

File No: STD/1157

9 September 2005

**NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS NOTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT SCHEME
(NICNAS)**

FULL PUBLIC REPORT

Lutensol XP 80

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	3
1. APPLICANT AND NOTIFICATION DETAILS	3
2. IDENTITY OF CHEMICAL	3
3. COMPOSITION	3
4. INTRODUCTION AND USE INFORMATION	3
5. PROCESS AND RELEASE INFORMATION	4
5.1. Distribution, Transport and Storage	4
5.2. Operation description	4
5.3. Occupational exposure	4
5.4. Release	5
5.5. Disposal	5
5.6. Public exposure	5
6. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES	6
7. TOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS	7
7.1. Acute toxicity – oral	8
7.2. Acute toxicity – dermal	8
7.3. Acute toxicity – inhalation	9
7.4. Irritation – skin	9
7.5. Irritation – eye	9
7.6. Skin sensitisation	10
7.7. Repeat dose toxicity	10
7.8. Genotoxicity – bacteria	12
7.9. Genotoxicity – in vitro	12
7.10. Genotoxicity – in vivo	12
7.11. Developmental toxicity	13
8. ENVIRONMENT	14
8.1. Environmental fate	14
8.1.1. Ready biodegradability	14
8.1.2. Bioaccumulation	15
8.2. Ecotoxicological investigations	15
8.2.1. Chronic toxicity to fish	15
8.2.3. Algal growth inhibition test	17
8.2.4. Inhibition of microbial activity	17
9. RISK ASSESSMENT	17
9.1. Environment	17
9.1.1. Environment – exposure assessment	17
9.1.2. Environment – effects assessment	18
9.1.3. Environment – risk characterisation	18
9.2. Human health	18
9.2.1. Occupational health and safety – exposure assessment	18
9.2.2. Public health – exposure assessment	19
9.2.3. Human health – effects assessment	19
9.2.4. Occupational health and safety – risk characterisation	19
9.2.5. Public health – risk characterisation	19
10. CONCLUSIONS – ASSESSMENT LEVEL OF CONCERN FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND HUMANS	19
10.1. Hazard classification	20
10.2. Environmental risk assessment	20
10.3. Human health risk assessment	20
10.3.1. Occupational health and safety	20
10.3.2. Public health	20
11. MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET	20
11.1. Material Safety Data Sheet	20
11.2. Label	20
12. RECOMMENDATIONS	20
12.1. Secondary notification	21
13. BIBLIOGRAPHY	22

FULL PUBLIC REPORT**Lutensol XP 80****1. APPLICANT AND NOTIFICATION DETAILS**

APPLICANT(S)

BASF Australia Ltd (ABN 62 008 437 867) of 500 Princes Highway Noble Park VIC 3174.

NOTIFICATION CATEGORY

Standard: Polymer with NAMW < 1000 (more than 1 tonne per year).

EXEMPT INFORMATION (SECTION 75 OF THE ACT)

Data items and details claimed exempt from publication:

Chemical Name, Other Names, CAS Number, Molecular and Structural Formulae, Molecular Weight, Spectral Data, Polymer Constituents, Purity, Hazardous and Non-hazardous Impurities/Residual Monomers, Additives/Adjuvants.

VARIATION OF DATA REQUIREMENTS (SECTION 24 OF THE ACT)

Variation to the schedule of data requirements is claimed as follows:

Part B: Vapour Pressure, Water Solubility, Hydrolysis as Function of pH, Partition Coefficient, Dissociation Constant, Flammability Limits, Explosive Properties, Reactivity.

Part C: Acute Dermal and Inhalation Toxicity, Skin Sensitisation, In Vitro/In Vivo Genotoxicity.

PREVIOUS NOTIFICATION IN AUSTRALIA BY APPLICANT(S)

None.

NOTIFICATION IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Canada (2004).

2. IDENTITY OF CHEMICAL

MARKETING NAME(S)

Lutensol XP 80

Lutensol XL 800

Eusapon LD 6026

3. COMPOSITION

DEGREE OF PURITY

High

HAZARDOUS IMPURITIES/RESIDUAL MONOMERS

None are present at above the relevant cut off level for classification of the notified polymer as a hazardous substance

4. INTRODUCTION AND USE INFORMATION

MODE OF INTRODUCTION OF NOTIFIED CHEMICAL (100%) OVER NEXT 5 YEARS

Import, pure substance.

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

<i>Year</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Tonnes</i>	100-200	100-200	100-200	100-200	100-200

USE

A non-ionic surfactant used at <10% for industrial detergents and cleaners.

5. PROCESS AND RELEASE INFORMATION

5.1. Distribution, Transport and Storage

PORT OF ENTRY

Melbourne.

IDENTITY OF MANUFACTURER/RECIPIENTS

BASF Australia Ltd.

TRANSPORTATION AND PACKAGING

Lutensol XP 80 (notified polymer) will be shipped and transported by road in 200 kg drums or 950 kg tanks from the wharf to the notifier's warehouse at North Laverton VIC for storage, and then to a number of customer blending facilities. The finished industrial cleaning products will be packed into 5 L and 20 L consumer containers and road transported to end users. Storage will be in a covered bunded area and in accordance with state legislation.

5.2. Operation description

The notified polymer will be brought into Australia as an essentially raw material with approximately 2-3 shipments per year.

At a customer blending facility, store persons will receive and transfer drums of the notified polymer by forklift to various work areas as required, for example, warehouse or batch formulating areas. Various techniques are employed in delivering the correct quantities of the notified polymer and other ingredients according to the batch sheet. Most often this process involves placing the drum on a scale, inserting a dip pipe into the drum and pumping the desired quantity into blending vessels. The transfer hose and dip pipe are then washed to effluent. The blending vessels are enclosed tanks, situated in well ventilated areas. Local exhaust ventilation will be employed where the natural ventilation is considered inadequate. At the end of the blend, laboratory technicians will perform testing and adjustment to the formulation specifications if necessary. The final product mixtures containing <10% notified polymer will be packed manually by use of a pump and filling line directly from the blending tank. Pallets of packed product will then be stored and for sale to customers.

The final products containing the notified polymer will be used in the industrial and institutional settings and are not likely to be used by the general public. Some products may be used to degrease and clean machinery, others to clean metal prior to plating, coating or anodising. Other applications include floor and tile cleaners and disinfectants. These products will typically be supplied as concentrates and will be diluted before use. End users including janitorial cleaning staff and kitchen hands will wipe these cleaners and detergents over hard surfaces during industrial cleaning tasks which could take up to eight hours a day.

5.3. Occupational exposure

Number and Category of Workers

<i>Category of Worker</i>	<i>Number*</i>	<i>Exposure Duration</i>	<i>Exposure Frequency</i>
Transport and warehouse workers	2-3	1.5 h/day	2-3 days/year
Store persons	1	0.5-10 h/week	48 weeks/year
Plant technicians	2	0.5-10 h/week	48 weeks/year
QC laboratory technicians	2	0.5-10 h/week	48 weeks/year
Drums recyclers	1	10 min/week	48 weeks/year

End users (cleaning staff) 100 8 h/day 240 days/year
*Per each customer site and it is expected that up to 100 customer sites will be using the notified polymer over the next 5 years.

