

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

## **Analysis of the most appropriate risk management options for D5**

**Substance name:** Decamethylcyclopentasiloxane  
[Referred to as D5 in this document]

**EC number:** 208-764-9

**CAS number:** 541-02-6

**Submitted by:** United Kingdom  
**Date:** June 2015<sup>1</sup>

### **1. Background**

Two cyclic volatile methylsiloxane (cVMS)<sup>2</sup> substances (referred to as D4 and D5) were included in Commission Regulation (EC) No 465/2008 to clarify their PBT properties. Industry submitted data in compliance with the Regulation in November 2009, and a final evaluation report for each substance was submitted by the UK rapporteur to ECHA in October 2010 (EA, 2010a & 2010b). The conclusion was that D5 meets the vPvB criteria and that D4 meets the PBT and vPvB criteria of Annex XIII. In parallel, the UK published detailed environmental risk evaluation reports (RERs) for both substances in 2009, along with a third related substance (D6) (EA, 2009a, 2009b & 2009c).

The purpose of this RMO analysis is to summarise what evidence is available to support any additional regulatory action required to minimise the release of D5 to the environment and the form that this regulatory action should take. This RMO analysis only considers measures to protect the environment and does not consider measures to protect human health. D5 has not been identified as an SVHC on human health grounds and a detailed review of other human health risks has not been performed for this RMO paper. The Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety (SCCS) published its opinion that cyclomethicone (D4, D5) does not pose a risk for human health when used in cosmetic products (SCCS, 2010).

### ***Regulatory Action Outside the EU***

#### ***Canada***

D5 was included in Batch 2 of the Challenge initiative under the Canadian Chemicals Management Plan. The final screening assessment report concluded that D5 is entering or may be entering the environment in a quantity or a concentration or under conditions that have or may have an immediate or long-term harmful effect on the environment or its biological diversity, but is not entering the environment in a quantity or a concentration or under conditions that constitute or may constitute a danger in Canada to human life or health. Therefore, it was concluded that D5 met the criteria in paragraph 64 (a) of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999 (CEPA 1999). The Canadian Ministers of the Environment and of Health proposed that it should be added to the Toxic Substances List. This intention was published in the Canada Gazette Part I on 31 January 2009, and the Proposed Order to add D5 to Schedule 1 of

---

<sup>1</sup> This RMO is an updated version of one that has been previously circulated in 2011, taking into account further information that has been provided and including an annex on additional uses identified.

<sup>2</sup> Cyclomethicone is a general term used when mixtures of D4, D5 and D6 are used.

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

CEPA 1999 was published on 16 May 2009<sup>3</sup>. This triggered a legal obligation to develop an instrument under CEPA to reduce their release to the environment within two years.

In July 2009, the Silicones Environmental, Health and Safety Council of North America submitted a Notice of Objection<sup>4</sup> regarding the Proposed Order. The Minister of the Environment subsequently established a Board of Review (BoR) to enquire into the danger posed by this substance. The Board produced its report<sup>5</sup> to the Minister of the Environment by in October 2011 which concluded the siloxane D5 does not pose a danger to the environment. However, it should be noted that the Canadian criteria are not the same as the Annex XIII criteria.

## **USA**

The US Environment Protection Agency (US-EPA) considered asking industry to enter into negotiation for an Enforceable Consent Agreement (ECA) for D5, similar to that agreed for D4. However, monitoring and risk assessment of D5 was not considered necessary after EPA reviewed the available data and the Canadian D5 BoR conclusions.

Regulatory agencies in a number of individual states are assessing the PBT profile of D5. The assessments are at different stages and are proceeding along individual timelines.

## **Japan**

CES (personal communication) has indicated that the Japanese regulatory authorities have expressed concern about D4 and D5 in relation to their national PBT criteria, although they are not yet considering specific risk management activities. They have requested an additional assessment of biomagnification for both D4 and D5, including laboratory studies in Japanese Carp and field monitoring. They have also requested human health data on D5 since it meets the PB criteria for a Type 1 Monitoring chemical. It is understood that the need for avian toxicity data on D5 is under discussion.

The European manufacturers/suppliers have indicated that they would prefer consistent global approaches to managing the risks of D5.

## **2. Objectives for (further) risk management**

The key concern for D5 is its vPvB properties and therefore its possible long-term effects on release to the environment from products in which it is contained and/or industrial waste. REACH calls for minimisation of emissions and exposures of SVHCs as far as technically and practically possible (recital 70). The aim for further regulatory action on D5 is therefore to minimise its release to the environment.

The timing of any intervention is potentially important in terms of its correspondence with regulatory action concerning D4, as D5 is a possible major substitute for D4. A RMO paper is also being put forward for D4. Considering regulatory action for both D4 and D5 at the same time should prevent any major

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://canadagazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p1/2009/2009-05-16/html/reg1-eng.html>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.cdr-siloxaned5-bor.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=70551E34-1>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.cdr-siloxaned5-bor.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=9320DEF6-1>

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

reformulation from taking place that would have potentially higher costs in the longer-term to the industry.

If the level of D5 is above 0.1 % w/w in any other substances, this would make them vPvB-containing substances, regardless of their own PBT/vPvB profile. Therefore, any further regulation of D5 will also need to take account of its presence in higher homologue substances<sup>6</sup>, which might be potential alternatives in some applications. This is considered further below (and is also discussed in the separate RMO document prepared for D4).

### **3. Available information**

#### **3.1 Current information on environmental hazard and risk**

##### **3.1.1. Issues around substance identity**

This information is taken from EA (2009b) and EA (2010b).

The typical purity of D5 is generally >90% w/w. The main impurities are hexamethylcyclotrisiloxane (D3), octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4) which is present at a concentration of less than 1 % w/w and dodecamethylcyclohexasiloxane (D6) which is present at a concentration of less than 3 % w/w. Other cyclic siloxanes are reported present at less than 1 %. Since D4 is a PBT substance, its presence in D5 above 0.1 % w/w would make D5 a PBT-containing substance, regardless of its own PBT profile. This must be taken into account in the RMO analysis.

##### **3.1.2 Hazard evaluation**

###### **3.1.2.1 Classification**

There is no harmonised classification for D5 under the CLP Regulation. No proposal for classification has been made by companies under the CLP Regulation. The available aquatic toxicity data for fish, invertebrates and algae show that D5 does not cause toxic effects in long-term studies at concentrations up to its water solubility limit, so the implementation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> ATP to the CLP Regulation will not affect this conclusion.

###### **3.1.2.2 PBT assessment**

Full details are provided in EA (2010b).

**Persistence:** Based on its rate of hydrolysis, D5 meets the Annex XIII criteria for a very persistent (vP) substance in water under typical environmental conditions (although there will be water bodies where the half-life is below 60 days). In addition, D5 has a very long degradation half-life in sediment, in the order of 800-3,100 days at 24 °C, and longer at lower temperatures. D5 therefore meets the Annex XIII criteria for a very persistent (vP) substance. Persistence in sediment is also supported by the sediment core data from Lake Pepin in the USA.

**Bioaccumulation:** A steady state fish bioconcentration factor (BCF) of 5,860 l/kg has been determined for D5 and so it clearly meets the Annex XIII criteria for B

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, dodecamethylcyclohexasiloxane (D6) (CAS no. 540-97-6) and tetradecamethylcycloheptasiloxane (D7) (CAS no. 107-50-6).

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

and vB. Monitoring studies show that it is frequently found in biota in the environment, the highest concentrations being associated with local sources of release (including in many cases its presence in biota in remote regions). Accumulation from sediment has been demonstrated but, in the food chains studied, the overall weight of evidence suggests that trophic dilution is occurring.

**Toxicity:** The available aquatic toxicity data for fish, invertebrates and algae show that D5 does not cause toxic effects in either short- or long-term studies at concentrations up to its water solubility limit. D5 is not classified on the basis of carcinogenicity, mutagenicity, or reproductive toxicity. Therefore it can be concluded that D5 does not meet the Annex XIII criteria for toxicity (T) based on either aquatic or mammalian end points (no data are available for birds).

**Summary:** D5 meets the vPvB criteria of Annex XIII. This has since been confirmed by an opinion from the Member State Committee, issued in April 2015.<sup>7</sup>

### **3.2 Overview of uses for D5 and availability of alternative substances**

The UK risk evaluation report (EA, 2009b) was based on the total European tonnage that was known about at the time of its preparation. Industry has confirmed that the use pattern has remained broadly consistent (personal communication), and so unless otherwise stated the rest of the information in this section is taken from EA (2009b).

Four companies produced or supplied D5 in the EU in 2004. The actual quantities are confidential. The main uses of D5 can be divided into five areas:

- Use as a site-limited chemical intermediate at the site of production.
- Use as an off-site chemical intermediate for the production of silicone polymers.
- Use in personal care products.
- Use in household products.
- Use in industrial/institutional cleaning (e.g. dry cleaning).

