information, but its own food-safety assessment must consider the intended application and any further concentration, blending or processing effects. [13]

Spain's food operators remain subject to general EU food law, including the responsibility not to place unsafe food on the market and to maintain appropriate risk-based controls. The presence of a drinking-water certificate is evidence about the supplied water under the reported parameters; it is not a universal warranty of the safety of every downstream formulation. Conversely, detecting TFA does not automatically prove that a food breaches a statutory maximum level.

Competent authorities and enforcement routes differ across drinking-water supply, environmental discharge, pesticide residues and food safety. Companies should therefore identify the applicable instrument and authority before using the words “legal limit”, “exceedance” or “authorised concentration”.

8 | Great Britain and Northern Ireland: avoid treating the UK as one regulatory table

England and Wales use Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) guidance and water-supply legislation, with a risk-management and reporting approach for a named PFAS set. DWI's 2025 guidance and subsequent information requirements should be read as jurisdiction-specific; a guidance trigger is not necessarily the same thing as an express statutory parametric value. Scotland has its own water-quality administration, while Northern Ireland requires separate consideration of its water and food regulatory arrangements. [14,15]

For a food business exporting to the UK, EU TFA guidance values and EU surface-water EQSs should not be described as if automatically enforceable UK product limits. The correct exercise is a product-and-jurisdiction assessment, supported by supplier testing and scientific risk evaluation. Where there is no directly applicable TFA-specific food maximum, the absence of that maximum does not displace general food-safety obligations.

9 | United States: a narrower federal drinking-water list and active rulemaking

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's 2024 National Primary Drinking Water Regulation addressed named PFAS including PFOA and PFOS, but did not set a federal TFA maximum contaminant level. In May 2026, EPA proposed to extend the PFOA/PFOS compliance timetable in specified circumstances and separately proposed rescission of the rules for several other PFAS and a hazard-index mixture. As of 22 October 2026 these are proposals, not changes that may safely be presented as completed final rules. [16–18]

An EU manufacturer's TFA result therefore cannot be classified against a nonexistent federal U.S. TFA MCL. State rules, contracts, customer standards, applicable FDA food requirements and product-specific circumstances may nevertheless impose relevant obligations. The practical lesson is regulatory asymmetry: the same laboratory result can have different legal significance in different markets without changing the underlying chemistry.

10 | Agricultural inputs and environmental origin are not interchangeable with process-water inputs

TFA can reach crops through precipitation, soil water, groundwater and transformation of certain precursors. A 2026 catchment study documented diffuse sources, temporary retention and hydrological mobilisation, while a 2025 Swiss atmospheric and surface-water budget demonstrated the importance of source attribution. Such findings justify investigating agricultural pathways, but not attributing every detected food concentration to pesticide use alone. [7,8]

For agricultural ingredients, source apportionment should consider crop geography, irrigation, rainfall, relevant pesticide history, post-harvest washing, extraction and blending. Organic status does not logically guarantee zero environmental TFA; nor does a detected concentration identify a particular farming practice without supporting evidence.

11 | Food and beverage evidence: why matrix matters

Peer-reviewed work has investigated TFA in consumer foods, archived wines and beverages. A 2025–2026 literature base includes a long-term archived-wine series, a consumer-food investigation and targeted beverage/water methods. These studies provide evidence of occurrence and analytical feasibility, but sampling designs and matrices differ; they cannot be merged into a representative European dietary-exposure distribution without appropriate weighting. [19–21]

An aqueous beverage may reflect its source water plus botanical or other ingredient contributions. A concentrated plant extract may retain water-soluble contaminants from the starting material, but concentration is not automatically proportional to the evaporation factor because separation, partitioning, losses and additions differ by process. A dry powder can carry contaminant mass even after the water used to manufacture it has been removed. The process must be investigated, not presumed.

12 | A simple mass balance that prevents false reassurance

For a process step, a useful first-order accounting identity is: TFA mass in final product = TFA mass introduced through water + raw materials + processing inputs – TFA mass removed in separated streams ± any net transformation or analytical reconciliation term. The last term should be zero only when that assumption is experimentally justified.

For example, adding 1,000 L of process water at 5 µg/L introduces 5 mg of TFA. If a subsequent product contains only 100 L of water, the final concentration cannot be calculated from this fact alone. If all 5 mg were retained in the 100 L aqueous fraction, the concentration would be 50 µg/L; if some TFA left with a filtrate or wash stream, it would be lower. If raw ingredients contributed additional TFA, it could be higher. Each outcome requires data.

