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Goals

• Continuing education and dialog
• To advance the practice of alternatives assessment for informed substitution across federal, state, and local agencies through networking, sharing of experiences, development of common approaches, tools, datasets and frameworks, and creation of a community of practice.
Purpose of this call

- Increasing acknowledgement of the challenges of identifying, evaluating, and adopting safer chemicals and materials.

- Growing understanding of the need for supply chain, government, academic and non-profit collaboration to advance application of alternatives assessment for informed substitution.

- Many examples of successful supply chain collaborations to advance evaluation and application of safer materials.

- Such collaborations may not be encouraged or supported by government agencies or face challenges in their implementation due to budgets, limitations in working with the private sector, etc.

- Two case examples of collaborations between academic institutions and other stakeholders to prioritize and evaluate safer chemistries. Examples provide lessons for the role of government in supporting alternatives assessment and adoption of safer chemistries.
Speakers

• Kate Winnebeck, New York Pollution Prevention Institute

• Monica Becker, Monica Becker and Associates
Discussion Questions

- What lessons have you learned about how collaborative efforts can advance policy goals for safer alternatives?

- Are collaborative efforts more effective at some points in the evaluation and adoption process than others (prioritization and evaluation of alternatives versus adoption).

- What are some of the main barriers to collaborative efforts such as these and how can these be overcome?

- Is there a “right” policy mix of collaborative (voluntary) and regulatory initiatives that can advance adoption of safer alternatives?
Webinar Discussion Instructions

• Due to the number of participants on the Webinar, all lines will be muted.

• If you wish to ask a question, please type your question in the Q&A box located in the drop down control panel at the top of the screen.

• All questions will be answered at the end of the presentations.
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New York State Pollution Prevention Institute

The vision of the NYSP2I is to foster the transformation and development of sustainable businesses and organizations in NYS in a collaborative program committed to making the State a leader in environmental stewardship.

The mission of the Institute is to provide a high-impact, comprehensive and integrated program of technology research development and diffusion, outreach, training and education aimed at making New York State more sustainable for workers, the public, the environment and the economy through:

– reductions in toxic chemical use
– reductions in emissions to the environment and waste generation
– efficient use of raw materials, energy and water
SI Group, Inc.

- SI Group is a privately held, global manufacturer of chemical intermediates, and phenolic resins headquartered in Schenectady, NY
- 16 manufacturing facilities on six continents & customers in 90 countries
- SI Group has created a global network to deliver exceptional quality, consistency, and efficiency
- Operations in the USA, European Union and Asia make global regulatory compliance and product stewardship issues of paramount importance
- Operational safety, product safety and corporate responsibility are at the foundation of our organization
- As a member of the American Chemistry Council and a Responsible Care® company, SI Group is interested in evaluating their existing chemical products for potential environmental, health, and safety risks as a part of the Responsible Care® code.
Assessing the Risk of Chemical Products

- SI Group asked NYSP2I to assist with evaluating the environmental footprint of their industrial chemical and polymeric products through the development of a risk assessment tool specific to SI Group operations.
- The assessment tool will characterize hazardous properties and prioritize SI Group products to inform the business of the current state of the product line to aid in strategic decision making.
- The goal is to understand current and future potential for the substance to be regulated or voluntarily deselected.
  - Identify to what degree EHS attributes will be a factor in future use of the substance.
Need for the Tool

- Traditionally, chemical substances are evaluated on their intrinsic hazard/risk.
- Companies make decisions based on a substance’s intrinsic hazard and business risk.
  - Factors which may impact a business’ perception of the long term viability and growth potential of a chemical product or product portfolio.

Graphic: http://www.epa.gov/ncea/risk/hazardous-identification.htm
Tool Development

1. SI Group developed a draft tool based on ACC’s Prioritization Screening Approach, incorporating
   - Exposure ranking: use, PBT, & tonnage
   - Hazard ranking: environmental hazard & human health hazard

2. NYSP2I & SI Group worked to develop attributes for business risk

3. Framework developed

4. Tool piloted by SI Group
Guiding Principles

• Method to *assess and rank products internally*.  
• Evaluating chemical intermediates is the goal.  
• The **structure is adaptable** such that users may integrate other factors which may be critical to evaluating the risk of a substance.  
• Results are **replicable internally**.  
• Results speak to the **sustainability of a product line**.  
• Results are **predictive**.  
• Results are **actionable**.  
• Results **represent a snapshot in time**.  
• The structure **focuses on trends**. The intrinsic EHS risk of a substance changes over time as additional testing and exposure information becomes available and regulations change.  
• **Market driven greening of the portfolio**. R&D activities are guided to reduce high risk substances and high risk aspects of substances.
### Framework Structure

| Intrinsic Hazard |  
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| **identify substances with high intrinsic hazard & exposure potentials due to high production volume or dispersive end use** [based on ACC’s Prioritization Screening Approach] |

| Precautionary Risk |  
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| **understand the potential for future regulatory action or voluntary deselection** of chemistries and considers detection & production volume |

| Strategic Risk |  
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| **understand the potential risk of industry moving away from use of the substance** |
# Framework Structure