Use as a cleaning solvent in the electronics industry was stated to be of historical interest only.

In 2004, around 2,283 tonnes were used as an off-site intermediate for the production of silicone polymers and 17,300 tonnes were used in personal care products. The other uses are much smaller in scale (the amounts are confidential).

Production of D5 in the UK has shown an increasing trend over recent years. The main uses (shown above) show a generally increasing trend in both the UK and the EU. This analysis is based on relatively few data points (in some cases only two years).

Reasonable worst case regional and continental emissions for each use based on EA (2009b) are presented in Table 1.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://echa.europa.eu/about-us/who-we-are/member-state-committee/opinions-of-the-msc-adopted-under-specific-echa-s-executive-director-requests>

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

**Table 1 Summary of environmental release estimates for D5**

Scenario	Emission (kg/year)	
	Regional	Continental
Production and on-site use as an intermediate – UK site	Confidential to air 3.1 to surface water	Not quantified
Chemical intermediate – off-site – polymers – wet process (non-UK site)	Confidential to air Confidential to wastewater	Confidential to air Confidential to wastewater
Chemical intermediate – off-site – polymers – dry process (non-UK site)	Confidential to air 0 to wastewater	Confidential to air 0 to wastewater
Personal care products – formulation	315 to air 1,557 to wastewater	2,834 to air 14,013 to wastewater
Personal care products – use	756,000 to air 84,000 to wastewater	14,814,000 to air 1,646,000 to wastewater
Household products – formulation	Confidential to air Confidential to wastewater	Confidential to air Confidential to wastewater
Household products – use	Confidential to air Confidential to wastewater	Confidential to air Confidential to wastewater
Industrial/institutional cleaning – formulation	Not relevant	Not relevant
Industrial/institutional cleaning – use	Confidential to air Confidential to wastewater	Confidential to air Confidential to wastewater
Residual monomer in polymers	87,390 to air	786,510 to air

The release estimates are based on assumptions about percentage losses from different scenarios and are not necessarily measured data. The most significant release to wastewater is expected to arise from use in personal care products. Formulation of personal care products is also a significant source. Smaller releases to wastewater are expected from (in order of declining magnitude): use of household products, production and on-site use as an intermediate, off-site chemical intermediate for polymer production (wet processes), and use in industrial/institutional cleaning. Monitoring data (summarised in EA (2009b) and EA (2010b)) demonstrate that environmental exposure in aquatic ecosystems is widespread. Although the sources of that exposure are not always apparent, the levels are highest downstream from municipal WWTP and industrial areas.

Siloxanes (both cyclic and linear) are well known components of landfill gas, and can cause mechanical problems in pumping engines due to the build up of silica deposits (EA, 2010c). A further emission of 44,875–78,000 kg/year of D5 to air is estimated from the possible degradation of silicone polymers in soil and landfills in the EU, although this is subject to a large uncertainty. This amount is small compared to other sources of emission to air and so has not been considered further.

D5 is highly volatile (the Henry's law constant is around  $3.34 \times 10^6$  Pa m<sup>3</sup>/mol at 25 °C), which has a significant influence on its environmental fate and distribution. Release to water can lead to accumulation in sediments, where it has a long dissipation half-life. Transport through the marine environment is unlikely given D5's overall volatility, low water solubility and hydrolytic instability at normal pHs of the marine environment.

Release to air can lead to long-range transport. The available experimental and modelling studies indicate that once in the atmosphere, D5 is present almost entirely in the vapour phase and has a low potential for wet and dry deposition (EA, 2009b & 2010b). Monitoring shows that D5 is present in some biota samples

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

from remote regions, generally at very low concentrations (close to the limit of detection). The possibility of local sources of D5 even in remote locations means that the interpretation of these data in terms of long-range transport potential is difficult.

It is therefore proposed that the aim for regulatory action should be to limit release into the aquatic environment in the first instance, since its presence in the atmosphere is not expected to lead to significant exposure of the aquatic or terrestrial environments.

### **3.2.1 Use as a chemical intermediate**

By far the major use of D5 is as a monomer in the manufacture of silicone polymers. The equilibrium concentration of cVMS in polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) is thought to be around 18% by weight with D4, D5, and D6 making up >95 per cent of the total cyclic fraction. CVMS can also be reformed through thermal degradation of the polymer. Similarly, modified PDMS polymer and silicone elastomer products may contain small amounts of cVMS as impurities (at levels that are currently unclear).

The polymers have a very wide range of uses in consumer and industrial applications:

- foaming agents in oil processing;
- flow and/or gloss improvers in alkyd paints and varnishes;
- lubricants in polishes and maintenance products;
- anti-adhesion/anti-adherence coatings and mould-release agents;
- hydraulic, dielectric, and heat-transfer fluids and in diffusion pump oils;
- barrier creams and lipsticks;
- pharmaceuticals;
- lubricants for motors, instruments, and precision bearings;
- silicone emulsions used as antifoams;
- silicone greases for gear and bearing lubrications;
- silicone pastes for valve lubricants, mould-release agents, and electrical and electronic protection;
- pressure-sensitive adhesives;
- textile manufacturing additives (waterproofing and softness & wetting agent); and
- paper sizing and paper coating additives.

Modified PDMS are used as intermediates and as waterproofing agents for textiles and wall boards, high-temperature oil baths, greases, diffusion pump fluids, paint additives, gasket materials, release agents for plastics and urethane parts, for cutting oils, personal care products, household care products, automotive care products, and in plastic modification.

Organosiloxane (silicone) elastomers are used for coatings, gels, sealants, and rubbers (for the manufacture of tubes, rods, wire and cable insulation, and continuous profile); coated textiles and glass cloth (used to form tubes and hoses of complex shapes); electrical connectors, O-ring seals, valves, electrical components, health care products, and sports equipment (goggles and scuba masks); silicone foam for building and construction fire-stop systems and as pipe insulation in power plants. It is also used in the production of sealants, encapsulants, foams, coatings, caulking, and mould making. Applications of heat-cured rubber include tubing, hoses, wire and cable insulation, penetration seals, laminates, release coatings, foams, and other moulded and extruded articles, such as gaskets, key pads, ignition cables, belting, and catheters. Gel applications include electronic encapsulates and wound-dressing patches. One component

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

cold-cured rubbers are used as caulks and sealants for expansion joints and windows, for seals, gaskets, and shock-absorbing fixing in vehicles and domestic appliances, and in heat-resistant adhesives. Two component cold-cured (addition cured) rubbers are used as dielectric gels, for electronic and electrical encapsulation, in fire-resistant cable coatings, in foamed sealants, and in resin-casting moulds. Two-component cold-cured (condensation cured) rubbers are used as moulding compounds for furniture and construction, in paper anti-adhesion coatings, as electrical component sealants, as roofing membranes, and as window and curtain walling sealants. Heat-cured silicone rubbers are used in chemical resistant and medical tubing and mouldings, flexible and rigid foams, press-foamed automobile seals, and wire and cable jacketing. Also in paper release coatings used in label systems.

The breakdown of the total use between the various main applications in Western Europe for 2002 was:

- sealants, 210,000 tonnes (~32 per cent)
- elastomers, 139,000 tonnes (~21 per cent)
- fluids, 139,000 tonnes (~21 per cent)
- specialities, 92,000 tonnes (~14 per cent)
- silanes, 60,000 tonnes (~9 per cent)
- resins, 20,000 tonnes (~3 per cent).

Another, more detailed, breakdown was given for the Western European use of elastomers and silicone fluids. For elastomers, 20 per cent were used in automotive applications, 15 per cent in electrical fittings, 14 per cent in medical and healthcare applications, 9 per cent in appliances, 9 per cent in consumer goods, 7 per cent in textile coatings, 7 per cent in paints and coatings, 7 per cent in mould making, 5 per cent in business machines, and 7 per cent in other applications.

For the silicone fluids, 26 per cent were used as processing aids, 18 per cent in personal care products, 15 per cent in paper coatings, 10 per cent in paints and coatings, 7 per cent as mechanical fluids, 5 per cent in textile applications, and 24 per cent in other applications. Further information has been included in the annex on the use of silicone polymers in the oil/gas, paper/pulp and detergent industries.

### ***Alternatives***

Due to the equilibrium nature of the reaction that leads to the formation of silicone polymers from cVMS, it is generally not possible to reduce D4 and D5 to below 0.1% w/w in polymers at the manufacturing stage. It is possible that other polymer systems might be suitable for some applications, but the high demand for silicone polymers suggests that they are the material of choice for many. In this context, the polymers can also be made using linear siloxane monomers. However, this is currently a minor technology in Europe. A major silicone manufacturing company has indicated that they could make the switch to this technology over a number of years (the situation for other companies and investment required is not known).