Exposure Details

During transport and storage, workers are unlikely to be exposed to the notified polymer except when packaging is accidentally breached. Should a spill occur, it is expected to be contained and collected using absorbent materials, and placed into suitable containers for recovery or disposal in accord with the MSDS and official regulations.

Laboratory technicians may be potentially exposed to the notified polymer when sampling and testing formulation samples containing it. However, they will handle only small quantities and will wear appropriate personal protective equipment.

Dermal and ocular exposure due to splashes and spillages can occur during weighing, mixing, packing, and equipment cleaning processes. For example, plant operators may be potentially exposed to the pure form of the notified polymer or at concentrations up to 10% respectively when weighing and pumping the notified polymer from imported drums into a mixing tank and when connecting/disconnecting transfer hoses. Exposure of equipment cleaning and maintenance workers are anticipated to be less frequent and in smaller quantities.

The notifier indicates that adequate ventilation will be in place to prevent workers from breathing mist and volatiles. Operators of the formulation plants will wear splash proof goggles, chemically resistant gloves, boots, aprons, or other protective clothing, and appropriate respirators when required. In addition, current work procedures and practices for the use of a similar existing product are in place and directly applicable to the intended use of the notified polymer. Copies of the MSDS will be readily accessible in all work areas.

Exposure to the notified polymer during end use is expected to be widespread, frequent and extensive. This would include dermal contact with drips and spills and possibly accidental ocular contact when industrial cleaning workers apply and wipe over hard surfaces with cleaners and detergents containing the notified polymer. It is expected that the workers will wear suitable protective clothing and gloves when carrying out these activities.

5.4. Release

RELEASE OF CHEMICAL AT SITE

The notified polymer will be imported into Australia as a raw material. At a customer blending facility, if incidental spillage or wastes occur during normal operating procedures, it will be contained and soaked up with absorbent material before being transported off-site to an approved industrial facility for disposal by incineration or landfill. The transferring/pumping of the notified polymer into blending vessels and the packaging of the mixture into the final consumer products will be automated. The transfer hose and dip pipe are then washed to effluent. It is expected that <0.5% of the notified polymer would be discharged to effluent through the washout procedures. It is estimated that the maximum residue in the empty import containers will amount to 0.5%, corresponding to 1 tonne of the notified polymer per annum based on a maximum import of 200 tonnes. The residues will be discharged to effluent via drum recyclers.

RELEASE OF CHEMICAL FROM USE

The notified polymer will be used in detergents or cleaner products for industrial purposes only (eg floor cleaners) and it is unlikely to be sold to the public. While limited details are available, the notifier accepts practically all of the notified polymer will be discharged into sewer. Therefore, release is expected to be widespread and include both metropolitan and country areas. Small amount may remain in empty product containers, and be disposed of to landfill.

5.5. Disposal

The notifier recommends that liquid wastes of the notified polymer should be disposed of in a secure landfill. The majority of the import volume will be released to the sewage system as a result of use.

5.6. Public exposure

The notified polymer is intended for use in industrial cleaning only. There is potential for dermal exposure among public members to hard surfaces that have been cleaned with products containing the notified polymer. However, exposure would be low because contact is only intermittent and residues of the notified polymer should have been largely removed during cleaning.

6. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

Appearance at 20°C and 101.3 kPa Colourless to yellowish liquid with characteristic odour

Boiling Point >250°C

Remarks Full test report was not provided.

Density 1000 kg/m³ at 20°C

Remarks Full test report was not provided.

Vapour Pressure Not determined

Remarks Quantitative structure activity modelling on a representative structure using the US EPA EPI Suite estimated a vapour pressure of 8.5×10^{-20} – 7.1×10^{-13} kPa, indicating the notified polymer is not likely to be volatile.

Water Solubility >2 g/L

Remarks From a stability test (discussed below), the notified polymer was completely dissolved at 2 g/L.

Hydrolysis as a Function of pH Stable

Remarks The notified polymer has no functional groups that are likely to hydrolyse within the environmental pH range of 4-9. Results of a stability test on the notified polymer would support this conclusion (see below).

Partition Coefficient (n-octanol/water) Not determined

Remarks The notifier indicates that the logPow determination cannot be applied to surfactants as these surface active substances will be enriched in the phase boundary. Based on its relatively high water solubility, it is likely that the notified polymer will partition mainly to the aqueous phase.

Adsorption/Desorption

METHOD ISO 18749:2001 Water quality – Adsorption of substances on activated sludge: Batch test using specific analytical methods.

<i>Soil Type</i>	<i>Dissolved Organic Carbon – DOC Nominal Concentration (mg/L)</i>	<i>Time (h)</i>	<i>Mean DOC Elimination (%)</i>
Activated sludge	50	0	0
	50	3	4
	50	24	13

Remarks Test was conducted on Lutensol ON 110 (details of this analogue are claimed exempt from publication) in triplicate using a mixture of an inorganic medium, activated sludge and the test substance that simulates conditions of wastewater treatment plants. The measured DOC concentrations at 0, 3, and 24 h of the test substance are used as the basis for calculating the degree of adsorption.

It was noted that the use of DOC generally requires relatively high test

concentrations (usually not less than 40 mg/L) and it is not a specific method (ie no direct differentiation between adsorption and/or elimination mechanisms such as complex formation, flocculation, precipitation, sedimentation or biodegradation). However, there may be cases where no acceptable alternative is available as for water soluble or miscible polymers and such a test concentration is usually too high compared with concentrations found under real wastewater conditions.

TEST FACILITY The notified polymer is not likely to be strongly adsorbed.
BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2002)

Dissociation Constant Not determined

Remarks The notified polymer has no functional groups that are likely to dissociate under the environmental pH 4-9.

Particle Size Not applicable

Remarks The notified polymer is a liquid at room temperature.

Flash Point >100°C

METHOD DIN 51798 (Pensky-Martens closed cup)
Remarks Full test report was not provided.

Flammability Limits Not determined

Remarks The notified polymer is not expected to be flammable.

Autoignition Temperature >200°C

METHOD DIN 51794
Remarks Full test report was not provided.

Explosive Properties Not determined

Remarks The notified polymer is not expected to be explosive on structural grounds.

Reactivity Stable under normal environmental conditions

Remarks Results of a stability test submitted (BASF GKA Analytik, 2002) would support this conclusion. The test showed the notified polymer dissolved at 2 g/L was stable in buffer at pH 1.2, 4, 7, and 9 for up to 14 days at 40°C in natural sunlight. Analysis methods were Total Organic Carbon and Gel Permeation Chromatography. The notified polymer is not expected to degrade, decompose or undergo hazardous polymerisation. However, it may not be compatible with reactive chemicals and extremes of temperature.

7. TOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

There were limited toxicity data available for the notified polymer. Toxicity information in relation to structural analogues, which are representative of certain parts of the notified polymer, were also submitted. Analogues are denoted as analogue A (details are claimed exempt from publication) and analogue B (a non-ionic surfactant category of alcohol/alkylphenol ethoxylates) (Talmage, 1994).

Analogue A is the major expected metabolite of the notified polymer and is therefore relevant for subchronic effects. Analogue B is most relevant for acute exposure.

<i>Endpoint and Result</i>	<i>Assessment Conclusion</i>
----------------------------	------------------------------

Rat, acute oral LD50 >200 to <2000 mg/kg bw	Harmful
Rat, acute dermal	test not conducted
Rat, acute inhalation	test not conducted
Rabbit, skin irritation	slightly irritating
Rabbit, eye irritation	severely irritating
Guinea pig, skin sensitisation	test not conducted
Rat, oral repeat dose toxicity - 90 days	NOAEL = 150 (male) and 30 (female) mg/kg bw/day (analogue A)
Genotoxicity – bacterial reverse mutation	non mutagenic (analogue A)
Genotoxicity – in vitro	test not conducted
Genotoxicity – in vivo	test not conducted
Pharmacokinetic/Toxicokinetic studies	no data available
Developmental and reproductive effects	NOAEL = 158 mg/kg bw/day (analogue A)
Carcinogenicity	no data available

7.1. Acute toxicity – oral

TEST SUBSTANCE	Notified polymer
METHOD	OECD TG 423 Acute Oral Toxicity – Acute Toxic Class Method. EC Directive 96/54/EC B.1 tris Acute Oral Toxicity – Acute Toxic Class Method. US EPA OPPTS 870.1100 Acute Oral Toxicity.
Species/Strain	Rat/Wistar CrI Glx BrI Han:WI
Vehicle	Doubly distilled water.
Remarks – Method	No significant protocol deviations.

RESULTS

<i>Group</i>	<i>Number and Sex of Animals</i>	<i>Dose mg/kg bw</i>	<i>Mortality</i>
I	3 males	200	0/3
II	3 females	200	0/3
III	3 females	2000	2/3

LD50 >200 to <2000 mg/kg bw

Signs of Toxicity The 2000 mg/kg females showed poor general state, dyspnoea, apathy, ataxia, staggering, abdominal and lateral position, salivation and piloerection from the time of administration to Day 1. No clinical signs and findings were observed in the 200 mg/kg bw females while one male of this dose group showed impaired general state, gasping and respiratory sounds on Day 1. The mean body weights of the 200 mg/kg bw dose group increased throughout the 14-day study period.

Effects in Organs No macroscopic pathologic abnormalities were noted in any animals, either at study termination or in the two animals that died 2 hours and 1 day after administration.

Remarks – Results The isolated findings such as impaired general state, gasping and respiratory sounds in one male of the 200 mg/kg bw dose group were considered to be associated with the gavage procedure.

CONCLUSION The notified polymer is harmful via the oral route.

TEST FACILITY BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2001a)

7.2. Acute toxicity – dermal

Remarks Test was not conducted. Analogue B chemicals have been shown to exhibit a low order of dermal toxicity (Talmage, 1994).

7.3. Acute toxicity – inhalation

Remarks Test was not conducted. Inhalation exposure would be unlikely due to the expected low vapour pressure of the notified polymer, but could occur from mist or aerosols formed. Also, analogue B chemicals have been shown not to be acutely toxic to rats at concentrations less than or equal to their saturated vapour concentrations in air (Talmage, 1994).

7.4. Irritation – skin

TEST SUBSTANCE Notified polymer

METHOD OECD TG 404 Acute Dermal Irritation/Corrosion.
EC Directive 92/69/EEC B.4 Acute Toxicity (Skin Irritation).
US EPA OPPTS 870.2500 Acute Dermal Irritation.

Species/Strain Rabbit/New Zealand White
Number of Animals 1 male, 2 females
Vehicle None – applied undiluted as supplied
Observation Period 7 days
Type of Dressing Semi-occlusive
Remarks – Method No significant protocol deviations.

RESULTS

<i>Lesion</i>	<i>Mean Score* Animal No.</i>			<i>Maximum Value</i>	<i>Maximum Duration of Any Effect</i>	<i>Maximum Value at End of Observation Period</i>
	1	2	3			
<i>Erythema/Eschar</i>	1.0	1.7	2.0	2	3 d	0
<i>Oedema</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0 d	0

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

Remarks – Results Slight to moderate erythema (grade 1-2) with scaling or severe scaling was seen in all animals. The reactions resolved within 7 days after treatment except scaling was still observed in one animal at study termination. No oedema was noted. Primary irritation index (PII) = (Σ erythema at 1,24,48,72 hours)/(number of test sites x 4 scoring intervals) + (Σ oedema at 1,24,48,72 hours)/(number of test sites x 4 scoring intervals).

$$\text{PII} = (5+5+4+5)/(3 \times 4) = 1.6 \text{ (slightly irritating).}$$

CONCLUSION The notified polymer is slightly irritating to the skin.

TEST FACILITY BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2001b)

7.5. Irritation – eye

TEST SUBSTANCE Notified polymer

METHOD OECD TG 405 Acute Eye Irritation/Corrosion.
EC Directive 92/69/EEC B.5 Acute Toxicity (Eye Irritation).
US EPA OPPTS 870.2400 Acute Eye Irritation.

Species/Strain Rabbit/New Zealand White
Number of Animals 1 male
Observation Period 14 days

Remarks – Method Due to the severe irritation findings, the study was terminated on day 14 and additional animals were not tested.

RESULTS

<i>Lesion</i>	<i>Mean Score* Animal No.</i>	<i>Maximum Value</i>	<i>Maximum Duration of Any Effect</i>	<i>Maximum Value at End of Observation Period</i>
	1			
<i>Conjunctiva: redness</i>	3.0	3.0	14 d	2.0
<i>Conjunctiva: chemosis</i>	2.3	3.0	14 d	2.0
<i>Conjunctiva: discharge</i>	1.7	3.0	14 d	1.0
<i>Corneal opacity</i>	1.0	4.0	14 d	4.0
<i>Iridial inflammation</i>	1.0	1.0	72 h	0.0

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

Remarks - Results Moderate to severe ocular reactions were observed, including eyelid retraction, suppuration, contracted pupil, cornea vascularisation and blood discharge. Iritis was reversible by day 7, but corneal opacity and vascularisation had progressively increased covering up to 2/3 of the corneal area. These reactions were considered irreversible and hence the study was terminated on day 14.

CONCLUSION The notified polymer is severely irritating to the eye.

TEST FACILITY BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2001c)

7.6. Skin sensitisation

Remarks Test was not conducted. Analogue B chemicals have not been shown to be skin sensitisers (Talmage, 1994).

