File No: STD/1198

2 May 2006

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS NOTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT SCHEME (NICNAS)

FULL PUBLIC REPORT

Component 3 in OLOA 249S

This Assessment has been compiled in accordance with the provisions of the *Industrial Chemicals (Notification and Assessment) Act 1989* (Cwlth) (the Act) and Regulations. This legislation is an Act of the Commonwealth of Australia. The National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS) is administered by the Department of Health and Ageing, and conducts the risk assessment for public health and occupational health and safety. The assessment of environmental risk is conducted by the Department of the Environment and Heritage.

For the purposes of subsection 78(1) of the Act, this Full Public Report may be inspected at:

Library
Australian Safety and Compensation Council
25 Constitution Avenue
CANBERRA ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA

To arrange an appointment contact the Librarian on TEL + 61 2 6279 1162 or email ascc.library@dewr.gov.au

This Full Public Report is available for viewing and downloading from the NICNAS website or available on request, free of charge, by contacting NICNAS. For requests and enquiries please contact the NICNAS Administration Coordinator at:

Street Address:	334 - 336 Illawarra Road MARRICKVILLE NSW 2204, AUSTRALIA.
Postal Address:	GPO Box 58, SYDNEY NSW 2001, AUSTRALIA.
TEL:	+ 61 2 8577 8800
FAX	+ 61 2 8577 8888
Website:	www.nicnas.gov.au

Director
NICNAS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FULL PUBLIC REPORT

Component 3 in OLOA 249S

1. APPLICANT AND NOTIFICATION DETAILS

APPLICANT(S)
Chevron Oronite Australia (ABN: 16 101 548 716)
Level 10, 45 William Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000

NOTIFICATION CATEGORY
Standard: Chemical other than polymer (more than 1 tonne per year).

EXEMPT INFORMATION (SECTION 75 OF THE ACT)
Data items and details claimed exempt from publication:
Chemical name
CAS number
Molecular formula
Structural formula
Molecular weight
Spectral data
Purity
Identity of toxic impurities
Non-hazardous impurities
Identity and percentage of additives
Manufacture or import volumes
Identity of manufacturing sites

VARIATION OF DATA REQUIREMENTS (SECTION 24 OF THE ACT)
Variation to the schedule of data requirements is claimed as follows:
Melting point/ Boiling point
Vapour pressure
Water solubility
Hydrolysis as a function of pH
Partition co-efficient
Absorption/desorption
Dissociation constant
Flammability limits
Autoignition temperature
Acute oral toxicity
Acute dermal toxicity
Acute inhalation toxicity
Skin irritation
Eye irritation
Skin sensitisation
28-day repeat dose toxicity
Induction of point mutations
Chromosome damage
Reproductive toxicity – one generation study
Fish acute toxicity
Daphnia acute toxicity
Alga growth inhibition test
Ready biodegradation

Estimates using EPI Suite (US EPA):
Melting point
Boiling point

Vapour pressure
Water solubility
Log Pow
Adsorption/desorption

Tests on analogous chemicals:
Acute oral toxicity
Acute dermal toxicity
Dermal irritation
Eye irritation
Skin sensitisation
28-day repeat dose toxicity
Ames test
Chromosomal aberrations in vitro and in vivo
Toxicity to rainbow trout
Toxicity to daphnids
Toxicity to a freshwater alga
Activated sludge respiration inhibition
Aerobic aquatic biodegradation

Not supplied:
Hydrolysis as a function of pH
Dissociation constant
Particle size
Flammability limits
Autoignition temperature
Density
Explosive properties

PREVIOUS NOTIFICATION IN AUSTRALIA BY APPLICANT(S)
None.

NOTIFICATION IN OTHER COUNTRIES
Canadian New Substances Notification (2005)
Korean New Substances Notification (2005)
United States Environmental Protection Agency (2005)

2. IDENTITY OF CHEMICAL

MARKETING NAME(S)
Component 3 in OLOA 249S (contains <70% notified chemical). The notified chemical and those in STD 1141, 1142 and 1199 have the same trade name. The difference between the notified chemicals is the length of an alkyl chain.

3. COMPOSITION

DEGREE OF PURITY
High.

4. INTRODUCTION AND USE INFORMATION

MODE OF INTRODUCTION OF NOTIFIED CHEMICAL (100%) OVER NEXT 5 YEARS
The notified chemical will be imported into Australia as part of a lubricant additive package.

MAXIMUM INTRODUCTION VOLUME OF NOTIFIED CHEMICAL (100%) OVER NEXT 5 YEARS (FIRST NOTIFIER)

Year	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*

Tonnes	10-100	10-100	10-100	10-100	10-100

USE
The notified chemical is part of a lubricant additive package that will be used as a detergent additive at 1-5% concentration in lubricants for automotive and diesel engine crankcase oils, air and water-cooled two-cycle engine oils, industrial oils, hydraulic fluids and gear oils.

5. PROCESS AND RELEASE INFORMATION

5.1. Distribution, transport and storage

PORT OF ENTRY
Melbourne

TRANSPORTATION AND PACKAGING
The notified chemical will be transported either by ship and offloaded to tank trucks or rail cars for distribution to a blending facility or by drum shipped directly to the customer. After blending, the finished lubricant will be transported in 1-4 L containers, drums or tank trucks.

5.2. Operation description

Reformulation
At the blending site the additive package (containing <70% notified chemical) is transferred from drums or rail cars into storage tanks. Transfer of the additive package from the tank trucks to storage tanks will be via a 10 cm hosing.

Transfer from storage tanks to blend tanks is automated with computer-controlled valves. The additive package is blended with other components to form the finished lubricant (1-5% notified chemical). The blending process occurs in a closed system and is computer controlled. The blended lubricant is transferred automatically to a storage tank. The finished lubricants are then packaged for shipment in 1-4 L containers, drums, or bulk tank trucks.

The small container-processing machine is fully automated with a worker watching to ensure the filling mechanism properly enters the containers. The drumming facility uses automated weight scales to fill the drums, with a worker watching to ensure the drum filling mechanism properly enters the drum before the drum is filled. The operators manually apply bungs and labels to filled drums. A transfer hose is used for bulk tank truck filling.

The finished lubricants are transported for use commercially (70%) or to service stations and retail outlets (30%). The lubricants are transported in the following manner: 50% in drums, 40% in 1-4 L containers and 10% in bulk tank trucks.

Commercial end users:
Some of the 1-4 L containers (10% of the total volume of the imported chemical) and the drums (50% of the total volume of the imported chemical) will be sold to commercial automotive engine service outlets (i.e. auto repair shops). A pneumatic pump will be inserted into the drum and used to transfer the lubricant. In many cases, stationary engines will be routinely lubricated using dedicated lubricating oil reservoirs and piping to add lubricants directly without human intervention. For non-stationary automotive applications, workers will check lubricant levels in the engine manually and top off, as needed using lubricant added via pneumatic delivery systems. Most of the commercial end users will recycle their used oil obtained from engine oil drains occurring during routine maintenance and repair work.

The bulk product (10% of the total volume of the imported chemical) will be sold to high volume commercial end users, such as truck and taxi fleets, where it will be used to lubricate petrol and diesel engines. It is assumed that engines lubricating process is similar as discussed in the paragraph above.

5.3. Occupational exposure

Number and Category of Workers

Category of Worker	*Number*	*Exposure Duration*	*Exposure Frequency*
Analysing additive package on arrival	1	10 mins	30 d/yr
Unloading tanks trucks and drums	1-2	30 mins	30 d/yr
Sampling finished oil	1-2	10 mins	220 d/yr
Loading finished oil into tank trucks	1-2	30 mins	220 d/yr
Commercial end users	>1000	8 hours	220 d/yr

Exposure Details

Warehousing and transport:
The workers would only be exposed to the notified chemical in the case of accidental rupture of the containers.

Reformulation:
At blending sites, the notified chemical is transferred from drums, rail cars and tank trucks into storage tanks. During connection and disconnection of lines, incidental skin contact from splashes, drips and spills is possible. Connection of the hose during transfer from tank trucks takes 10 minutes. An air back flush system is used to prevent spillage during this process.

