

0.1 µg/L for public freshwater bodies and around 0.051 µg/L for seawater. When releases to public freshwater bodies in fiscal 2011 reported according to the PRTR Law were divided by the ordinary water discharge of the national river channel structure database, estimating the concentration in rivers by taking into consideration only dilution gave a maximum value of 0.44 µg/L.

3. Initial assessment of health risk

This substance may cause corrosion to eyes, skin and respiratory tract. Inhalation exposure to the substance may cause coughing, burning sensation, shortness of breath and labored breathing. Pulmonary edema may occur when its vapors are inhaled. Exposure to the substance through oral ingestion may also cause stomach convulsions, abdominal pain, burning sensation and weakness and even corrosion. Contact of the substance with skin may cause redness, skin burns, pain and blisters, while its contact with eyes may cause redness, pain, loss of vision and severe burns.

As sufficient information was not available to evaluate carcinogenicity of the substance, an initial assessment was conducted on the basis of information on its non-carcinogenic effects.

With regard to oral exposure to the substance, its 'non-toxic level*' could not be identified. As for its inhalation exposure, a LOAEL of 20 ppm (for inflammation and generation in anterior nasal concha) obtained from its mid-term and long-term toxicity tests on rats was adjusted for their durations to provide 3.6 ppm (13 mg/m³) for its intermittent to continuous exposure, and divided by a factor of 10 for conservative use of the LOAEL. Outcome of 0.13 mg/m³ was identified to be the reliable lowest dose and its 'non-toxic level*'.

With regard to oral exposure to the substance, its health risk could not be assessed as its 'non-toxic level*' could not be identified. However, if a LOAEL of 5 mg/kg/day were assumed on the basis of its mid-term and long-term toxicity tests on rats, this LOAEL would be divided by a factor of 10 for conservative use of the LOAEL and further divided by a factor of 10 for their short test periods, to provide 0.05 mg/kg/day as its 'non-toxic level*'. The MOE (Margin of Exposure) would be 1,300 when calculated from its 'non-toxic level*' of 0.05 mg/kg/day and its maximum exposure level predicted from its concentrations in freshwater in public water bodies and divided by a factor of 10 to convert animal data to human data. In addition, the MOE would be 280 when calculated for reference from this level and its maximum concentration of 0.018 µg/kg/day in river water with effluents from operators discharging the substance in high concentrations in their discharges reported in FY 2011 under the PRTR Law. Meanwhile, except for the direct effects on respiratory tracts, which are specific to its inhalation exposure in mid-term and long-term toxicity tests on rates, effects on the body weight, liver weight, nodus lymphaticus mandibularis and kidneys were observed in animals of 300 ppm dose group, and its 'non-toxic level*' was obtained from this. If a NOAEL of 100 ppm were assumed for the systemic effects from its inhalation exposure, this NOAEL would be adjusted for their durations to provide 18 ppm (63 mg/m³) for its intermittent to continuous exposure and divided by a factor of 10 due to their short test periods, and 6.3 mg/m³ would be identified as its 'non-toxic level*'. If 100 % absorption were assumed, the 'non-toxic level*' for its inhalation exposure would be converted to the 'non-toxic level*' of 1.9 mg/kg/day for its oral exposure. The MOE would be 48,000 when calculated for reference from this level and its maximum exposure concentration in freshwater in public water bodies predicted from animal experiments and divided by a factor of 10 to convert animal data to human data. Moreover, the MOE would be 11,000 when calculated from its maximum exposure concentration in river water with effluents from operators discharging the substance in high concentrations. As its exposure in the environment through food intakes would be limited, the MOE would not change significantly even when this exposure was included. Therefore, collection of further information would not be required at this moment to assess health risk from oral exposure to the substance.

