



OWNERSHIP STATEMENT

This document, the data contained in it and copyright therein are owned by Bayer CropScience. No part of the document or any information contained therein may be disclosed to any third party without the prior written authorisation of Bayer CropScience.

The summaries and evaluations contained in this document are based on unpublished proprietary data submitted for the purpose of the assessment undertaken by the regulatory authority. Other registration authorities should not grant, amend, or renew a registration on the basis of the summaries and evaluation of unpublished proprietary data contained in this document unless they have received the data on which the summaries and evaluation are based, from Bayer CropScience; or from other applicants once the period of data protection has expired. either:

- •
- •

Version history

Date	Data points containing amendments or additions ¹ and brief description	Document identifier and version number
2016-06-10	Original document submitted for AIR	M-557153-01-1
2016-10-13	Correction of formulation name in last paragraph on page 14	M-557153-02-1
2016-06-10 2016-10-13 ¹ It is suggested tha SANCO/10180/20	Driginal document submitted for AIR Original document submitted for AIR Correction of formulation name in last paragraph on page 14 at applicants adopt a similar approach to showing revisions and 13 Chapter 4 How to revise an Assessment Report Control of the second of the seco	version number M-59/153-01-1 M-557153-02-1 Crision history as outlined in the second s
¥	Jan	

Table of Contents

	Page
CP 7	TOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES ON THE PLANT PROTECTION PRODUCT5
CP 7.1	Acute toxicity
CP 7.1.1	Oral toxicity
CP 7.1.2	Dermal toxicity
CP 7.1.3	Inhalation toxicity
CP 7.1.4	Skin irritation
CP 7.1.5	Eye irritation
CP 7.1.6	Skin sensitization 7
CP 7.1.7	Supplementary studies on the plant protection product
CP 7.1.8	Supplementary studies for combinations of plant projection products
CP 7.2	Data on exposure
CP 7.2.1	Operator exposure
CP 7.2.1.1	Estimation of operator exposure 13
CP 7.2.1.2	Measurement of operator exposure \mathcal{X} X
CP 7.2.2	Bystander and resident exposure
CP 7.2.2.1	Estimation of bystander and resident exposure 2
CP 7.2.2.2	Measurement of bystander and resident exposure 3
CP 7.2.3	Worker exposure 2 16
CP 7.2.3.1	Estimation of worker exposure. () 18
CP 7.2.3.2	Measurement of worker exposure
CP 7.3	Dermal adsorption
CP 7.4	Available toxicological data relating to cosformulants
8	
L.	
- N	
A	
V S	
-	

CP 7 TOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES ON THE PLANT PROTECTION **PRODUCT**

This document provides detailed summaries of new studies which were not available at the time of the first EU review of amidosulfuron and were therefore not evaluated for the Annex I inclusion of this active substance. Existing studies already submitted for the first EU review are found evaluated in the Draft assessment report (DAR) or its Addenda; in the present document the studies are therefore only briefly referenced, marked in grey shade. In exemption from this, upon/specific° request by the RMS expressed at the pre-application meeting, studies that have been submitted as part of the confirmatory data post Annex I are summarised and discussed as 'new information', even though they have undergone review for the EU by former RMS AGES Austria and are found summarised in the 'Addendum to monograph prepared in the context of post Amex I procedure (new Annex I data)', December 2010 (rev. 1 Feb. 2011) and are reflected in the updated VU List of Endpoints of December 2010.

Complete reports to all studies are included in the electronic dossier provided by Bayer Crogercience. The numbering and the headlines correspond to latest EU requirements.

