

COMMITTEE ON TOXICITY OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD, CONSUMER PRODUCTS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

First draft statement on COT principles for assessing risks from less than lifetime exposure or variable exposure over a lifetime

Introduction

1. At the March 2020 meeting, the COT considered principles produced by the Committee on Carcinogenicity (COC) on assessing risks from less than lifetime (LTL) exposure to genotoxic and non-genotoxic carcinogens (COC, 2019). The COT had been asked to consider the applicability of the principles to other endpoints which are considered by the COT. The COT wished to test the principles using cases from past COT work. At the October 2020 meeting the COT considered a paper which included two test cases from the COT's work on chemicals in the diets of infants and young children, cadmium and fumonisins.

2. The COT found the two test cases useful. The approach to the fumonisins, in which a shorter term HBGV had been used, was considered appropriate. Similarly, the approach to cadmium, which bioaccumulates and for which a Haber's rule-based approach had been taken, was considered to have followed the COC principles appropriately; however, the COT wished to consider further how to approach bioaccumulative chemicals, particularly in children, since accumulation does not occur linearly with duration of exposure.

3. The COT agreed that LTL exposure was not exactly the correct term as it is exposures that vary over the lifetime that the COT primarily considers, and a more accurate descriptive term should be considered.

4. In relation to establishing short-term HBGVs, the Committee agreed that comparison of exposure should be to the "chronic" HBGV in the first instance, and the consideration of a short-term HBGV would only be in cases where there was a need to refine the risk assessment and where this could have practical application in risk management.

5. Members agreed that COT-specific principles should be produced based on the COC principles. A draft COT Statement is attached at Annex A. This is based on the COC principles, with the main deviations being highlighted in yellow.

6. Some Members considered that the toxicology should be the starting point rather than the exposure scenario, and the toxicology should inform the exposure window of interest. At present the draft COT Statement starts with the exposure scenario as it follows the COC principles and as risk assessment questions to the

This is a draft statement for discussion.
It does not reflect the final views of the Committee and should not be cited.

COT may start with a particular exposure scenario, e.g. the infant diet or maternal diet. However, Members will wish to consider how they would wish the principles to be structured if toxicology were the starting point.

Questions on which the views of the Committee are sought

7. Members are invited to consider and comment on the draft Statement in Annex A, and to consider the following questions

i). What is the Committee's views on the structure of the steps in the draft Statement? Would the Committee wish the steps to be restructured to start with the consideration of the toxicology?

ii). Do Members have further thoughts on how bioaccumulative chemicals should be assessed and whether the approach based on Haber's law is appropriate?

Secretariat
January 2021

This is a draft statement for discussion.
It does not reflect the final views of the Committee and should not be cited.

References

COC (2019). COC set of principles for consideration of risk due to less than lifetime exposure. Committee on Carcinogenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (COC). COC Guidance Statement G09 v1.0, September 2019

This is a draft statement for discussion.
It does not reflect the final views of the Committee and should not be cited.

TOX/2021/XX ANNEX A

**COMMITTEE ON TOXICITY OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD,
CONSUMER PRODUCTS AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

**First draft statement on COT principles for assessing risks from less than
lifetime exposure or variable exposure over a lifetime**

**Secretariat
January 2021**

COMMITTEE ON TOXICITY OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD, CONSUMER PRODUCTS AND THE ENVIRONMENT (COT)

First draft statement on COT principles for assessing risks from less than lifetime exposure or variable exposure over a lifetime

Introduction

1. The COC published principles for consideration of risk from carcinogens due to less than lifetime (LTL) exposure in 2019 (COC, 2019). The COT considered the applicability of these principles to other toxicological endpoints considered by the COT using cases from the COT's past work. The principles set out here are based on the COC principles with some modification to reflect the endpoints considered by the COT.

