

310 µg/L for public freshwater bodies and around less than 0.14 µg/L for seawater. However, there is a report of a maximum of 900 µg/L for public freshwater bodies and seawater, albeit in an environmental survey of a limited area. When releases to public freshwater bodies in fiscal 2012 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 2400 µg/L.

3. Initial assessment of health risk

This substance causes irritation to the eyes. Coughing may occur when inhaled. Contact of the substance with the eyes may cause redness.

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

With regard to the oral exposure to the substance, the NOAEL of 12.5 mg/kg/day (based on follicular hyperplasia of thyroid gland), obtained for mid-term and long-term toxicity tests on rats, was considered to be the reliable lowest dose of the substance and was identified as its 'non-toxic level*'. As for the inhalation exposure to the substance, the 'non-toxic level*' could not be established.

Regarding the oral exposure to the substance, the predicted maximum exposure was approximately 12 µg/kg/day, assuming water from public water bodies and freshwater was ingested. The MOE (Margin of Exposure) of 100 was derived from the substance's 'non-toxic level*' of 12.5 mg/kg/day and the predicted maximum exposure concentration and after the division by a factor of 10 to convert animal data to human data. Meanwhile, the MOE of 35 was derived from the oral exposure concentration of 36µg/kg/day, calculated from data on public water bodies and freshwater in limited areas. In addition, the MOE of 13 was derived from the maximum exposure level of 96 µg/kg/day, calculated itself from concentrations in effluents from high discharging plants, according to the reported emissions in public water bodies and freshwater reported in FY 2012 under the PRTR Law. As the exposure to the substance in the environment through diet is limited, the MOE would not change significantly even when this exposure is included. Therefore, collection of further information would be required to assess the health risk for oral exposure to this substance.

Concerning the inhalation exposure to the substance, the absence of information on exposure concentrations in ambient air did not allow the health risk assessment. In addition, assuming a 100 % absorption, and converting the 'non-toxic level*' for oral exposure to the inhalation one, the 'non-toxic level*' would be 42 mg/m³. The maximum concentration in ambient air in the high discharging plants area was estimated to be 0.00030 µg/m³ (annual mean), calculated from the emissions reported in FY 2012 under the PRTR Law. The MOE of 14,000,000 was derived from this level and after the division by a factor of 10 to convert animal data to human data. Therefore, collection of further information would not be required to assess the health risk for the inhalation exposure to this substance in 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*' 12.5 mg/kg/day	Rat	Follicular hyperplasia of thyroid gland	Drinking water	— µg/kg/day	MOE	—	×	(▲)
				Freshwater	12 µg/kg/day	MOE	100	○	
Inhalation	'Non-toxic level*' — mg/m ³	—	—	Ambient air	— µg/m ³	MOE	—	×	(○)
				Indoor air	— µg/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 96-h EC₅₀ of 6,800 µg/L for growth inhibition in the green alga *Desmodesmus subspicatus*, a 48-h EC₅₀ of 16,000 µg/L for swimming inhibition in the crustacean *Daphnia magna*, a 96-h LC₅₀ exceeding 110,000 µg/L for the fish species *Oryzias latipes* (medaka), and a 48-h EC₅₀ exceeding 50,000 µg/L for behavioral inhibition in the mollusk *Dreissena polymorpha* (zebra mussel). Accordingly, based on these acute toxicity values and an assessment factor of 100, a predicted no effect concentration (PNEC) of 68 µg/L was obtained.

With regard to chronic toxicity, the following reliable data were obtained: a 72-h NOEC of 32,000 µg/L for growth inhibition in the green alga *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*, and a 21-d NOEC of 1,800 µg/L for reproductive inhibition in the crustacean *D. magna*. Accordingly, based on these chronic toxicity values and an assessment factor of 100, a PNEC of 18 µg/L was obtained.

The value of 18 µg/L obtained from the chronic toxicity to the crustacean was used as the PNEC for this substance.

The PEC/PNEC ratio is 17 for freshwater bodies and less than 0.008 for seawater; accordingly, the substance is considered as a candidate for further work.

Hazard assessment (basis for PNEC)			Assessment coefficient	Predicted no effect concentration PNEC (µg/L)	Exposure assessment		PEC/PNEC ratio	Judgment based on PEC/PNEC ratio	Assessment result
Species	Acute/ chronic	End point			Water body	Predicted environmental concentration PEC (µg/L)			
Crustacean <i>Daphnia magna</i>	Chronic	NOEC reproductive inhibition	100	18	Freshwater	310	17	■	■
					Seawater	<0.14	<0.008		

5. Conclusions

	Conclusions		Judgment
Health risk	Oral exposure	Further information collection would be required for risk characterization.	(▲)
	Inhalation exposure	Although risk to human health could not be confirmed, collection of further information would not be required.	(○)
Ecological risk	Candidates for further work.		■

[Risk judgments] ○: No need for further work ▲: Requiring information collection
 ■: Candidates for further work ×: Impossibility of risk characterization
 (○) : Although risk to human health could not be confirmed, collection of further information would not be required.
 (▲) : Further information collection would be required for risk characterization.