

File No: LTD/1432

January 2010

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

**FULL PUBLIC REPORT**

**Component 2 in CYCOM 5250-4 RTM Resin**

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, Water, Heritage and the Arts.

For the purposes of subsection 78(1) of the Act, this Full Public Report may be inspected at our NICNAS office by appointment only at 334-336 Illawarra Road, Marrickville NSW 2204.

This Full Public Report is also 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:        | <a href="http://www.nicnas.gov.au">www.nicnas.gov.au</a>   |

**Director  
NICNAS**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <u>FULL PUBLIC REPORT</u> .....   | 3  |
| 1. APPLICANT AND NOTIFICATION DETAILS.....                                      | 3  |
| 2. IDENTITY OF CHEMICAL .....   | 3  |
| 3. COMPOSITION.....   | 3  |
| 4. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES.....  | 4  |
| 5. INTRODUCTION AND USE INFORMATION.....  | 4  |
| 6. HUMAN HEALTH IMPLICATIONS.....   | 5  |
| 7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS .....   | 7  |
| 8. CONCLUSIONS AND REGULATORY OBLIGATIONS.....                                  | 9  |
| <u>APPENDIX A: PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES</u> .....                       | 12 |
| <u>APPENDIX B: TOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS</u> .....                           | 13 |
| <u>APPENDIX C: ENVIRONMENTAL FATE AND ECOTOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS</u> ..... | 20 |
| <u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u> .....   | 22 |

**FULL PUBLIC REPORT****Component 2 in CYCOM 5250-4 RTM Resin****1. APPLICANT AND NOTIFICATION DETAILS**

## APPLICANT(S)

Cytec Australia Holdings Pty Ltd (ABN: 45 081 148 629)  
Suite 1, Level 1 Norwest Quay  
21 Solent Circuit  
Norwest Business Park  
Baulkham Hills NSW 2153

Boeing Aerostructures Australia Pty Limited (ABN: 15 103 165 466)  
226 Lorimer Street  
Port Melbourne VIC 3207

## NOTIFICATION CATEGORY

Limited-small volume: Chemical other than polymer (1 tonne or less 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, purity, impurities and use details.

## VARIATION OF DATA REQUIREMENTS (SECTION 24 OF THE ACT)

Variation to the schedule of data requirements is claimed as follows: melting point, boiling point, density, vapour pressure, hydrolysis as a function of pH, partition coefficient, adsorption/desorption, dissociation constant, flash point, flammability and autoignition temperature.

## PREVIOUS NOTIFICATION IN AUSTRALIA BY APPLICANT(S)

CEC/682  
CER/19

## NOTIFICATION IN OTHER COUNTRIES

None

**2. IDENTITY OF CHEMICAL**

## MARKETING NAME(S)

CYCOM 5250-4 RTM Resin (contains 10-30% of the notified chemical)

## OTHER NAME(S)

TDAB

## MOLECULAR WEIGHT

< 500 Da

## ANALYTICAL DATA

Reference IR spectra were provided.

**3. COMPOSITION**

DEGREE OF PURITY > 95%

ADDITIVES/ADJUVANTS None

#### 4. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

APPEARANCE AT 20°C AND 101.3 kPa: Yellow powder

| Property                                | Value  | Data Source/Justification   |
|---|--|---|
| Melting Point                           | 175°C  | MSDS  |
| Boiling Point                           | 511°C at 101.3 kPa   | Calculated  |
| Density                                 | 620 kg/m <sup>3</sup> (bulk density)   | MSDS  |
| Vapour Pressure                         | 1.33 × 10 <sup>-11</sup> kPa   | Calculated  |
| Water Solubility                        | 0.060 g/L at 20°C  | Measured  |
| Hydrolysis as a Function of pH          | Not determined.  | The notified chemical contains groups that can undergo hydrolysis, but typically only under conditions of extreme temperature and pH. |
| Partition Coefficient (n-octanol/water) | log P <sub>ow</sub> = -0.0036  | Estimated using KOWWIN (v1.67)  |
| Adsorption/Desorption                   | log K <sub>oc</sub> = 0.8743 – 2.7051  | Estimated using KOCWIN (v2.00)  |
| Dissociation Constant                   | Not determined   | The notified chemical does not have any groups that can dissociate in water.  |
| Particle Size                           | Inhalable fraction (<100 µm): 100%<br>Respirable fraction (<10 µm): > 85%<br>MMAD* = 1.8 -3.1 µm | Measured  |
| Flash Point                             | Not determined   | Given the physical state and low vapour pressure the flash point is likely to be high.  |
| Flammability                            | Not highly flammable   | Measured  |
| Autoignition Temperature                | Not determined   | Expected to be high based on the lack of flammability.  |
| Explosive Properties                    | Not expected to be explosive   | The structural formula contains no explosives.  |

\* MMAD = Mass Median Aerodynamic Diameter

#### DISCUSSION OF PROPERTIES

For full details of tests on physical and chemical properties, refer to Appendix A.

#### Reactivity

The notified chemical is not expected to be stable at temperatures significantly above room temperature based on its use in the manufacture of heat-cured composite structures. The notified chemical also appears to undergo reactions in water that may involve hydrolysis.

#### 5. INTRODUCTION AND USE INFORMATION

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

The notified chemical will not be manufactured within Australia.

The notified chemical will be imported as a resin (CYCOM 5250-4RTM) at up to 30% concentration.

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

| Year   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tonnes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

##### PORT OF ENTRY

Sydney and Melbourne.

##### IDENTITY OF MANUFACTURER/RECIPIENTS

Cytec Australia Holdings Pty Ltd

Suite 1, Level 1 Norwest Quay  
21 Solent Circuit  
Norwest Business Park  
Baulkham Hills NSW 2153

Boeing Aerostructures Australia Pty Limited  
226 Lorimer Street  
Port Melbourne VIC 3207

#### TRANSPORTATION AND PACKAGING

The notified chemical will be imported in 20 L sealed pails as a resin. It is anticipated that it may also be introduced in 4 L pails. The pails will be transported by road from the wharf to the customer's warehouse.

#### USE

The notified chemical will be imported as a component of resin (up to 30%) for the manufacture of composite materials.