Transfer from storage tanks to blend tanks is automated with computer-controlled valves. The blending process occurs in a closed system and is computer controlled, thus, there should be minimal exposure during this stage. The blended lubricant is transferred automatically to a storage tank before packaging for transport. The blending facilities are well ventilated, with control systems for accidental spills and wastewater treatment.

Workers may be exposed to the finished lubricant (containing the notified chemical at 1-5%) during the filling operations. The 1-4 L container-packaging machine is fully automated and worker exposure may occur when the filling mechanism does not properly enter the container. The drumming facility uses automated weight scales to fill the drums, however, worker exposure may occur if the drum filling mechanism does not properly enter the drum. Exposure may also occur when the workers put on bungs and labels. Transfer of the finished product from storage tanks to bulk containers can cause dermal exposure to workers by way of drips and spills of blended lubricant. An air flush system is used to prevent spillage during this process. Workers' exposure during transfer/filling will be minimised by the use of PPE such as gloves, eye protection, protective clothing and hard hats.

Laboratory staff takes samples of the notified chemical in the additive package as well as the blended oil products for testing. During sampling and analysis of the additive package the most likely worker exposure is via skin contact. However, minimal exposure will occur during the laboratory testing since it will take only a few minutes per batch.

Commercial end users:
Workers may be exposed to the notified chemical at up to 5% in the finished lubricant product during engine maintenance and during transfer of lubricant product from containers to engines, mainly via dermal contact. In the industrial and commercial environment, engines are maintained by professional mechanics, who are likely to wear appropriate PPE and have access to engineering controls.

5.4. Release

RELEASE OF CHEMICAL AT SITE
The chemical will be transferred from rail car, tank trucks or drums to on-site holding tanks. A special air back flush system prevents any spillage. It is expected that the residue of the notified chemical contained in the drums will be 0.1%. Empty drums are steam cleaned with the resultant aqueous waste sent to on-site wastewater facilities. Assuming that the chemical is 70% pure and that 10% is delivered by drum, then it is estimated that 7 kg of the notified chemical will be sent to the wastewater treatment plant per year, based on the maximum import of 100 tonnes of notified chemical. The wastewater treatment separates 90% of the oil with further treatment of the wastewater removing a further 80%, resulting in 0.14 kg per annum being released by this route.

Rail car and tank trunks containing the chemical are likely to be refilled without flushing to the extent practicable or be rinsed by licensed contractor with disposal by incineration. The blending of the chemical with lubricating oil will occur in fully enclosed automated systems. Blending tanks are rinsed with lubricating oil with the rinseate recycled back into the blending system or disposed by incineration.

In the unlikely event of an accident, the spillage will be contained within concrete bunds and either reclaimed or sent to on-site wastewater treatment facilities where residual hydrocarbon based products will be separated from the aqueous stream by the American Petroleum Industry (API) process, with a claimed removal of greater than 95%. The aqueous waste undergoes further treatment involving pond aeration and biological treatment before being released to the sewage system. The remaining oily waste will be incinerated. As a result of these processes, the accidental release from transport of the additive package and finished oils is unlikely to be significant.

RELEASE OF CHEMICAL FROM USE

Virtually no release will result from transport of the finished lubricant, as the dedicated tank trucks are simply refilled and are rarely cleaned. Some minor and diffuse exposure will result from spills during addition of oil to vehicles and from oil leaks from engines. It is also expected that 0.1% of the finished product containing the notified chemical will remain in drums or 1 - 4 L containers. Drums are expected to be used for 50% of the finished product. Therefore, of the total 100 tonnes containing up to 70% pure chemical, 35 tonnes will be will transported as finished product in drums. It is expected that 0.1% will remain in drums meaning that 35 kg will be sent to waste water treatment during drum recycling. During water treatment, 90% of the oil containing the product is separated with the oil sent for recycling and the waste water containing 3.5 kg of notified chemical sent for further waste water treatment. The waste water is subjected to biological treatment and filtration removing a further 80% of the chemical. Consequently, 0.7 kg per annum is expected to be released to waterways via this route. For the 1 – 4 L containers, which will be used for 40% of the packaging, it is expected, using the above assumptions, that 28 kg will remain as residue. This is likely to be disposed as domestic waste. However, the greatest potential for exposure is through disposal of waste oil containing the additive.

A survey by the Australian Institute of Petroleum (AIP 1995) indicates that of the annual sales of automotive engine oils in Australia, some 60% are potentially recoverable (ie not burnt in the engines during use). This report also indicates that around 86% of oil changes take place in specialised automotive service centres, where old oil drained from crankcases could be expected to be disposed of responsibly - either to oil recycling or incineration. The remaining 14% are removed by “do it yourself” (DIY) enthusiasts, and in these cases some of the used oil would be either incinerated, left at transfer stations where it is again likely to be recycled, or deposited into landfill. A recent report estimated that DIY activities account for between 7 to 10% of the unaccounted used oil (MEINHARDT 2002).

According to a survey tracing the fate of used lubricating oil in Australia (Snow 1997) only around 20% of used oil removed by enthusiasts is collected for recycling, approximately 25% is buried or disposed to landfill, 5% is disposed of into stormwater drains and the remaining 50% unaccounted for.

Consequently, assuming that oil removed by professional mechanics is disposed of appropriately (ie sent for recycling or possibly burning as workshop heating oil), negligible release of the notified chemical should result from these professional activities. During recycling it is expected that most of the chemical will decompose and any remainder will report to the asphalt portion.

Assuming that 14% (14 tonnes) of the used oil is removed by the DIY enthusiasts it is possible to have 20% (2.8 tonnes) collected for recycling, 25% (3.5 tonnes) buried or disposed to landfill, 5% (700 kg) disposed into stormwater drains and 50% (7 tonnes) unaccounted for.

Since gear oil and hydraulic fluid changes are likely to be carried out by specialists, and will be disposed of more appropriately, an amount less than 1% of the total import volume of the notified substance could be expected to enter the aquatic environment via disposal into the storm water system. Since the use of the lubricating oils will occur throughout Australia, all releases resulting from use or disposal of used oil will be very diffuse, and release of the notified chemical in high concentrations is very unlikely except as a result of transport accidents.

Although a listed potential use is for water cooled marine engines including two stroke engines, in actuality the notifier indicates that this is unlikely to occur. Therefore there will be no likely release to the aquatic environment via this route.

5.5. Disposal

Drums are sent to drum recyclers where they are steam cleaned and water is sent to wastewater treatment. It is assumed 0.1% of the notified chemical remains after use. Small containers sold to consumers are likely to be sent to landfill.

5.6. Public exposure

The public will not be exposed to the notified chemical during storage, transport or reformulation except in the event of an accident or spill.

The small containers (1-4 L) of lubricants containing up to 55 of the notified chemical (30% of the total volume of the imported chemical) will be sold to service stations and the general public. Public exposure to the notified chemical may occur during do-it-yourself replenishment of lubricant through spills, splashes and contact with runs or drips on the outside of the container after filling. Exposure is also possible while handling automotive components that have been in contact with the lubricant. The most likely route of public exposure is by skin contact, with the possibility of ocular and inadvertent oral exposure. It is unlikely that PPE will be worn.

6. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

No experimental data on the notified chemical have been provided, with all the values given here estimated using EPI Suite (US EPA) or using analogue chemicals.