For transparent overall data interpretation and risk assessment key energoints derived from both old



An overview of the studies is given in the following table:

Study/Parameter	Species/Gender	Results	Reference
Acute oral toxicity	Rat, male and female	LD50: > 5000 mg/kg	
		bw	; 1989; M-
			129295-01-1
Acute dermal toxicity	Rat, male and female	LD50: > 4000 mg/kg	A;
		bw 2	123295-01-1
Acute inhalation	Rat, male and female	LC50: > 5 mg/L air	
toxicity	,	s s	(1989;
5			M-123292-01-1
Acute skin irritation	Rabbit	No irritation	A;
			; 1988; M- 🔬
			23130-01-1
Acute eye irritation	Rabbit	No irritation 🔬 🖌	»,
			, 1989; M-
		J O O	123/140-02 1
Sensitization	Buehler test in female	NQ sensitization 🔌	,; 1997; M-
	Guinea pigs		142799-01-1
Sensitization	Mouse, female	No seusitization 🔍	,; 2010; M-
			366308-01-1

Classification/labelling:

according to Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 Based on the study results, no classification/labelling (CLP) is proposed.

CP 7.1.1



CP 7.1.3 Inhalation toxicity



Report:	KCP 7.1.6/02 ;; 2010; M-366308-01-1
Title:	Amidosulfuron WG 75 - Evaluation of potential skin sensitization in the local lymph
	node assay in the mouse
Report No.:	SA 10001
Document No.:	M-366308-01-1
Guideline(s):	O.E.C.D. guideline 429 (2002); US-EPA OPPTS 870.2600 (2003)
Guideline deviation(s):	not specified
GLP/GEP:	yes

Executive summary:

In this study the potential of Amidosulfuron WG 75, an agrochemical formulation containing the active ingredient Amidosulfuron (AE F075032) at 74.8% w/v (batch N°: EFKE00196), Specification N°:102000000550-02), to induce skin sensitization using the murine Local Lymph Node Assay was assessed.

Twenty-five female CBA/J mice were allocated to 5 groups of five animals each

- one control group received the vehicle, 1% Puronic Acid L& R in water.
- three groups received the test substance at a concentration of 25 and 50% in vehicle or 100% neat substance.
- one positive control group received 30% alpha-Hec/Icinnan/aldebyde (CAS)N° 101-86-0, batch N°: MKAA2596) in vehicle.

The test substance and the vehicle were applied on external surfaces of each ear $(25 \ \mu L/ear)$ for three consecutive days (Days 0, 1 and 2) at the appropriate concentrations. On Day 9 the cell proliferation in the draining auricular lymph nodes was measured by incorporation of tritiated thymidine and the obtained values were used to calculate proliferation indices.

No mortality and no relevant clinical sens were observed during the study. No cutaneous reactions were observed in the vehicles reference control or treated groups.

The proliferation index values of the test substance were $1.8 (\pm 0.9)$, $2.0 (\pm 1.0)$ and $1.8 (\pm 0.5)$ at treatment concentrations of 25, 50 and 100% respectively.

The proliferation index value of the positive control alpha-Hexylcinnamaldehyde was 4.4 (±2.2) at a treatment concentration of 30%.

I Materials and methods

A. Materials

1. Test material
itentification:
Physical appearance.
Batch?
Content:
Content:
CAS no
Storage condition:
Expiry date

2. Vehicle and/or positive control:

The test item was formulated in 1% Pluronic Acid L92® Positive control: alpha-Hexylcinnamaldehyde (HCA) is a well-known sensitizer

3. Test animals

Species:	Mice
Strain:	CBA/J mice
Age:	8 weeks old
Sex:	Female, nulliparous, non-pregnant
Weight at dosing:	19.0-22.6 grams
Source:	, France.
Acclimation period:	at least 5 days before study begin at least 5 days
Diet:	A04C-10, S.A.F.E. (
	, France
Water:	softened tap water from thomunicipal water supply was
	available ad libitum.
Housing:	Mice were housed individually in suspended, spinless steel,
	wire-mesh cages in a final second sec
Environmental conditions :	
Temperature:	$20-24^{\circ}C$
Humidity:	40-70%
Air changes:	10£13/hour 0 2
Photoperiod:	A hours
 B. Study design and methods 1. In-life dates: 	Start: February 15, 2010 End: February 20, 2019
2. Animal assignment and treatment: The animals were assigned to the group	s as follows:
Groups	Test item core No. of animals
Negative (vehicle) control (1% Pluronic)	
Amidosulfuron WG Z5 0 0	
Amidosulfuron W&75	2 50 5
AmidosulfurdoWG 75	100 5
Positive Control (HCA)	30 5

Each mouse was topically dosed once daily with 25 μ L of the formulation using micro pipette, to the dorsal surface of each each Mice were dosed on Days 0, 1 and 2.