In addition, the linear siloxanes may also have similar environmental issues as the cVMS in terms of their PBT profiles. For example, some have been reviewed by the OECD, and the following conclusions presented in Table 2 were drawn:

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

**Table 2 Summary of reviewed environmental data for linear siloxanes**

<b>Chemical</b>	<b>Hazard profile</b>	<b>Area of Use</b>
<b>Octamethyltrisiloxane (L3)</b>	Due to hydrolysis L3 possesses properties indicating a low aquatic hazard profile (at the limit of the water solubility), although it has potential to bioaccumulate and is not readily biodegradable. L3 possesses properties indicating a hazard for human health (repeated-dose toxicity).  L3 therefore meets the screening P criterion, is vB and T for mammalian data.	L3 is used in personal care (25-40%) and consumer products, as a chemical intermediate (0.1-100%) and as an intermediate for silicone oligomers and polymers.
<b>Trisiloxane, 1,1,1,5,5,5-hexamethyl-3,3-bis[(trimethylsilyl)oxy] M4Q</b>	M4Q possesses properties indicating a hazard for the environment. It is not readily biodegradable and is expected to bioaccumulate. Industry has stated that a study has been completed that demonstrates this material does not meet the criteria for bioaccumulation.	M4Q is an organic substance that occurs as a reaction by-product or impurity in a wide range of silicon-based products, including those found in adhesives, sealants, processing intermediates, lubricants, antifoaming agents, paints and coatings. This is therefore not an alternative to D4 or D5 but may be present in substitutes.

Environment Canada is reviewing the linear siloxanes. They have completed screening assessments for linear siloxanes L3 (octamethyltrisiloxane (MDM), CAS No. 107-51-7) and M4Q that concluded that it did not meet the criteria for CEPA 1999 and also include data for L4 (decamethyltetrasiloxane, CAS No. 141-62-8) and L5 PTS, (dodecamethylpentasiloxane, CAS No. 141-63-9), as analogues.<sup>8</sup> In addition, the UK has added L2, L3, L4 and L5 to the Community Rolling Action Plan to evaluate their hazards and risks. Conclusions are unlikely to be available until 2018 at the earliest.

A more detailed assessment of alternatives will be undertaken for the Annex XV dossier.

### **3.2.2 Use in personal care products**

D5 is used directly in the manufacture of cosmetic, skin- and hair-care formulations. The Cosmetic Toiletry and Perfumery Association (CTPA) indicate that the functions of the cVMS used in cosmetics in the UK are, in general, in the following three main areas (EA, 2009a):

- as hair-conditioning agents,
- as skin-conditioning agents (emollient),
- as solvents.

The types of products in which they are reported to be used include aftershave lotions, colognes, toilet waters, perfumery products, baby lotions, oils, powders and creams, baby shampoos, bath oils and bath salts, etc., make-up products, make-up removers and skin cleaning products, deodorants and antiperspirants,

---

<sup>8</sup> Additional substances that might be relevant as substitutes in some or all uses of D4 include hexamethyldisiloxane (HMDS, CAS no. 107-46-0), previously reviewed by OSPAR and included on the draft CoRAP; and 1,1,1,3,5,5,5-heptamethyltrisiloxane (HMTS, CAS no. 1873-88-7), which is due to be reviewed by the OECD later in 2011.



**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

eye creams and eye make-up products (such as powders, mascaras, pencils, etc.), general make-up (such as foundations, blushers, face powders, and lipsticks), shampoos, conditioners, and hair dyes and colours, hair sprays, shaving products, skin-care preparations (such as creams, lotions, cleansers, and toners), sun creams and after-sun products, and hair-grooming aids.

SCCS (2010) adds that cVMS are used in various cosmetic products as an antistatic/ emollient/humectant/solvent/viscosity controlling/hair conditioning ingredient and for the good spreadability of the products. Published data in the scientific literature indicated that cyclomethicone may be present in some cosmetic products, for instance in antiperspirants, at concentrations >40% concentration. COLIPA provided limited information on typical use patterns and concentrations, which has been supplemented by information provided by the Norwegian authorities (Talberg, 2006 – see Table 3) and the Danish EPA (2005) on use concentrations and relevant subgroups of cosmetic products. This and recent surveys on organosilicone compounds in personal-care and household products (Horii & Kannan, 2008; Wang et al., 2009; CIR, 2009) indicate the presence of both D4 and D5 in several cosmetic products.

**Table 3 Concentration of D4 and D5 in different types of cosmetic products according to Talberg (2006)<sup>9</sup>**

Type of product	Number of product within group	Average concentration (%)	Range (%)
Sun protection products (SPP)	25	7.2	0.5 - 24
Skin care products (SCP)	17	5.7	1 – 16.5
<i>SPP and SCP combined</i>	42	6.6	-
Hair styling products	4	2.0	1 - 5
Hair care (not colours)	4	14.2	3 - 28
<i>Hair care combined</i>	8	8.1	-
Rouge, powder	8	9.9	2 – 33.6
Deodorants and antiperspirants	4	23	8 - 45
All products	62	8.3	-

It is worth noting that cyclomethicone (D4 and/or D5) is not present in all cosmetic products: the Danish EPA<sup>10</sup> has a database in which 766 cosmetic products are registered with respect to their chemical content: 61 products (8%) contain D4 or cyclomethicone (D4 and/or D5). These are hair styling products, shampoos, conditioners and stick deodorants (Lassen et al., 2005). Another database (Skin Deep), established by the American environmental organisation the Environmental Working group, lists 14,900 cosmetic products and their ingredients. According to this database, 719 products contain cyclomethicone, and 964 products contain D5, i.e. about 11% of all cosmetic products (cited from Talberg, 2006). Data published in the final report of the Cosmetic Ingredient Review Expert Panel (CIR, 2009) support similar conclusions on use patterns in various product categories. For example, D5 is reportedly used in 60 out of 499 mascara products, suggesting that about 12% of mascara products on the market contain cyclomethicone (SCCS, 2010).

For the environmental emission estimates in EA (2009a), it was assumed that the cVMS is lost rapidly to air via volatilisation after application of products to the skin

<sup>9</sup> The information on D4 and D5 concentrations was actually taken from the American branch periodical Cosmetic & Toiletries Magazine (C&TM), which regularly provides formulations for many different types of cosmetics.

<sup>10</sup> (<http://www.mst.dk/NR/rdonlyres/13C1D483-54CE-48BCB281-5F51EBCF7460/0/engudgavelayout.pdf>)

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

(antiperspirants, skin care products, etc.) (i.e. it is assumed that the skin is not washed immediately after application of the product). However, for hair care products (i.e. shampoos, conditioners) it was assumed that the cVMS is lost to water during use (since the hair is wetted/washed during or immediately after application of the product). It is understood that industry has since performed additional studies to investigate skin retention and wash-off for several product types. These data will be reviewed as part of a larger review of technical data during Annexe XV dossier production.

### **Alternatives**

As noted above, a significant proportion of personal care products do not contain cVMS. It is therefore clear that the overall function of the product (e.g. perspiration prevention, hair conditioning, etc.) can be delivered without their use. However, it is recognised that cVMS have particular technical properties that make them useful for specific product formulations. Direct substitution with alternative substances to deliver those same properties is currently considered difficult. (Industry, personal communication). Low molecular weight silicone materials may be able to deliver similar volatility/drying properties. As they are produced in lower volumes, they are more expensive.

There is an increasing trend in the use of D5 in these applications. In addition, it is noted that D6 is also used in personal care products. D6 is considered a possible direct substitute for D4 and D5, in some if not all product types, imparting all of the desired properties. However industry does not currently have the capacity to produce sufficient D6 to satisfy the requirements of the personal care industry (personal communication).

Personal care product formulators can, if needed, replace cVMS where they are used as solvents and carriers because alternatives do exist for these functions. Organofunctional silicones used with natural esters can act as a substitute for cVMS in antiperspirants imparting the same characteristics<sup>11</sup>. Other alternatives are emollients such as esterified vegetable oils, and whilst not considered a drop-in replacement they can be formulated to make face, body, sun, and hair care products with the same feel as siloxane-containing products. Micronized wax dispersions are also possible alternatives with hair conditioning, shine, and strengthening properties. 'Silk Conditioning Polymers' can also be used: the polymer minimises hair breakage allowing a comb to glide through. It is also claimed that these polymers also have a small environmental footprint.

An entirely different approach to cVMS is already on the market in the form of a cationic polymer. Used as a conditioner and rheology stabiliser, it enhances deposition of silicone on hair and skin, meaning less silicone is required in a formulation and ultimately less goes down the drain.