Appearance at 20°C and 101.3 kPa	Dark brown viscous liquid (notified chemical is never isolated from reaction mixture)
Melting Point	Not measured.
Remarks	Estimated using EPI Suite to be 289 – 332°C
Boiling Point	Not measured.
Remarks	Estimated using EPI Suite to be 663 – 756°C at 101.3 kPa
Density	<1000 kg/m^3 at 25°C
Remarks	No report submitted.
Vapour Pressure	Not measured.
Remarks	Estimated using EPI Suite to be 6.20 x 10^{-23} – 2.25 x 10^{-19} kPa at 25°C
Water Solubility	Not measured.
Remarks	Estimated from log Kow using EPI Suite to be 7.12 x 10^{-11} – 8.63 x 10^{-7} mg/L at 25°C
Hydrolysis as a Function of pH	Not measured.
Remarks	The notified chemical is unlikely to hydrolyse as there are no hydrolysable groups present.
Partition Coefficient (n-octanol/water)	Not measured.
Remarks	Log Pow was estimated using EPI Suite to be 10.48-14.41 and indicates strong preference for the octanol phase.
Adsorption/Desorption	Not measured.
Remarks	Log K_{oc} was estimated using EPI Suite to be 7.99 – 10.12 and indicates a preference for adsorption to soils.
Dissociation Constant	Not measured.

Remarks The notified chemical is an anionic chemical which is expected to be fully dissociated under normal environmental conditions.

Particle Size Not measured.
Remarks Not applicable, as the notified chemical never isolated from the reaction mixture.

Flash Point Not measured.
Remarks Estimated from an analogous chemical to be 150°C.

Flammability Limits Not measured.

Autoignition Temperature Not measured.

Explosive Properties Not expected to be explosive.

Reactivity
Remarks May react with strong oxidising agents, such as chlorates, nitrates and peroxides. Hazardous polymerisation will not occur.

7. TOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

The following data have been provided for analogous chemical in different concentrations in mineral oil that are considered to be acceptable analogues of the notified chemical. The concentrations are:

- Analogue A - 43% weight in a highly refined mineral oil
- Analogue B - 55-61% weight in a highly refined mineral oil
- Analogue C - 55-61% weight in a highly refined mineral oil (with a different trade name)
- Analogue D - 44% weight in a highly refined mineral oil
- Analogue E - Analogue D at various concentrations in petrolatum

Endpoint and Result	*Assessment Conclusion*
Rat, acute oral LD50 >5000 mg/kg bw (Analogue B)	low toxicity
Rat, acute dermal LD50 >2000 mg/kg bw (Analogue B)	low toxicity
Rat, acute inhalation toxicity	not performed
Rabbit, skin irritation (Analogue C)	moderately irritating
Rabbit, eye irritation (Analogue C)	slightly irritating
Skin sensitisation (human patch test) (Analogue B)	non-irritating and no evidence of sensitisation
Guinea pig, skin sensitisation non-adjuvant tests. (Analogue B, D, E)	evidence of sensitisation
Rat, repeat dose oral toxicity – 28 days. (Analogue A)	NOAEL 150 mg/kg bw/day
Reproductive toxicity – one generation study. (Analogue B)	NOEL >500 mg/kg bw/day
Genotoxicity – bacterial reverse mutation (Analogue B)	non mutagenic
Genotoxicity – in vivo Mammalian Erythrocyte Micronucleus Test (Analogue B).	non genotoxic

7.1. Acute toxicity – oral

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue B

METHOD OECD TG 401 Acute Oral Toxicity – Limit Test.
EC Directive 92/69/EEC B.1 Acute Toxicity (Oral) – Limit Test.
Species/Strain Rat/Sprague-Dawley
Vehicle None
Remarks - Method No significant protocol deviations.

RESULTS

Group	*Number and Sex of Animals*	*Dose mg/kg bw*	*Mortality*
1	5/sex	5004	0

LD50	>5004 mg/kg bw
Signs of Toxicity	None
Effects in Organs	None
Remarks - Results	None

CONCLUSION The analogous chemical is of low toxicity via the oral route.

TEST FACILITY Pharmakon (1997a)

7.2. Acute toxicity – dermal

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue B

METHOD OECD TG 402 Acute Dermal Toxicity – Limit Test.
EC Directive 92/69/EEC B.3 Acute Toxicity (Dermal) – Limit Test.

Species/Strain	Rat/Sprague-Dawley
Vehicle	None
Type of dressing	Semi-occlusive
Remarks - Method	No significant protocol deviations

RESULTS

Group	*Number and Sex of Animals*	*Dose mg/kg bw*	*Mortality*
1	5/sex	2006	0

LD50	>2006 mg/kg bw
Signs of Toxicity - Local	None
Signs of Toxicity - Systemic	One treated female showed low body weight gain, however, this is likely incidental.
Effects in Organs	None
Remarks - Results	None

CONCLUSION The analogous chemical is of low toxicity via the dermal route.

TEST FACILITY Pharmakon (1997b)

7.3. Acute toxicity – inhalation

Not performed.

7.4. Irritation – skin

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue C

METHOD 0.5 mL of test substance was applied to three clipped, intact areas on the back of each of six rabbits for four hours under occlusive dressings. After exposure, the exposed areas were wiped with mineral oil. Irritation was scored at 1, 24, 48 and 72 hours and 7 and 14 days, using a modified Draize scoring method.

Species/Strain	Rabbit/New Zealand White
Number of Animals	6
Vehicle	None
Observation Period	14 days
Type of Dressing	Occlusive
Remarks - Method	None

RESULTS

Lesion	*Mean Score**	*Maximum Value*	*Maximum Duration of Any Effect*	*Maximum Value at End of Observation Period*
Erythema/Eschar	1.93	4	7 days	0
Oedema	0.15	2	72 hours	0

*Calculated on the basis of the scores at 24, 48, and 72 hours for ALL animals.

Remarks - Results: After 1 hour, all animals exhibited well defined to moderate erythema. Over the next 48 hours, the severity of the irritation was reduced in only one animal, and progressed to severe erythema and eschar in one animal. At 72 hours, two animals exhibited severe erythema and eschar, with the other animals exhibiting slight to moderate erythema. At seven days the worst-affected animal still displayed well-defined erythema, which cleared after 14 days.

All animals had dry/flaky skin at 72 hours and/or 7 days.

CONCLUSION: The analogous chemical is moderately irritating to the skin.

TEST FACILITY: CEHC (1989a)

7.5. Irritation – eye

TEST SUBSTANCE: Analogue C

METHOD: 0.1 mL of test substance was applied to the conjunctival sac of one eye of each of nine rabbits. After a 30-second exposure, the eyes of three rabbits were washed with water for one minute. Irritation was scored at 1, 24, 48 and 72 hours, using a modified Draize scoring method.

Species/Strain: Rabbit/New Zealand White
Number of Animals: 9
Observation Period: 72 hours
Remarks - Method: No significant protocol deviations.

RESULTS

Treated-unrinsed

Lesion	*Mean Score**	*Maximum Value*	*Maximum Duration of Any Effect*	*Maximum Value at End of Observation Period*
Conjunctiva: redness	0	3	1 hour	0
Conjunctiva: chemosis	0	1	1 hour	0
Conjunctiva: discharge	0	3	1 hour	0
Corneal opacity	0	0	0	0
Iridial inflammation	0	0	0	0

*Calculated on the basis of the scores at 24, 48, and 72 hours for ALL animals.

Treated-rinsed

Lesion	*Mean Score**	*Maximum Value*	*Maximum Duration of Any Effect*	*Maximum Value at End of Observation Period*
Conjunctiva: redness	0	3	1 hour	0
Conjunctiva: chemosis	0	1	1 hour	0
Conjunctiva: discharge	0	2	1 hour	0
Corneal opacity	0	0	0	0
Iridial inflammation	0	0	0	0

*Calculated on the basis of the scores at 24, 48, and 72 hours for ALL animals.

Remarks - Results: All effects had a maximum duration of 1 hour.

CONCLUSION The analogous chemical is slightly irritating to the eye.