There was no run of of the formulation during the application. The applied dose remained on the ears so a realistic skin exposure to the formulation was achieved.

On Day 5, animals were moved into an animal room within a Radiation Controlled Zone. Each mouse was placed individually in a retention box, intravenously injected via the tail vein with 250 μ L of sodium chloride (0.9%) containing approximately 20 μ Ci of [methyl-3H]-Thymidine and placed in a

plastic cage for 5 hours. Five hours (± 30 min) after intravenous injection, the mice were sacrificed by an overdose of Pentobarbital.

The draining auricular lymph nodes from each mouse were placed in an individual tube containing physiological saline and were disaggregated by crushing with a plastic piston. A cell suspension was obtained, free of connective tissue.

3. Determination of proliferation indices:

Cell suspensions were washed with 4 mL of 0.9% physiological saline, centrifuged for 20 minutes at 1800 rpm and the pellets obtained were re-suspended in 2 mL of 5% trichloroacetic acid (TCA) and stored overnight at 5±3°C. After a final centrifugation, the pellets were re-suspended in 1 mL of saline, mixed and then placed for approximately 25 mins in @ Ultrasonic Bath to ensure a thoroughly dispersed suspension. Once prepared cell suspensions were added to mumbered scintalitation pots containing 19 mL of scintillation fluid and assayed in a lota-counter.

The results were expressed as disintegrations per minute (DPM) Stimulation Indices (SI) were calculated according to the following formula

DPM of treated group SI= DPM of control group

In addition, an individual stimulation index (SI) was calculated using the absolute DPM value for each mouse as the numerator and the mean DPM value for the vehicle control group as the denominator. Standard deviations (SD) were calculated for each test group on the group mean disintegration per minute (DPM) and the stimulation indices (SI).

4. Evaluation criteria:

A test substance is regarded as a skip sensitizer if one concentration of the test substance results in an increase of 3H-TdR incorporation of three fold or greater, when compared to control values in the absence of skin irritation and if there is a dose-related response.

II. Results and discussion

A. Findings The results are summarized in the following tables

Groups 🔊 🔿 Oʻ Õč 、	⑦ ★ ¥ est item con- Mean
	🦻 👔 centration stimulation
	index (SD)
Negative (vehicke) control (1% Ruronic)	
Amidosulfuron WG 750 🖉 🖉	25 1.8 (0.9)
Amidosulfuren WG 🛪 浴 🕉 🍾	50 2.0 (2.0)
Amidosulturon W 🖓 75 👘 🖉 🖉	100 1.8 (0.5)
Positive control (HCA)	30 4.4 (2.2)

Stimulation indices lower than 3 were noted for Amidosulfuron WG 75 at all concentrations tested. The resulting calculated minulation index values were 1.8, 2.0, and 1.8 at concentrations of 25 %, 50 and 100 % (w/W, respectively.

There were no confounding effects of irritation or toxicity, so the proliferation values are considered to reflect the sensitization effects of the test and positive control substances.

III. Conclusions

In conclusion, under the conditions of the present assay Amidosulfuron WG 75 was found to be a nonsensitizing formulation in the Local Lymph Node Assay at all concentrations tested.

CP 7.1.7 Supplementary studies on the plant protection product

Not required by Commission Regulation (EU) No 284/2013 in the case of Amidosulfuron WG 75.

