



red blood cells, hemoglobin levels and hematocrit levels) for female animals obtained from its mid-term and long-term toxicity tests on rats was adjusted for their durations to provide 186 ppm (560 mg/m<sup>3</sup>) for its intermittent to continuous exposure and divided by a factor of 10 due to their short test periods. 56 mg/m<sup>3</sup> was identified to be the reliable lowest dose as its ‘non-toxic level\*’.

As for its oral exposure, its maximum exposure concentration was predicted to be approximately 0.011 µg/kg/day, when its intakes through freshwater from public water bodies were assumed. The MOE (Margin of Exposure) would be 2,700,000 when calculated from the substance’s ‘non-toxic level\*’ of 297 mg/kg/day and the maximum exposure concentration predicted from animal experiments and divided by a factor of 10 to convert animal data to human. As exposure to the substance in the environment through food intakes would be limited, the MOE would not change significantly even when this exposure was included. Therefore, no further action would be required at this moment to assess its health risk from oral exposure.

With regard to inhalation exposure to the substance, the maximum exposure concentration in the ambient air was predicted to be about 0.74 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. The MOE would be 7,600 when calculated from the substance’s ‘non-toxic level\*’ of 56 mg/m<sup>3</sup> and the maximum exposure concentration predicted from animal experiments and divided by a factor of 10 to convert animal data to human. As for concentrations in the indoor air, the MOE would be 470 when the maximum exposure concentration was predicted to be approximately 12 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, no further action would be required at this moment to assess health risk from its inhalation both in the ambient air and in the indoor air.

| Toxicity      |  |        | Exposure assessment  |                 |   | Result of risk assessment |           |   | Judgment |
|---------------|--|--------|--|-----------------|---|---------------------------|-----------|---|----------|
| Exposure Path | Criteria for risk assessment               | Animal | Criteria for diagnoses (endpoint)                                  | Exposure medium | Predicted maximum exposure dose and concentration |                           |           |   |          |
| Oral          | ‘Non-toxic level*’<br>297 mg/kg/day        | Rat    | Increased kidney weight  | Drinking water  | - µg/kg/day                                       | MOE                       | -         | x |          |
|               |  |        |  | Freshwater      | 0.011 µg/kg/day                                   | MOE                       | 2,700,000 |   |          |
| Inhalation    | ‘Non-toxic level*’<br>56 mg/m <sup>3</sup> | Rat    | Increased red blood cells, hemoglobin levels and hematocrit levels | Ambient air     | 0.74 µg/m <sup>3</sup>                            | MOE                       | 7,600     |   |          |
|               |  |        |  | Indoor air      | 12 µg/m <sup>3</sup>                              | MOE                       | 470       |   |          |

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 48-h EC<sub>50</sub> of 2,300,000 µg/L for growth inhibition in the green alga *Desmodesmus subspicatus*, a 96-h LC<sub>50</sub> of 949,000 µg/L for the crustacean *Orconectes immunis* (North American freshwater crayfish), a 96-h LC<sub>50</sub> of 1,330,000 µg/L for the fish species *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (rainbow trout), and a 48-h LC<sub>50</sub> of 2,090,000 µg/L for the midge *Tanytarsus dissimilis*. Accordingly, based on these acute toxicity values and an assessment factor of 100, a predicted no effect concentration (PNEC) of 9,490 µg/L was obtained.

With regard to chronic toxicity, a 21-d NOEC of 4,000 µg/L for reproductive inhibition in the crustacean *Daphnia magna* was obtained as a reliable data. Accordingly, based on this chronic toxicity value and an assessment factor of 100, a PNEC of 40 µg/L was obtained.

The value of 40 µg/L obtained from the chronic toxicity to the crustacean was used as the PNEC for this substance.

The PEC/PNEC ratio was 0.007 for both freshwater bodies and seawater. Accordingly, further work is considered unnecessary at this time.

| Hazard assessment (basis for PNEC) |                |                                 | Assessment factor | Predicted no effect concentration PNEC (µg/L) | Exposure assessment |  | PEC/PNEC ratio | Judgment based on PEC/PNEC ratio | Assessment result |
|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|---|---------------------|--|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Species                            | Acute/ chronic | Endpoint                        |                   |   | Water body          | Predicted environmental concentration PEC (µg/L) |                |                                  |                   |
| Crustacean<br><i>Daphnia magna</i> | Chronic        | NOEC<br>Reproductive inhibition | 100               | 40  | Freshwater          | 0.27   | 0.007          |                                  |                   |
|                                    |                |                                 |                   |   | Seawater            | 0.29   | 0.007          |                                  |                   |

-----

## 5. Conclusions

|                 | Conclusions                         |                           | Judgment |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| Health risk     | Oral exposure                       | No need for further work. |          |
|                 | Inhalation exposure                 | No need for further work. |          |
| 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.