#### OPERATION DESCRIPTION

The notified chemical will not be manufactured or reformulated within Australia.

Truck drivers will transport the sealed CYCOM 5250-4 RTM resin (10-30% notified chemical) containers by road from the wharf to the customer's warehouse and then used as needed. Two incoming goods receiving personnel will unload the containers of CYCOM 5250-4 RTM resin for storage in designated refrigeration equipment.

The CYCOM 5250-4 RTM resin containing the notified chemical will be moulded into articles at the customer's manufacturing site. CYCOM 5250-4 RTM resin will be used in a closed mould process known to the aerospace industry as Resin Transfer Moulding (RTM). In this process the resin will be removed from refrigeration (the resin is a one part, self catalysed system and will undergo slow, non facile curing at room temperature and above, thus requiring cold temperature storage) and allowed to warm to room temperature. The resin, in a solid state after refrigerated storage, will be transferred manually to a sealed pressure pot (4 L capacity) of the injection moulding system, which extrudes the resin into the mould under heat and pressure conditions. The resin will be then injected into the mould at a temperature range of 90°C – 120°C. The mould will be sealed from atmosphere and internal pressure maintained while the temperature is elevated to a cure temperature of 190°C for 3 hours. After this initial cure process the matrix is near fully cross-linked. An in-situ post cure is then performed at 210°C for 4 hours. The post cure stage increases the glass transition temperature (T<sub>g</sub>) of the polymer matrix to allow continuous service of the finished part in operating temperatures of 180°C. The above processes will be carried out under local exhaust ventilation.

## 6. HUMAN HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

### 6.1 Exposure assessment

### 6.1.1 Occupational exposure

#### NUMBER AND CATEGORY OF WORKERS

| <i>Category of Worker</i>   | <i>Number</i> | <i>Exposure Duration<br/>(hours/day)</i> | <i>Exposure Frequency<br/>(days/year)</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|
| <i>Transport and storage</i>  |               |  |   |
| Transporting from dock to customer's site for warehousing                         | 2             | 2 – 3                                    | 10 – 15                                   |
| <i>Manufacture of parts</i>   |               |  |   |
| Workers involved in introducing CYCOM® 5259-4 RTM resin to resin moulding machine | 2-4           | 0.5 – 6                                  | 30  |
| Quality control/chemists and technical service                                    | 4-8           | 1  | 30  |
| Workers involved in packaging of parts  | 4             | 3  | 30  |
| <i>End-use in Aerospace industry</i>  |               |  |   |
| Assembly of aircrafts   | 10-15         | 6 – 8                                    | 50  |

#### EXPOSURE DETAILS

##### *Transport and Storage*

Waterfront, transport and warehouse workers will not be exposed to the notified chemical (10-30% in CYCOM 5250-4 RTM resin) except in an accident.

##### *Manufacture of parts*

Dermal and ocular exposure to the notified chemical will be possible when manually transferring the resin (10-30% notified chemical) to the pressure pot, during equipment maintenance or quality control testing. Exposure is expected to be minimised by the use of PPE including coveralls, goggles and gloves. Inhalation exposure to the notified chemical is likely to be negligible due to the very low vapour pressure ( $1.33 \times 10^{-11}$  kPa) of the notified chemical, the form of the resin in which it will be introduced, the enclosed systems and the use of exhaust ventilation.

##### *End use -in aerospace parts*

Exposure to notified chemical during end use is expected to be negligible. Once cured the notified chemical will be bound within a polymer matrix and will not be bioavailable.

### 6.1.2. Public exposure

There is negligible potential for public exposure to the notified chemical as it will only be used within the aerospace industry and once cured the notified chemical will be bound within a polymer matrix and will not be bioavailable.

## 6.2. Human health effects assessment

The results from toxicological investigations conducted on the notified chemical are summarised in the table below. Details of these studies can be found in Appendix B.

| <i>Endpoint</i>                                    | <i>Result and Assessment Conclusion</i>   |
|--|---|
| Rat, acute oral toxicity                           | oral LD50 > 2000 mg/kg bw<br>low toxicity |
| Rat, acute dermal toxicity                         | LD50 > 2000 mg/kg bw<br>low toxicity      |
| Rat, acute inhalation toxicity                     | LC50 0.09 mg/L/4 hour<br>very toxic       |
| Rabbit, skin irritation                            | non-irritating                            |
| Rabbit, eye irritation                             | severely irritating                       |
| Guinea pig, skin sensitisation – adjuvant test     | no evidence                               |
| Guinea pig, skin sensitisation – adjuvant test     | evidence of sensitisation                 |
| Mouse, skin sensitisation – Local lymph node assay | evidence of sensitisation                 |
| Mutagenicity – bacterial reverse mutation          | non mutagenic                             |

*Toxicokinetics, metabolism and distribution.*

Based on the low molecular weight (< 500 Da) and the low lipophilicity of the notified chemical (water solubility 0.060 g/L at 20°C; log Pow = log P<sub>ow</sub> = -0.0036) dermal absorption may occur, but the transfer from the stratum corneum into the epidermis is expected to be slow.

#### *Acute toxicity.*

The notified chemical is considered to be of low acute toxicity via the oral and dermal routes based on tests conducted in rats. The notified chemical is very toxic via inhalation based on a test conducted in rats.

#### *Irritation and Sensitisation.*

Based on tests conducted in rabbits the notified chemical is considered to be non-irritating to the skin and severely irritating to the eye.

The notified chemical was found to be a non-sensitiser in one maximisation test involving guinea pigs where a 25% topical application was used at challenge. In second maximisation test involving guinea pigs where a 10% topical application was used at challenge, 70% of the guinea pigs in the test group exhibited a reaction significantly greater than in the control animals. In 4 separate local lymph node assays conducted using mice the notified chemical was found to be a strong sensitiser (J. Appl. Toxicol., 1992). Therefore, based on the weight of evidence the notified chemical is considered to be a sensitiser.

#### *Mutagenicity.*

The notified chemical was found to be non mutagenic using a bacterial reverse mutation test.