Supplementary studies for combinations of plant protection products **CP 7.1.8**

Not applicable. This plant protection product is not planned to be combined with other plant protection products.

CP 7.2 Data on exposure

CP 7.2.1 Operator exposure

Risk assessment for operator

Dermal Absorption

The default values provided by the recent EFSA guidance document on dermal absorption were used: 25% for neat formulation and 75% for spray dilution for amidosulfuron as it is present at a concentration >50 g/kg.

Acceptable Operator Exposure Le

The AOEL for amidosulfuron was derived from a 90 day and a Dyear dog study (100% oral absorption and a safety factor of 190) resulting in an AOEL of 1.4 mg/kg bw/day (EFSA Scientific Report 116. (2007).

The formulation Amidosulfuron WG 75 containing 750 g/kg @amidosulfuron is intended to be used on cereals, flax and grass fields a an het picide. The formulation is a water dispersible granule formulation (WG). Ś

The application (WG). application rate and thus the worst case scenario. Treatment is achieved via downward vehiclemounted spray application. Fire application parameters of the critical GAPs (cGAPs) are summarised in Table CP 7.2.1

O Application parameters of Amidosulfuron WG 75 professional uses relevant to Table CP 7.2 $\hat{a} \rightarrow 1$. **Operators**

((\sim	V				
Application		Ŭ F∕ G Ø	✓ Maximu ra	ım dose te	Spray	Number of	Application
technique	S Crop y		(Kg/ha product)	(kg a.s./ha)	(L/ha)	applications	(days)
Outdoor Vehicle-Mounted Downward Spraying	Grass/pasture (permanent grass)	р F	0.06	0.045	200-400	1	-

Operator exposure Stimation to Amidosulfuron WG 75 was calculated on the basis of the "EFSA Guidance on the assessment of exposure of operators, workers, residents and bystanders in risk

¹ EFSA Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues (PPR); Guidance on Dermal Absorption. EFSA Journal 2012;10(4):2665. [30 pp.] doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2665.

assessment for plant protection products"2 for the application scenario: "outdoor vehicle-mounted downward", without and with PPE (Personal Protective Equipment). Exposure predictions were obtained out of the available version of the currently exposure calculation spreadsheet³.

Details of calculations are given in CP 7.2.1.1. The results of exposure calculations are summarised in Table CP 7.2.1-2.

Table CP 7.2.1-2. Predicted systemic operator exposure] as a proportion of the AOEL

Application technique	PPE	Total systemic, xposure (ang@a.s./kgbw/day) ³
Outdoor vahiala mounted downward	Without PPE ¹⁾	
Outdoor venicle-mounted downward	With PPE ²⁾	× \$20086 % × \$9.62

1

¹⁾ work wear – arms, body and legs covered, bare hands;

²⁾ work wear – arms, body and legs covered, gloves;

³⁾ 60 kg body weight; dermal absorption 25% concentrate and 75 Whalation absorption

⁴⁾ AOEL= 1.4 mg/kg bw/day.

Assessment

The results of the calculations reveal that the situation is favourable. operator for the intended

The exposure predictions of systemic operator exposure account for 8% and 1% of the AOEL (1.4 mg/kg bw/day), while operating vehicle mounted downward application equipment, without and with

Based on above presented results there is no macceptable risk anticipated for the operator with the

² EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2014. Guidance on the assessment of exposure of operators, workers, residents and bystanders in risk assessment for plant protection products. EFSA Journal 2014;12(10):3874, 55 pp., doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3874

³ EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2014. Exposure calculation spreadsheet. Available at http://www.efsa.europa.eu/fr/efsajournal/doc/3874ax1.zip. Version of 30.03.2015.

CP 7.2.1.1 Estimation of operator exposure

Operator exposure estimations to **Amidosulfuron WG 75 G** were calculated on the basis of EFSA^{1,2}. Summaries of assumptions and the calculation details are presented in **Table CP 7.2.1.1-1**.