As for inhalation exposure to the substance, its mean exposure concentration in the ambient air was below

about 0.00077 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ while its maximum exposure concentration was predicted to be about 0.0028 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The MOE would be 4,600 when calculated from its predicted maximum exposure concentration and its ‘non-toxic level*’ of 0.13 mg/m^3 from animal experiments and divided by a factor of 10 to convert animal data to human data. Meanwhile, the MOE would be 3 when calculated for reference from its maximum (annual mean) concentration of 3.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in the ambient air near the operators discharging it in high concentrations in their emissions reported in FY 2011 under the PRTR Law. Therefore, collection of further information would be required to assess health risk from inhalation exposure to the substance in the ambient air.

Exposure Path	Toxicity			Exposure assessment		Result of risk assessment			Judgment
	Criteria for risk assessment	Animal	Criteria for diagnoses (endpoint)	Exposure medium	Predicted maximum exposure dose and concentration				
Oral	‘Non-toxic level*’ - $\text{mg}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$	-	-	Drinking water	- $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$	MOE	-	×	()
				Freshwater	0.004 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$	MOE	-	×	
Inhalation	‘Non-toxic level*’ 0.13 mg/m^3	Rat	Inflammation and generation in anterior nasal concha	Ambient air	0.0028 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	MOE	4,600		()
				Indoor air	- $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	MOE	-	×	×

Non-toxic level *

- When a LOAEL is available, it is divided by 10 to obtain a NOAEL-equivalent level.
- When an adverse effect level for the short-term exposure is available, it is divided by 10 to obtain a level equivalent to an adverse effect level for the long-term exposure.

4. Initial assessment of ecological risk

With regard to acute toxicity, the following reliable data were obtained: a 72-h EC_{50} of 45,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ for growth inhibition in the green alga *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*, a 48-h LC_{50} of 210,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ in the crustacean calanoid copepod *Acartia tonsa*, and a 96-h LC_{50} of 85,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ for the fish species *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (rainbow trout). Accordingly, based on these acute toxicity values and an assessment factor of 100, a predicted no effect concentration (PNEC) of 450 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ was obtained.

With regard to chronic toxicity, the following reliable data were obtained: a 72-h NOEC of 8,200 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ for growth inhibition in the green alga *P. subcapitata*, a 21-d NOEC of 53,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ for reproductive inhibition in the crustacean *Daphnia magna*, and a 2-d NOEC of 50,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ for reproductive inhibition in the marine rotifer *Brachionus calyciflorus*. Accordingly, based on these chronic toxicity values and an assessment factor of 100, a PNEC of 82 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ was obtained.

The value of 82 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ obtained from the chronic toxicity to algae was used as the PNEC for this substance.

The PEC/PNEC ratio was 0.001 for freshwater bodies and 0.0006 for seawater. In addition, the river concentration estimated by using releases reported according to the PRTR Law and taking only dilution into consideration gives 0.44 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$, resulting in a ratio to PNEC that is less than 0.1. Accordingly, further work on this substance is considered unnecessary at this time.

Hazard assessment (basis for PNEC)			Assessment factor	Predicted no effect concentration PNEC ($\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$)	Exposure assessment		PEC/PNEC ratio	Judgment based on PEC/PNEC ratio	Assessment result
Species	Acute/chronic	Endpoint			Water body	Predicted environmental concentration PEC ($\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$)			
Green algae	Chronic	NOEC Growth inhibition	100	82	Freshwater	0.1	0.001		
					Seawater	0.051	0.0006		

5. Conclusions

	Conclusions		Judgment
Health risk	Oral exposure	Although risk to human health could not be confirmed, collection of further information would not be required.	()
	Inhalation exposure	Collection of further information would be required.	()
Ecological risk	No need of further work at present.		

[Risk judgments] : No need for further work ▲: Requiring information collection
 ■: Candidates for further work ×: Impossibility of risk characterization
 () : Though a risk characterization cannot be determined, there would be little necessity of collecting information.
 (▲) : Further information collection would be required for risk characterization.