TEST FACILITY CEHC (1989b)

7.6. Skin sensitisation – 5% challenge

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue D

METHOD OECD TG 406 Skin Sensitisation – Buehler test
EC Directive 96/54/EC B.6 Skin Sensitisation - Buehler test

Species/Strain Guinea pig/Hartley
Vehicle Mineral oil
PRELIMINARY STUDY Maximum Non-irritating Concentration:
None determined. Maximum score at 0.5% (w/v) was 1.
MAIN STUDY
Number of Animals Test Group: 10/sex Control Group: 10/sex
INDUCTION PHASE Induction Concentration:
Topical: 100%
Signs of Irritation Erythema, up to score 2.
CHALLENGE PHASE
1st challenge Topical: 5%
2nd challenge Topical: 5%

3rd challenge Topical: 0.5%

Remarks - Method No significant protocol deviations.

RESULTS

Animal	*Challenge Concentration*	*Number of Animals Showing Skin Reactions* after:*			
		1st challenge		*2nd challenge*	
		24 h	*48 h*	*24 h*	*48 h*
Test Group	5%	17/20	19/20	19/20	19/20
	0.5%			8/20	15/20
Control Group	5%	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
	0.5%			0/10	0/10

*Animals with a response of 2 or more.

Remarks - Results Controls exhibited scores of 1, at most. Animals scored as positive at challenge or rechallenge had scores of 2 or more.

CONCLUSION There was evidence indicative of skin sensitisation to the analogue chemical under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY HTR (1995)

7.7. Skin sensitisation – various % challenge

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue E (75, 50, 25 and 10% in petrolatum)

METHOD 40 CFR 792, US EPA FIFRA and TSCA 40 CFR 792 Good Laboratory Practice Standards

Species/Strain Guinea pig/Hartley
Vehicle Petrolatum
PRELIMINARY STUDY Maximum Non-irritating Concentration:
None determined.
MAIN STUDY
Number of Animals Test Group: 5 groups of 20 females Control Group: 6 groups of 10 females as concurrent initiation controls for either challenge or rechallenge and one group of 10 for

vehicle control.

INDUCTION/ CHALLENGE PHASE — Induction Concentration: Topical

Test	Induction (%)	Challenge (%)	Re-challenge (%)
1	10	5	1
2	25	5	1
3	75	25	No rechallenge
4	50	25	10
5	50	1	No rechallenge
6	Vehicle (100)	Vehicle (100)	Vehicle (100)

Signs of Irritation: Erythema, up to score 2.

Remarks - Method: No significant protocol deviations.

RESULTS

Animal	*Number of Animals Showing Skin Reactions* after:*			
	1st challenge		*2nd challenge*	
	24 h	*48 h*	*24 h*	*48 h*
Test 1	20/20	14/20	20/20	12/20
Control Group	0/10	1/10	1/10	0/10
Test 2	16/20	5/20	10/20	13/20
Control Group	0/10	0/10	1/10	0/10
Test 3	17/20	14/20		
Control Group	1/10	0/10		
Test 4	7/20	7/20	9/20	11/20
Control Group	2/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
Test 5	7/20	10/20		
Control Group	0/10	0/10		
Test 6 (vehicle)	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10

*Animals with a response of 2 or more.

Remarks - Results: Controls exhibited scores of 1, at most. Animals scored as positive at challenge or rechallenge had scores of 2 or more.

CONCLUSION: There was evidence indicative of skin sensitisation to the analogue chemical under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY: HTR (1993)

7.8. Skin sensitisation – 50% challenge

TEST SUBSTANCE: Analogue C

METHOD: OECD TG 406 Skin Sensitisation – Buehler test
EC Directive 96/54/EC B.6 Skin Sensitisation - Buehler test

Species/Strain: Guinea pig/Hartley
Vehicle: Mineral oil

PRELIMINARY STUDY: Maximum Non-irritating Concentration:
None determined. Maximum score at 0.5% (w/v) was 1.

MAIN STUDY

Number of Animals: Test Group: 10/sex Control Group: 5/sex

INDUCTION PHASE: Induction Concentration:
Topical: 100%

Signs of Irritation: Erythema, up to score 2.

CHALLENGE PHASE

1st challenge: Topical: 50%

Remarks - Method No significant protocol deviations.

RESULTS

Animal	*Challenge Concentration*	*Number of Animals Showing Skin Reactions* after:*	
		1st challenge	
		24 h	*48 h*
Test Group	50%	4/20	7/20
Control Group	50%	0/10	0/10

*Animals with a response of 2 or more.

Remarks - Results Controls exhibited scores of 1, at most. Animals scored as positive at challenge or rechallenge had scores of 2 or more.

CONCLUSION There was evidence indicative of skin sensitisation to the analogue chemical under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY HTR (1991)

7.9. Skin sensitisation – human volunteers

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue B

METHOD

Study Design Pilot phase: Test substance was applied undiluted, and at 50%, 25% and 10% in mineral oil. 0.2 mL was applied under occlusive dressing, for 24 hours.

Induction Procedure: Nine consecutive applications of 0.2 mL undiluted test substance under occlusive dressing for 24 hours each.

Rest Period: 14 days.

Challenge Procedure: Application of 0.2 mL of test substance to a naïve location under occlusive dressing for 24 hours.

Study Group 101 subjects between 21 and 60 years old.

Vehicle None

Remarks - Method Nineteen subjects completed a one week pilot phase to determine the appropriate concentration to be used in the main study and continued on with the main study.

RESULTS

Remarks - Results One subject was discontinued from the test due to pruritis on the left arm, which was regarded by the consulting dermatologist as unrelated to exposure to the test product.

No other significant irritation was observed.

There was no evidence of sensitisation in the test.

CONCLUSION A repeat insult patch test was conducted using undiluted analogous chemical under occlusive dressing. The analogous chemical was non-irritating and non-sensitising under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY CRTC (1991)

7.10. Repeat dose toxicity - 28 days

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue A

METHOD	OECD TG 407 Repeated Dose 28-day Oral Toxicity Study in Rodents. EC Directive 96/54/EC B.7 Repeated Dose (28 Days) Toxicity (Oral).
Species/Strain	Rat/Sprague Dawley Crl:CD(SD)IGS BR
Route of Administration	Oral – gavage
Exposure Information	Total exposure days: 28 days Dose regimen: 7 days per week Post-exposure observation period: 14 days
Vehicle	Corn oil
Remarks - Method	No significant protocol deviations.

RESULTS

Group	*Number and Sex of Animals*	*Dose mg/kg bw/day*	*Mortality*
I (control)	10/sex	0	0
II	10/sex	50	0
III	10/sex	150	0
IV	10/sex	500	0
V	10/sex	1000	0
VI (control recovery)	10/sex	0	0
VII	10/sex	1000	0

Mortality and Time to Death

None

Clinical Observations

Significantly lower body weight gain was noted in males receiving 500 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day, with overall weight gain being 9% and 6% lower than controls at the end of treatment. Food consumption was also significantly decreased in group 4 males during week 3.

The differences seen between groups in the functional observation battery were not dose related and were not considered to be treatment related.

Laboratory Findings – Clinical Chemistry, Haematology, Urinalysis

Platelet counts were significantly increased on day 28 in males receiving 500 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day. This is unlikely to be toxicologically relevant as abnormalities in platelet count generally manifest as decreases.

Gamma-glutamyl transferase (GGT) was significantly increased in males in all treated groups, however this was thought to be the result of an abnormally low concentration observed in the control group.

Serum alanine amino transferase (ALT) was significantly increased on day 28 in high-dose males (52%) and females receiving 500 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day (108% and 144%), and increased (not significantly) by 42% in 500 mg/kg bw/day males and 36% in 150 mg/kg bw/day females. These changes were not supported by changes to other indicators of hepatic injury.

Phosphorus was significantly increased by 9% in 1000 mg/kg bw/day males. This was considered incidental in the absence of any related findings.

Other changes to hematology and blood chemistry did not show a dose response, or occurred in the recovery period only, and were not considered to be treatment related.