- Qualitative or quantitative criteria established for each risk attribute
- Substance receives a score from 0 to 5
- Mathematical models roll individual attributes up to category level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic Hazard</th>
<th>Precautionary Risk</th>
<th>Strategic Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazard Potential</td>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>Alternatives Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Safety</td>
<td>Human Biomonitoring</td>
<td>• Government Marketing &amp; Use Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human Health</td>
<td>• Environmental Detection</td>
<td>• Stakeholder Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exposure Potential</td>
<td>• High Production Volume</td>
<td>• Safer Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use Patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Production Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Persistence and Bioaccumulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Framework Structure

### Precautionary Risk

- **Detection**
  - Human Biomonitoring: trends in US CDC National Biomonitoring program data
  - Environmental Detection: detection in environmental media based on the appropriate region for the analysis
- **High Production Volume**: US EPA & OECD HPV chemicals
Framework Structure

Strategic Risk

• Alternatives Assessment: status of government AA and to degree recommendations are implemented
• Government Marketing & Use Restrictions: applications of the substance with restricted use
• Stakeholder Requests: requests for the reduction of substances in specific applications
• Safer Alternative: degree to which safer alternatives have been identified and the price/performance of the alternatives
Framework Results

- Resulting risk profile allows the user to
  - Review results at the individual risk attribute level and the higher risk category level
  - Understand the attributes which contribute the most and least risk to be easily identified
  - Compare substances at the individual component level of risk & at risk category level
Prioritizing Substances for Action

Risk profile results provide information, but they aren’t actionable

1. **Identify high risk substances** by adding or multiplying the risk profile scores and ranking the results
   a. Intrinsic hazard, precautionary risk, and strategic risk are equally important
   b. One risk type is prioritized
   Result: high risk substances – may be actionable, but does not account for importance to the business

2. **Prioritize high risk substances for action** by multiplying by a business factor and ranking the results
   a. Prioritize substances with the highest sales margin
   b. Prioritize substances with the highest profit margin
   Result: high risk and high business importance substances
Use at SI Group Today

• Slightly modified version of the Framework for one of their product lines
• Trial the Framework and roll it out to other product lines as appropriate
• Results used to inform the business development group
• Results are an element of decision making used in business planning
• Results are not necessarily used to deselect materials from the product portfolio at this time, though other users may use the Framework for this
The GC3 Plasticizer Project: A Collaborative Alternatives Assessment to Identify Safer Alternatives to DEHP in Electronics Wire & Cable
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Monica Becker, Principal
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Green Chemistry and Commerce Council (GC3)
Overview of Presentation

1. Brief overview of the Green Chemistry & Commerce Council (GC3)

2. Collaborative Plasticizer AA
   - objectives
   - process
   - results
   - lessons learned
   - role of government
A cross sectoral, B-2-B network of more than 80 companies and other organizations formed in 2005 with a mission to promote green chemistry and design for environment (DfE), nationally and internationally

- Share best practices and push the frontier of business practices that promote green chemistry

- Work collaboratively on projects to develop new business strategies, technologies, tools and information
Based at the Lowell Center for Sustainable Production (LCSP) at the University of Mass. Lowell

Project groups meet by teleconference to work on projects that further the mission of the GC3

Annual meeting –
2013 GC3 Roundtable
Johnson & Johnson
May 8-10
New Brunswick, NJ
GC3 Members, include:

**Chemical/Specialty Chemicals**
- Alpha Chemical Service, Inc.
- BASF Corporation
- Bayer MaterialScience LLC
- The Dow Chemical Company
- Kluber Lubrication
- The HallStar Company
- Hubbard Hall
- ACS Green Chemistry Institute
- Diversey
- DuPont
- ecoSolv Technologies, Inc.
- Rivertop Renewables

**Outdoor Industry**
- REI

**Consumer Products**
- Avon Products, Inc.
- Johnson & Johnson
- Henkel/Dial
- Method Products, Inc.
- Seventh Generation, Inc
- Colgate-Palmolive Company