### **3.2.3 Use in household products**

D5 is used directly in the manufacture of cleaning products, which may include polishes, waxes etc., and it is also used in car care products such as tyre refinishers and polishes and waxes ([www.silicones-europe.com](http://www.silicones-europe.com)). The UK risk evaluation report (EA, 2009b) made an assumption about the volumes and uses of household products in the absence of any detailed information from this sector. The Chemical Safety Report (CSR) indicates that the aquatic emissions from this use are insignificant in comparison to the personal care sector. The use in

---

<sup>11</sup> <http://pubs.acs.org/cen/coverstory/89/8918cover.html> Chemical and Engineering News

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

household products is considered a minor use in terms of tonnage and product market. The UK Cleaning Products Industry Association (UKCPI) believes that D5 is not currently used in their products and therefore any EU-wide risk management measures will not impact their industry.

### ***Alternatives***

There is an increasing trend to use D5 in these applications. Other alternatives are also available, and a more detailed assessment of alternatives will be undertaken for the Annex XV dossier. Contacts have been made with the trade associations who represent the industry who manufacture possible alternatives.

#### ***3.2.4 Use in industrial/institutional cleaning***

This represents use in dry cleaning. Estimated releases to wastewater are based on confidential information but local emissions were expected to be negligible based on its low solubility in water and the small amounts of wastewater generated by the process.

### ***Alternatives***

D5 was developed as an alternative dry cleaning fluid to chlorinated solvents, and there was an increasing trend in the use of D5 in this application in 2004.

This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.

**Table 4: Summary of available information on D5: uses and availability of alternative substances**

Use	Alternatives		
	Available substances	Identified hazards	Technical and economic feasibility
Sun protection products (SPP)	D6	Contains a vPvB substance as an impurity	
	esterified vegetable oils		
	cationic polymer		
Skin care products (SCP)	D6	Contains a vPvB substance as an impurity	
	esterified vegetable oils		
	cationic polymer		
Hair styling products	D6	Contains a vPvB substance as an impurity	
	esterified vegetable oils		
	Micronized wax dispersions		
	cationic polymer		
Hair care (not colours)	D6	Contains a vPvB substance as an impurity	
	esterified vegetable oils		
	Micronized wax dispersions		
	cationic polymer		
Deodorants and antiperspirants	D6	Contains a vPvB substance as an impurity	
	Organofunctional silicones / natural esters		
	esterified vegetable oils		
	cationic polymer		
<b>Fabric Conditioner</b>			
<b>Wax Polish</b>			
<b>Shoe Polish</b>			
<b>Industrial/Institutional Cleaning</b>			

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

### **3.3 Sources of uncertainty**

The following sources of uncertainty are identified which could influence decisions on the most appropriate regulatory action to take:

#### ***Identity and composition:***

- A number of related commercial substances contain D5 as an impurity, sometimes above 0.1% w/w. Impurity profiles vary between manufacturers.
- D5 is also present above 0.1% w/w in most silicone polymers.

#### ***PBT properties:***

- Registrants have not identified D5 as a vPvB (or PBT-containing) substance, because they believe that there is no evidence of biomagnification, which is a relevant consideration in the revised Annex XIII. However, the EU has since agreed that it clearly meets the vPvB criteria, and on that basis, the UK CA considers that D5 should be managed accordingly. Its unusual fate and behaviour properties mean that releases to air are assumed to be of low concern. This assumption affects the extent to which risk management is necessary.
- No adverse effects on fertility were seen in the two reproductive toxicity studies conducted for D5 at up to 160 ppm, the highest dose tested. An impairment of female fertility was reported for D4. Reproductive toxicity studies with D5 were conducted at concentrations below the NOAEL for fertility effects identified for D4 and, given the similarities between D4 and D5; it is possible that positive findings might have been obtained for D5 if higher systemic doses had been achieved. In addition there are no avian toxicity data. It is therefore possible that identification as a PBT substance would be warranted if a more complete dataset were available.

#### ***Use pattern:***

- In EA (2009a), assumptions were made about the extent of loss to waste water from various consumer products. This could be refined with better information on wash off rates, market splits and product composition data.

#### ***Use and availability of alternatives***

- It is not clear if it is possible to reformulate products to remove or reduce the levels of D5 without affecting the technical performance of the product.
- The extent to which D5 could be substituted with less hazardous alternatives is not clear. This is partly due to a lack of information on which substances may be suitable and partly due to a lack of information on the hazardous properties of the alternatives that have been identified.

## **4. Justification for further intervention at the European level**

Given the high tonnage, large number of potential users and widespread use pattern, European-wide measures to minimise emissions would be appropriate, since the substance is considered to meet the Annex XIII vPvB criteria. There is the potential for release during the manufacture of products formulated with D5 and during the use and disposal of such products. Products manufactured with D5 in one Member State may be transported to and used in other Member States. In addition, countries within the EU may be exposed to D5 emissions caused by other member states, regardless of action to reduce D5 use within their own borders. This means that it is appropriate to consider EU-wide measures for risk reduction. This offers the most effective way to implement controls efficiently and uniformly within the EU.

D5 can be transported long distances in the atmosphere. The European Commission may decide to examine its potential listing as a Persistent Organic

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

Pollutant under international conventions at a later stage. This aspect has not been considered as the focus of this RMO paper is on EU controls. However, it is worth noting that D5 is not expected to redeposit to any significant extent in remote environments

Another reason for proposing EU-wide measures to control the manufacture/use of D5 stems from the need to avoid trade and competition distortions, which could occur within the EU under measures imposed at a national level. Proposing measures to control the manufacture/use of D5 at a community level ensures a "level playing field" such that the burden on enterprises from any legislative requirements does not result in them becoming less competitive in the EU market, as compared to the case if national level measures are taken.

## **5. Identification of risk management options**

The following legislative instruments and other initiatives have the potential to influence emissions to the environment:

- REACH: The following elements of REACH have the potential to control emissions to the environment.
  - Registration
  - Evaluation
  - Authorisation (including candidate listing)
  - Restriction
- Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC)
- The Solvents Emissions Directive (1999/13/EC) (as amended by Directive 2004/42/EC)
- Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) Directive (2008/1/EC)
- Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC)
- Sewage Sludge Directive (86/278/EEC)
- Voluntary Product Stewardship

The primary goal for regulatory action on D5 is to reduce the level of risk (i.e. emission) that the use of this substance poses to the aquatic environment. This RMO paper therefore looks at the potential for different tools to provide the additional information that is required and considers the way in which legislation could be used to take additional regulatory action.

## **Assessment of the identified risk management options**

### **6.1 REACH**

The supply of D5 onto the European market is within the scope of REACH. The following elements of REACH have the potential to address the issues with D5:

- Registration
- Substance Evaluation
- Authorisation (including candidate listing)
- Restriction

The baseline against which other risk management options will be assessed is the registration of D5 under REACH.

### **Registration**

The ECHA website confirms registration of D5 has taken place. Eight registrations have been submitted, and nineteen exposure scenarios and corresponding recommended risk management measures (RMMs) are identified.

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

The recommended RMMs do not specifically seek to minimise emissions. The only environmental RMMs mentioned in the CSRs are effluent treatment in a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), and/or use of air emission abatement equipment, depending on the exposure scenario. These are related to the control of PEC/PNEC risks. Although a detailed review has not been performed, it is understood that the lead registrant's risk assessment is based on a number of assumptions that are not included in the REACH Technical Guidance (e.g. a change in the default connection rate to WWTP, implying less untreated wastewater is discharged direct to rivers, which is relevant for the regional background concentration). It is therefore unclear whether the recommended RMMs are indeed adequate to control the PEC/PNEC risks, or set an acceptable baseline for current emissions.

Modelling in the lead registrant's CSR (Section 10.20) suggests that a reduction in D5 concentrations in water and sediment can be achieved by reducing emissions to water but would not be affected significantly by reduction in emissions to air (it is not clear if this relates to this registrant's tonnage only, but presumably this is the case). On this basis, the CSRs do not provide evidence that emissions of this SVHC have been minimised to a sufficient extent.

### ***Substance Evaluation***

An EU Member State evaluation under the transitional arrangements (EA, 2010b) has already established that the substance meets the Annex XIII vPvB criteria. There is no formal mechanism for agreement of evaluation dossiers in this context, although an informal PBT workshop of interested Member States accepted the conclusions in November 2010. Substance evaluation could provide some additional information relevant to risk management, although data can also be gathered using voluntary means and so this is not considered to be a useful route. Authorisation and restriction should therefore be considered. In particular, REACH would appear to be the primary mechanism that could be used to apply controls on imported goods.