#### **Health hazard classification**

Based on the acute inhalation, eye irritation and sensitisation tests the notified chemical is classified as hazardous according to the *Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances* (NOHSC, 2004) with the following risk phrases:

T<sup>+</sup>: R26 Very toxic by inhalation

Xi: R41 Risk of serious damage to eyes

Xi: R43 May cause sensitisation by skin contact

### **6.3. Human health risk characterisation**

#### **6.3.1. Occupational health and safety**

Dermal and ocular exposure to the notified chemical (up to 30%) will be possible during the manufacture of articles. The notified chemical is severely irritating to the eyes and a sensitiser and as such, good hygiene practices should be maintained and exposure to the skin and eyes minimised by the use of impervious gloves, safety glasses and protective clothing.

The notified chemical is very toxic by inhalation. Inhalation exposure to the notified chemical is likely to be negligible due to the very low vapour pressure ( $1.33 \times 10^{-11}$  kPa) of the notified chemical and the form of the resin in which it will be introduced. Inhalation exposure will be further minimised by the enclosed systems and the use of exhaust ventilation. Therefore, the risk to workers from inhalation exposure to the notified chemical is not considered to be unacceptable.

Given the risk of causing skin sensitisation and eye irritation, the risk to workers is likely to only be acceptable when used under controlled conditions with the appropriate PPE.

#### **6.3.2. Public health**

There is negligible potential for public exposure to the notified chemical as it will only be used within the aerospace industry and once cured the notified chemical will not be bioavailable, as it will be bound in an inert polyurethane matrix. Therefore, the risk to public health is considered to be low, due to the expected negligible exposure.

## **7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

### **7.1. Environmental Exposure & Fate Assessment**

#### **7.1.1 Environmental Exposure**

**RELEASE OF CHEMICAL AT SITE**

The imported resin, in the end-use formulation, will be transported directly to customer's site for storage and use. Release of notified chemical would only arise if accidental spills occur during transport and handling operations.

**RELEASE OF CHEMICAL FROM USE**

Very little release of the notified chemical is anticipated during manufacture of parts for the aerospace industry. The closed mould process known as Resin Transfer Moulding (RTM) has a dedicated dispensing system and  $\leq 0.5\%$  of the annual introduction volume is expected to be released as a result of cleaning and maintenance operations. Spillage from pails during transfer operations is expected to account for  $\leq 1\%$  of the annual introduction volume. Residual within import containers may also account for  $\leq 1\%$  of the annual introduction volume. Any notified chemical that is not consumed in the manufacturing process is expected to react with other ingredients in the residual end-use formulation and cure under ambient environmental conditions prior to disposal.

**RELEASE OF CHEMICAL FROM DISPOSAL**

Resin collected from spillages, cleaning and maintenance operations and from residual within import containers is expected to be disposed of to landfill after curing, through reactions with other ingredients in the end-use formulation.

The majority of the notified chemical will share the fate of the manufactured composite components. Given their use in aircraft, it is expected that this will entail eventual disposal to landfill.

**7.1.2 Environmental fate**

A single Ready Biodegradability test report was submitted which concluded that the notified chemical is not "ready biodegradable". For the details of the environmental fate studies refer to Appendix C.

**7.1.3 Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)**

Release of the notified chemical to the aquatic environment is not expected to occur in any significant quantities at any stage in its lifecycle. Therefore, a Predicted Environmental Concentration cannot be estimated.

**7.2. Environmental effects assessment**

The results from the single ecotoxicological investigation conducted on the notified chemical is summarised in the table below. Details of this study can be found in Appendix C.

| <i>Endpoint</i>  | <i>Result</i>  | <i>Assessment Conclusion</i>         |
|------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Daphnia Toxicity | 48 h EC <sub>50</sub> = 0.59 mg/L<br>(95% C.I. = 0.52 – 0.72 mg/L) | Very toxic to aquatic invertebrates. |

**7.2.1 Predicted No-Effect Concentration**

Based on the single ecotoxicity study submitted, the Predicted No-Effect Concentration has been calculated using a conservative assessment factor of 1000, as shown below.

| <i>Predicted No-Effect Concentration (PNEC) for the Aquatic Compartment</i> |           |
|---|-----------|
| EC <sub>50</sub> (Invertebrates)  | 0.59 mg/L |
| Assessment Factor   | 1,000     |
| PNEC:   | 0.59 µg/L |



### 7.3. Environmental risk assessment

The notified chemical will be imported into Australia in the end-use formulation. The notified chemical is expected to react with other ingredients in the end-use formulation and cross-link under ambient environmental conditions. During the reaction, the notified chemical will be consumed in the formation of an inherently stable cross-linked matrix. Due to the combination of its high toxicity to aquatic invertebrates and low biodegradability, releases of the notified chemical to the aquatic environment could have long-lasting harmful effects. However, release of the notified chemical into water is not expected under the proposed use pattern. Release of the notified chemical to atmosphere will not be significant due to its low vapour pressure, and the specific engineering practices employed. In landfill, cross-linked polymer matrix containing the notified chemical is expected to be stable, immobile and inert. Ultimately, it is expected that this will degrade via abiotic and biotic process to form simple organic compounds and water.

Therefore, the notified chemical is not considered to pose a risk to the aquatic environment under the proposed use and introduction volume.

## 8. CONCLUSIONS AND REGULATORY OBLIGATIONS

### Hazard classification

Based on the provided data the notified chemical is classified as hazardous according to the *Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances* [NOHSC:1008(2004)]. The following risk phrases apply to the notified chemical:

- T<sup>+</sup>: R26 Very toxic by inhalation
- Xi: R41 Risk of serious damage to eyes
- Xi: R43 May cause sensitisation by skin contact

and

As a comparison only, the classification of the notified chemical using the Globally Harmonised System for the Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) (United Nations 2009) is presented below. This system is not mandated in Australia and carries no legal status but is presented for information purposes.

|                                   | <i>Hazard category</i> | <i>Hazard statement</i>                              |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Acute Toxicity                    | Category 2             | Fatal if inhaled                                     |
| Serious Eye Damage/Eye Irritation | Category 1             | Causes serious eye damage                            |
| Skin Sensitisation                | Category 1A            | May cause an allergic skin reaction                  |
| Environment                       | Acute Category 1       | Very toxic to aquatic life                           |
| Environment                       | Chronic Category 1     | Very toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects |

### Human health risk assessment

Under the conditions of the occupational settings described, the notified chemical is not considered to pose an unacceptable risk to the health of workers.