7.7. Repeat dose toxicity

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue A

METHOD OECD TG 408 Repeated Dose 90-Day Oral Toxicity Study in Rodents.
EC Directive 88/302/EEC B.26 Sub-Chronic Oral Toxicity Test: 90-Day
Repeated Oral Dose Study using Rodent Species.

Species/Strain Rat/Fischer F-344

Route of Administration Oral – gavage

Exposure Information Total exposure days: 90 days

Dose regimen: 7 days per week

Post-exposure observation period: 0 day

Vehicle 0.005% Cremophor EL (castor oil, ethoxylated) in doubly distilled water

Remarks - Method Control was used for both vehicle and doubly distilled water.

RESULTS

<i>Group</i>	<i>Number and Sex of Animals</i>	<i>Dose mg/kg bw/day</i>	<i>Mortality</i>
0 (control – water)	10 per sex	0	0/20
I (control – vehicle)	10 per sex	0	0/20
II (low dose)	10 per sex	30	0/20
III (mid dose)	10 per sex	150	0/20
IV (high dose)	10 per sex	600	0/20

Mortality and Time to Death

All animals survived until the scheduled study termination.

Clinical Observations

As a reversible effect of treatment, salivation and/or a urine-smear anogenital region was seen in high dose animals within 3-4 h of administration. These were assessed as local rather than systemic effects. Other high dose treatment related effects were impairment of food consumption in males and females (18% and 10% vs controls, respectively) and impairment of body weight/body weight change (14%/25% vs vehicle controls) in males throughout the observation period. Mean terminal body weight was also significantly decreased in high dose males and females (17% and 8% vs vehicle controls, respectively). No statistically significant deviations were observed in the other dose groups. There were no other abnormal clinical or ophthalmological findings.

Laboratory Findings – Clinical Chemistry, Haematology, Urinalysis

The most prominent finding in clinical pathology was the increase in cyanide-insensitive palmitoyl-CoA-oxidation in the high dose animals. This is probably caused by hepatic peroxisome proliferation which is accompanied by induction of peroxisomal enzymes particularly those involved in β -oxidation of fatty acids. As a result of the increased fatty acid metabolism, cholesterol concentrations in the sera of the high dose males and females and triglyceride levels in the high dose males were significantly reduced. However, the slightly increased triglyceride levels in the high dose females were difficult to interpret, and thus were assessed as being incidental. Moreover, the statistically significant decreased cholesterol and increased albumin in the mid dose males compared with water control were also considered to be fortuitous, because these findings were marginal.

The decrease in platelet counts and globulins and the increase in albumin in the high dose animals of either sex were regarded as treatment related. They are indicative of a disturbance of protein metabolism. However the mechanism of the fall in platelets is unclear because there are no concomitant changes in clinical examinations and pathology which might explain the cause of this isolated finding.

Changes in urinalyses such as increased squamous epithelial cells in high dose males, increased transitional and squamous epithelial cells and increased urinary volume with decreased specific gravity in high dose females were regarded as signs of a mild nephrotoxic activity of the test substance at a dose level of 600 mg/kg bw/day.

Effects in Organs

The mean absolute and relative liver weights were significantly increased in high dose male and female rats (28%/54% and 25%/36% vs vehicle controls, respectively). The relative liver weight was also significantly increased in mid dose females (6%), revealing a dose response relationship. Other changes in absolute and/or relative organ weights (adrenal glands, kidneys, ovaries, testes, epididymides, and brain) were also seen in high dose animals.

The liver weight increase was related to liver cell hypertrophy most likely due to peroxisome proliferation. In high dose male rats, there was also loss of fatty infiltration of the liver cells. However, this alteration of the endogenous lipid metabolism would not represent a pathological situation but rather an adaptation, probably attributed to the significantly decreased mean terminal body weight seen in this group.

In the high dose male group, the thyroid follicular epithelium was hypertrophic (7/10 animals) and in three animals, thyrotropic basophilic cells in the glandular part of the pituitary gland were enlarged, vacuolated, and intensively pink. This may be related to an accelerated metabolic degradation of T3 and/or T4 in the liver, resulting in a negative feedback over the hypothalamic pituitary axis.

Remarks – Results

Statistically significantly decreased values (vs vehicle controls) obtained for body weight/body weight change in high dose females were assessed as being incidental and hence not treatment related because of the fact that the body weight of the vehicle control was slightly higher than that of the water control. Consequently, due to the significantly decreased mean terminal body weight (vs vehicle controls), changes seen in mean absolute and/or relative weights of brain, kidney, adrenal glands, epididymides, testes or ovaries in high dose animals were regarded as chance deviations. Impairment of food efficiency in the high and mid dose males and females was also assessed as being incidental because they were isolated findings with no dose response relationship. Gross lesions or microscopic findings in spleen, stomach, trachea, etc. were also interpreted to have arisen fortuitously since they were individual observations and by no means related to treatment.

CONCLUSION

The No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) was established as 150 and 30 mg/kg bw/day in male and female rats respectively in this study, based on effects on the liver.

TEST FACILITY BASF Aktiengesellschaft (1996)

7.8. Genotoxicity – bacteria

TEST SUBSTANCE Analogue A

METHOD OECD TG 471 Bacterial Reverse Mutation Test.
EC Directive 92/69/EEC B.14 Mutagenicity – Reverse Mutation Test using Bacteria.
Plate incorporation procedure/Pre incubation procedure
Species/Strain *S. typhimurium*: TA1535, TA1537, TA98, TA100
Metabolic Activation System S9 fraction from Aroclor 1254 induced rat liver
Concentration Range in Main Test With and without metabolic activation:
Test 1: 20, 100, 500, 2500, 5000 µg/plate
Test 2 & 3: 15, 30, 60, 120, 250 µg/plate
Vehicle DMSO
Remarks – Method Three independent tests (2x plate incorporation and 1x pre-incubation) were conducted in triplicate.

RESULTS

<i>Metabolic Activation</i>	<i>Cytotoxicity in Preliminary Test</i>	<i>Test Substance Concentration (µg/plate) Resulting in:</i>			<i>Genotoxic Effect</i>
		<i>Cytotoxicity in Main Test</i>	<i>Precipitation</i>		
<i>Absent</i>					
Test 1	Not conducted	≥500	>5000		Negative
Test 2	--	≥250 (TA1535 only)	>5000		Negative
Test 3	--	≥120	>5000		Negative
<i>Present</i>					
Test 1	Not conducted	≥500	>5000		Negative
Test 2	--	≥250 (TA1535 only)	>5000		Negative
Test 3	--	≥120 (all) & ≥250 (TA1537 only)	>5000		Negative

Remarks – Results No increases in the his⁺ revertant numbers were observed both in the plate incorporation and pre-incubation tests with any tester strains at any concentration either with or without S9 mix. A bacteriotoxic effect (reduced his⁻ background growth and/or his⁺ revertant numbers) was observed at ≥120 – 250 µg/plate depending on the strains and test conditions. The vehicle and positive controls responded appropriately.