**Office Furniture**
- Steelcase
- Herman Miller
- Designtex

**Aerospace**
- Lockheed Martin

**Electronics**
- Bose Corporation
- HP
- Intel
- Dell
- EMC Corporation

**Apparel & Footwear**
- Anvil Knitwear
- Nike, Inc.
- VF Corporation
- New Balance

**Building Products**
- Construction Specialties

**Retail**
- Walmart
- Staples
- Target
- Green Depot

**Pharmaceutical**
- BWC Pharma Consulting
GC3 Members, include:

**Software**
- Actio Software
- The Wercs

**Product Standards & Certification**
- Bureau Veritas
- Green Seal
- EPEAT, Inc.
- NSF International

**Consulting**
- Inside Matters
- Pure Strategies
- ToxServices, LLC
- Environmental and Public Health Consulting
- Daley International
- Sustainable Research Group

**Government**
- Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
- Environmental Protection Agency
- German Federal Environment Agency
- Mass. Toxics Use Reduction Institute
- Washington State Department of Ecology

**Non Governmental Organizations**
- Investor Environmental Health Network
- Center for Environmental Health
- Clean Production Action
- Cradle to Cradle Products Innovation Institute
- GreenBlue
- Environmental Health Fund
- Pacific Northwest Pollution Prevention Resource Center
The GC3 Plasticizer Project: A Collaborative AA

Project Objectives:

• To develop a model for collaborative AAs, involving industry and academia
• To create the model through the development of an actual collaborative AA, with useable results

The GC3 Plasticizer Project

A Collaborative AA to Identify Safer Alternatives to DEHP di (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate plasticzer in Electronics Wire & Cable
Why did the GC3 focus its project on wire and cable & DEHP?

- Phthalates are of interest to many GC3 members
  - Many are toxic
  - High exposure potential from plastics
  - Used in many different plastic products
  - Focus of numerous regulations
  - Many companies need to eliminate them and find safer substitutes

- Wire & cable is of interest to many GC3 members
- Most wire and cable is made from PVC
- DEHP is the most commonly used plasticizer for PVC wire and cable
- Leverages Univ. of Mass. Lowell’s expertise in plastics engineering
Project Audience:

- Organizations that are interested in collaborating on AAs, rather than going it alone

- Organizations that need to make decisions on plasticizers
  - Electronics brands (e.g., HP, Dell) original equipment manufacturers (OEMs)
  - Plastic compounders
  - Plasticizer manufacturers
  - Retailers
  - Others: purchasing organizations, governments, advocates, green certification programs
Plasticizer Evaluation Project Partners

**OEMs/Retail**
- Dell
- EMC
- HP
- Staples

**Suppliers**
- BASF
- Dow Chemical
- Hallstar
- Teknor Apex

**University Partners**
- Lowell Center for Sustainable Production
- Faculty of Univ. of Mass Lowell

**Government & NGOs**
- Washington State
- Clean Production Action
- Pacific Northwest Pollution Prevention Resource Center
Plasticizer Candidate Screening Process

1. Inventory of plasticizer alt’s from lit./web research

2. Pared list from industry knowledge – availability, performance

3. Checked for and eliminated chemicals on “red lists”

4. GreenScreen (EHS)

(5. Performance testing & cost analysis)

(6. Final candidates)
Chemical Hazard Assessment with the GreenScreen™

Created by Clean Production Action
What is the GreenScreen?

- Comparative Chemical Hazard Assessment approach (CHA) developed by Clean Production Action
- Builds on the U.S. EPA’s DfE Alternatives Assessment approach and Safer Product Criteria and other precedents such as the Globally Harmonized System (GHS) of Classification & Labeling of Chemicals
- Considers 18 environmental and human health endpoints
- Addresses chemical constituents and any chemical transformation products
- Evaluates chemical hazards for an overall chemical score, or “Benchmark”
  - Benchmark 1 – 4, or
  - U if there is insufficient data to establish a benchmark
How to do a GreenScreen Assessment

Three Steps:

