

## **New mask requirement against Corona from today 25.01.2021**

Many can no longer hear it: In more and more public places, in public buildings, shops, buses and trains, all public transport, now even inner cities, where there are supposedly many people, the so-called mask requirement now applies.

But more and more citizens simply don't feel like it anymore. Because they don't care about their own health or that of others? This clientele also exists, but more and more of the measures cannot be understood or justified with common sense, and because this is the case, drastic fines are quickly introduced in order to enforce them emphatically. The citizen asks himself, why should I wear a mask on public streets where there is enough distance or where I am traveling alone and the next passer-by is 20 meters away? For months the credo of wearing masks in public spaces was considered nonsense because there was "adequate ventilation". Apart from that, no masks had to be worn at work in open-plan offices. In this context, I remember an experience at an event in the fresh air, which was still permitted at the time, where the audience had to wear a mask while walking and standing at a stunt show, but as soon as they had sat down, also close together, removed the mask were allowed to. Even this grotesque example, and there are many of them, shows how nonsensical some mask rules were and still are today. No favorite argument of Mr. Spahn, who likes to talk about "constant" learning without really learning, can apply here. Because especially when it comes to virus spread, no one has to learn anything, the spread behavior of viruses has been known for decades and is similar to the same. B. compares the flu viruses.

So at some point a committee suddenly came up with the idea of how important it is to wear masks. Masks, which meant wearing something to cover your mouth and nose. Whether a pulled-up T-shirt, a scarf, cloth flaps, whatever was optically suitable, was used and recognized by the public. But now that has been overturned again. Rightly, in my opinion, but I ask myself why months have to pass before someone says somewhere that the previous one is wrong and has to be changed. Why didn't they say back in April what kind of masks are even useful? Questions about questions that nobody wants to comment on these days or the excuse: At that time they weren't available - talked out. More on that later. Okay, today wearing a so-called medical mask is mandatory. So that I do not report incorrectly, here is the exact wording of the resolution from Tuesday: On page 3, item 3 of the resolution in the wording of the federal government, the following sentence (quote) is written: Especially against the background of possible particularly contagious mutations, the federal and state governments point out that Medical masks (i.e. so-called surgical masks or masks of the KN95 / N95 or FFP2 standards) have a higher protective effect than everyday masks, which are not subject to any standardization with regard to their effectiveness. Therefore, the obligation to wear mouth and nose covers in public transport and in shops has been made binding in terms of an obligation to wear medical masks. (Quote end)

Before I get into the topic completely, here is an assessment of the responsible federal office in terms of mask quality / effect:

The Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices comes to the following conclusion: Everyday masks or mouth and nose covers are mostly sewn from commercially available fabrics without any filter performance requirements that they have to meet. Everyday masks do not provide proof of performance, so they usually offer less protection than these regulated and tested mask types. Note: Why are they accepted until now when they were almost useless?

The 2nd category includes the so-called surgical masks. The institute states: Medical face masks are medical products for external protection, especially against released infectious droplets of the face mask wearer. The shape and fit of most medical face masks allow some of the air you breathe to bypass the edges. Therefore, medical face masks generally offer the wearer less protection against aerosols containing pathogens. Note: It doesn't sound particularly safe to me either, but it is still the most common mask in the private sector.

The third category that specially authorized people have received in pharmacies since the end of the year and will still receive is the FFP 2 mask. These protect the wearer from particles, droplets and aerosols. Correctly fitting FFP masks without valve offer external and internal protection, FFP masks with valve mainly self-protection.

And now the absolute hammer, in my opinion. We remember that the resolution speaks of the obligation to wear medical masks, i.e. so-called surgical masks or masks of the KN95 / N95 or FFP2 standards. Among other things, I am the carer of a person accommodated in the nursing home with care level 4 and have picked up the first 6 masks with an additional payment of 2 euros with the FFP2 authorization certificate from the federal government. And what do I see before I hand them over to the nursing home? The individual mask packaging clearly says: CE 2163. FFP2 mask. This is a NON-MEDICAL DEVICE. How now, the mask is not a medical product at all? So, strictly speaking, not what is to be carried according to the resolution. Then why are they distributed free of charge, so to speak? When asked by a well-known certification company, the press spokesman shares my assessment, if you take it very precisely, but sees a sufficiently documented protective function that meets the requirements due to the CE certification. His words were something like this: Since you don't want to have an operation in an operating room. No, we all don't want to.