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

TEST FACILITY BASF Aktiengesellschaft (1995a)

7.9. Genotoxicity – in vitro

Remarks Test was not conducted. Analogue B chemicals have been shown negative in a variety of short-term genotoxicity tests (Talmage, 1994).

7.10. Genotoxicity – in vivo

Remarks Test was not conducted. Chromosome damage was not observed in

dominant lethal and bone marrow cytogenic tests when an analogue B chemical was administered orally to rats and hamsters (Talmage, 1994).

7.11. Developmental toxicity

TEST SUBSTANCE	Analogue A
METHOD	OECD TG 414 Teratogenicity. EC Directive 88/302/EEC B.31 Teratogenicity – Rodent and Non-rodent. US EPA 40 CFR 798.4900 Developmental Toxicity Study.
Species/Strain	Rat/Wistar Chbb:THOM (SPF)
Route of Administration	Oral – gavage
Exposure Information	Exposure days: 6 – 15 post coitum Post-exposure observation period: 5 days
Vehicle	0.005% Cremophor EL (castor oil, ethoxylated) in doubly distilled water
Remarks – Method	Control was used for both vehicle and doubly distilled water.

RESULTS

<i>Group</i>	<i>Number and Sex of Animals</i>	<i>Dose mg/kg bw/day</i>	<i>Mortality</i>
0 (control – water)	10 females	0	0/10
I (control – vehicle)	10 females	0	0/10
II (low dose)	10 females	158	0/10
III (mid dose)	10* females	790	0/10
IV (high dose)	10 females	1580	9/10

* two were excluded from evaluation as not being pregnant.

Mortality and Time to Death

9/10 high dose females died between days 8 and 11. Other animals survived until the scheduled sacrifice on day 20.

Effects on Dams

Numerous adverse clinical findings like apathy, unsteady gait, chromodacryorrhea, poor general/nutritional state, salivation and urine smeared fur were observed in high dose animals before and/or after the daily intubation. Furthermore, the only surviving high dose dam, which resorbed all of its implants during late gestation, showed vaginal haemorrhage on days 12, 13 and 15. In mid dose animals, salivation was seen after the daily treatment between days 8 and 15.

Food consumption and hence body weight/body weight gain were statistically significantly reduced in mid and high dose females, primarily during the exposure period (days 6-15). The impairments were also shown to be statistically significant on the first day post exposure for food consumption and from days 8-20 for body weight in the only surviving high dose dam, when compared to controls.

Due to the resorption of all implants, uterus weight of this high dose dam was drastically reduced, while the significantly reduced mean uterus weight of the mid dose dams was caused by clear reductions in the foetal body weights in this group. Relative liver and kidney weights were statistically significantly increased (61% and 45% respectively) in the surviving high dose animal. A slight, but statistically significantly increase in relative liver weights (8%) occurred also in the mid dose animals. These findings were regarded to be treatment related.

At necropsy, stomach ulcerations and/or erosions were found in 4/10 high dose rats that died. The surviving high dose rat showed a papillomatous hyperplasia in the forestomach, probably attributed to the irritation properties of the test substance. All implants of this dam were resorbed, thus the post-implantation loss was 100%. Only small amounts of foetal tissue in addition to placental tissue were visible, in contrast to the usual appearance of the uterine mucosa, seen in late resorptions.

The conception rate reached 100% in all control and test groups except the mid dose group which reached 80%.

Effects on Foetus

Due to the premature death of all implants, no foetuses could be evaluated in the high dose group.

In the mid dose group, the mean foetal body weight was statistically significantly lower (10%) than the two control groups, and this was considered to be treatment related. In addition, the rate of skeletal malformations (36%) was distinctly increased as were the incidences of skeletal variations and retardations (68% and 98% affected foetuses/litter, respectively). The increased skeletal malformations and variations were predominantly due to the occurrence of asymmetrical dumbbell-shaped thoracic vertebral bodies and of irregular-shaped sternebrae and accessory 14th ribs, respectively. The increased rate of retardations in the skeletal maturation was in line with the lower mean foetal body weight, particularly substantiated by incompletely ossified skull bones and incompletely ossified or dumbbell-shaped (symmetrical) thoracic vertebral bodies in this test group. Thus, a dose of 790 mg/kg bw/day caused clear teratogenic effects and other signs of developmental toxicity.

Remarks – Results

There were no statistically significant and/or biological relevant differences between any dams/foetuses of the control and low dose test groups. Soft tissue malformations (dextrocardia) and variations (dilated renal pelvis and/or hydronephrosis) were assessed to be spontaneous in nature and hence not treatment related due to lack of a clear dose response relationship.

CONCLUSION

The No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) was established as 158 mg/kg bw/day in maternal and foetal subjects in this study, based on teratogenic effects.

TEST FACILITY

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (1995b)

8. ENVIRONMENT**8.1. Environmental fate****8.1.1. Ready biodegradability****TEST SUBSTANCE**

Analogue polymer [Lutensol XL80 - details are claimed exempt from publication]

METHOD

ISO 9439:1999 Water quality – Evaluation of ultimate aerobic biodegradability of organic compounds in aqueous medium: CO₂ Evolution, equivalent to OECD TG 301 B Ready Biodegradability: CO₂ Evolution (Modified Sturm).

Inoculum

Activated sludge from laboratory wastewater plants treating municipal sewage

Exposure Period

28 days

Auxiliary Solvent

None

Analytical Monitoring

CO₂ and DOC

Remarks - Method

Test was conducted in duplicate at a nominal concentration of 32 mg/L (equivalent to 20 mg/L TOC). % degradation = CO₂/ThCO₂, where ThCO₂ = theoretical CO₂ production calculated from elemental analysis. The combination of both CO₂ and DOC measurements allows a prediction of biodegradability and abiotic removal of the test substance, eg by adsorption onto sludge.

RESULTS

<i>Test Substance</i>			<i>Reference Substance – Aniline</i>		
<i>Day</i>	<i>% Degradation</i>	<i>% DOC Elimination</i>	<i>Day</i>	<i>% Degradation</i>	<i>% DOC Elimination</i>
1	0	19	1	0	0
5	3	55	5	28	92
10	20	54	10	52	89
14	33	60	14	68	90
21	47	62	21	83	90
28	63	74	28	101	100

Remarks - Results	The degradation of the analogue polymer was >60% within 28 days. It did not meet the OECD 10-day window criteria (60% degradation within 10 days of reaching 10%). However, as a surfactant the analogue polymer is possibly a multi-component substrate and typically characterised by different degradation steps. Thus the 10-day window criteria do not apply (CSTEE 1999 and in line with Regulation (EC) No. 648/2004), and it is considered readily biodegradable. The degradation of the reference substance and the inhibition control were >60% and >25% after 14 days respectively, confirming the validity of the test and that the notified polymer is not inhibitory to sewage microorganisms.
CONCLUSION	The analogue polymer is considered readily biodegradable.
TEST FACILITY	BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2003a)