### ***Authorisation (including candidate listing)***

D5 is supplied in high tonnages. Its use as an additive in a variety of consumer products creates a potential for significant, diffuse releases to the environment. D5 meets the criteria of a vPvB substance. D5 could therefore be considered to meet Article 57 (e) for the identification of a SVHC. On this basis, it is considered that D5 fulfils all the relevant criteria for inclusion on Annex XIV. This would create pressure on industry to find substitutes in the long-term. Nevertheless, there are some additional considerations to bear in mind:

- i) Authorisation does not apply to the principal use of the substance as a chemical intermediate, and so is not able to address any issues arising from the presence of D5 as a significant impurity in polymeric products.
- ii) Candidate listing could lead to commercial pressure to move away from the use of D5 for polymeric uses (which are generally expected to be low risk, yet high volume), with unknown consequences (e.g. replacement with equally or more harmful substances).
- iii) Environmental concentrations are expected to respond to reductions in waste water emissions rather than air emissions. Annex XIV listing would capture any use, regardless of the level of risk it poses, and therefore provides a somewhat blunt tool to address the risks. This might be dealt with by specifying

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

product exclusions, but these would need to be carefully described. The work to do this might be equivalent to that needed to develop a restriction proposal.

iv) D5 can be a significant impurity in other substances (such as D6), which would therefore be a source of environmental exposure. Authorisation would not be able to address this source, unless the higher homologues were also added to Annex XIV.

### ***Restriction***

Restrictions can be introduced when there is an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment arising from the manufacture, placing on the market and use of a substance and the risk needs to be addressed on a Community-wide basis. A restriction can also address article imports (if relevant) and production and use of chemical intermediates, which authorisation is unable to address.

D5 is of concern because of its vPvB properties. This concern applies to any use where there is the potential for environmental release. However, environmental concentrations can only be reduced significantly by controlling aquatic emissions. D5 has a wide range of uses. The greatest aquatic emissions (in a regional context), are from use in personal care products. Restriction could provide a targeted risk management approach, as it can specifically address those uses with significant releases which pose the greatest risk to wastewater. The scope of the restriction is therefore important and it is suggested that in the first instance a restriction could be targeted at personal care products. However, if new evidence shows that other uses create unacceptable risks further regulatory action may need to be considered at a later date. In addition, a restriction can also address the concentration of D4 in D5.

Introduction of a restriction on the use of D5 would require the identification of a suitable alternative for all uses that fall within the scope of the restriction. Personal care products are available that do not contain cVMS to provide the desired function, so this should be possible. The introduction of a restriction will mean that the same legislative requirements apply to imported articles as those manufactured within the EU.

## ***6.2 Other Legislative measures<sup>12</sup>***

### ***Water Framework Directive (WFD) (2000/60/EC):***

This provides a framework for the protection of inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal water and groundwater. It places duties on Member States to regulate the release of discharges into the aquatic environment. The Directive itself does not provide any mechanisms to gather information about a substance/product or to regulate emissions directly; local emissions to the environment would be controlled by national measures including environmental permits. D5 is not a current Priority Substance (PS) or Priority Hazardous Substance (PHS). There would therefore be a delay before the relevant Commission committees could consider it, in line with the planning cycle for inclusion of new substances.

---

<sup>12</sup> Although one of the main uses of concern is in personal care products, the Cosmetics Directive 76/768/EEC (and its draft revision) only considers risks to human health, and does not address environmental concerns. It is therefore not relevant for this RMO paper.



**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

Identification of D5 as a PHS would require the Commission to establish an Environmental Quality Standard (EQS) at the European level. Member States would then be obliged to carry out measures to achieve the EQS, where it is technically feasible and not disproportionately costly to do so. If D5 were to be designated as a PHS then Member States would also have to carry out measures for the cessation, or phasing out of discharges, emissions and losses to the aquatic environment.

The Water Framework Directive is potentially an important risk management tool in this case because the primary concern relates to aquatic discharges. However, there is an issue of timing and consistency. The current PS/PHS prioritisation round is being finalised at the moment, and the next round will not be complete until 2015. Even if the substance were to be considered during the next round there is no guarantee that it would be identified as a PS/PHS as this may depend on information on environmental levels, etc. If it was accepted as a PS/PHS, the Directive still does not provide an effective way to reduce emissions, and measures may vary across the EU due to differences in national priorities. Supply controls are likely to be much more cost effective than improvements at wastewater treatment plants. Nevertheless, it might provide a useful monitoring tool to assess whether aquatic emissions are declining following the introduction of relevant risk management under REACH.

***The Solvents Emissions Directive 1999/13/EC (as amended by Directive 2004/42/EC):***

This legislation is not especially relevant to emissions to wastewater, but is listed here because D5 is a volatile organic compound (VOC) within the meaning of the legislation.

The purpose of the Solvent Emissions Directive is to prevent or reduce the direct and indirect effects of emissions of VOCs into the environment, mainly via air, by providing measures and procedures to be implemented for certain activities. These activities are listed in Annex I of the Directive, and are within scope of the Directive provided they are operated above the emission thresholds listed in Annex IIA.

D5 is used in dry cleaning, and the Directive covers "any industrial or commercial activity using VOCs in an installation to clean garments, furnishing and similar consumer goods with the exception of the manual removal of stains and spots in the textile and clothing industry". The appropriate emission-limit values related to VOCs from dry cleaning are a total emission limit value of 20 g solvent/kg of product cleaned and dried (certain exemptions also apply).

The use as a cleaning solvent in the electronics industry was stated to be of historical interest only. If it is still relevant, then this use would be captured by this Directive as surface cleaning (i.e. any activity except dry cleaning using organic solvents to remove contamination from the surface of material including degreasing. A cleaning activity consisting of more than one step before or after any other activity shall be considered as one surface cleaning activity. This activity does not refer to the cleaning of the equipment but to the cleaning of the surface of products). The solvent consumption threshold is >2 tonnes/year for an installation to be subject to the Directive, and the appropriate emission-limit values are a limit of 75 mg C/Nm<sup>2</sup> in waste gases, and 20% or 15% of solvent input as fugitive emissions (the latter applies if consumption exceeds 10 tonnes/year). Certain exemptions apply.

D5 may have some therapeutic uses (e.g. for head lice treatment). Manufacturing of pharmaceutical products is covered by the Directive, with a solvent

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

consumption threshold of >50 tonnes/year. The appropriate emission-limit values are a limit of 20 mg C/Nm<sup>2</sup> in waste gases, and 5% or 15% of solvent input as fugitive emissions, or a total emission limit value of 5% or 15% of solvent input (certain exemptions also apply).

It should be noted that in contrast to other organic compounds of similar reactivity, the breakdown of cVMS in the atmosphere does not lead to the formation of ground-level ozone.

### ***Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) Directive (2008/1/EC):***

The aim of the IPPC directive is to regulate emissions to the environment from installations conducting specified operations. The IPPC Directive will apply to some sites that use D5, because of the nature and size of the installations. Parts of the life cycle affected include<sup>13</sup>:

- Production of D5; and
- Polymer production (mainly larger installations; does not apply to processing alone).

It is possible that use in production of pharmaceutical products is also addressed. Installations for the surface treatment of substances, objects or products using organic solvents, in particular for dressing, printing, coating, degreasing, waterproofing, sizing, painting, cleaning or impregnating, with a consumption capacity of more than 150 kg per hour or more than 200 tonnes per year, are also covered.

All installations covered by Annex I of the Directive must obtain a permit from the national authorities to continue operating. Permits place a requirement for the use of Best Available Techniques (BAT) to reduce emissions and the impact on the environment as a whole, and must include emission limit values for pollutants, in particular those listed in Annex III<sup>14</sup> to the Directive, likely to be emitted from the installation concerned in significant quantities. In addition, the Directive provides for emission limit values to be established at the Community level. Such emission limits would apply to the categories of installations listed in Annex I to the Directive.

A recommendation could therefore be made to IPPC authorities to strengthen Best Available Techniques Reference (BREF) Documents. However, since the uses that lead to significant wastewater emissions are not covered by the Directive (other than D5 production), this measure would only be partially useful in the context of risk management for this substance.

---

<sup>13</sup> It follows that the IPPC Directive does not apply to the following parts of the life cycle (unless one of the other activities in Annex I to the Directive takes place and where the D5 application is directly associated with the main activity):

- polymers - small installations where synthesis takes place, and all sites that only compound or convert (unless certain substances, e.g. lead, are used)
- Formulation of personal care products,
- Formulation of household products.
- Dry cleaning facilities.

<sup>14</sup> Annex III of the Directive provides an indicative list of the main polluting substances to be taken into account for fixing emission limit values. For air, this includes volatile organic compounds, and for water, substances and preparations which have been proved to possess properties which may affect reproduction in or via the aquatic environment, or persistent and bioaccumulable organic toxic substances.

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

### ***Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC):***

This sets out basic requirements for the management of defined wastes (including waste oils<sup>15</sup>) using a hierarchy approach to ensure recovery or disposal without risk to water, air, soil, plants or animals. Costs are borne by the waste producer or waste holder. "Since D5 is not classified under the CLP Regulation for environmental endpoints, any waste mixture containing it would not be considered to be hazardous waste."