Effects in Organs

The most notable findings at the day 28 necroscopy involved the stomach:

Group	*50 mg/kg bw/day*	*150 mg/kg bw/day*	*500 mg/kg bw/day*	*1000 mg/kg bw/day*
Males	-	-	(2/5) Thickening (2/5) Minimal oedema of submucosa	(4/5) Thickening (2/5) Minimal/mild oedema of submucosa (3/5) Minimal epithelial hyperplasia

Females	(1/5) Thickening	(1/5) Thickening (1/5) Foci (2/5) Minimal oedema of submucosa	(1/5) Thickening (1/5) Foci (1/5) Ulcer, mild oedema of submucosa, minimal haemorrhage, minimal epithelial hyperplasia, mild inflammation	(1/5) Thickening (1/5) Minimal oedema of submucosa (2/5) Minimal epithelial hyperplasia

There were no notable findings in the stomachs of animals after the recovery period, or in control animals.

The liver-to-body weight ratio was significantly increased in 1000 mg/kg bw/day males (19%) and 500 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day females (11% and 20% respectively). There were no unusual microscopic findings in the livers of any animals.

Thymus weights were decreased in 1000 mg/kg bw/day males. This was considered to be incidental in the absence of any related findings.

Minimal to mild pulmonary irritation was seen at day 28 in one male and two females receiving 1000 mg/kg bw/day, and in three males and one female after the recovery period. This irritation most likely arises from a foreign body response to incidentally aspirated test article.

Other changes to organs did not show a dose response relationship, and were not considered to be treatment related.

Remarks – Results

The main toxicologically relevant findings were related to irritation of the stomach. One female receiving 500 mg/kg bw/day had severe stomach irritation, including an ulcer.

There was also some evidence of test-substance-related changes to the liver (increased liver weight, increased serum ALT). These were statistically significant in both sexes at 500 mg/kg bw/day and above, with non significant trends in serum ALT at 150 mg/kg bw/day. However there were no microscopic findings or supporting blood chemistry findings, and there was full recovery, indicating that these were most likely adaptive changes.

Body weight gain and food intake was slightly decreased in high dose males.

CONCLUSION

The No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) was established as 150 mg/kg bw/day in this study, based on a stomach ulcer and related findings in one female treated with 500 mg/kg bw/day.

TEST FACILITY SLI (2002)

7.11. Toxicity to reproduction – one generation study

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue C

METHOD OECD TG 415 Reproductive toxicity test

Species/Strain	Rat/Sprague-Dawley
Route of Administration	Oral – gavage
Exposure Information	Exposure period - female: At least 14 days prior to mating through lactation day 20. Exposure period - male: At least 70 days prior to mating
Vehicle	Corn oil
Remarks – Method	No significant protocol deviations.

RESULTS

Group	*Number and Sex of Animals*	*Dose mg/kg bw/day*	*Mortality*
1	28/sex	50	0

2	28/sex	167	0
3	28/sex	500	0

Mortality and Time to Death
None

Effects on Parental (P) animals:
Slightly decreased mean absolute weight and mean relative to body weight for the epididymides at 500 mg/kg bw/day. In the absence of any other findings, this was not considered toxicologically relevant.

Other changes did not show any dose response relationship and thus were not considered to be treatment related.

Effects on 1st Filial Generation (F1)
Any changes did not show any dose response relationship and thus were not considered to be treatment related.

Remarks – Results
None

CONCLUSION
The No Observed Effect Level (NOEL) for reproductive effects was established as 500 mg/kg bw/day in this study, based on no significant findings at any dose level.

TEST FACILITY SLI (2004)

7.12. Genotoxicity – bacteria

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue B

METHOD OECD TG 471 Bacterial Reverse Mutation Test.
EC Directive 97/69/EC Mutagenicity – Reverse Mutation Test using Bacteria.
Plate incorporation procedure

Species/Strain	*S. typhimurium*: TA1535, TA1537, TA98, TA100 *E. coli*: WP2*uvr*A
Metabolic Activation System	Aroclor 1254 induced rat liver S9 fraction
Concentration Range in Main Test	a) With metabolic activation: 100, 250, 500, 1000, 5000, 10000 µg/plate b) Without metabolic activation: 100, 250, 500, 1000, 5000, 10000 µg/plate
Vehicle	None
Remarks - Method	No significant protocol deviations

RESULTS

Metabolic Activation	*Test Substance Concentration (µg/plate) Resulting in:*			
	Cytotoxicity in Preliminary Test	*Cytotoxicity in Main Test*	*Precipitation*	*Genotoxic Effect*
Absent				
Test 1	None	None	≥ 1000µg/plate	None
Test 2		None	≥ 1000µg/plate	None
Present				
Test 1	None	None	≥ 1000µg/plate	None
Test 2		None	≥ 1000µg/plate	None

Remarks - Results Positive control substances had the appropriate response. Negative controls were within historical limits.

CONCLUSION The analogous chemical was not mutagenic to bacteria under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY CHV (1997)

7.13. Genotoxicity – in vivo

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue B

METHOD OECD TG 474 Mammalian Erythrocyte Micronucleus Test.
EC Directive 2000/32/EC B.12 Mutagenicity - Mammalian Erythrocyte Micronucleus Test.

Species/Strain	Mouse/Crl:CD-1(ICR)BR
Route of Administration	Intraperitoneal injection
Vehicle	Peanut oil
Remarks - Method	No significant protocol deviations.

Group	*Number and Sex of Animals*	*Dose mg/kg bw*	*Sacrifice Time hours*
I (vehicle control)	5/sex	0	24, 48, 72 hours
II (low dose)	5/sex	625	24, 48, 72 hours
III (mid dose)	5/sex	1250	24, 48, 72 hours
IV (high dose)	5/sex	2500	24, 48, 72 hours
V (positive control, CP)	5/sex	60	24 hours

CP=cyclophosphamide.

RESULTS

Doses Producing Toxicity	Animals receiving 625 mg/kg bw were slightly hypoactive at 72 hours. Animals receiving 1250 mg/kg bw were slightly hypoactive with rough haircoats at 48 hours (males only) and 72 hours (all animals). Animals receiving 2500 mg/kg bw were slightly hypoactive at 24 hours, hypoactive with rough haircoats at 48 hours, and very hypoactive with rough haircoats, laboured breathing and distended abdomens at 72 hours. Two animals receiving 2500 mg/kg bw died during the test. Bone marrow cytotoxicity was pronounced in animals receiving 2500 mg/kg bw and there was some evidence of bone marrow toxicity in animals receiving 1250 and 625 mg/kg bw.
Genotoxic Effects	None
Remarks - Results	The positive control group induced statistically significantly increases in micronucleated polychromatic erythrocytes. Negative controls were within historical limits. The notified chemical did not induce a stastically significant increase in bone marrow polychromatic erythrocytes under the conditions of the test.

CONCLUSION The analogous chemical was not clastogenic under the conditions of this in vivo mouse micronucleus test.

TEST FACILITY CHV (1996)

8. ENVIRONMENT

8.1. Environmental fate

The following data have been provided for Analogue A and Analogue C which are considered to be acceptable analogues of the notified chemical.

8.1.1. Ready biodegradability

TEST SUBSTANCE	Analogue C
METHOD	OECD TG 301D Ready Biodegradability: Closed Bottle Test. EEC Directive 79/831 and EEC Directive 67/548 Annex V C6.
Inoculum	Activated sludge from the HRC Limited sewage treatment plant
Exposure Period	28 days
Auxiliary Solvent	None
Analytical Monitoring	COD
Remarks - Method	The test consisted of inoculated, inoculated with filter paper and non-inoculated controls; two references, aniline and sodium benzoate at 2 and 3 mg/L, respectively, and a treatment group at a concentration of 2 mg/L. Dissolved oxygen concentrations for each test medium were determined in duplicate at 0, 5, 15 or 28 days by means of a Yellow Springs BOD probe and COD were measured by using a semi-micro sample digestion method.