8.1.2. Bioaccumulation

Remarks	No bioaccumulation study was provided for the notified polymer. However, based on the expected solubility and ready biodegradability of the notified polymer, there is a potential for bioaccumulation to occur.
---------	--

8.2. Ecotoxicological investigations

8.2.1. Chronic toxicity to fish

TEST SUBSTANCE	Analogue polymer [Lutensol XL80 - details are claimed exempt from publication]
METHOD	OECD TG 210 Fish Early Life Stage Toxicity Test. US EPA FIFRA 72-4(a) Fish Early Life Stage Toxicity Test. US EPA OPPTS 850.1400 Fish Early Life Stage Toxicity Test.
Species	<i>Pimephales promelas</i> (Fathead minnow)
Exposure Period	33 days (31 days after the start of hatch – day 2, and 28 days after the majority of larvae had hatched – day 5)
Auxiliary Solvent	None
Medium	Drinking water (unchlorinated)
Water Hardness	98-101 mg CaCO ₃ /L
Analytical Monitoring	TOC and LC/MS
Remarks – Method	Test was conducted under flow through conditions in four replicates with fertilised eggs of <6 h old at the start of exposure that were laid by 8 different breeding groups of fathead minnows. Statistical evaluation were Dunnett's test [a simultaneous comparison of several dose groups with the control – two sided] for body weights (wet and dry) and lengths of the fish, and Fisher's test [a pairwise comparison of each dose group with the control – one sided] for the embryo, larvae and fish survival. The temperature, pH, oxygen content, conductivity, acid capacity and total hardness were within acceptable limits over the exposure period.

RESULTS

Concentration (mg/L)	Nominal	Actual	Number of Fertilised Eggs	Mean Survival Rates (%) for		
				Embryo (Day 0)	Larvae (Day 0-9)	Young Fish (Day 9-33)
						Surviving Fish (Day 0 –33)
0.0		0.00	100	90	93	96
0.1		0.06 (60%)	100	92	90	99
0.3		0.19 (64%)	100	91	90	95
1.0		0.98 (98%)	100	89	88	96

3.0	2.78 (93%)	100	83	86	89	63
10.0	9.90 (99%)	100	32	0	0	0
NOEC and LOEC		NOEC = 0.98 mg/L and LOEC = 2.78 mg/L (measured concentrations) based on impairment of body weight/length or growth.				
Remarks – Results		<p>Over the 33-day exposure period, survival was statistically significantly decreased in comparison to the control group in all concentrations ≥ 3.0 mg/L. Mortality occurred predominantly during or shortly after hatch.</p> <p>A clear test substance related effect was the delayed time to hatch in the nominal concentration group of 10 mg/L (hatch started at day 3 of exposure and completed on day 7 vs 3-6 days in the control group). Body weight and length were statistically significantly reduced in the surviving fishes exposed to nominal concentrations ≥ 3.0 mg/L. No abnormalities in appearance or behaviour were observed in any of the test groups surviving until sacrifice.</p> <p>The two lower measured concentrations were below the nominal concentration on several occasions due to the unexpected rapid degradation of the test substance in the stock solution. Since these two concentrations were below NOEC, the deviation was not considered to affect the NOEC determination and therefore the validity of the results.</p>				
CONCLUSION		The analogue polymer is considered to be slightly toxic to fish (Mensink et al 1995).				
TEST FACILITY		BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2004)				

8.2.2. Acute toxicity to aquatic invertebrates

TEST SUBSTANCE	Notified polymer
METHOD	<p>OECD TG 202 <i>Daphnia</i> sp. Acute Immobilisation Test – Static.</p> <p>EC Directive 92/69/EEC C.2 Acute Toxicity for <i>Daphnia</i> – Static.</p> <p>US EPA OPPTS 850.1010 Aquatic Invertebrate Acute Toxicity Test, Freshwater Daphnids.</p> <p>ISO 6341:1998 Water quality – Determination of the inhibition of the mobility of <i>Daphnia magna</i> Straus (Cladocera, Crustacea) – Acute Toxicity Test.</p>
Species	<i>Daphnia magna</i>
Exposure Period	48 hours
Auxiliary Solvent	None
Medium	M4 water (ultrapure, demineralised, synthetic fresh water according to ISO 10706), then aerated with oxygen until saturation
Water Hardness	220-330 mg CaCO ₃ /L
Analytical Monitoring	Potentiographic titration with a surfactant sensitive electrode
Remarks - Method	Test was conducted in four replicates. Statistical evaluation for EC50 was the moving average method. The temperature, pH, and oxygen content were within acceptable limits during the test.

RESULTS

Concentration (mg/L) Nominal	Number of <i>D. magna</i>	Number Immobilised	
		24 h	48 h
0	20	20	19
6.25	20	20	20
12.5	20	20	19
25	20	18	13
50	20	15	8
100	20	0	0

LC50	37.3 mg/L (95%CI: 29.8-46.6) at 48 hours
Remarks - Results	The test concentrations remained stable with recovery >80% and thus nominal concentrations were presented without transformation.
CONCLUSION	The notified polymer is considered to be harmful to daphnia.
TEST FACILITY	BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2001d)

8.2.3. Algal growth inhibition test

TEST SUBSTANCE	Analogue polymer [Lutensol XL80 - details are claimed exempt from publication]
METHOD	OECD TG 201 Alga Growth Inhibition Test. EC Directive 92/69/EEC C.3 Algal Inhibition Test. US EPA OPPTS 850.5400 Alga Toxicity Test.
Species	<i>Desmodesmus subspicatus</i> CHODAT SAG 86.81
Exposure Period	96 hours
Concentration Range	
Nominal	0.391, 0.781, 1.56, 3.13, 6.25, 12.5, 25, 50, 100 mg/L
Auxiliary Solvent	None
Medium	Deionised water
Water Hardness	Not reported
Analytical Monitoring	In vivo chlorophyll-a-fluorescence at 0, 24, 48, 72, and 96 h
Remarks - Method	Three replicates per each test concentration and five replicates for the control were used. The stability of the test substance was guaranteed by the sponsor and thus no concentration control analysis were performed. The pH and temperature remained within acceptable limits during the test. The EC50 values were determined by linear regression analysis of the concentration response relationship.

RESULTS

<i>Biomass</i>		<i>Growth</i>	
<i>Nominal E_bC₅₀</i> <i>mg/L at 96 h</i>	<i>Nominal NOE_bC</i> <i>mg/L at 72 h</i>	<i>Nominal E_rC₅₀</i> <i>mg/L at 96 h</i>	<i>Nominal NOE_rC</i> <i>mg/L at 72 h</i>
23.2	6.25	40.2	6.25

Remarks - Results	The test appears to meet the validity criteria.
CONCLUSION	The analogue polymer is considered to be harmful to alga.
TEST FACILITY	BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2003b)

8.2.4. Inhibition of microbial activity

Remarks	Test was not conducted.
---------	-------------------------

9. RISK ASSESSMENT

9.1. Environment

9.1.1. Environment – exposure assessment

Potentially all of the notified polymer for industrial uses will be released into the sewer when used cleaning water is released. The notified polymer is considered to be relatively soluble in water and is considered readily biodegradable in the 28-day biodegradation test under the EU

conditions for surfactants (based on an analogue polymer). Therefore it is likely to be biodegradable in water and is unlikely to be adsorbed fully in the activated sludge or the sediments.