When used in the proposed manner, the notified chemical is not considered to pose an unacceptable risk to public health.

### Environmental risk assessment

On the basis of the reported use pattern, the notified chemical is not expected to pose a risk to the environment.

### Recommendations

## REGULATORY CONTROLS

## Hazard Classification and Labelling

- Safe Work Australia should consider the following health hazard classifications for the notified chemical:
  - T<sup>+</sup>: R26 Very toxic by inhalation
  - Xi: R41 Risk of serious damage to eyes
  - Xi: R43 May cause sensitisation by skin contact
- Use the following cut-off concentrations and risk phrases for products/mixtures containing the notified chemical:
  - Conc ≥ 10%: R26; R41; R43
  - ≥ 7% Conc < 10%: R26; R36; R43
  - ≥ 5% Conc < 7%: R23; R36; R43
  - ≥ 1% Conc < 5%: R23; R43
  - ≥ 0.1% Conc < 1%: R20

## Health Surveillance

- As the notified chemical is a sensitizer and very toxic by inhalation, employers should carry out health surveillance for any worker who has been identified in the workplace risk assessment as having a significant risk of sensitisation or inhalation exposure to the notified chemical.

## CONTROL MEASURES

## Occupational Health and Safety

- Employers should ensure that the facilities are equipped such that operations involving the notified polymer are performed in a controlled manner. The following isolation and engineering controls should be in place to minimise occupational exposure to the notified polymer:
  - Automated processes
  - Local exhaust ventilation
  - Sealed equipment
- Employers should implement the following safe work practices to minimise occupational exposure during handling of products containing the notified polymer:
  - Avoid inhalation of aerosols/particles
  - Avoid contact with skin and eyes
  - Clean spills immediately, taking care to avoid inhalation
- Employers should ensure that the following personal protective equipment is used by workers to minimise occupational exposure to the notified chemical in the product CYCOM 5250-4 RTM resin:
  - impervious gloves
  - safety glasses
  - protective clothing
  - respirator

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 *Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances* [NOHSC:1008(2004)] workplace practices and control procedures consistent with provisions of State and Territory hazardous substances legislation must be in operation.

## Disposal

- The notified chemical should be disposed of to landfill.

#### Emergency procedures

- Spills or accidental release of the notified chemical should be handled by physical containment, collection and subsequent safe disposal.

### Regulatory Obligations

#### *Secondary Notification*

This risk assessment is based on the information available at the time of notification. The Director may call for the reassessment of the chemical under secondary notification provisions based on changes in certain circumstances. Under Section 64 of the *Industrial Chemicals (Notification and Assessment) Act (1989)* the notifier, as well as any other importer or manufacturer of the notified chemical, have post-assessment regulatory obligations to notify NICNAS when any of these circumstances change. These obligations apply even when the notified chemical is listed on the Australian Inventory of Chemical Substances (AICS).

Therefore, the Director of NICNAS must be notified in writing within 28 days by the notifier, other importer or manufacturer:

- (1) Under Section 64(1) of the Act; if
  - the importation volume exceeds one tonne per annum notified chemical;
  - the notified chemical is introduced in a powdered form instead of a resin.or
- (2) Under Section 64(2) of the Act; if
  - the function or use of the chemical has changed from a component of resin (up to 30%) for the manufacture of composite materials, or is likely to change significantly;
  - the amount of chemical being introduced has increased from 1 tonne, or is likely to increase, significantly;
  - the chemical has begun to be manufactured in Australia;
  - additional information has become available to the person as to an adverse effect of the chemical on occupational health and safety, public health, or the environment.

The Director will then decide whether a reassessment (i.e. a secondary notification and assessment) is required.

#### *Material Safety Data Sheet*

The MSDS of the notified chemical and products containing the notified chemical provided by the notifier were reviewed by NICNAS. The accuracy of the information on the MSDS remains the responsibility of the applicant.

**APPENDIX A: PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES**

**Water Solubility** 0.060 g/L at 20°C

Method EC Directive 92/69/EEC A.6 Water Solubility.  
 Remarks Flask Method, with HPLC/UV analysis. The chromatographic analysis apparently shows that the test item isn't stable in water. Additional peaks in the chromatogram of the notified chemical were attributed to hydrolysis products, although they were not identified.  
 Test Facility Kesla Forschung and Service GmbH, Greppin, Germany (2006)

**Particle Size** Inhalable fraction (<100 µm): 100%  
 Respirable fraction (<10 µm): > 85%  
 MMAD = 1.8 -3.1 µm

Method OECD TG 110 Particle Size Distribution/Fibre Length and Diameter Distributions.

| <i>Range (µm)</i> | <i>Mass (%)</i> |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 29.5              | 1.8 – 2.4       |
| 18.2              | 1.7 – 3.4       |
| 8.5               | 3.2 – 9.3       |
| 5.5               | 3.7 – 9.3       |
| 2.8               | 23.9 – 35.9     |
| 1.2               | 25.7 – 33.4     |
| < 1.2             | 16.1 – 32.3     |

Remarks The particle size was measured as part of the acute inhalation toxicity test. A sample for particle size testing was taken from each of the 4 dose groups.  
 Test Facility BASF (1990)

**Flammability** Not highly flammable

Method EC Directive 92/69/EEC A.10 Flammability (Solids).  
 Remarks The test substance could not be ignited although it did melt and emit sparks while in contact with the ignition source.  
 Test Facility NOTOX (2003a)

**APPENDIX B: TOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS****B.1. Acute toxicity – oral**

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| TEST SUBSTANCE   | Notified chemical  |
| METHOD           | OECD TG 401 Acute Oral Toxicity.<br>EC Directive 92/69/EEC B.1 Acute Toxicity (Oral).  |
| Species/Strain   | Rat/Wistar   |
| Vehicle          | Distilled water  |
| Remarks - Method | The test substance was administered via gavage.<br>No significant protocol deviations. |