**This product is a non medical device – so it is not correct because of the federal state resolution**

And now we are going straight into the drama: At that time, that is, at the beginning of the pandemic in Germany, many citizens, including myself, ordered masks from online providers because they were initially not available in Germany. And not only that, we remember, as Mr. Spahn expressly pointed out, not to buy the FFP2 masks away from the medical staff because of the shortage. We also remember that some staff had to reuse used masks more often than allowed or made do with self-made masks. And it is precisely these masks, some of which were only delivered from China at the beginning of May / June 2020, in some cases do not even have the certification marks that are required to be recognized by laypeople, this mask offers the necessary protection. Basically, this can be recognized by a printed CE mark followed by a 4-digit number. But what does the number say, why are

there FFP2 masks that have different numbers printed on after the CE mark? The CE mark ensures certification of the masks in Europe, attention, not the EU, because Turkey does not belong to the EU, but also certifies. The 4-digit number shows the country, or more precisely, in a country, the institution that checked the mask. The standards within Europe are the same in every country. For example, in Germany CE 0158 shows DEKRA, more precisely DEKRA Testing and Certification GmbH, as a certification company, CE 2163, widely used, shows Universal Certification and Surveillance Service Trade Ltd. Co. in Turkey. So far so good.



Certificated in turkey as FFP2



Typical from China with KN95 – Should be similar to CE

Other masks have the identifier KN95 or GB2626 printed on them. In short, these are standards from other countries. The confusion is great, because not every mask sold as an FFP2 mask is also an FFP2 mask, because they do not always have the necessary certificates and quality requirements. A layperson can hardly tell, because sometimes there is the FFP2 imprint on the packaging and the mask. The confusion becomes even greater when you consider that the federal government itself allowed the sale and import of masks without CE mark until the beginning of October 2020 because too few

masks were available. Dealers were able to subject their masks to a quick test at a testing institute. After passing the test, a special approval could be applied for from the authorities, which was usually granted if the test was successful. The masks could be brought onto the market as corona pandemic respiratory protection (CPA), but not as FFP2 masks, which were actually required as medical masks for personal protective equipment (PPE) by medical staff. But for reasons of cost and other reasons, some retailers have just put their masks on the market. That is why it is not possible to say today without an examination whether one or the other mask without CE mark meets the requirements or not. The highlight in this opaque location are the masks, but there seem to be only a few of them that have no print on either the individual packaging or the mask. I got a multitude of different masks on the Internet or on site and caught just one mask that has no markings. When asked about this by the Federal Ministry of Health, the conversation went so far that the authorities wanted to know where this mask was obtained from, because there are obviously several violations. I gave out information about this, the business address was given (no joke): guangzhoulingnadianshangyuanshichang5jie3lou321A. All right.

Thankfully, I would like to mention that I have received helpful support for this report and additional material from the Federal Ministry of Health, DEKRA Stuttgart, the Independent Patient Advisory Service in Germany and the DUGV (German Statutory Accident Insurance).

Now, because it fits the general mask topic, I would like to go into a few more pieces of information. An important topic, especially at the federal press conference. Dor was talking about what Mr. Heil, Federal Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, is remembering, z. b. Hartz IV recipient to give a grant of whatever kind in terms of mask procurement. Mr Jung von Jung & Naiv speaks to Mr Seibert about why this regulation should not apply to students, mini-jobbers and self-employed people. Mr. Seibert points out that masks can be used several times if treated appropriately. Thereupon he is informed by another journalist that the RKI is advising on its website not to use FFP 2 masks multiple times. Mr. Seibert then explains what the RKI is sure to be correct, but refers to alleged expert advice on the Internet about permissible multiple use, especially with regard to the fact that the masks are sometimes only worn for a short time, 10 minutes or so. In addition, the masks can be "treated" accordingly in order to be able to use them again. What Mr. Seibert knows.

And, as always, a joke in the end that the state government of Lower Saxony does not see as such. The question is, who will get a letter from the federal government that they can pick up for free FFP2 masks from the pharmacy? And the state government of Lower Saxony had a really great idea: Use the postal data for 28,000 euros to find out who is authorized. But now this: Nobody could have known that the date of birth is not always included in the postal data, so that's no use. The municipalities are involved, they should also look into the registers. And you still have a sure idea of how to get hold of the people: the age estimate based on the first name. Work like in the 22nd century or like in the Middle Ages, choose it: All seriously, the age of the person is estimated based on the first name. So while Annemarie or Karl Ludwig is at least shortlisted for those entitled, 80 year old Chantal has bad cards. Gone stupid.

Anyone who has finally lost track of the possible chaos of correct mask wear permits can be helped. The German Statutory Accident Insurance has designed a clear and easy-to-understand poster that anyone can use to quickly check whether it is a real, certified, effective mask. The poster says: "Check x 5 - Mask without blemishes? "And can be reached under the following link: <https://publikationen.dguv.de/forschung/ifa/allgemeine-informationen/4000/check-x-5-maske-ohne-makel-plakat-din-a3>