In calculating the Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC), the following were assumed: (1) usage of the maximum import volume of 200 tonnes is evenly distributed over a 365-day period; (2) usage is nationwide, with a population of 20.1 million contributing 200 L of water per person per day to the sewer; (3) there is no adsorption or degradation in the sewer prior to release. Hence, the daily PEC in a worst-case scenario in the sewage effluent is estimated as $[200 \times 10^{12} \mu\text{g} / (200 \text{ L} \times 20.1 \times 10^6 \text{ persons} \times 365 \text{ days})] = 136 \mu\text{g/L}$.

Due to lack of partition coefficient values, the modelling using the SimpleTreat model (European Commission, 2003) could not be performed for partitioning and losses of the notified polymer in sewage treatment plants (STP). Based on the adsorption data on activated sludge for the analogue Lutensol ON 110 as well as the biodegradability data after 1 day for the notified polymer, it is reasonable to assume that approximately 15% of the notified polymer will be absorbed in the sludge in a 24 h period. Therefore, the PEC in the sewage effluent is calculated to be $0.85 \times 136 = 116 \mu\text{g/L}$.

Based on the respective dilution factors of 1 and 10 for rural areas and coastal discharges of effluents, the PECs of the notified polymer in these watercourses may approximate 136 and 13.6 $\mu\text{g/L}$ or 116 and 11.6 $\mu\text{g/L}$ when mitigated, respectively.

9.1.2. Environment – effects assessment

The aquatic toxicity data are summarised as follows:

Algae: 96 h EC₅₀ = 23.2 mg/L; 72 h NOEC = 6.25 mg/L

Daphnia magna: 48 h EC₅₀ = 37.3 mg/L

Fathead minnow: 33 day (chronic) NOEC = 0.98 mg/L

The Predicted No Effect Concentration (PNEC) is 19.6 $\mu\text{g/L}$, using an Assessment Factor (AF) of 50 based on the availability of the notified polymer's acute ecotoxicity data for *Daphnia*, and analogue data for algae and the chronic NOEC for fish of 0.98 mg/L.

9.1.3. Environment – risk characterisation

The mitigated PECs and Risk Quotients (Q) for the aquatic environment are calculated below:

<i>Sewage effluent</i>	<i>PEC</i>	<i>Q</i>
Coastal city	11.6	$11.6/19.6 = 0.59$
Rural areas	116	$116/19.6 = 5.9$

The risk quotients indicate an acceptable risk ($Q < 1$) for marine release but a potential risk for freshwater organisms. However, since it is not expected that all will be released to the sewer or fresh water and given the industrial use, most will be used in major cities and thus the risk is acceptable. This assumes <15% will be released to fresh water. Should import levels rise above 200 tonnes per annum the risk needs to be revised. This will include a better estimate of the release to the sewer and acute fish test and chronic *Daphnia* test results should be provided to allow use of a lower assessment factor.

9.2. Human health

9.2.1. Occupational health and safety – exposure assessment

During transport and storage, workers are unlikely to be exposed to the notified polymer. In the event of an accident, spills will be removed in accord with the MSDS and government regulations.

During reformulation, blending, weighing or packing procedures, dermal and ocular exposure will potentially occur due to splashes, drips and spills of the notified polymer, particularly, when workers connect or disconnect transfer hoses, pump the notified polymer from bulk containers into a blend tank, or pack the final cleaning product into consumer containers. Workers may also

make dermal contact with contaminated surfaces when inserting bungs and labelling the containers and residues of the notified polymer when flushing blend tanks and transfer lines to effluent. However, the blending and packaging processes are mainly semi-automated and will occur in an enclosed system, worker intervention is not required unless the machine malfunctions or needs adjustment. The plant operators generally receive adequate training in handling surfactants and detergents, observe safe work practices and wear personal protective equipment such as gloves, chemical goggles, protective clothing, and respirators when required.

During end use in industrial cleaning tasks exposure would be widespread, frequent and extensive. However, workers will wear gloves, overalls and safety boots.

Overall, on the basis of the engineering controls, industrial hygiene, safe work practices and personal protective equipment, occupational exposure to the notified polymer would be limited.

9.2.2. Public health – exposure assessment

The industrial cleaning products containing the notified polymer are not available for sale to the public. The potential for public exposure to the notified polymer via dermal contact with hard surfaces cleaned with these products is assessed as being sporadic and negligible.

9.2.3. Human health – effects assessment

Based on the available toxicity data, the notified polymer is expected to be harmful if swallowed (LD50 per oral, rat: $200 < \text{LD50} \leq 2000$ mg/kg bw). It would be a skin irritant and may cause serious damage to eyes on exposure. As a non-ionic surfactant, the notified polymer would have low sensitising potential, however, long-term exposure can lead to a weakening of the skin barrier by helping the transport of molecules (KCPC, 2004). The NOAEL was established as 150 (male) and 30 (female) mg/kg bw/day in a 28-day repeat dose oral study in rats, based on effects of the analogue A on the liver, particularly the increased liver weight and cyanide-insensitive palmitoyl-CoA-oxidation. In the developmental toxicity study of the same analogue submitted, the NOAEL was established as 158 mg/kg bw/day in maternal and foetal subjects, based on teratogenic effects. The notified polymer is expected to be negative in vitro and in vivo genotoxicity assays.

Based on the available data the notified polymer is classified as hazardous under the NOHSC *Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances* (NOHSC, 2004).

9.2.4. Occupational health and safety – risk characterisation

The notified polymer is a hazardous chemical based on the available toxicological data. However, the OHS risk presented by the notified polymer would be low, given the automated process and engineering controls implemented at customer blending facilities, the industrial hygiene, the good work practices and safety measures including use of appropriate personal protective equipment by workers. Moreover, the notified polymer will be used at formulation sites where operatives are familiar in using such products and good handling procedures and housekeeping are the norm.

Large numbers of industrial cleaning workers will be potentially exposed to products containing the notified polymer. However, they are expected to be adequately trained and to wear suitable protective clothing and gloves when carrying out these activities. While oral exposure is unlikely, workers are advised to avoid eye and skin contact with products containing it and observe general hygiene practices such as washing of hands thoroughly once completing their cleaning tasks. In addition, although the concentration of the notified polymer in these end use cleaning products will not exceed 10%, the products are hazardous (see the hazard classification below).

9.2.5. Public health – risk characterisation

Given the notified polymer will only be used in the cleaning industry, the risk to public health is considered negligible.