## RESULTS

| <i>Group</i> | <i>Number and Sex<br/>of Animals</i> | <i>Dose<br/>mg/kg bw</i> | <i>Mortality</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| I            | 5 per sex                            | 2000                     | 0                |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| LD50              | > 2000 mg/kg bw   |
| Signs of Toxicity | There were no deaths from the test material. Ruffled fur (5 animals) and a hunched posture (1 male) were observed during the course of the study. |
| Effects in Organs | Discolouration of the liver and lungs was noted in 1 male animal.   |
| Remarks - Results | Body weight gains were as expected.   |

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

TEST FACILITY RCC (1990a)

**B.2. Acute toxicity – dermal**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE   | Notified chemical   |
| METHOD           | OECD TG 402 Acute Dermal Toxicity.<br>EC Directive 92/69/EEC B.3 Acute Toxicity (Dermal). |
| Species/Strain   | Rat/Wistar  |
| Vehicle          | Distilled water   |
| Type of dressing | Semi-occlusive.   |
| Remarks - Method | No significant protocol deviations  |

## RESULTS

| <i>Group</i> | <i>Number and Sex<br/>of Animals</i> | <i>Dose<br/>mg/kg bw</i> | <i>Mortality</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| I            | 5 per sex                            | 2000                     | 0                |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| LD50                         | > 2000 mg/kg bw   |
| Signs of Toxicity - Local    | Scales and yellow discolouration of the skin was seen in all animals. |
| Signs of Toxicity - Systemic | There were no deaths or test-substance related clinical signs.        |
| Effects in Organs            | Discolouration of the lungs was seen in 1 animal per sex.             |
| Remarks - Results            | Body weight gains were as expected.                                   |

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

TEST FACILITY RCC (1990b)

**B.3. Acute toxicity – inhalation**

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE     | Notified chemical   |
| METHOD             | OECD TG 403 Acute Inhalation Toxicity.  |
| Species/Strain     | Rat/Wistar  |
| Vehicle            | Test substance administered as supplied   |
| Method of Exposure | Oro-nasal exposure.   |
| Exposure Period    | 4 hours   |
| Physical Form      | solid aerosol (particulate).  |
| Particle Size      | Inhalable fraction (<100 µm): 100%<br>Respirable fraction (<10 µm): > 85%<br>MMAD = 1.8 -3.1 µm |
| Remarks - Method   | No significant protocol deviations  |

## RESULTS

| Group | Number and Sex<br>of Animals | Concentration<br>mg/L |        | Mortality               |
|-------|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------|-------------------------|
|       |                              | Nominal               | Actual |                         |
| I     | 5 per sex                    | 0.021                 | 0.016  | 0/10                    |
| II    | 5 per sex                    | 5.77                  | 0.13   | 7/10 (5 male, 2 female) |
| III   | 5 per sex                    | 15.5                  | 0.52   | 10/10                   |
| IV    | 5 per sex                    | 28.1                  | 5.0    | 10/10                   |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| LC50              | 0.09 mg/L/4 hours both sexes combined<br>> 0.016 and < 0.13 mg/L/4 hours male rats<br>Approximately 0.13 mg/L/4 hours female rats  |
| Signs of Toxicity | The only sign of toxicity noted in the lowest dose group was accelerated respiration. In the higher dose groups a range of respiration difficulties were observed as well as eyelid closure, nasal discharge, restlessness during the first few hours and apathy at later stages.<br>All recorded deaths occurred on day 1 of study, except for group III, where 3 deaths occurred on day 2. |
| Effects in Organs | In animals dying during study, main effects were hyperaemia, oedema and emphysema of lung and hydrothorax. No adverse effects were seen in animals surviving to end of study.  |
| Remarks - Results | Body weight gains of surviving animals in groups I and II were retarded compared to control animals.   |

CONCLUSION The notified chemical is very toxic via inhalation.

TEST FACILITY BASF (1990)

**B.4. Irritation – skin**

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE     | Notified chemical   |
| METHOD             | OECD TG 404 Acute Dermal Irritation/Corrosion.<br>EC Directive 84/449/EEC B.4 Acute Toxicity (Skin Irritation). |
| Species/Strain     | Rabbit/New Zealand White  |
| Number of Animals  | 3 (1 male, 2 female)  |
| Vehicle            | The test substance was moistened with distilled water prior to application.                                     |
| Observation Period | 72 hours  |
| Type of Dressing   | Semi-occlusive.   |
| Remarks - Method   | Study terminated after 72 hrs as no irritant effects were seen.   |

## RESULTS

Remarks - Results No acute clinical symptoms were observed in animals during the test

period, and no mortality occurred. No effect on bodyweight gain was seen.

CONCLUSION The notified chemical is non-irritating to the skin.

TEST FACILITY RCC (1989a)

### B.5. Irritation – eye

TEST SUBSTANCE Notified chemical

METHOD OECD TG 405 Acute Eye Irritation/Corrosion.  
EC Directive 84/449/EEC B.5 Acute Toxicity (Eye Irritation).  
Species/Strain Rabbit/New Zealand White  
Number of Animals 3 (1 male, 2 female)  
Observation Period 21 days  
Remarks - Method No significant protocol deviations

#### RESULTS

| Lesion                 | Mean Score* |     |     | Maximum Value | Maximum Duration of Any Effect | Maximum Value at End of Observation Period |
|------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|---------------|--------------------------------|--|
|                        | 1           | 2   | 3   |               |                                |  |
| Conjunctiva: redness   | 2           | 2   | 2   | 2             | 21 days                        | 1  |
| Conjunctiva: chemosis  | 3           | 3   | 3   | 3             | 14 days                        | 0  |
| Conjunctiva: discharge | **          | **  | **  | **            | 14 days                        | 0  |
| Corneal opacity        | 2.7         | 2.7 | 2.7 | 4             | 21 days                        | 3  |
| Iridial inflammation   | 1           | 1   | 1   | 2             | 21 days                        | 1  |

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

\*\* No score assigned, but described as severe at all observation times up to 14 days.