1. Assess and classify hazards
2. Apply the Benchmarks
3. Make informed decisions
# GreenScreen™ v1.2

## Hazard Endpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Health Group I</th>
<th>Human Health Group 2</th>
<th>Environmental Toxicity &amp; Fate</th>
<th>Physical Hazards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carcinogenicity</td>
<td>Acute Toxicity</td>
<td>Acute Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>Reactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutagenicity &amp; Genotoxicity</td>
<td>Systemic Toxicity &amp; Organ Effects</td>
<td>Chronic Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>Flammability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive Toxicity</td>
<td>Neurotoxicity</td>
<td>Other Ecotoxicity Studies when available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Toxicity</td>
<td>Skin Sensitization</td>
<td></td>
<td>Persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocrine Activity</td>
<td>Skin Irritation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bioaccumulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Irritation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Image: GreenScreen_LOGO.png]
## GreenScreen™ Criteria for Each Endpoint
**Example - Carcinogenicity (C)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information type</th>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>High (H)</th>
<th>Moderate (M)</th>
<th>Low (L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>GHS Category</td>
<td>1A (Known) or 1B (Presumed) for any route of exposure</td>
<td>2 (Suspected) for any route of exposure or limited or marginal evidence of carcinogenicity in animals</td>
<td>Adequate data available, and negative studies, no structural alerts, and GHS not classified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IARC</td>
<td>Group 1 or 2A</td>
<td>Group 2B</td>
<td>Group 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prop 65</td>
<td>Known to the state to cause cancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See the GreenScreen™ V 1.2 for the complete set of A & B lists*
# Hazard Summary Table with Hazard Classification and Confidence Levels

## Green Screen Hazard Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I Human</th>
<th>Group II and II* Human</th>
<th>Ecotox</th>
<th>Fate</th>
<th>Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carcinogenicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutagenicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive Toxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Toxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocrine Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Toxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Toxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurotoxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Sensitization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Sensitization*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Irritation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Irritation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioaccumulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flammability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level of Concern:
- **vH** = very High
- **H** = High
- **M** = Moderate

### Level of Confidence:
- **Bold** = High confidence
- **Italics** = Low confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Confidence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Bold = High confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Italics = Low confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Concern:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• vH = very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• H = High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M = Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecotox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS
P  Persistence
B  Bioaccumulation
T  Human Toxicity
   and Ecotoxicity

BENCHMARK 1
a.  PBT = High P + High B + [very High T (Ecotoxicity or Group II Human) or High T (Group I or III Human)]
b.  vPvB = very High P + very High B
c.  vPT = very High P + [very High T (Ecotoxicity or Group II Human) or High T (Group I or III Human)]
d.  vBT = very High B + [very High T (Ecotoxicity or Group II Human) or High T (Group I or III Human)]
e.  High T (Group I Human)

Avoid—Chemical of High Concern

BENCHMARK 2
a.  Moderate P + Moderate B + Moderate T (Ecotoxicity or Group I, II, or III Human)
b.  High P + High B
c.  High P + Moderate T (Ecotoxicity or Group I, II, or III Human)
d.  High B + Moderate T (Ecotoxicity or Group I, II, or III Human)
e.  Moderate T (Group I Human)
f.  Very High T (Ecotoxicity or Group II Human) or High T (Group III Human)
g.  High Flammability or High Reactivity

Use but Search for Safer Substitutes

BENCHMARK 3
a.  Moderate P or Moderate B
b.  Moderate Ecotoxicity
c.  Moderate T (Group II or III Human)
d.  Moderate Flammability or Moderate Reactivity

Use but Still Opportunity for Improvement

BENCHMARK 4
Low P* + Low B + Low T (Ecotoxicity, Group I, II and III Human) +
Low Physical Hazards (Flammability and Reactivity) + Low (additional ecotoxicity end points when available)

Prefer—Safer Chemical

If this chemical and its breakdown products pass all of these criteria, then move on to Benchmark 4.

If this chemical and its breakdown products pass all of these criteria, then move on to Benchmark 3.

If this chemical and its breakdown products pass all of these criteria, then move on to Benchmark 2.

BENCHMARK U
- Unspecified Due to Insufficient Data

Apply the Benchmarks
GreenScreen Benchmark 1 Criteria

BENCHMARK 1

a. $PBT = \text{High P} + \text{High B} + [\text{very High T (Ecotoxicity or Group II Human)}$ \\
   or $\text{High T (Group I or II* Human)}]$

b. $\text{vPvB} = \text{very High P} + \text{very High B}$

c. $\text{vPT} = \text{very High P} + [\text{very High T (Ecotoxicity or Group II Human)}$ \\
   or $\text{High T (Group I or II* Human)}]$  

d. $\text{vBT} = \text{very High B} + [\text{very High T (Ecotoxicity or Group II Human)}$ \\
   or $\text{High T (Group I or II* Human)}]$ 

e. $\text{High T (Group I Human)}$

Avoid—Chemical of High Concern
How to Apply the Benchmarks

Does the Chemical Meet One or More Criteria for Benchmark 1?

BENCHMARK 1

Does the Chemical Meet One or More Criteria for Benchmark 2?