In addition, waste oils must be collected separately (where technically feasible) and Member States may, according to national conditions, apply additional measures such as technical requirements, producer responsibility, economic instruments or voluntary agreements. Waste treatment facilities must obtain permits from the relevant competent authority, which specify technical and other requirements for each type of operation permitted, as well as the safety and precautionary measures to be taken (with monitoring conditions where necessary). Waste management plans must be produced by Member States, which may include economic and other instruments in tackling various waste problems, and awareness campaigns directed at specific sets of consumers.

Waste legislation has limited applicability to the uses of D5 with the greatest aquatic emissions (i.e. consumer products and waste water emissions from specific industrial applications), and so it is not considered further in this RMO paper.

### ***The Sewage Sludge Directive (86/278/EEC):***

This Directive regulates the use of sewage sludge in agriculture in such a way as to prevent harmful effects on soil, vegetation, animals and humans, with a focus on certain heavy metals. A stakeholder consultation on possible revision has taken place, but major changes to include specific organic substances are not currently envisaged. Since there are no specific requirements at present, this risk management measure is not considered further.

## ***6.3 Non-legislative measures***

Industry has set up a voluntary product stewardship arrangement. The industry's objective is to assess emissions to the aquatic environment by targeting the most significant sources directly (e.g. manufacturing sites, personal care formulation sites, etc.) and to demonstrate that they do not pose a risk to the environment.

The D5 REACH consortium has a range of activities under assessment, ongoing or planned, including a proposed environmental monitoring programme, investigation of mass loadings in wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), studies of personal care product wash-off, emission surveys and site audits. The plan is to identify sites with the highest emissions and audit them to find ways of improving waste management practice. This work will run over the next five years, as the data are collated and recommendations made.

As far as we are aware the exact nature and scope of this activity has not been established yet and its starting date is unclear. As a voluntary initiative, the take up rate by downstream users may vary between sectors as well as suppliers, and

---

<sup>15</sup> This could apply to silicone oils made from D5. Waste waters are excluded from the scope of this Directive to the extent that they are covered by other Community legislation.

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

it is not clear what overall level of emission reduction will be achieved or when the results of the initiative will be available.

This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.

**Table 5: Summary assessment of general risk management options with respect to effectiveness, proportionality and practicality criteria**

	<b>DO NOTHING (REGISTRATION, VOLUNTARY PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP)</b>	<b>NON-REACH RMOs</b>	<b>RESTRICTION</b>	<b>AUTHORISATION</b>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<p>None of the 8 registrations identify D5 as a vPvB or PBT-containing substance, and so the recommended RMMS do not specifically seek to minimise emissions, i.e. PBT risks are not addressed.</p> <p>REACH would appear to be the primary mechanism that could be used to apply controls on imported goods.</p> <p>Industry has set up a voluntary product stewardship arrangement. The industry's objective is to assess emissions to the aquatic environment by targeting the most significant sources directly (e.g. manufacturing sites, personal care formulation sites, etc.) and to demonstrate that they do not pose a risk to the environment.</p> <p>As a voluntary initiative, the take up rate by downstream users may vary between sectors, and it is not clear what overall level of emission reduction will be achieved and when. Cleaning products have not been considered as part of this initiative due to the much smaller use volume.</p>	<p>Under WFD D5 is not a current PS or PHS. There would therefore be a delay before the relevant Commission committees could consider it, and any proposal would have to follow the planning cycle for inclusion of new substances. Identification of D5 as a P(H)S would require the Commission to establish an EQS at the European level. However, controls on release to water rely on national measures. This creates the potential for inconsistency between MSs and seems unlikely to be able to deliver a consistent and harmonised level of emission reduction across Europe within a reasonable period.</p> <p>IPPC covers some but not all user sites, and does not address diffuse exposures such as those arising from use and wash off of a product. Only larger installations may be affected, leaving the potential for the aggregated releases from smaller installations to continue at an unacceptable level.</p> <p>A recommendation could be made to IPPC authorities to strengthen BREF Documents. However, since the uses that lead to significant wastewater emissions are not covered by the Directive (other than D5 production), this would only be partially useful in the context of risk management for</p>	<p>Measures to minimise release could be introduced within 3-4 years.</p> <p>Restrictions can be applied to all life cycle stages and to imported articles, and can be targeted to areas of highest risk (aquatic emissions). They can also be flexible depending on the applications considered within scope, again targeting highest risk areas. This could include the content of D4 in D5.</p> <p>A restriction would avoid the creation of an unnecessary burden on companies whose products do not lead to significant water emissions.</p> <p>Given D5's widespread application, it may be challenging to develop proposals that tackle easy-to-substitute uses while taking into account essential (but potentially overlapping) uses where substitution may be problematic in the short and medium term.</p>	<p>Authorisation has the potential to remove all non-essential uses while allowing essential uses to continue and creating pressure to move to alternatives in the long run. D5 users would be obliged to provide information on alternatives and related research and development. All (potential) D5 users face the same responsibility regardless of current emissions and level of risk. Might result in a large number of authorisation applications, due to the diversity of current uses.</p> <p>Potentially all D5-containing substances would need to be identified and consideration given to adding them to the Candidate list. This appears disproportionate.</p> <p>Authorisation may not be as effective as restriction, because relatively high emission levels may be allowed on a case-by-case basis. At the moment, it is not clear whether any of the non-intermediate uses might be considered 'essential'. It may take a long time for</p>

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

	<b>DO NOTHING (REGISTRATION, VOLUNTARY PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP)</b>	<b>NON-REACH RMOs</b>	<b>RESTRICTION</b>	<b>AUTHORISATION</b>
		<p>this substance.</p> <p>Both IPPC and WFD focus on reducing emissions that are already occurring. This requires the regulation of each site that emits the substance. In contrast, measures under REACH are targeted upstream and are therefore more efficient since many fewer actors need to be regulated to reduce emissions.</p>		<p>emissions to decline if a large number of authorisations are granted to individual applicants.</p>
<b>Proportionality (Cost-effectiveness)</b>	<p>The costs to industry of implementing the voluntary product stewardship scheme are currently not known. Effectiveness cannot be established either.</p>	<p>It is likely that the costs to develop and implement measures under the Water Framework Directive will be disproportionate to the reductions in emissions that could be achieved (e.g. national legislation, modifications to WWTP, monitoring commitments, etc.). For IPPC sites, an update to BREF guidance might be cost-effective.</p>	<p>A more detailed analysis of emissions from different applications and the alternatives assessment will place considerable resource burdens on a Member State wishing to develop a restriction proposal for D5. Possible advantages to suppliers of alternatives if they are based within the EU.</p>	<p>Administrative costs for applicants might be disproportionate, depending on the commercial importance of the use being applied for. Allows the risks and benefits for each use to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p>
<b>Practicality (Clarity to duty holders)</b>	<p>As industry has not concluded that D5 is PBT/vPvB, a clear message to reduce emissions has not been developed and communicated to all DUs.</p> <p>There is the potential for DUs to implement differing standards of emissions control depending on whether or not they have access to and choose to implement the advice that is disseminated from the voluntary stewardship programme.</p>	<p>Legislative frameworks already exist but in some cases (e.g. IPPC) do not apply to all downstream users. This creates imbalances in the duties placed on downstream users.</p> <p>In order to implement measures under the WFD it will be necessary to ensure that a suitable environmental analytical monitoring method is developed and agreed upon.</p>	<p>A restriction is very clear to duty holders, provided it is suitably worded.</p> <p>It will be necessary to ensure that suitable analytical monitoring methods are in place.</p>	<p>By judging each use on its own merits, authorisation enables provisions to be tailored to specific use situations.</p> <p>It might be necessary to ensure that suitable analytical monitoring methods are in place.</p>
<b>Regulatory consistency</b>	<p>REACH registration applies across all EU Member States so there will be no inconsistency in implementation between Member States.</p> <p>The product stewardship scheme will</p>	<p>The level of emission reduction achieved will depend on the approaches taken by individual Member States and their mechanisms for enforcement</p>	<p>Good.</p>	<p>Good.</p>

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

	<b>DO NOTHING (REGISTRATION, VOLUNTARY PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP)</b>	<b>NON-REACH RMOs</b>	<b>RESTRICTION</b>	<b>AUTHORISATION</b>
	not necessarily provide a consistent approach to emissions reduction, as some suppliers and users might not take part.	creating a potential for different requirements in different Member States.		
<b>Uncertainties</b>	Cleaning products have not been considered as part of the VPS. It is not clear how effective measures that are targeted at DUs will be at minimising emissions during service life and disposal, particularly for consumer goods.	Source apportionment would need to be carried out for the purposes of the Water Framework Directive to establish which uses are important at an individual catchment level. Monitoring might also be necessary to establish the relative priority of action.		