This is why a supplier's water result, a finished-product result and a process validation result should be linked by mass, batch and analytical uncertainty, rather than displayed as unrelated certificates.

13 | Analytical chemistry: TFA needs an explicit method

The very properties that make TFA mobile also complicate routine determination. Strong polarity, low mass, ubiquitous laboratory background and matrix effects can undermine methods developed for longer-chain PFAS. A 2025 interlaboratory trial assessed direct-injection LC–MS/MS methods and reported reproducibility characteristics for water samples; a 2026 Australian method study reported nanogram-per-litre capability under its specified extraction and instrument conditions. These are method-specific achievements, not proof that every commercial laboratory has the same limit of quantification. [12,22]

A fit-for-purpose laboratory instruction should state the target analyte (acid and/or anion reported as a defined equivalent), matrix, method principle, calibration, internal standards, blank control, limit of quantification, recovery, uncertainty, sampling materials and chain of custody. In complex foods, extraction efficiency and matrix suppression require particular attention. Where a result is below quantification, it should be reported as such; “zero” is not a valid analytical substitute.

14 | Treatment: performance for PFOA is not performance for TFA

Adsorption onto activated carbon generally becomes less favourable for highly mobile, very short-chain anions than for many longer-chain PFAS. Anion exchange may provide removal in selected systems but performance depends on resin chemistry, competing ions, loading and regeneration. Nanofiltration and reverse osmosis can reject PFAS, yet membrane rejection is compound- and matrix-specific. Published work on a tight nanofiltration system reported substantial TFA rejection in a semiconductor wastewater matrix; that result cannot be transferred uncritically to food-grade water treatment. [23,24]

Treatment also creates a second question: where does the separated contaminant go? Concentrate streams, exhausted resins and regenerants can shift the environmental burden rather than destroy it. A process claiming TFA removal must demonstrate influent–effluent performance over operating life, account for waste streams and avoid treating conductivity, pH, oxidation–reduction potential or taste as proxies for TFA destruction.

In particular, there is no defensible basis for claiming that mineral conditioning, ionisation, altered water structure or microbial control alone eliminates TFA without a TFA-specific analytical mass balance. This distinction is relevant to any water-technology developer, including those evaluating non-electrolytic mineral systems: physicochemical conditioning and removal of a persistent fluorinated anion are separate propositions requiring separate evidence.

15 | A decision table for industry: what each result can actually establish

“Sum of 20 PFAS” below 0.10 µg/L: evidence for the specified drinking-water analyte set and reporting rules; it does not quantify TFA.

“PFAS Total” below 0.50 µg/L: evidence for the selected broader proxy method under the applicable drinking-water regime; review method limitations and TFA-specific reporting.

PFAS25 surface-water result in PFOA equivalents: evidence for an environmental mixture metric, subject to the directive's environmental standards and staged implementation; it is not a food batch specification.

Targeted TFA in water (µg/L): an analyte concentration relevant to source selection, process design and exposure assessment; its significance depends on matrix, intake and applicable legal requirements.

Targeted TFA in food (µg/kg or mg/kg): an ingredient/product measurement that requires consumption data, analytical uncertainty, source investigation and appropriate legal classification; it is not by itself a declaration of unsafe food.

16 | Research & Innovation Opportunity

Unresolved problem. The three regulatory ledgers and most commercial analytical records do not naturally connect catchment water, agricultural raw materials, process water, food fractions and consumer exposure. This creates a practical evidence gap even when individual laboratories perform competent tests.

What is established. TFA is persistent and mobile; targeted analytical methods exist; EFSA has revised health-based guidance values; the EU has introduced drinking-water monitoring and a separate environmental PFAS25 framework; and published studies demonstrate food occurrence and complex hydrological pathways. [1–8,12,19–22]

What remains uncertain. The magnitude of TFA transfer and retention across representative food-processing operations, the relative contribution of water versus raw ingredients for different matrices, and the predictive accuracy of treatment and supplier-screening models have not been established as one broadly validated cross-sector method.

Proposed hypothesis. A matrix-resolved TFA source-to-product evidence ledger, combining targeted analytical measurements with batch-specific mass balances, will identify high-contribution process nodes more reliably than either a generic PFAS certificate or finished-product testing alone. This is a proposed industrial research framework, not an existing standard, patented novelty claim or demonstrated performance result.

Development pathway. Select contrasting pilot matrices: a ready-to-drink beverage, a concentrated botanical extract, a protein ingredient and a water-intensive washed food. Measure TFA in incoming water, agricultural materials, intermediate streams, wastewater and finished lots. Record flow, moisture, mass yield, source geography, seasonality, supplier changes and analytical uncertainty. Compare observed concentrations with preregistered mass-balance predictions.