BENCHMARK 2

Does the Chemical Meet One or More Criteria for Benchmark 3?

BENCHMARK 3

Does the Chemical Meet ALL the Criteria for Benchmark 4?

BENCHMARK 4

START HERE
GreenScreen Assessment Process

- Hired ToxServices, a licensed GreenScreen Profiler, to conduct GreenScreens
- Draft GreenScreens and all project protocol documents were posted on a webpage, results were discussed on calls, and all call notes and comments from the workgroup were posted on-line
- Profiler reviewed assessments and comments from the workgroup, and revised assessments where scientifically valid and consistent with GreenScreen guidelines.
### GreenScreen Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasticizer</th>
<th>GreenScreen ™ Benchmark</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hexamoll® DINCH® (BASF)</td>
<td>BM 2</td>
<td>Moderate endocrine activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOZ</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Data gaps for cancer and endocrine activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPHP</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Data gaps for cancer and endocrine activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEHTM</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Data gaps for cancer and endocrine activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEHT (Eastman 168)</td>
<td>BM 3$_{DG}$</td>
<td>Data gaps for neurotoxicity and respiratory sensitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DINP</td>
<td>BM 1</td>
<td>High endocrine activity, developmental and reproductive toxicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow Ecolibrium™ (Redacted)</td>
<td>4 Formulations</td>
<td>The BM for the formulation is for the monomer with the lowest GS BM score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HallStar Dioplex™ and Paraplex™ (Redacted)</td>
<td>5 chemical ingreds</td>
<td>The BM 2 chemical is a fatty alcohol monomer with moderate developmental toxicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BM: Benchmark, DG: Developmental, GS: GreenScreen
Funding for the Project

Sources:

- Companies in the GC3 Project Group provided cash
  - Plasticizer manufacturers
  - Electronics companies (i.e., users of wire & cable)

- The GC3, Lowell Center, and the Toxics Use Reduction Institute contributed significantly from its operating budget and through in-kind contributions
1. Benefits of the project

• Plasticizer manufacturers found value in an independent assessment for internal communication and marketing
• Compounders found value in an independent assessment, to avoid “regrettable substitutions”
• Brands found value in an independent assessment to avoid “regrettable substitutions” and in getting a single score to support decision-making
  • Though they find the U’s confounding
• GreenScreen offered a robust system/program for comparative hazard assessment for all parties
Lessons Learned (cont’d)

2. Value of collaborative process

• Pooling knowledge, funds and data to evaluate alternatives is valuable
  - lowers the cost to individual companies to get assessments done
  - creates more robust results
  - can create alignment on safer chemical alternatives within a sector, which can lead to greater demand and lower costs for alternatives
  - organizations learn from each other
Lessons Learned (cont’d)

3. Challenges

• Lack of transparency in some formulations
  - Some GreenScreens done under NDA with the Profiler
  - GreenScreen results reported but not the identity of chemicals used
  - Some brands/retailer find this frustrating/not entirely helpful
Lessons Learned (cont’d)

3. Challenges (cont.)

• Obtaining complete tox data sets for chemicals
  - Data availability for certain endpoints particularly challenging
    o Cancer
    o Endocrine activity
  - Even though the GreenScreen allows for chemical surrogates to be used, in some cases suitable surrogates could not be found

• Data gaps are particularly problematic when evaluating newer chemical products and products from smaller manufacturers
Current Status of Project

- Finishing “verification” (i.e., peer review) of the GreenScreens
- Once verification is done, GreenScreens will be made public
  - Requests from several organizations to include the assessments in their chemical/material databases
- Publishing articles on our model for collaborative AAs
Discussion Questions

- What lessons have you learned about how collaborative efforts can advance policy goals for safer alternatives?

- Are collaborative efforts more effective at some points in the evaluation and adoption process than others (prioritization and evaluation of alternatives versus adoption).

- What are some of the main barriers to collaborative efforts such as these and how can these be overcome?

- Is there a “right” policy mix of collaborative (voluntary) and regulatory initiatives that can advance adoption of safer alternatives?
Next Webinars

• The Interstate Clearinghouse on Chemicals Alternatives Assessment Guidance Document Process
  ○ April 4, 2013 at 12pm Eastern/ 9am Pacific

• Identifying priority chemicals, uses, and sectors for alternatives assessment and informed substitution –
  ○ May/June 2013

• Evaluating and addressing tradeoffs in alternatives assessment practice
  ○ May/June 2013
Webinar Audio & Slides

The audio recording and slides shown during this presentation will be available at:
http://www.chemicalspolicy.org/alternativesassessment.webinarseries.php