Table CP 7.2.1.1-1. Predicted systemic exposure to Amidosulfuron according to EFSA. (Downward spraying. Vehicle-mounted. Without and with PPE)

					. L
Substance	Amidosulfuron	Formulation	= Application	Sprax dilution #	Vapour pressore
		Wettable granules	s, rate-0.45 kg a.s	. 2.2 Og a.s./1	= low youatile
		soluble granules	/ha 🔍 🔍		substances
		•	Č,		Maving a vapour
			× (S IN W	<pre>> pressage of <5*40-3Pa</pre>
Scenario	Grassland and la	wns / Outdoor / De	ownward spraying	Buffer = $2-3$	Number °
	Vehicle-mounted			O S	applications =
					1, Application
					interval = 365
			$\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$		days
Percentage	Dermal for	Dermal for in was	e Oral ≠ 100 ~	Inhalation 7100	.K
Absorption	product = 25	dilution = 75 \bigcirc	a u		0
	1 /1 /1		C DVA A 6)* [*]
RVNAS	1.4 mg/kg bw/day	, <u> </u>	KVAAS V	mg/kg/bw/day	
DFR	3 μg a.s./cm ² per	A a	DT S	30 days	
	kg a.s./ha	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~			
				~(x['], Č	
		· 10 11 1		<u>0'`^</u>	
Operator M	odel Mit	king, waading and appli		1 1	
Potential	Longer term	systemic (Syposure)	0.1743	% ORVNAS	12.45%
exposure	mg/kg bw/dav		°∼ . Q	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
- F		Nit!	wit PPF	Ś. Ś.	
	<u> </u>			, y	
Mixing and I	Loading 🔊 🖉 Glo	ves = No	Clothing = Work	RPE = None	Soluble bags =
	0		wear - arms,		No
	ð .~		body and legs		
			wered a		
Application	Solution States Solution	ves No 🔊 🧍	Clothing = Work	RPE = None	Closed cabin =
			wear - arms,		No
			body and legs		
			covered		
Exposure	, Nonger Jerm	systemic exposure	0.1070	% of RVNAS	7.64%
(including F	PF mg/kg bw/da	vs 0			
options aboy	en n				
(o _o r x	Wi	th PPE		
4	<u> </u>				
Mixing and I	Loading _@ Glo	oves = Yes 🔗	Clothing = Work	RPE = None	Soluble bags =
	_0 <u>\$</u>		wear - arms,		No
¥ .			body and legs		
		<u>s</u>	covered		
Application	CGlo	oves = Yes	Clothing = Work	RPE = None	Closed cabin =
	8 4	"O"	wear - arms,		No
			body and legs		
	Ĩ		covered		
Exposure	Longer terr	n systemic exposure	0.0086	% of RVNAS	0.62%
(including	PPE mg/kg bw/c	lay			
options abov	e)	-			
L	,				

PPE = Personal Protective Equipment

RVNAS = Reference value non acutely toxic active substance

Document MCP: Section 7 Toxicological studies Amidosulfuron WG 75

CP 7.2.1.2 Measurement of operator exposure

Since the risk assessments carried out indicated that the AOEL for amidosulfuron was not be exceeded under practical conditions of use, a study to provide a measure of operator exposure under field conditions was not necessary and was therefore not carried out.

Bystander and resident exposure CP 7.2.2

Risk assessment for bystander and resident

The EFSA guidance has proposed a number of changes to current practice in assessing exposure to plant protection products. These changes include the introduction of agute risk assessments and the application of an AAOEL value (Acute Acceptable Operator Exposure Level) - Fterm osed to describe a reference value against which acute non-dietary exposures (i.e. those that might be incurred in a single day) could be assessed. Currently, however, no methodology is available for setting an AAOEL. Non-dietary risk exposure is primarily via derival and inhalation routes. Thus, the derivation of an AAOEL will differ from the procedure of setting an ARfD, which is used on dietary risk assessments where oral exposure is relevant. It will require careful evaluation, expert judgment or even additional data to determine which toxicological information should be used for AAOEL setting. It is therefore proposed that an acute risk assessment is made when an asreed guideline is available for establishing an AAOEL. The following risk assessment therefore considers the longer term exposure which will be compared with the AOEL. In this context on Oresident exposure is calculated using the EFSA model⁴ and is considered as covering the bystander exposure.