Key validation steps. Use matrix-matched recovery and blank studies; replicate across seasons and plants; test source-water switching and selected treatment barriers; perform blinded prediction against held-out batches; quantify mass-balance closure and false-negative rates; and assess whether the model improves decision time or reduces unnecessary tests. A treatment claim should be supported by TFA-specific removal and waste-stream data, not by general PFAS reduction alone.

Regulatory constraints. The framework would support due diligence and hazard analysis; it would not replace drinking-water legal requirements, food-safety assessments, pesticide-residue rules, competent-authority decisions or any required product-specific authorisation. Disclosure to customers can be tiered to protect proprietary manufacturing details while preserving auditable conclusions.

Industrial relevance. The immediate applications are supplier qualification, source-water risk screening, validation of concentration steps, contract-manufacturer change control, cross-border customer documentation and defensible R&D decisions about treatment economics.

17 | The economics of testing the right molecule

A comprehensive analytical programme need not test every matrix at maximum frequency indefinitely. The rational starting point is a risk-based map of source variability and process concentration. A low-risk stable municipal source and a seasonally variable groundwater source may warrant different sampling. A dry ingredient made from high volumes of water may warrant different controls from a low-water formulation. A customer-specific demand for TFA absence should be translated into a realistic detection limit, a defined sampling plan and an agreed meaning of “not detected”.

This approach can reduce both under-testing and analytical overreach. It also prevents commercial claims such as “PFAS-free” from resting on a 20-analyte screen while other relevant compounds were never measured. Broad absolute claims should be avoided unless their scope and analytical basis can actually be defended.

18 | Governance: change control, claims and legal accountability

TFA evidence should be version-controlled. Relevant changes include water source, agricultural origin, pesticide supply chain, membrane configuration, resin type, process concentration factor, cleaning regime, laboratory method and reporting threshold. A supplier change that leaves the commercial ingredient name unchanged can still alter exposure-relevant inputs.

Contractual documentation should specify the tested matrix and analyte, unit, method, reporting limit, frequency, corrective-action triggers and responsibility for changed sources. The contract should not declare that EFSA's ADI is a statutory product limit or that a surface-water EQS applies directly to food. Where a regulatory duty is uncertain, legal analysis should identify the jurisdiction, instrument, status and competent authority before drafting a compliance declaration.

19 | Evidence status: five propositions kept separate

Established evidence: TFA's persistence and mobility, the existence of targeted analytical methods, the 2026 EU drinking-water milestone, Directive (EU) 2026/805 and EFSA's new ADI/ARfD. [1–8,12]

Emerging evidence: expanding occurrence datasets in food and beverages, catchment-scale source apportionment and treatment performance under specified conditions. Their generalisability remains matrix-dependent. [7,8,19–24]

Expert interpretation: a “PFAS compliant” certificate is often too ambiguous for a TFA-specific food-supply decision, because legal metrics and analytical panels do not coincide.

Hypothesis: a source-to-product TFA mass-balance ledger may improve prediction and prioritisation, but its accuracy and cost-effectiveness require prospective validation.

Research agenda: interlaboratory food-matrix validation, representative dietary exposure, process transfer coefficients, source attribution and life-cycle accounting of treatment residues.

20 | Conclusions: the question is not one concentration but one chain of evidence

The 2026 regulatory record shows why TFA cannot be managed by borrowing a convenient PFAS number from another legal domain. A 20-substance drinking-water sum, a 25-substance potency-weighted environmental standard and a dietary ADI measure different things. Their coexistence is not a contradiction; it is an invitation to build better evidence across the food and water systems.

For industry, the defensible sequence is straightforward: identify the analyte, understand the source, validate the method, map the process, quantify the finished-product contribution, evaluate exposure and apply the correct jurisdictional instrument. The resulting evidence may support a low-risk conclusion, a source change, a treatment intervention or further investigation. It should never be replaced by a slogan.

Related Knowledge Areas

Food Safety; Regulatory Affairs; Mineral Technologies; Processing Technologies; Functional Ingredients; Sustainability; Biotechnology; Emerging Research.

Editorial Scope and Limitations

This independent academic-industrial analysis is based on material available by 22 October 2026. It is not an EFSA, ECHA, European Commission, FDA or national authority opinion, nor a product-specific legal determination. Hypothetical concentration examples are identified as such. The research framework is proposed for testing and must not be marketed as validated. No claim is made that a specific INTABIOTECH product removes or destroys TFA.