Remarks - Results Corneal opacity was seen in all animals from 1 hour to 21 days. Corrosion (partial) of the conjunctiva was observed in all animals from 24 or 48 hours to 7 days post treatment. Conjunctiva chemosis and discharge had resolved in all animals by day 14.  
No acute clinical effects or effects on bodyweight gains were seen.

CONCLUSION Considering that severe ocular lesions were still present at the end of the observation period, the notified chemical is severely irritating to the eye.

TEST FACILITY RCC (1990c)

### B.6. Skin sensitisation

TEST SUBSTANCE Notified chemical

METHOD OECD TG 406 Skin Sensitisation - Maximisation test (Magnusson and Kligman method)  
EC Directive 84/449/EC B.6 Skin Sensitisation - Maximisation test (Magnusson and Kligman method)  
Species/Strain Guinea pig/albino (Himalayan spotted)  
PRELIMINARY STUDY Maximum Non-irritating Concentration:  
intradermal: 3% (test substance in ethanol)  
topical: 25% (test substance in ethanol)  
MAIN STUDY  
Number of Animals Test Group: 20 (10 animals per sex)  
Control Group: 10 (5 animals per sex)

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| INDUCTION PHASE           | Induction Concentration:<br>intradermal: 3% (test substance in ethanol)<br>topical: 25% (test substance in ethanol)   |
| Signs of Irritation       | Slight to well defined erythema was seen in all test group animals immediately after induction along with slight oedema in 3 animals. Slight oedema was still present in 3 animals after 24 hours but erythema was observed in half of the test animals. At the 48 hour observation no oedema was observed with slight to well defined erythema present in 4 animals. |
| CHALLENGE PHASE           |   |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> challenge | topical: 25% (test substance in ethanol)  |
| Remarks - Method          | No significant protocol deviations.   |

## RESULTS

| <i>Animal</i>        | <i>Challenge Concentration</i> | <i>Number of Animals Showing Skin Reactions after:<br/>1<sup>st</sup> challenge</i> |             |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------|
|                      |                                | <i>24 h</i>   | <i>48 h</i> |
| <i>Test Group</i>    | 0% (ethanol only)              | 0/19  | 0/19        |
|                      | 25%(test substance in ethanol) | 0/19  | 0/19        |
| <i>Control Group</i> | 0% (ethanol only)              | 0/10  | 0/10        |
|                      | 25%(test substance in ethanol) | 0/10  | 0/10        |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Remarks - Results | One female died spontaneously (on day 3 of study). No systemic effects were observed during the study. No effect on bodyweight gain was seen.<br><br>At 24 and 48 hours after the challenge procedure, all irritation scores in test and control animals were zero.<br><br>The positive control induced a marked sensitisation response confirming the sensitivity of the test. |
|-------------------|---|

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| CONCLUSION | There was no evidence of reactions indicative of skin sensitisation to the notified chemical under the conditions of the test. |
|------------|--|

|               |             |
|---------------|-------------|
| TEST FACILITY | RCC (1990d) |
|---------------|-------------|

**B.7. Skin sensitisation**

|                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| TEST SUBSTANCE | Notified chemical |
|----------------|-------------------|

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| METHOD | The method was based on that described in the following 2 references.<br>Magnusson and Kligman (1969)<br>Magnusson and Kligman (1970) |
|--------|---|

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Species/Strain    | Guinea pig/Dunkin Hartley  |
| PRELIMINARY STUDY | Maximum Non-irritating Concentration:<br>intradermal: 0.1% (test substance in ethanol) |

|            |                |                  |
|------------|----------------|------------------|
| MAIN STUDY | Test Group: 10 | Control Group: 4 |
|------------|----------------|------------------|

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| INDUCTION PHASE     | Induction Concentration:<br>topical: 25%  |
| Signs of Irritation | The paper mentions that intradermal injections of a slightly irritating concentration were applied. |

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| CHALLENGE PHASE           | topical: 10%   |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> challenge | Freund's complete adjuvant was injected along with the notified chemical during the preliminary stage. |
| Remarks - Method          | An occluded dressing was applied for 48 hours during the induction phase.                              |



The potential of the test substance to cause skin sensitisation was determined by assessment of the erythema at 24 and 48 hours after the challenge procedure.

The use of a positive control was not reported.

## RESULTS

## Remarks - Results

No deaths or signs of toxicity were reported.

The percentage of guinea pigs exhibiting a reaction significantly greater than in the control animals was 70%.

## CONCLUSION

There was evidence of reactions indicative of skin sensitisation to the notified chemical under the conditions of the test.

## TEST FACILITY

J. Appl. Toxicol. (1992)

**B.8. Skin sensitisation – mouse local lymph node assay (LLNA)**

## TEST SUBSTANCE

Notified chemical

## METHOD

The method was based on that described in the following 3 references:

Kimber et al. (1989)

Kimber et al. (1991)

Basketter et al. (1991)

## Species/Strain

Mouse/CBA/Ca female

## Vehicle

Dimethylfomamide and dimethyl sulfoxide

## Remarks - Method

The study was carried out in four different laboratories, 3 used dimethylfomamide as the vehicle and 1 used dimethyl sulfoxide (Lab A). The proliferative response values were not reported in the paper.

The study differed from the test methods above with the modification that the test subjects received topical applications of the test substance on 3 consecutive days and the assay was terminated after 5 days.

Whether a positive control was used was not reported in the paper.

## RESULTS

| Concentration of test substance<br>(% w/w) | Stimulation Index<br>(Test/Control Ratio) |       |       |       |
|--|---|-------|-------|-------|
|  | Lab A                                     | Lab B | Lab C | Lab D |
| 0 (vehicle control)                        |   |       |       |       |
| 2.5  | -   | -     | -     | 18.4  |
| 5.0  | 11.9                                      | 13.8  | 16.3  | 29.6  |
| 10.0                                       | 12.2                                      | 19.1  | 25.3  | 35.3  |
| 25.0                                       | 11.8                                      | 15.5  | 25.7  | -     |

## Remarks - Results

No information on test subject deaths or signs of systemic toxicity was reported in the paper.

A stimulation index of greater than 3 was observed for all concentrations of the test substance.

## CONCLUSION

There was evidence of induction of a lymphocyte proliferative response indicative of skin sensitisation to the notified chemical.