The intended outdoor uses comprise gass/pasture fields. Treatment is achieved via downward vehiclemounted spray application. The application parameters of the critical GAPs (cGAPs), following a risk envelope approach, are summarised in Table 7.2,2 1

Application technique	Grop A	F/G (K@/ha product)	um dose ate (kg a.s./ha)	Spray volume (L/ha)	Number of applications	Application interval (days)
Outdoor						
Vehicle-	Grass/pasture					
Mounted	(permanent	F 0.06	0.045	200-400	1	-
Downward	erass)					
Spraying			Ċ,			
4			\bigcirc			

Table 7.2.2-1. Critical@AP for bystander and resident exposure assessment

Consideration on estimation of resident exposure

Resident exposure estimations to Amidesulfuron WG 75 are estimated using the EFSA model⁵ with the refevant scenario "Trasfor-mounted/trailed boom sprayer: hydraulic nozzles". Details of calculations are given in **CP** 7.2.2.4. The results of exposure calculations are summarised in Table 7.2.2-2.

⁴ EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2014. Guidance on the assessment of exposure of operators, workers, residents and bystanders in risk assessment for plant protection products. EFSA Journal 2014;12(10):3874, 55 pp., doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3874

⁵ EFSA Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues (PPR); Guidance on Pesticides Exposure Assessment of Operators, Worker, Residents and Bystanders, EFSA Journal 2014;12(10):3874.

Table 7.2.2-2. Predicted systemic bystander and resident exposure [mg amidosulfuron kg bw/day] as a proportion of the AOEL

Application Scenario	Exposure Scenario		Total systemic exposure (mg amidosulfuron/kg bw/day)*	% of AOEL**
Field Cron	Pagidant	Adult	0.0408	2.92%
Field Clop	Resident	Children	0.0122	0.87%

* 60 and 10 kg body weight for adult and children respectively; dermal absorption 75% diluted spray; inhalation absorption 100%; ** 1.4 mg/kg bw/day.

Assessment

The results of the calculations reveal that the situation is favourable for bystanders and residents for the intended outdoor uses of Amidosulfuron WG 75 for grass fields and the situation of the situation is favourable for bystanders and residents for the intended outdoor uses of Amidosulfuron WG 75 for grass fields and the situation is favourable for bystanders and residents for the intended outdoor uses of Amidosulfuron WG 75 for grass fields and the situation is favourable for bystanders and residents for the intended outdoor uses of Amidosulfuron WG 75 for grass fields and the situation is favourable for bystanders and residents for the intended outdoor uses of Amidosulfuron WG 75 for grass fields and the situation is favourable for bystanders and the situation

Conclusion

Based on above presented results there is no unacceptable risk anticipated for bystanders and residents, both adults and children, exposed to amidesulfuren with the intended uses of Amidesulfuren WG 75.

1

CP 7.2.2.1 Estimation of bystander and resident exposure

The following definitions and assumptions for bystanders residents may be applied.

Bystanders and residents are not involved in application or Plandling plant protection products or the professional handling of treated crops.

Bystander/resident exposure may occup following foliar spray application outdoors. Bystander/resident exposure is calculated regarding the application scenario leading to the highest drift value. Application scenarios causing lower spray drift will be covered by this calculation and separate evaluations are not made. Exposure is calculated for adult and child residents.

Data used for the diculation

The following assumptions have been made in calculating resident exposure:

- The application rate is 0.6 Kg/ha of Amildosulfuron WG 75 resulting in 0.045 kg of amidosulfuron.