RESULTS

Test substance		*Sodium benzoate*		*Aniline*	
Day	*% Degradation*	*Day*	*% Degradation*	*Day*	*% Degradation*
5	5	5	87	5	57
15	3	15	85	15	59
28	8	28	97	28	61

Remarks - Results	The test substance attained 8% biodegradation after 28 days and thus is considered not readily biodegradable. Sodium benzoate and aniline attained 97% and 61% degradation, respectively, within 28 days. Thus both references fulfil the criteria for a valid test. Oxygen depletion in the inoculated and non-inoculated control series were within the acceptable limits.
CONCLUSION	The test substance is not considered to be readily biodegradable.
TEST FACILITY	Huntingdon Research Centre (1989)

8.1.2. Bioaccumulation

The notified chemical may have potential to bioaccumulate as it has a high calculated log Kow value of 10.48 – 14.41, but a low Bio – Concentration Factor (BCF) of 70.79. (US EPA).

8.2. Ecotoxicological investigations

8.2.1. Acute toxicity to fish

TEST SUBSTANCE	Analogue C
METHOD	1985 EPA/TSCA Part 797 – Environmental effects testing guidelines, Subpart B – Aquatic Guidelines, Section 797.1440 fish acute toxicity test – under static renewal conditions.
Species	Rainbow trout (*Oncorhyricus mykiss*)
Exposure Period	96 h
Auxiliary Solvent	None
Water Hardness	36-38 mg $CaCO_3$/L
Analytical Monitoring	Carbon analyser
Remarks – Method	The test material was prepared as a Water Soluble Fraction (WSF) due to its low water solubility. The mixtures (see below) were stirred at room temperature for 20 h and allowed to settle for 1 h. Following the settling period the WSF, separated from floating or settled test material, was removed with a siphon. Throughout the test period, a film of undissolved test material was observed on the surface of all test solutions.

Based on the results of the range-finding test, the definitive test was conducted at nominal concentrations of 1000, 600, 360, 220 and 130 mg/L WSF. Twenty fish were allocated to each of treatment groups and control. The number of surviving organisms and the presence of sublethal effects were determined visually after 0, 3, 6, 24, 48, 72 and 96 h. Total organic carbon (TOC) analyses were performed at 0 and 24 h, with control ranging from 6.2-7.7 mg/L and treatment groups ranging from 40-92 mg/L. The pHs and dissolved oxygen concentrations were within acceptable levels during the test.

RESULTS

Concentration mg/L	*Number of Fish*	*Mortality*					
Nominal		*3h*	*6h*	*24h*	*48h*	*72h*	*96h*
1000[a]	20	0	0	0	0	0	0[b]
600	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
360	20	0	0	0[c]	0	0	0
220	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
130	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Control	20	0	0	0	0	0[d]	0[d]

a Test solutions were noted to have a heavy layer of film present on the surface at 48, 72 and 96 h of exposure
b One of the surviving fish exhibited darkened pigmentation
c Several of the surviving fish exhibited darkened pigmentation
d A total of 19 fish were observed in the control vessels

LC50	>1000 mg/L nominal WSF at 96 h
NOEC	1000 mg/L nominal WSF at 96 h
Remarks – Results	All organisms of the control and the treatment groups survived the 96 h toxicity test. Sub lethal effects of darkened pigmentation were noted at nominal WSF concentrations of 360 and 1000 mg/L WSF at 24 and 96 h, respectively.

CONCLUSION The test substance is considered to be non-toxic to fish up to the limit of its water solubility.

TEST FACILITY Springborn Laboratories Inc (1989)

8.2.2. Acute toxicity to aquatic invertebrates

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue C

METHOD 1985 EPA/TSCA Part 797 – Environmental effects testing guidelines, Subpart B – Aquatic Guidelines, Section 797.1300 Daphnid acute toxicity test – under static renewal conditions.

Species	*Daphnia magna*
Exposure Period	48 h
Auxiliary Solvent	None
Water Hardness	180 mg $CaCO_3$/L
Analytical Monitoring	Carbon analyser
Remarks - Method	The WSFs were prepared according to the procedures in the fish test. Based on the results of the range-finding test, a definitive test at nominal concentrations of 130, 220, 370, 600 and 1,000 mg/L WSF was conducted. Twenty daphnia were allocated to each of control and treatment groups in duplicate (ten daphnids per replicate). The number of surviving organisms and the presence of sublethal effects were determined visually after 0, 3, 6, 24 and 48 h. Total organic carbon (TOC) analyses were performed at 0 and 24 h, with no significant change compared to control (7.3-11.5 mg C/L). The pHs and dissolved oxygen concentrations were within acceptable levels.

RESULTS

Concentration mg/L Nominal	*Number of D. magna*	*Immobilization (%)*			
		3 h	*6 h*	*24 h*	*48 h*
1000	20	0[abc]	25[bcde]	60[ab]	75[ch]
500	20	0	0	0	0[c]
250	20	0	0	25	30[ci]
125	20	0	0	0[bf]	0[cg]
63	20	0	0	0	0[cg]
Control	20	0	0	0	0

a All of the surviving daphnia were lethargic
b A film was present on the surface of the test solution
c Test solutions were cloudy
d All of the surviving daphnids were lethargic and caught on particulate matter
e A precipitate was observed at the surface of the test solution
f One of the surviving daphnids was lethargic
g Several of the surviving daphnids were observed at the surface of the test solution
h All of the surviving daphnids were caught on particulate matter
i One of the surviving daphnids was observed at the surface of the test solution

LC50	830 mg/L nominal WSF at 48 h (CI: 130-1000 mg/L)
NOEC	<63 mg/L nominal WSF at 48 h
Remarks - Results	75% immobilisation was observed at nominal concentration of 1000 mg/L WSF. Immobilisation of 30% was observed at 250 mg/L WSF while no immobilised organisms were observed in the remaining concentrations tested. All surviving daphnids at 1000 mg/L WSF were observed to be caught on particulate matter. Several surviving daphnids at concentrations ≤ 250 mg/L WSF were observed at the surface of the test solution. Test solutions at test termination, except for control, were all observed to be cloudy. The 48 h EC50 of 830 mg/L WSF was estimated by non-linear interpolation.

CONCLUSION The test substance is considered to show some toxicity to *Daphnia magna* below the limit of its water solubility. However, these results should be treated with caution as it appears the toxic effects observed are a result of physical effects.

TEST FACILITY Springborn Laboratories Inc. (1990)

8.2.3. Algal growth inhibition test

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogous chemical

METHOD OECD TG 201 Alga, Growth Inhibition Test Static Test. No test data were provided but reference to the following literature values were provided: http://www.epa.gov/chemrtk/alklsulf/c13206tp.pdf

Species	Freshwater alga (*Selenastrum subcapitata*)
Exposure Period	96 h
Concentration Range	1000 mg/L
Auxiliary Solvent	None
Water Hardness	Not given
Remarks - Method	The WAF was prepared.

RESULTS

Biomass	*Growth*
EL50 mg/L	EL50 mg/L
> 1000	> 1000

8.2.4. Inhibition of microbial activity

TEST SUBSTANCE	Analogue A
METHOD	OECD TG 209 Activated Sludge, Respiration Inhibition Test.
Inoculum	Activated sludge was obtained from the wastewater treatment plant
Exposure Period	3 h
Concentration Range	Nominal: 100, 300 and 1000 mg/L
Remarks – Method	The test was conducted under static conditions. Nominal concentrations were prepared by the addition of the test substance directly to the dilution water derived from the dechlorinated tap water. After 3 h incubation period the concentrations of the dissolved oxygen was measured. The test was also performed using 3,5-dichlorophenol as the reference.
RESULTS	
IC50	>1000 mg/L (nominal)
NOEC	1000 mg/L (nominal)
Remarks – Results	Insoluble material was observed on the bottom and on the surface of non-control test vessels. The EC50 for the reference was 9.0 mg/L and within the acceptable range of 5-30 mg/L. The test substance did not inhibit respiration of the activated sludge for the concentration range tested. The 3 h EC50 could not be calculated by standard statistical techniques as the % inhibition was <50% of the control at all concentrations tested.
CONCLUSION	The test substance is not inhibitory to the activated sludge micro-organisms.
TEST FACILITY	Wilbury Laboratories Inc. (1994)

9. RISK ASSESSMENT

9.1. Environment

9.1.1. Environment – exposure assessment

The notified chemical will be imported and reformulated into lubricant oils at the blending facilities. The used oil and the sludge collected from the on-site wastewater treatment facilities may be incinerated. This will likely generate water vapour and oxides of carbon and calcium oxide. The main environmental exposure is expected to result from inappropriate disposal of waste lubricant product, assuming a worst case scenario of about 14% of oil changes in Australia are performed by DIY enthusiasts.