## TEST FACILITY

J. Appl. Toxicol. (1992)

**B.9. Genotoxicity – bacteria**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE                   | Notified chemical   |
| METHOD                           | OECD TG 471 Bacterial Reverse Mutation Test.<br>EC Directive 2000/32/EC B.13/14 Mutagenicity – Reverse Mutation Test using Bacteria.<br>Plate incorporation procedure   |
| Species/Strain                   | <i>S. typhimurium</i> : TA1535, TA1537, TA98, TA100<br><i>E. coli</i> : WP2uvrA   |
| Metabolic Activation System      | Rat S9 fraction from phenobarbitone/ $\beta$ -naphthoflavone induced rat liver  |
| Concentration Range in Main Test | <i>Test 1</i><br>TA100 and WP2uvrA<br>a) With metabolic activation: 3 – 5000 $\mu$ g/plate<br>b) Without metabolic activation: 3 – 5000 $\mu$ g/plate<br>TA1535, TA1537 and TA98<br>a) With metabolic activation: 3 – 1000 $\mu$ g/plate<br>b) Without metabolic activation: 3 – 1000 $\mu$ g/plate<br><br><i>Test 2</i><br>TA1535 and TA100<br>a) With metabolic activation: 3 – 333 $\mu$ g/plate<br>b) Without metabolic activation: 3 – 333 $\mu$ g/plate<br>TA1537 and TA98<br>a) With metabolic activation: 3 – 333 $\mu$ g/plate<br>b) Without metabolic activation: 1 – 100 $\mu$ g/plate<br>WP2uvrA<br>a) With metabolic activation: 10 – 1000 $\mu$ g/plate<br>b) Without metabolic activation: 10 – 1000 $\mu$ g/plate |
| Vehicle                          | Dimethyl sulfoxide  |
| Remarks - Method                 | 5% v/v of S9 was used in experiment 1 and 10% v/v S9 was used in experiment 2.<br>No significant protocol deviations. The positive control chemical for all strains with metabolic activation was 2-aminoanthracene. Positive control chemicals without activation: TA 1535: sodium azide; TA1537: 9-aminoacridine; TA98: 2-nitrofluorene; TA100: MMS; Negative control: solvent (dimethyl sulfoxide).  |

## RESULTS

| Metabolic Activation | Test Substance Concentration ( $\mu$ g/plate) Resulting in: |                           |               |                  |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|
|                      | Cytotoxicity in Preliminary Test                            | Cytotoxicity in Main Test | Precipitation | Genotoxic Effect |
| <i>Absent</i>        |   |                           |               |                  |
| Test 1               | 333   | 100                       | > 5000        | negative         |
| Test 2               |   | 100                       | > 1000        | negative         |
| <i>Present</i>       |   |                           |               |                  |
| Test 1               | 333   | 100                       | > 5000        | negative         |
| Test 2               |   | 100                       | > 1000        | negative         |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Remarks - Results | No toxicologically significant increases in the frequency of revertant colonies were recorded for any of the bacterial strains, with any dose of the test material, either with or without metabolic activation.<br><br>Moderate reduction in the background lawn seen at a concentration of 100 $\mu$ g/plate in both tests with and without the presence of metabolic activation.<br><br>Negative controls were within historical limits. All the positive control chemicals used in the test induced marked increases in the frequency of revertant colonies thus confirming the activity of the S9-mix and the sensitivity of the bacterial strains. |
|-------------------|--|

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

TEST FACILITY                      NOTOX (2008)

## APPENDIX C: ENVIRONMENTAL FATE AND ECOTOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

### C.1. Environmental Fate

#### C.1.1. Ready biodegradability

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE        | Notified chemical   |
| METHOD                | OECD TG 301 B Ready Biodegradability: CO <sub>2</sub> Evolution Test.<br>EC Directive 92/69/EEC C.4-C Biodegradation: Determination of the "Ready" Biodegradability: Carbon Dioxide Evolution Test                                  |
| Inoculum              | Activated sludge from a municipal STP.  |
| Exposure Period       | 29 days   |
| Auxiliary Solvent     | Water   |
| Analytical Monitoring | None.   |
| Remarks - Method      | No significant protocol deviations. Since the notified chemical was not sufficiently soluble, test solutions were continuously stirred during the test to ensure optimal contact between the test substance and the test organisms. |

#### RESULTS

| Day | Test substance |                     | Day | Sodium acetate |               |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----|----------------|---------------|
|     |                | % Degradation (Avg) |     |                | % Degradation |
| 0   |                | 0                   | 0   |                | 0             |
| 2   |                | 3.5                 | 2   |                | 9             |
| 5   |                | 7.5                 | 5   |                | 43            |
| 7   |                | 8                   | 7   |                | 59            |
| 9   |                | 8                   | 9   |                | 68            |
| 14  |                | 8                   | 14  |                | 75            |
| 19  |                | 10                  | 19  |                | 83            |
| 23  |                | 12                  | 23  |                | 86            |
| 27  |                | 14                  | 27  |                | 86            |
| 29  |                | 16                  | 29  |                | 88            |

Remarks - Results                      Since all criteria for acceptability of the test were met, this study was considered to be valid.

CONCLUSION                                The notified chemical cannot be classed as ready biodegradable.