**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

## **6. Conclusions on the most appropriate (combination of) risk management option(s)**

D5 is a high tonnage substance. It is present in a very wide variety of consumer products and therefore has significant potential for environmental release. In terms of achieving the highest level of emission reduction for least cost, and given the nature of the risk (i.e. that aquatic concentrations can be reduced by controls on waste water emissions rather than air emissions), we propose to prioritise risk management based on the magnitude of aquatic emissions.

At this stage, the UK considers a targeted restriction for the manufacture and use of personal care products will be the most appropriate route to reduce environmental concentrations.

Of the measures available under the REACH Regulation, restriction is preferred to authorisation because:

- It provides a more flexible approach to achieve the aims of emission reduction as it can be targeted to those applications that pose the greatest risk (i.e. waste water discharges from relatively minor uses of the substance).
- It is likely to achieve significant reduction in environmental concentrations more quickly.
- It can cover all relevant parts of the life cycle, including the presence of D4 as an impurity in polymeric products (where relevant) and higher molecular weight homologues like D6<sup>16</sup>.
- It would avoid the creation of an unnecessary burden on companies whose products do not lead to significant waste water discharges.
- It can address the D4 content of D5 (which is relevant as D4 is a PBT substance)<sup>17</sup>.

The exact nature and scope of the restriction will depend on the detailed analysis that will be performed as the Annex XV dossier is developed, but we anticipate that it would most likely relate to concentration limits for personal care (and possibly sub-categories thereof), and possibly waste water emission limits at non-IPPC sites. Alternative products already exist, and the fact that the manufacturers of personal care products are already substituting this substance indicates that they have (or are developing) effective substitutes. It has been proposed in the restriction text that the Commission could review the emissions from other sources after a period of 10 years of entry into force of the restriction. This would give relevant industry sectors time to consider the importance of other relevant sources, and could include a review of monitoring data to see if the

---

<sup>16</sup> Industry (personal communication) has confirmed that an impurity level of 0.1% w/w or below is practically achievable in D5 using suitable distillation apparatus. It may also be possible to remove it from silicone polymers by stripping techniques. The necessary equipment is not currently in place at all manufacturing sites, and requires an investment of several million euros. Improved distillation efficiency also entails an energy cost, and therefore increased carbon dioxide emission (D4 is easier to remove than D5 due to its higher vapour pressure).

<sup>17</sup> Industry (personal communication) has confirmed that a D4 impurity level of 0.1% w/w or below is practically achievable in D5 using suitable distillation apparatus. It may also be possible to remove it from silicone polymers by stripping techniques. The necessary equipment is not currently in place at all manufacturing sites, and requires an investment of several million euros. Improved distillation efficiency also entails an energy cost, and therefore increased carbon dioxide emission (D4 is easier to remove than D5 due to its higher vapour pressure).

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

proposed restriction has effectively removed inputs to wastewater treatment plants.

For IPPC sites, the emission limit developed in the Annex XV dossier could be proposed for inclusion in the relevant BREF documents. The Commission should also consider whether D5 should be identified as a Water Framework Directive Priority (Hazardous) Substance as part of the next round of negotiations.

## **References**

EA, 2009a. Environmental Risk Assessment Report: Octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane. ISBN: 978-1-84911-031-0. Environment Agency April 2009.

EA, 2009b. Environmental Risk Assessment Report: Decamethylcyclopentasiloxane. ISBN: 978-1-84911-029-7. Environment Agency April 2009.

EA, 2009c. Environmental Risk Assessment Report: Dodecamethylcyclohexasiloxane. ISBN: 978-1-84911-030-3. Environment Agency April 2009.

EA, 2010a. D4 PBT Evaluation Factsheet. Final version of September 2010.

EA, 2010b. D5 PBT Evaluation Factsheet. Final version of September 2010.

EA, 2010c. Guidance on gas treatment technologies for landfill gas engines. Report LFTGN06. Second Edition. Environment Agency, Bristol. Available from <http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/PDF/GEHO0311BTON-E-E.pdf>.

SCCS, 2010. Opinion on Cyclomethicone: Octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (Cyclotetrasiloxane, D4) and Decamethylcyclopentasiloxane (Cyclopentasiloxane, D5). Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety, Directorate-General for Health & Consumers.  
[http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific\\_committees/consumer\\_safety/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/consumer_safety/index_en.htm)

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

## **RMO Appendix – Potential releases of D5 to the aquatic environment during the use of silicone polymer-based antifoaming agents**

A review of potential sources of D5 by a contractor for the UK CA (wca, 2013) suggested that emissions from silicone polymer-based antifoaming agents could be a significant contributor to overall releases to the aquatic environment. The UK CA was not aware of these uses at the time the original RMO analysis was drafted, and so has subsequently performed more detailed investigations. Our findings are summarised below.

### **Detergents**

The 2010, 2012 and 2014 CSRs do not include any descriptive or quantitative information about this application, which appeared for the first time in an industry socio economic analysis (SEA) in 2013 (AMEC, 2013a&b; PFA, 2012).

It appears that the use in detergents is relatively small compared to other sources (just over 3 tonnes/year of D5 is expected to be present in the polymers as impurities):

- Two-thirds of the silicone polymer antifoaming agents are used in domestic laundry detergents (in which D5 is present at levels “a lot” less than 0.1% w/w) with 100% release to domestic wastewater (Peter Fisk, pers comm.).
- The other third is used in the textile industry (with D5 levels <0.01% w/w in the polymer), with the assumption that there is 100% release to wastewater, and treatment equivalent to a municipal WWTP at 90% of sites (i.e. 10% is discharged direct to surface water). This treatment is undertaken to meet local regulation of the activities carried out at the sites. Using the information from industry’s SEA, total continental releases of D5 to wastewater are expected to be 2 tonnes/year for domestic laundry detergents and 1 tonne/year from industrial (textile) detergents.

The resulting contribution to the overall emissions of these substances to surface waters is <1% of D5, which is <1 tonne/year. We therefore currently consider these two scenarios to be of low relevance for further risk management.

### **Paper and pulp industry**

The CSRs assume that 15,000 tonnes/year of silicone polymer are used as antifoaming agents in pulp processing and paper manufacture. The average concentration of D5 in these polymers is 0.15% w/w, i.e. there is approximately 22.5 tonnes/year of D5 (PFA, 2012).

Information provided to the dossier submitter by both the manufacturers of antifoam agents and the operators of pulp mills within the EU indicates that silicone-based antifoams are used in the pulp washing phase of chemical pulp production. The antifoam removes entrained air from within the pulp and surface foam generated during its production.

Chemical pulp is used to produce a high quality product, but with a much lower yield. Over 90% of chemical pulp production is via the Kraft process. Antifoam agents are necessary in this process as excessive foam reduces washing efficiency and can cause overflow from the washing vat, which in extreme circumstances can halt production. According to anecdotal evidence from the industry given via personal communication silicone-based antifoam agents are

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

preferred in most cases to other antifoam agents due to high efficiency, efficacy and better antifoam removal from the pulp.

Addition rates of antifoam products vary between users depending on the process and technical and quality issues. However, due to issues with final product quality, the use of any antifoam is kept to a minimum.

The Emission Scenario Document (ESD) for the pulp, paper and board industry (OECD, 2009) indicates that all materials used for antifoaming should be assumed to be emitted via wastewater. The document indicates that effluents from these processes will at least undergo primary treatment before being discharged either to wastewater or surface water. The primary treated effluents are likely to undergo further biological treatment either on-site or off-site at a municipal WWTP<sup>18</sup>.

The BAT Reference Document (BREF) for the pulp and paper industry (EC, 2015) indicates that use of antifoaming agents ("defoamers") occurs both within the paper making process and also during on-site wastewater treatment (see "Other applications" below). The antifoaming agents are considered to be predominantly discharged in the effluent. D5 however is much more volatile than the silicone polymers in which it is an impurity. Following information on the operating conditions in the Kraft process provided by the Finnish Safety and Chemicals Agency (responsible for regulating paper mills in Finland) (pers. comm.), it seems unlikely that residual D5 would be discharged to surface waters because:

- The chemical pulp washing process runs at a temperature of 80-95 °C. Some volatile components, including D5, are likely to be driven off at this stage. After the washing phase the separated weak black liquor is evaporated into dry matter. The temperature during evaporation rises up to ca. 135 °C. At this stage other volatile components, such as methanol and turpentine are recovered for further processing. Given the relatively high volatility of D5 it seems likely that it will also be volatilized at this stage and either released to air (with appropriate abatement measures) or present in the distillate as an impurity.
- The concentrated liquor from the evaporation stage is then incinerated at around 1000-1100 °C to generate electricity and heat. Any residual silicone polymers/siloxanes would be broken down in this process due to the very high incineration temperature.
- The air emissions containing the volatile components of the process are often controlled by steam stripping and then incineration. This process efficiently mineralizes all organic substances present. Another way to treat the air emissions is to discharge the condensates to the biological WWTP. Once discharged to waste water treatment the removal rate for D5 is over 95%.