This disposal is however, widespread across Australia. Most of the improperly released notified chemical due to DIY activities is likely to become associated with soils or sediments, as will the notified chemical released to landfill as container residues. The notified chemical released into the aquatic environment would be expected to become associated with the sediments due to its estimated low water solubility. While some components of the notified chemical are not readily degradable, these can be expected to slowly degrade due to the biotic and abiotic processes.

The amount released to stormwater drains (less than 1% of the import volume) can enter the aquatic compartment and could be expected to become associated with suspended organic material (due to the calculated high Pow), settle out into the sediments and eventually be biodegraded.

It is difficult to estimate the Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) of the notified chemical released into the stormwater drains, which have the potential to directly enter the aquatic environment. However, a worst case estimated PEC might be calculated if it is assumed that all of the 1% of the notified chemical that is expected to be released into the stormwater (i.e. 1 tonne) drains into a single metropolitan area with a geographical footprint of 500 square kilometres and an average annual rainfall of 500 mm. With a maximum annual release into this localised stormwater system of 1000 kg and the annual volume of water drained from this region estimated to be approximately 250 X 10^6 m^3, the resultant PEC is approximately 4 µg/L. It

should be stressed that this result is very much a worst case scenario, and that in reality releases of the chemical would be very much more diffuse than indicated here, and also at significantly reduced levels.

9.1.2. Environment – effects assessment

Based on the ecotoxicity data provided, the notified chemical is not toxic up to the limit of water solubility where the TOC = 9.1–92 mg/L. A PNEC is not able to be calculated based on the TOC value.

9.1.3. Environment – risk characterisation

The notified chemical is not toxic to the aquatic organisms tested up to the limit of its water solubility where the TOC = 9.1–92 mg/L. This value allows for a safety factor well in excess of the 100, required when toxicity data are available for three species, and when compared with the PEC of 4 µg/L. Further, the low water solubility of the notified chemical and its limited release to the aquatic environment (mainly via stormwater drainage) can expect to reduce the possibility of sufficient amounts to remain in solution to cause acute toxicity. The notified chemical is expected to become associated with the sediments, and biodegradation will further reduce the risk to the aquatic life.

Overall, the environmental risk from the proposed blending and use of the notified chemical is expected to be low.

As the notified chemical forms a component of an oil based product, which in itself poses a risk to the aquatic environment, the product should be prevented from entering waterways.

9.2. Human health

9.2.1. Occupational health and safety – exposure assessment

Warehouse and transportation workers would only be exposed to the notified chemical in the case of accidental rupture of containers.

During blending of the lubricant additive into the final lubricant product, the main exposure will be from drips and spills during transfer into storage tanks through hoses and lines, and during filling of the finished lubricant into containers and drums and containers. During the rest of the operation there is unlikely to be exposure, as the process is automated and enclosed. Exposure may also occur when workers put bungs or labels on drums and containers. Laboratory workers may also be exposed during quality testing.

About 70% of the lubricant products (containing <5% notified chemical) will be sold to commercial users. There is potential for exposure to skin during transfer of lubricant or during its use. These users will likely be professional mechanics and engineers, and use either pneumatic device to transfer oil, or have access to engineering controls and use of PPE. Exposure to the notified chemical is expected to be low, based on these controls, and the low concentration of the notified chemical in the products.

9.2.2. Public health – exposure assessment

Approximately 30% of the final lubricant product will be sold to service stations and consumer users, therefore, public exposure will be widespread. The lubricant will be used to manually top up and fill engines in cars, lawn mowers etc. Dermal exposure, and possible ocular, and inadvertent oral exposure to the notified chemical may occur when the lubricant oil is added and drained from engines and when handling components that have come into contact with the oil. DIY end users are not likely to wear PPE while using the engine oil. It is expected that exposure to individuals will be intermittent, and the concentration (<5%) of the notified chemical within the oil will limit the total exposure levels.

The public may also be exposed to the notified chemical from spills onto roads, parking areas and soil. However, exposure will be limited by the dispersive use and low concentration of the notified chemical in products.

9.2.3. Human health – effects assessment

All toxicity studies provided were conducted using analogous chemicals which are accepted.

In three Buehler skin sensitisation tests, challenges to previously exposed rats resulted in markedly increased skin reactions compared with naïve controls. In a human patch test, the analogous chemical was found to be non sensitising in the population studied. Based on the positive result in the animal test, the notified chemical is classified in accordance with the NOHSC *Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances* (NOHSC 2004) as:

R43 - May cause sensitisation by skin contact.

The analogue chemical is a moderate skin irritant, with mean Draize score for erythema of 1.93. Erythema formation was classed as > 2 in 2/6 animals tested. Thus, classification as a hazardous substance is not required according to the NOHSC criteria (an average score above 2.0 or more or 2/3 animals having a score above 2). A human repeat insult occlusive patch test found no evidence of irritation.

Based on analogue data, it is expected that the notified chemical will have low acute toxicity via the oral and dermal routes, and be slightly irritating to the eye.

A repeat-dose oral toxicity study found that the chemical was irritating to the stomach, but no other conclusive signs of systemic toxicity were observed. A NOAEL of 150 mg/kg bw/day was established based on the stomach irritation.

No adverse effects were observed in a one generation reproductive toxicity study, with the NOAEL established as 500 mg/kg bw/day.

An in vivo mammalian erythrocyte micronucleus test and an Ames test did not indicate genotoxocity.

Based on the available data, the notified chemical is classified as a hazardous substance in accordance with the NOHSC *Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances* (NOHSC 2004).

9.2.4. Occupational health and safety – risk characterisation

The lubricant additive package (<70% notified chemical) that is imported into Australia is hazardous, specifically it may cause skin sensitisation. However, the risk to workers will be mitigated by the mainly automated transportation and formulation process of the additive package. Exposure is not expected, except via splashes and spills, and it is expected that PPE will minimise exposure.

Commercial users will use the final product containing 1-5% of the notified chemical. They are likely to have minimal exposure to the formulated lubricants as they use pneumatic transfer equipment and personal protective equipment, such as gloves, overalls and work boots. The OHS risk presented by the notified chemical is expected to be low in situations where the workers take precautions to reduce dermal exposure. Commercial users are likely to take precautions that are recommended on the label/MSDS.

Based on the concentration of the notified chemical in the finished product, the risk of skin sensitisation exists, especially at workplaces with low level of control mechanisms.

9.2.5. Public health – risk characterisation

Consumer users of the lubricants containing the notified chemical are unlikely to take precautions to minimise exposure. Thus, they will have intermittent dermal exposure, and possibly accidental ocular and oral exposure, to the notified chemical.

The risk of dermal irritation due to acute exposure will be limited by the low concentration of the notified chemical within the lubricants. However, there is a high risk of dermal sensitisation for people who use the lubricants containing 1-5% of the notified chemical without PPE. Therefore, advice to consumers needs to be highlighted on the label.

10. CONCLUSIONS – ASSESSMENT LEVEL OF CONCERN FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND HUMANS

10.1. Hazard classification

Based on the available data the notified chemical is classified as hazardous under the NOHSC *Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances*. The classification and labelling details are:
R43 – May cause sensitisation by skin contact

As a comparison only, the classification of notified chemical using the Globally Harmonised System for the Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) (United Nations 2003) is presented below. This system is not mandated in Australia and carries no legal status but is presented for information purposes.

	Hazard Category	Hazard statement
Skin Sensitisation	1	May cause an allergic skin reaction

10.2. Environmental risk assessment

On the basis of the PEC/PNEC ratio, the chemical is not considered to pose a risk to the environment based on its reported use pattern.