TEST FACILITY                             NOTOX (2003b)

### C.2. Ecotoxicological Investigations

#### C.2.1. Acute toxicity to aquatic invertebrates

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE    | Notified chemical   |
| METHOD            | ISO International Standard 6341 – Water Quality – Determination of the inhibition of the mobility of <i>Daphnia magna Straus</i> – Acute Toxicity Test, Third Edition (1996).<br>OECD TG 202 <i>Daphnia sp</i> Acute Immobilisation Test and Reproduction Test – 48 hr flow-through (1994).<br>EC Directive 92/69/EEC C.2 Acute Toxicity for <i>Daphnia</i> . |
| Species           | <i>Daphnia magna</i>  |
| Exposure Period   | 48 hours  |
| Auxiliary Solvent | Dimethylsulphoxide  |
| Water Hardness    | 250 mg CaCO <sub>3</sub> /L   |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Analytical Monitoring | Temperature was recorded continuously. Dissolved oxygen and pH were recorded before and after study. The concentrations of the test solutions were verified by chemical analysis at 0 hr, 24 h and 48 h using a validated HPLC analytical method.   |
| Remarks - Method      | No significant protocol deviations. Target concentrations were within 30-60% of nominal concentrations for the definitive flow-through test. Concentrations remained within 20% variance during the study period. Flow through rate 6 L/h. The sensitivity of <i>Daphnia</i> was checked by a reference test with potassium dichromate (48 h EC50 = 0.60 mg/L). |

## RESULTS

| Concentration mg/L |                | Number of <i>D. magna</i> | Number Immobilised |      |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------|
| Nominal            | Actual (mean*) |                           | 24 h               | 48 h |
| 0**                | 0              | 20                        | 0                  | 0    |
| 0.10               | 0.059          | 20                        | 0                  | 0    |
| 0.22               | 0.085          | 20                        | 0                  | 0    |
| 0.46               | 0.19           | 20                        | 0                  | 0    |
| 1.0                | 0.31           | 20                        | 0                  | 0    |
| 2.2                | 0.82           | 19                        | 12                 | 16   |

\*mean of 0 hr and 48 hr analyses. \*\*DMSO

EC50 0.71 mg/L at 24 hours (95% C.I. = 0.60 – 0.94 mg/L)

0.59 mg/L at 48 hours (95% C.I. = 0.52 – 0.72 mg/L)

NOEC 0.31 mg/L at 48 hours

Remarks – Results

The study met the acceptability criteria prescribed by the protocols and was considered valid.

## CONCLUSION

The notified chemical is very toxic to aquatic invertebrates.

## TEST FACILITY

NOTOX (2003c)

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- BASF (1990) Study on the acute inhalation toxicity LC<sub>50</sub> of Notified Chemical as a dust aerosol in rats 4-hour exposure. (Study Number, 13I0421/897047, 27 March 1990), BASF Aktiengesellschaft, Ludwigshafen, Germany (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).
- Basketter DA, Scholes EW, Kimber I, Botham PA, Hilton J, Miller K, Robbins MC, Harrison PTC and Waite SJ (1991) Interlaboratory Evaluation of the Local Lymph Node Assay with 25 Chemicals and Comparison with Guinea Pig Test Data. *Toxicol. Methods*, **1**:30-43.
- J. Appl. Toxicol. (1992) The reference information is considered to be confidential.
- Kesla Forschung and Service (2006). Determination of the water solubility of Notified Chemical (Final Report). Study No. KBL 2005/1512/WLO, Kesla Forschung and Service GmbH, Greppin, Germany (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).
- Kimber I, Hilton J and Weisenberger C (1989) The Murine Local Lymph Node Assay for Identification of Contact Allergens: a Preliminary Evaluation of *in situ* Measurement of Lymphocyte Proliferation. *Contact Dermatit.*, **21**:215-220.
- Kimber I, Hilton J, Botham PA, Basketter DA, Scholes EW, Miller K, Robbins MC, Harrison PTC, Gray TJB and Waite SJ (1991) The Murine Local Lymph Node Assay, Results of an Inter-laboratory Trial. *Toxicol. Lett.*, **55**:203-213.
- Magnusson B and Kligman AM (1969) The Identification of Contact Allergens by Animal Assay, the Guinea Pig Maximisation Test Method. *J. Invest. Dermatol.*, **52**:268-276.
- Magnusson B and Kligman AM (1970) Allergic Contact Dermatitis in the Guinea Pig: Identification of Contact Allergens. C. C. Thomas, Springfield, IL.
- 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, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition [NOHSC:2011(2003)]. National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- NOHSC (2004) Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition [NOHSC:1008(2004)]. National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, Canberra, AusInfo.
- NOTOX (2003a) Determination of the Flammability of the Notified Chemical. (Study Number, 377257, 20 March 2003), Notox B.V. Hambakenwetering 7 5231 DD's-Hertogenbosch, The Netherlands (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).
- NOTOX (2003b) Determination of the Ready Biodegradability: Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) evolution test (modified Strum test), with notified chemical. (Notox Project 377268, 27 May 2003), Notox B.V. Hambakenwetering 7 5231 DD's-Hertogenbosch, The Netherlands (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).
- NOTOX (2003c) Acute toxicity study with *Daphnia Magna* with Notified Chemical. (Notox Project 377279, 30 July 2003) Notox B.V. Hambakenwetering 7 5231 DD's-Hertogenbosch, The Netherlands (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).
- NOTOX (2008) Evaluation of the Mutagenic Activity of Notified Chemical in the *Salmonella typhimurium* Reverse Mutation Assay and the *Escherichia coli* Reverse Mutation Assay (with Independent Repeat) (Notox Project 487231, 18 February 2008) Notox B.V. Hambakenwetering 7 5231 DD's-Hertogenbosch, The Netherlands (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).
- NTC (National Transport Commission) 2007 Australian Code for the Transport of Dangerous Goods by Road and Rail (ADG code), 7th Edition, Commonwealth of Australia.
- RCC (1989a) Primary Skin Irritation Study with Notified Chemical in Rabbits (Study Number, 256162, 28 December 1990), Research & Consulting Company AG, Itingen, Switzerland (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).
- RCC (1990a) Acute Oral Toxicity with Notified Chemical Study in Rats (Study Number, 256140, 24 January 1990), Research & Consulting Company AG, Itingen, Switzerland (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).

RCC (1990b) Acute Dermal Toxicity Study with Notified Chemical in Rats (Study Number, 256151, 26 January 1990), Research & Consulting Company AG, Itingen, Switzerland (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).

RCC (1990c) Primary Eye Irritation Study with Notified Chemical in Rabbits (Study Number, 256173, 12 January 1990), Research & Consulting Company AG, Itingen, Switzerland (Unpublished report submitted by notifier).

RCC (1990d) Contact Hypersensitivity to Notified Chemical in Albino Guinea Pigs Maximization-Test (Study Number, 256184, 28 March 1990), Research & Consulting Company AG, Itingen, Switzerland (Unpublished report submitted 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.