2. In comparison to the COC principles, the title has been expanded to reflect that, in most cases, the COT is not considering exposure that is shorter than a lifetime and then ceases, but rather exposure that is over a lifetime but varies over that lifetime, being substantially higher for a certain portion of that lifetime. This may be due to exposure being higher in a particular life-stage or due to a short-lived contamination incident.

3. Chronic health-based guidance values (HBGVs) such as the acceptable daily intake (ADI), tolerable daily intake (TDI) or tolerable weekly intake (TWI) are estimates of the amount of a chemical, expressed on a body weight basis, that may be ingested over a lifetime without appreciable risk. They are often based on chronic toxicity studies, but in some cases may be based on shorter term data such as reproductive toxicity or developmental toxicity studies where endpoints from these studies occur at lower dose levels. One question that arises is how relevant these chronic HBGVs are for exposure that is shorter term, for example due to an incident. Another question that arises is how to assess risks if the exposure is within the HBGV when averaged over a lifetime or a period of time relevant to the basis upon which the HBGV was established, but exceeds it for a shorter period of that lifetime such as in childhood or due to short-term increased contamination. Infants and children may require particular consideration as they are potentially sensitive subgroups.

4. Such LTL exposures, or exposures that are higher on an LTL basis, may initially be compared to the HBGV established to be protective of lifetime exposure. However, in the case that a refinement to the risk assessment is required, the following steps are intended as a set of principles to guide the risk assessment process for a specific less than lifetime or variable exposure scenario. Acute (one-off) exposure is not considered here, as acute reference doses (ARfDs) are established where required. The steps are also illustrated in Figure 1.

This is a draft statement for discussion.
It does not reflect the final views of the Committee and should not be cited.

Step 1 – What is the scenario being assessed for risk?

Step 1A – Define the exposed population(s)

5. The aim of this step is to define the population or population subgroup of interest. The particular life stages of exposed individuals (or those with the higher exposure) should be considered. Some age groups or life stages may have greater susceptibility, which may need to be taken into account in the assessment of risk (e.g. infants, children, unborn infants, pregnant women, the elderly).

Step 1B – Define the exposure scenario

6. The aim of this step is to characterise the less than lifetime or variable exposure scenario that is being considered. Consideration should be given to:

- Whether the exposure is/was short term or is ongoing
- Is the cumulative exposure measured? (i.e. the total amount of exposure over the defined period?)
- Whether there is a single or multiple route(s) of exposure
- Is there normally a background level of exposure from the source(s) being considered?
- Are other background sources present (food, water, air, consumer products etc)?
- Is the substance under consideration produced endogenously and, if so, how do endogenous levels compare with the exposure level?
- Whether exposure is continuous, fluctuating, or intermittent, peaks above background exposure, or is life-long but variable.
- Duration of exposure, or duration of raised exposure
- Average and peak levels of exposure(s) (including consideration of how exposure(s) has/have been measured or estimated)
- Whether, for inhalation exposure, levels of physical activity (low, medium, high), during the exposure period are known
- Whether calculation of body burden is possible and/or appropriate (linked to accumulative properties of the particular chemical(s) and duration of exposure(s)).

Step 2 – What are the hazards being assessed?

7. Human and animal toxicological data and evaluations relating to the chemical of interest should be collated to assist with the hazard identification process. If the chemical is genotoxic and carcinogenic and if no threshold can be assumed then the COC principles on less than lifetime exposure should be followed, following the steps for a genotoxic carcinogen. Otherwise, consideration should be given to the following:

- Have toxicokinetic properties been defined, including the potential for rapid metabolism or accumulation to occur?
- Are dose-response relationships available for the various endpoints?
- Whether the endpoint used as the basis for the chronic HBGV is the most applicable endpoint for the LTL exposure(s) being assessed
- Are the dose route, duration and intermittency of the studies used to generate hazard data relevant to the LTL scenario being considered?

This is a draft statement for discussion.

It does not reflect the final views of the Committee and should not be cited.