References and Primary Sources

- [1] European Commission, DG Environment. “New EU-wide protections against PFAS in drinking water come into effect.” 12 January 2026. https://environment.ec.europa.eu/news/new-eu-rules-limit-pfas-drinking-water-2026-01-12_en
- [2] Directive (EU) 2020/2184 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the quality of water intended for human consumption (recast). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2020/2184/oj>
- [3] Directive (EU) 2026/805 of 30 March 2026 amending Directives 2000/60/EC, 2006/118/EC and 2008/105/EC as regards pollutants in surface and groundwater. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2026/805/oj>
- [4] EFSA. “EFSA lowers safe level for exposure to TFA.” 22 July 2026. <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/news/efsa-lowers-safe-level-exposure-tfa>
- [5] EFSA. “Scientific Report on consumer health-based guidance values for trifluoroacetic acid.” EFSA Journal (2026). <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2026.10227>
- [6] Arp, H. P. H. et al. “The global threat from the irreversible accumulation of trifluoroacetic acid (TFA).” Environmental Science & Technology (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.4c06189>
- [7] Frenzel, I. et al. “Diffuse sources of TFA: atmospheric and terrestrial inputs, retention and pathways at the catchment scale.” Hydrology and Earth System Sciences 30 (2026): 1969–1997. <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-30-1969-2026>
- [8] Henne, S. et al. “Trifluoroacetate (TFA) in precipitation and surface waters in Switzerland: trends, source attribution, and budget.” Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics 25 (2025): 18157–18186. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-25-18157-2025>
- [9] European Commission. Notice C/2024/4910: Technical guidelines regarding methods of analysis for monitoring PFAS in water intended for human consumption. 7 August 2024. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C_202404910
- [10] European Parliament. Legislative Train, review of the lists of pollutants affecting surface waters and groundwater, 2026. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/legislative-train/carriage/integrated-water-management-surface-and-groundwater-pollutants/report>
- [11] RIVM. “Relative Potency Factors PFAS” (including TFA RPF 0.002). <https://www.rivm.nl/pfas/rpf>

- [12] Dorgerloh, U. et al. "Standardising the quantification of trifluoroacetic acid in water: interlaboratory validation trial using liquid chromatography-mass spectrometric detection." Accreditation and Quality Assurance (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00769-025-01640-2>
- [13] Spain. Real Decreto 3/2023, de 10 de enero, por el que se establecen los criterios técnico-sanitarios de la calidad del agua de consumo, su control y suministro. BOE-A-2023-628. <https://www.boe.es/eli/es/rd/2023/01/10/3/con>
- [14] Drinking Water Inspectorate (England and Wales). "Guidance and codes of practice", including 2025 PFAS drinking-water guidance. <https://dwi.defra.gov.uk/water-companies/guidance-and-codes-of-practice/>
- [15] UK Parliament. Written answer on monitoring PFAS in tap water, 6 May 2025. <https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2025-04-29/49285/>
- [16] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. "Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS): National Primary Drinking Water Regulation." <https://www.epa.gov/sdwa/and-polyfluoroalkyl-substances-pfas>
- [17] U.S. EPA. "Proposed PFOA and PFOS Compliance Extension Rule", 18 May 2026. <https://www.epa.gov/sdwa/proposed-pfoa-and-pfos-compliance-extension-rule>
- [18] U.S. EPA. "Proposed PFAS Rescission Rule", 18 May 2026 (page updated 8 October 2026). <https://www.epa.gov/sdwa/proposed-pfas-rescission-rule>
- [19] Cahill, T. M. "Trifluoroacetic Acid Concentrations in Consumer Foods." Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 73 (2025): 32250–32254. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.5c07390>
- [20] "Tracking Trifluoroacetate (TFA) through Time: A 78-Year Record from Archived Wines." Environmental Science & Technology (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5c10868>
- [21] Affricano, A. et al. "Case study: Targeted HPLC-MS/MS analysis of TFA and other USC-PFAS in beverages and waters from Italy and Asia." Food Control (2026): 111779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2025.111779>
- [22] "Sensitive detection of trifluoroacetic acid (TFA): Analytical method development and application to a South Australian watershed." Hazardous Materials (2026). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hazmo.2026.100032>
- [23] Ma, Q. et al. "Evaluation of commercial nanofiltration and reverse osmosis membrane filtration to remove per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances: Effects of transmembrane pressures and water matrices." Water Environment Research 96 (2024): e10983. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wer.10983>
- [24] "Rejection of PFAS and priority co-contaminants in semiconductor fabrication wastewater by nanofiltration membranes." (2024). PubMed PMID: 39089122. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39089122/>