The relatively low concentration of residual D5 in silicone antifoams used in the pulp and paper industry suggests a maximum theoretical emission of between 1.5 and 22.5 tonnes/year for each substance, The practice of minimizing the amount used to ensure final product quality, the high temperatures of the pulp washing and evaporation stages causing volatilization of D5, the incineration of liquors and

---

<sup>18</sup> JS Seaman, Environment Agency (Regulated Industry - Site Based Regulation) (pers. comm.) suggested that 90% of UK paper mill sites would either discharge their wastewater for treatment at a municipal WWTP, or treat it on-site to an equivalent standard. The remaining 10% of sites discharge direct to surface water after onsite treatment.

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

steam-stripped air emissions, and/or the use of on-site and off-site waste water treatment for air emission condensates (leading to over 95% removal), implies that final releases of D5 to surface water from the paper and pulp industry will be *significantly* lower than 1 tonne/year for each substance across the whole EU. The actual amount cannot be estimated with certainty due to the lack of confirmatory analytical data for pulp mill effluents.

## **Oil and gas industry**

### **Silicone antifoams for the oil/gas industry**

Silicone polymer-based antifoam agents are used to eliminate foam in oil and gas production, refining and processing. In the CSRs, a total potential emission of four tonnes per year of D5 was predicted due to their presence as a residual impurity in the polymers at an average concentration of 0.4% w/w in 1,000 tonnes/year of polymer (PFA, 2012). This application was assumed to result in a direct emission of 100% to surface (marine) waters.

- **Use in drilling muds:** The presence of foams slows production and triggers maintenance operations, which is a particular problem on offshore rigs because of the limited space and weight restrictions (AMEC, 2013c). Antifoam agents are added to drilling muds to prevent foaming during separation of the cuttings from the fluid by centrifugation. One major oil producer (Statoil Norway, pers. comm.) has indicated to the dossier submitter that silicone-based antifoam agents were not used for this purpose in their operations in the EU in 2013. Due to the practice of recycling drilling muds following separation of the cuttings back into the well, some residual antifoam may be present in the muds.
- **Use in well cementing:** Silicone-based antifoams are added to low viscosity cements used in well consolidation to remove bubbles from the cement and increase its strength. As the antifoam is added to the cement prior to use in the well, the application is considered by the operators to be well controlled. A small amount may be lost during application of the cement but this is considered minimal and infrequent so this application has not been considered further (Reconsile Consortium and Statoil Norway, pers comm.).
- **Gas-oil separation:** Silicone-based antifoams are mainly used in gas-oil separation to prevent foam occurring during depressurisation (Reconsile consortium). Two main types of silicone polymer – i.e. PDMS (polydimethylsiloxane) and FS (fluorosiloxanes) – are used depending on process conditions and the nature of the gas/oil/water mix. The antifoam products typically contain 5-10% w/w silicone polymer, and the typical dosage of the antifoam products into the crude oil for separation is 5-20 ppm. Given the typical concentration for D5 as an impurity in the silicone polymers (0.15% according to PFA, 2012), the range of residual D5 present in the crude oil is estimated to be 3 to 38 ppb. (Statoil Norway, pers comm.)

The high octanol-water partition coefficients of D5 (8.02 as  $\log_{10}$  values) mean that it will partition predominantly to the oil phase (i.e. the concentration in oil will be at least around 1000000 times higher than in water). This oil ends up at refineries, and it has been reported that residual D5 causes problems in crude oil refining (Reconsile Consortium and Statoil Norway, pers comm.), which is one reason why dosing of antifoams in separation is kept to a minimum.

It is possible that a small amount of D5 may remain in the waste water produced during separation. Assuming that 4 tonnes/year is a reasonably accurate estimate

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

of the total amount available for release, partitioning with oil should mean that there will be much less than 1 kg/year of each substance in the waste water. This wastewater is cleaned via flotation cells, hydrocyclones or different kinds of centrifuges, if necessary, prior to disposal. Disposal methods for the waste water depend on whether production is on- or offshore, but can include discharge back to the sea (provided the water meets local limits for oil content) or injection into the ground to provide pressure to extract further oil from the well, hundreds or thousands of metres below the ground/sea bed (Statoil Norway, pers. comm.).

In summary, the main source of D5 emissions from oil and gas operations is likely to be in waste water from gas-oil separation activities, which may undergo further treatment prior to discharge. Given the low dosage rates and the high partitioning of D5 into the oil phase, the use of silicone polymers in antifoams in the oil and gas industry is not considered to be a significant source of aquatic emissions.

### **Other applications**

From an Internet search, various silicone polymers can be used in antifoaming agents in several sectors that were not mentioned in either the CSRs or the industry socio-economic analysis (SEA) from 2013.

- According to Blackburn Chemicals<sup>19</sup> (pers. comm.) silicone antifoams are generally not used in the food sector, where vegetable oil-, hydrocarbon- and alkoxane-based defoamers are preferred. However, the UK CA notes that this company offers a dimethyl polysiloxane product (Dispelair® SE 81A) that is said to be an effective foam control agent suitable for use in fermentation systems.
- Blackburn Chemicals offers one silicone-based product (Dispelair® SE 81A) as an effective control for surfactant type foam in WWTP, which is suitable for aeration lagoons. However, a representative of water supply companies in the UK has stated that silicone-based antifoams are not routinely used in final effluent treatment to treat foaming incidents at wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) (B. Ellor, UKWIR<sup>20</sup>, pers. comm.). It is possible that they are used more at industrial WWTP.
- Blackburn Chemicals supplies several modified polysiloxane antifoaming agents for use in metal working fluids. These are used with soluble oils, fully- and semi-synthetic cutting fluids and metal cleaners. The UK CA notes that controls are in place to minimise the release of oils from operations that involve metal working fluids. Disposal of metal working fluids should be done in line with the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC). As long as this is followed the releases of D5 associated with use in metal working fluids will be minimal.
- Blackburn Chemicals offers several silicone-based antifoaming agents (e.g. Dispelair® CF 328, 737 and 890/895) for use in aqueous surface coatings to prevent air entrainment during the production of paints, adhesives and varnishes. They also prevent air bubbles from causing defects in the coating film upon application. The products containing silicones are specifically sold for use in medium to high PVC paints and a broad range of aqueous systems including gloss, elastomeric coatings, polymer latex systems and inks.

---

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.bbchem.co.uk/home.htm>

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.ukwir.org/site/web/content/home>

**This is an updated version of the D5 RMO that has been previously circulated, updated with further information that has been provided since the original RMO.**

No information has been sought about these uses or their relevance as a source of D5 emissions to the aquatic environment in the EU. Further information would be welcome.

## **OVERALL CONCLUSION**

Although silicone polymer-based antifoaming agents are an additional source of D5 emissions to the environment, the available evidence suggests that it makes a very small contribution to the overall releases of these substances. There currently appears to be no reason to seek further risk management of these uses, although further information on use in the textile, food, WWTP, metal working and surface coating industries would be useful.

## **References**

AMEC 2013a. Socio-Economic Analysis for Cyclic Siloxanes: Report on decamethylcyclopentasiloxane (D5). Confidential Final Report, January 2013. AMEC Environment and Infrastructure UK Ltd

AMEC 2013b. Socio-Economic Analysis for Cyclic Siloxanes: Annex – Case Study for Use in Antifoaming Agents in Detergents (Silicone Polymers Containing Residues of D4 and D5). Confidential Final Report, January 2013. AMEC Environment and Infrastructure UK Ltd

AMEC 2013c. Socio-Economic Analysis for Cyclic Siloxanes: Annex – Case Study for Use in Antifoaming Agents in Oil Drilling (Silicone Polymers Containing Residues of D4 and D5). Confidential Final Report, January 2013. AMEC Environment and Infrastructure UK Ltd

EC,2001. Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) Reference Document on Best Available Techniques in the Pulp and Paper Industry December 2001, European Commission

OECD 2009. OECD SERIES ON EMISSION SCENARIO DOCUMENTS Number 23 EMISSION SCENARIO DOCUMENTS ON PULIP, PAPER AND BOARD INDUSTRY, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

PFA 2012. Interim reports: technical support for D4 and D5 SEA. Confidential report to the Silicones Industry by Peter Fisk Associates

wca 2013. Siloxanes restrictions options – Confidential final report to the Environment Agency, November 2013. WCA Environment Limited.