C

Table 7.2.2.1-1:	Detailed calculations of resident exposure to amidosulfuron, absorbed dose and % of
	AOEL

Substance	Amidosulfuron	Formulation =	Application	Spray dilution =	Vapour pressure
		Wettable granules,	rate-0.45 kg a.s.	2.25 g a.s./l	= low volatile
		soluble granules	/ha	<i>₽</i> ₂	having a vapour
					pressure of
				<u> </u>	₀<5*10 ₅ 3Pa
Scenario	Grassland and lay	wns / Outdoor / Dov	vnward spraying /	Buffer ¥2-3	Number
	Vehicle-mounted			67 10	application =
			<u> </u>		Application
			ð		omtervar ≠ 365
Doroontago	Dormal for	Darmal for in usa	Oral = 100	Inholdtion - 1/00	ays a
Absorption	product = 25	dilution = 75			<i>6</i>
Absolption		unution 75		<u> </u>	
RVNAS	1.4 mg/kg bw/day		RYAAS O	mg/kg bw/day	ĵ (ĵ
		Å			
Resident -	Spray drift (75th per	centile) mg/kg bw/day	0.0453	% of KYNAS	3 QA%
child	N. (754				
	Vapour (/5th percent	file) mg/kg bw/day		% OF RVNAS	Ø.08%
	Surface deposits (7	5th percentile) mg/kg	CQ053 🖉 🕺	% of RV&AS	0.38%
	bw/day				0.000/
	Entry into treated c	rops (75th percentile)	0.0138 %	% OF EVNAS	0.98%
	ilig/kg 0w/day				
	All pathways (mean)	mg/kg b₩/day		So of RVNAS	2.92%
Resident -	Spray drift (75th per	centile) mg/kg w/day	0.0108	% of RVNAS	0.77%
adult	Vanour (75th paraar	ilh) mg/leobuy/day			0.02%
	vapour (75th percen			× VINAS	0.0270
	Surface deposits 47	5th pocentile) mg/kg	0023	% of RVNAS	0.16%
	bw/day			A(0.050/
	Entry into treated c	rops (75th percentile)	0.005	% of RVNAS	0.37%
	mg/kg Uw/ugy	s s			
	All pathways (mean)	mg/kg bw/day	9 0 122 5	% of RVNAS	0.87%
			atom a Mar and a	AOEI)	

CP 7.2.2.2 Measurement of bystander and resident exposure

Since the exposure estimate carried out indicated that the health-based limit values (AOEL) will not be exceeded under practical conditions of use a study to provide a measure of bystander and resident exposure was not becessary and was therefore not carried out.

L

CP 7.2.3 Worker exposure

Risk assessment for worker

The greatest potent of for worker exposure following re-entry will be contamination *via* the skin. Risk of inhalation exposure during re-entry is generally confined to a brief period after application, while the product is drying, which will be rapid under outdoor conditions and would generally be avoided according to good agricultural practices.

Consideration on dermal exposure of workers

Worker exposure estimation to **Amidosulfuron WG 75** was calculated on the basis of the "*EFSA Guidance on the assessment of exposure of operators, workers, residents and bystanders in risk assessment for plant protection products*"². Exposure predictions were obtained out of the available version of the exposure calculation spreadsheet³.

Dermal exposure from contact with residues on foliage should be estimated as the product of the dislodgeable foliar residue (DFR), the transfer coefficient (TC) and the task duration (V):

Potential dermal exposure (PDE) in mg a.s./day = (DFR $[\mu g/cm^2] \times TC [m^2/h] \approx h/da / h/da$

The default value for time of exposure should be taken as two hours for crop inspection and irrigationtype activities.