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

10.1. Hazard classification

Based on the available data the notified polymer is classified as hazardous under the NOHSC *Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances*. The classification and labelling details are:

- R22 – Harmful if swallowed;
- R38 – Irritating to skin;
- R41 – Risk of serious damage to eyes

As a comparison only, the classification of notified polymer 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.

The notified polymer is classified as harmful if swallowed (category 4), irritant to skin (category 2), and serious damage to eyes (category 1) under the GHS.

10.2. Environmental risk assessment

On the basis of the PEC/PNEC ratio, the notified polymer 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 Moderate Concern to occupational health and safety under the conditions of the occupational settings described.

10.3.2. Public health

There is Negligible Concern to public health when used in the proposed manner.

11. MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET

11.1. Material Safety Data Sheet

The MSDS of the notified polymer and product containing it (Degrease-It) provided by the notifier were in accordance with the NOHSC *National Code of Practice for the Preparation of Material Safety Data Sheets* (NOHSC, 2003). They are 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 notified polymer and product containing it (Degrease-It) provided by the notifier were 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 NOHSC Chemicals Standards Sub-committee should consider the following health hazard classification for the notified polymer:
 - R22 – Harmful if swallowed;
 - R38 – Irritating to skin;
 - R41 – Risk of serious damage to eyes
- Use the following risk phrases for products/mixtures containing the notified polymer:

- conc \geq 25%: R22 – Harmful if swallowed; R38 – Irritating to skin; R41 – Risk of serious damage to eyes;
- conc \geq 20%: R38 – Irritating to skin; R41 – Risk of serious damage to eyes;
- conc \geq 10%: R41 – Risk of serious damage to eyes;
- 5% \leq conc < 10%: R36 – Irritating to eyes.

CONTROL MEASURES

Occupational Health and Safety

- Employers should implement the following engineering controls to minimise occupational exposure to the notified polymer introduced as a pure substance:
 - Enclosed and automated processes at the blending and packaging sites, including use of semi-automated filling machines and metered pumps;
 - Adequate ventilation for the plant operators.
- Employers should implement the following safe work practices to minimise occupational exposure during handling of the notified polymer during reformulation and end use:
 - Adequate training for staff in handling nonionic surfactants;
 - Implementation of general health surveillance and monitoring programs as required.
- Employers should ensure that the following personal protective equipment is used by workers to minimise occupational exposure to the notified polymer during reformulation and end use:
 - Chemical goggles/face shields for plant operators;
 - Industrial standard protective clothing and impermeable gloves for plant operators and cleaning staff;
 - Vapour masks or appropriate respirators if required.

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 polymer 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.

Disposal

- The notified polymer should be disposed of to secure landfill or incineration.

Emergency procedures

- Spills/release of the notified polymer should be handled by containment with suitable absorbents, collection and storage in a sealable and labelled container for disposal in accord with local regulations.

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(1) of the Act; if
 - Concentration of the notified polymer exceeds 10% in end use products;
 - Import volume exceeds 200 tonnes per annum, it is required a better estimate of the release to the sewer, particularly in the rural areas, and acute fish and chronic

Daphnia magna test reports should be submitted for assessment.

or

- (2) 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.

13. BIBLIOGRAPHY

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (1995a) Study of [Analogue A] in the Ames test. Project no. 40M0279/944240. Germany, Department of Toxicology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (1995b) Study of the prenatal toxicity of [Analogue A] in Wistar rats after oral administration (gavage) – Screening. Project no. 10R0279/94014. Germany, Department of Toxicology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (1996) [Analogue A] – Subchronic oral toxicity study in Fischer F-344 rats, administration by gavage for 3 months. Project no. 51C0279/94026. Germany, Department of Toxicology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2001a) [Notified polymer, Lutensol XL 800] – Acute oral toxicity study in Wistar rats. Project no. 10A0238/011022. Germany, Experimental Toxicology and Ecology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2001b) [Notified polymer, Lutensol XL 800] – Acute dermal irritation/corrosion in rabbits. Project no. 18H0238/012073. Germany, Experimental Toxicology and Ecology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2001c) [Notified polymer, Lutensol XL 800] – Acute eye irritation in rabbits. Project no. 11H0238/012074. Germany, Experimental Toxicology and Ecology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2001d) [Notified polymer, Lutensol XL 800] – Determination of the acute effect on the swimming ability of the water flea *Daphnia magna* straus. Project no. 01/0238/50/1. Germany, Experimental Toxicology and Ecology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2002) [Analogue Lutensol ON 110] – Determination of the adsorption of substances on activated sludge. Project no. 02/0591/13/1. Germany, Experimental Toxicology and Ecology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2003a) [Analogue Lutensol ES 94013 or Lutensol XL 80] – Determination of the biodegradability and the elimination in the CO₂/DOC combination test. Project no. 03/0154/29/1. Germany, Experimental Toxicology and Ecology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2003b) [Analogue Eusapon LD 6031 or Lutensol XL 80] – Determination of the inhibitory effect on the cell multiplication of unicellular green algae. Project no. 03/0324/60/1. Germany, Experimental Toxicology and Ecology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF Aktiengesellschaft (2004) [Analogue Eusapon OD or Lutensol XL 80] – Early life-stage toxicity test on the fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*). Project no. 51F0324/035054. Germany, Experimental Toxicology and Ecology, BASF Aktiengesellschaft (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF GKA Analytik (2001) Characterisation of [notified polymer, Eusapon LD 6026]. Study no. 01L00346. Germany, GKA Analytik, BASF (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

BASF GKA Analytik (2002) Stability of [notified polymer, Eusapon LD 6026]. Study no. 02L00183. Germany, GKA Analytik, BASF (unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

CSTEE (1999) Opinion on a proposed “ready biodegradability” approach to update detergents legislation. The Scientific Committee on Toxicity, Ecotoxicity and the Environment.

- European Commission (2003) Technical Guidance Document in Support of Commission Directive 93/67/EEC on Risk Assessment for New Notified Substances, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 on Risk Assessment for existing substances and Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market. Part II, Appendix II <<http://ecb.jrc.it/php-bin/reframer.php?B=/TGD>> Accessed 2005.
- KCPC (2004) Nonionic surfactants. Key Centre for Polymer Colloids, School of Chemistry, University of Sydney <http://www.kcpc.usyd.edu.au/discovery/9.5.5/9.5.5_nonionic.html>. Accessed 2004 November 24.
- Mensink BJWG, Montforts M, Wijkhuizen-Maslankiewicz L, Tibosch H, & Linders JBHJ (1995) Manual for summarising and evaluating the environmental aspects of pesticides. Report No. 679101022. National Institute of Public Health and Environmental Protection, Bilthoven, The Netherlands.
- 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.
- Talmage SS (1994) Environmental and human safety of major surfactants: alcohol ethoxylates and alkylphenol ethoxylates. A report to the Soap and Detergent Association. Boca Raton, Lewis Publishers.
- 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.