10.3. Human health risk assessment

10.3.1. Occupational health and safety

There is Low Concern to occupational health and safety under the conditions of the occupational settings described, based on the expected low exposure.

10.3.2. Public health

There is High Concern to public health when used as a lubricant additive due to the hazardous nature and proposed use patterns.

11. MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET

11.1. Material Safety Data Sheet

The MSDS of the lubricant additive package containing the notified chemical provided by the notifier was in accordance with the NOHSC *National Code of Practice for the Preparation of Material Safety Data Sheets* (NOHSC 2003). It is published here as a matter of public record. The accuracy of the information on the MSDS remains the responsibility of the applicant.

11.2. Label

The label for the lubricant additive package containing the notified chemical provided by the notifier was in accordance with the NOHSC *National Code of Practice for the Labelling of Workplace Substances* (NOHSC 1994). The accuracy of the information on the label remains the responsibility of the applicant.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

REGULATORY CONTROLS
Hazard Classification and Labelling

- The Office of the ASCC, Department of Employment and Workplace Relations (DEWR), should consider the following hazard classification for the notified chemical:
  - R43 May cause sensitisation by skin contact
- The following risk phrase for products/mixtures containing the notified chemical applies:

- ≥ 1% R43 May cause sensitisation by skin contact

- Products containing ≥1% notified chemical should carry the following warning on the label:
  - S2 Keep out of reach of children
  - S24 Avoid contact with skin
  - S36 Wear suitable protective clothing
  - S37 Wear suitable gloves

- The National Drugs and Poisons Standing Committee (NDPSC) should consider the notified chemical for listing on the SUSDP.

CONTROL MEASURES

Occupational Health and Safety

- Employers should implement the following safe practices to minimise occupational exposure during handling of the notified chemical as introduced:
  - Minimise spills and drips
  - Where possible, automated processes should be used to reduce worker contact
  - Use closed systems for reformulation

- Employers should ensure that the following personal protective equipment is used by workers to minimise occupational exposure to the notified chemical as introduced and as diluted for use in the lubricant product:
  - Chemical resistant gloves
  - Protective clothing
  - Safety goggles

  Guidance in selection of personal protective equipment can be obtained from Australian, Australian/New Zealand or other approved standards.

- A copy of the MSDS should be easily accessible to employees.

- If products and mixtures containing the notified chemical are classified as hazardous to health in accordance with the NOHSC *Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances*, workplace practices and control procedures consistent with provisions of State and Territory hazardous substances legislation must be in operation.

Public Health

- The marketers of lubricants containing 1% or more the notified chemical should indicate on the product label that the product may cause skin sensitisation (allergic skin reaction) and that skin contact should be avoided.

Disposal

- The notified chemical should be disposed of by authorised landfill or incineration.

Emergency procedures

- Spills or accidental release of the notified chemical should be handled by preventing spills entering waterways, using physical containment, followed by absorption onto inert material (vermiculite, sand etc) and placed into suitable containers for disposal.

12.1. Secondary notification

The Director of Chemicals Notification and Assessment must be notified in writing within 28 days by the notifier, other importer or manufacturer:

(1) Under Section 64(2) of the Act:

– if any of the circumstances listed in the subsection arise.

The Director will then decide whether secondary notification is required.

No additional secondary notification conditions are stipulated.

13. BIBLIOGRAPHY

AIP (1995) AIP Survey of Used Oil. Australian Institute of Petroleum Ltd.

Alga Growth Inhibition Test Static Test. No test data were provided but reference to the following literature values were provided at http://www.epa.gov/chemrtk/alklsulf/c13206tp.pdf

CEHC (1989a) The Four-Hour Skin Irritation Potential of [Analogue Chemical] in Adult Albino Rabbits. CEHC Report number: 3073. Chevron Environmental Health Center, Inc. California, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

CEHC (1989b) The Acute Eye Irritation Potential of [Analogue Chemical] in Adult Albino Rabbits. CEHC Report number: 3072. Chevron Environmental Health Center, Inc. California, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

CHV (1996) Mutagenicity Test on [Analogue Chemical] in an In Vivo Mouse Micronucleus Assay. CHV Study number: 17869-0-455CO. Corning Hazleton Inc, Virginia, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

CHV (1997) Mutagenicity Test on [Analogue Chemical] in the Salmonella – Escherichia coli/Mammalian Microsome Reverse Mutation Assay with a Confirmatory Assay. CHV Study 17869-0-409R. Corning Hazleton Inc, Virginia, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

CRTC (1991) Repeated Insult Patch Test with [Analogue Chemical]. CEHC reference number 91-96. Chevron Environmental Health Center, Inc. California, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

HTR (1991) Delayed Contact Hypersensitivity Study in Guinea Pigs (Buehler Technique) of [Analogue Chemical]. HTB Project 91-8154-21. Hill Top Biolabs Inc, Ohio, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

HTR (1993) Delayed Contact Hypersensitivity Study in Guinea Pigs (Buehler Technique) of [Analogue Chemical]. CEHC Report number: 3212. Chevron Environmental Health Center, Inc. California, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

HTR (1995) Delayed Contact Hypersensitivity Study in Guinea Pigs (Buehler Technique) of [Analogue Chemical]. HTB Project 94-8280-21. Hill Top Biolabs Inc, Ohio, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

Huntingdon Research Centre Ltd (1989) The Ready Biodegradability of [Analogue chemical] in a Closed Bottle Test System. HRC Report No. 30/891706, Huntingdon Research Centre Ltd., Cambridgeshire, England (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

MEINHARDT (2002) Used Oil in Australia. Prepared by MEINHARDT Infrastructure & Environment Group for Environment Australia.

NOHSC (1994) National Code of Practice for the Labelling of Workplace Substances [NOHSC:2012(1994)]. National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.

NOHSC (2003) National Code of Practice for the Preparation of Material Safety Data Sheets, 2nd edn [NOHSC:2011(2003)]. National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.

NOHSC (2004) Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances [NOHSC:1008(2004)]. National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, Canberra, AusInfo.

Pharmakon (1997a) [Analogue Chemical] – Single Dose Toxicity Study by the Oral Route in the Rat (Limit Test). Report number: 50596. CRTC Reference Number 96-58. Pharmakon, France (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

Pharmakon (1997b) [Analogue Chemical] – Single Dose Toxicity Study by the Cutaneous Route in the Rat (Limit Test). Report number: 50696. CRTC Reference Number 96-59. Pharmakon, France (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

SLI (2002) A 28-Day Oral Toxicity Study in Rats with a 14-Day Recovery Phase Using [Analogue Chemical]. SLI Study Number: 3580.1. Springborn Laboratories, Inc., Ohio, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

SLI (2004) An Oral (Gavage) One-Generation Reproduction Study in Sprague Dawley Rats with [Analogue Chemical] SLI Study Number 3626.1. Springborn Laboratories, Inc., Ohio, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

Snow R (1997) Used Oil Management. Paper presented at the Used Oil Management Conference, Brisbane, August 1997, Queensland Dept. Environment.

Springborn Laboratories Inc. (1989) [Analogue Chemical] Acute Toxicity to Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus Mykiss*) Under Static Renewal Conditions. SLI Report No. 89-8-3068, Springborn Laboratories Inc., Massachusetts, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

Springborn Laboratories Inc. (1990) [Analogue Chemical] Acute Toxicity to Daphnids (*Daphnia Magna*) Under Static Renewal Conditions. SLI Report No. 89-8-3084, Springborn Laboratories Inc., Massachusetts, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).

United Nations (2003) Globally Harmonised System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS). United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE), New York and Geneva.

US EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) EPI (Estimation Program Interface) Suite™ – v2.14.

Wilbury Laboratories Inc. (1994) Activated Sludge Respiration Inhibition Test With [Analogue Chemical]. Study No. 76-CM-603, Wilbury Laboratories Inc., Massachusetts, USA (unpublished report supplied by notifier).