Consideration on Dislodgeable Foliar Residues (DFR)

As experimentally determined DFR data are not available, the initial PFR (PFR0 is the DFR just after application, it assumes that no dissipation will take place and that everything is diabdgeable) in a first tier assessment should assume 3 µg active substance Pn2 of foliage Rg a.s. applied that the value provided was regarded as highly conservative PUROPDEM [μ 2002]

Transfer Coefficients:

The indicative TC values are based and modified from EUROPOEM II (2002)⁵ and in consideration of US EPA values. US Re-entry Agricol tural Transfert Factor (TF) data were used, recalculated by Health and Safety Executive to account for 75^m percentile instead of arithmetic mean. For crop inspection, a TC of 12 500 cm²/b was considered.

Predicted exposures are compared with the AOEL of amidosulfuron. Systemic exposure values assume the highest dermal absorption values. A body weight of 60 kg is assumed for the re-entry worker. Exposure estimates based proportions of the systemic AOELs accounted for by the estimates are summarised in the following Table. Detailed calculations are presented below.

Table CP 7.2.3-1:	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	Summary of predicted worker exposures arising from the use of amidosulfuron
	0	in the Amido sulfuron WG 25 formulation and comparison with the AOEL

Active substance Scenario	AOEL (mg/kg bw/day)	% of AOEL
$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ ithout \mathbf{PPE}^{1} \mathbf{Q}	1.4	30.13
Amidosulfation $\sqrt{2}$ With PPE ² $\sqrt{2}$ 0.0473	1.4	3.38

¹⁾ without working clothes- bare ands; ²⁾, with working clothes- bare hands;

°~

³⁾ 60 kg body weight dermal absorption 25% concentrate and 75% dilution; inhalation absorption 100%;

Assessment Assessment

Conclusion

Based on above presented results there is no unacceptable risk anticipated for workers with the intended uses of Amidosulfuron WG 75 entering in grass fields for inspection. Working clothes must be worn during re-entry activities for safety reasons, according to good agricultural practices.

⁶ European European

Ô

Document MCP: Section 7 Toxicological studies Amidosulfuron WG 75

CP 7.2.3.1 Estimation of worker exposure

Details of calculations are presented in table CP 7.2.3.1-1.

Table CP 7.2.3.1-1 Predicted systemic worker exposure to amidosulfuron a	according to	EFSA	without and
with PPE (fields inspection)			L

	·····				\ _¥ &
Substance	Amidosulfuron	Formulation =	Application	Spray dilution	Vapour pressure
		Wettable granules,	rate-0.45 kg a.s.	2.25 g a.s./	jow volatile
		soluble granules	/ha 🚕 °		substances
			Or .	× ~ () having a vapour
			×		<pre>content of content of conten</pre>
Scenario	Grassland and la	wns / Outdoor / Do	wnward, spraying//	Buffer = $2-3$	Number 🔬 °
	Vehicle-mounted			"0" (S)	applications =
			á Ó,	, O , O (J1, Application
					interval = 365
					dagys
Percentage	Dermal for	Dermal for in use	• Ora) ≠ 100 🗘	In Dalation #100	A land
Absorption	product = 25	dilution = 75		× > 0) Y
RVNAS	1.4 mg/kg bw/day			mg/kg/bw/day	
Worker -	Potential exposure	e mg/kg bw/day	0.421/9	% of RVNAS	30.13%
Inspection, irrigation	Working clothing	mg/kg bw/day 0	\$9473 \$ *	% of RXNAS	3.38%

CP 7.2.3.2 Measurement of worker exposure

Since the exposure estimate carried out indicated that the acceptable operator exposure level (AOEL) will not be exceeded under practical conditions of use, a study to provide a measure of worker exposure was not necessary and was therefore not carried out

CP 7.3 Dermal adsorption

In the absence of dermal absorption studies for amidosulfuron with the formulation Amidosulfuron WG 75 the default values of 25% for the concentrate and 75% for the diluted spray is used for amidosulfuron (PFSA gridance, document on dermal absorption).



⁷ EFSA Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues (PPR); Guidance on Dermal Absorption. EFSA Journal 2012;10(4):2665. [30 pp.] doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2665.