- The availability of suitable human data from occupational or epidemiology studies which can be used to derive an HBGV
- Has a dose-response relationship (in humans or animals) been defined for the endpoint on which an HBGV might be based?
- Have cumulative exposure effects been assessed either in human or animal studies?
- Potency, particularly when the time to the adverse effect occurring is known to be rapid
- Whether there is evidence for reversibility of changes following cessation of exposure

Step 3 – Assessment of risk

8. The COT considers that the risk assessment of chemicals other than those which are genotoxic and carcinogenic should be carried out through derivation of an HBGV where feasible, by application of uncertainty factors to a point of departure. Alternatively, where the data are not sufficient to establish an HBGV, a margin of exposure (MOE) to a point of departure may be calculated.

9. The chronic HBGV (e.g. ADI, TDI or TWI) reflects a level of intake that people may be exposed to over a lifetime without appreciable risk. It should be noted that the use of an HBGV or MOE based on long term toxicity studies may be considered precautionary when applied to short duration LTL scenarios.

10. Where the LTL scenario being assessed indicates exposure higher than the chronic HBGV, **or a chronic HBGV is exceeded only on an LTL basis and exposure averaged over lifetime is within the chronic HBGV**, qualitative estimations of risk need to be made using evidence from the collated exposure (Step 1) and hazard (Step 2) data. Uncertainties that are inherent in the estimate of risk should be clearly defined and the impact on the overall estimate understood.

11. If the MOE approach is utilised a judgement will be required as to whether the magnitude of the MOE allows for sufficient uncertainty with respect to the available toxicological database and any differences between animals and humans. Judgement is therefore needed on a case-by-case basis.

12. Refinements to the risk assessment may be judged applicable where data allow (see Note on refining the risk assessment, below). In addition, the use of a shorter term study to define a short term HBGV may be considered appropriate. Alternatively, application of a Haber's rule-based approach may be considered, especially if exposure needs to be prolonged for adverse effects to occur, for example for chemicals which bioaccumulate.

13. Following these steps, the conclusion may be drawn that the LTL exposure is of no concern and communicated to risk managers. Otherwise, if further refinement of the assessment is not feasible or uncertainty in the assessment cannot be reduced, the assessment of risk should be communicated to risk managers.

This is a draft statement for discussion.
It does not reflect the final views of the Committee and should not be cited.

Notes on refining the risk assessment

14. As described above, where LTL exceedance is seen of a chronic HBGV, refinement of the assessment should be considered through consideration of:

- Whether a refined exposure assessment can be conducted
- The contribution of the LTL exposure to chronic background exposure (e.g. in terms of body burden)
- Whether the result of a shorter term study is a more appropriate basis for risk assessment of the LTL scenario being considered – providing that exposure over a time frame relevant to the basis of the chronic HBGV is also within the chronic HBGV.

15. Use of the Risk21 matrix may support refinement of the risk assessment by enabling visualisation of the uncertainty in the exposure and toxicity data.

16. In some cases, even after application of the suggested refinements, the LTL or raised exposure may still be of concern. In such cases, there is no established guidance on assessing the risk and these need to be treated on a case-by-case basis. Care needs to be taken when communicating the potential risk, which will also differ on a case-by-case basis.

Summary

17. Where exposures are short-term or vary over a lifetime, the COT recommends that the exposures in the window of raised exposure are initially compared to an HBGV that has been established to be protective for long term exposure. However, in cases where exposure averaged over a time frame relevant to the basis upon which the HBGV is established is within the HBGV but shorter term exposure exceeds it, this Statement recommends approaches that may be taken to refine the risk assessment, if required.

This is a draft statement for discussion.
It does not reflect the final views of the Committee and should not be cited.




Figure 1: Flowchart to illustrate the process of assessing risks from LTL or short-term-raised exposures

This is a draft statement for discussion.
It does not reflect the final views of the Committee and should not be cited.

References

COC (2019). COC set of principles for consideration of risk due to less than lifetime exposure. Committee on Carcinogenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (COC). COC Guidance Statement G09 v1.0, September 2019