Implementation of the precautionary principle in standards for the workplace

Anne Stijkel, Lucas Reijnders

Abstract

The objectives were to describe and discuss the current and proposed European occupational health policy on two categories of substances that pose serious effects: those potentially carcinogenic or genotoxic and those with toxic effects on reproduction. The precautionary principle was applied to setting standards for the workplace for those two categories of substances, to give an impression of the resulting limit values and the consequences of the implementation of this precautionary principle. A pragmatic approach was chosen as this starts with substantial indications of health risks. For the suspected carcinogenic or genotoxic substances 0.1 mg/m^3 as a precautionary occupational exposure limit (precautionary OEL) is proposed. For the substances suspected of causing reproductive toxicity the precautionary OEL was derived in three ways, depending on the availability of data and of a current Dutch workplace standard (MAC, maximum accepted concentration): (a) by calculation based on available inhalatory animal data on the risks of reproductive toxicity; (b) by adding a safety factor of 10 to the current MAC, if no inhalatory animal data on reproductive toxicity are available; (c) by using 0.1 mg/m^3 as precautionary OEL for substances suspected of having reproductive toxicity but without inhalatory animal data on reproductive toxicity and without a MAC.

(*Occup Environ Med* 1995;52:304-312)

Keywords: precaution; reproductive toxicity; safety factor

The current approach to setting workplace standards has been criticised in the past from different angles. One of the comments concerned the use of the rationale that if there is no evidence of impairment, no safety factors are needed. This approach implies that no protection is given if data are lacking. Also, more than 75% of the standards were established 15 to 40 years ago. Then and now, data about long term effects—for example carcinogenesis, genotoxicity, and reproductive toxicity—are inadequate or lacking for many substances. We discussed these points in more detail in the companion article in this *Journal*.¹

Several solutions are conceivable. An approach fundamentally different from the current one (as long as harm is not proved, risks are not considered likely) is "the reversal of the burden of proof": every exposure to a substance is considered dangerous, until the extent of toxicity is sufficiently known. According to the risk classifications,^{2,3} also described in the preceding article,¹ this type of risk attitude can be characterised as the attitude of risk avoidance, to be distinguished from the attitudes of risk regulation and risk acceptance.

In The Netherlands, for many years scientists and trade union representatives have criticised the existing workplace exposure standards.⁴ After the 1992 United Nations conference on environment and development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, this criticism was re-emphasised by a very broad range of social movements. More than 50 Dutch environmental, health, women's, and trade union organisations have joined forces and twice appealed to the government to use the precautionary principle in setting standards in the workplace. This approach, they claimed, would protect the quality of the children and prevent irreversible effects such as cancer.^{5,6} These organisations made a case for the introduction of the principle that potentially toxic substances should be banned, unless the extent of toxicity to men, women, children, and fetuses was sufficiently known to derive a standard.

Considering the comments on today's practices of setting standards in which the attitudes of risk regulation and risk acceptance are so apparent, we explore here an approach for setting standards for occupational exposure that fits the attitude of risk avoidance, by using the precautionary principle. So, the central question is: How can the precautionary principle be implemented in occupational exposure standards, and what might be the resulting limit values?

The precautionary principle was adopted internationally as a starting point for environmental policy in 1992 at the global UNCED in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. This principle stipulates that "where there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost effective measures to prevent degradation".⁷

The way in which the various concepts (threats, serious damage, certainty, cost effectiveness) within the description of the precautionary principle should be interpreted could

Utrecht University,
Department of
Science, Technology,
and Society,
Padualaan 14, 3584CH
Utrecht, The
Netherlands
A Stijkel

University of
Amsterdam,
Interfaculty
Department of
Environmental
Sciences, Nieuwe
Prinsengracht 130,
1018 VZ Amsterdam,
The Netherlands
L Reijnders

Correspondence to:
Dr Anne Stijkel, Utrecht
University, Department of
Science, Technology, and
Society, Padualaan 14,
3584CH Utrecht,
The Netherlands.

Accepted 19 January 1995

be extensively discussed, analogous to the concepts discussed in our companion article. Here we have chosen a more practical approach to give an impression of the consequences when interpreting the concepts in one specific way. The concept of cost effective measures is not included in our elaboration. The reason for this choice is that the Dutch legislation distinguishes two criteria in preventing harm to health: effectiveness in prevention of health injury and reasonableness of measures. According to that framework, discussion about the cost effectiveness fits within the discussion about reasonableness of measures (see also the preceding article!). So, here attention is given to only the first criterion considered from the viewpoint of the precautionary principle.

Which substances can cause serious or irreversible harm in occupational situations? Besides national and European lists with occupational exposure limits, intended to prevent some kind of harm, several other lists with substances that potentially cause serious or irreversible harm are presented in scientific literature or in policy documents. Important lists may be those derived from the EU directive about the classification of hazardous substances.⁸ This directive was adapted regularly by amendments on new categories or classification of new substances. The last amendment was passed in 1993.⁹ Some categories of this directive are especially important in the application of the precautionary principle for two important categories of workplace toxicants: those potentially carcinogenic or genotoxic and those substances with toxic effects on reproduction. Both categories are considered to have potentially serious and irreversible effects. International policy is under debate for carcinogens and substances toxic to reproduction.^{10,11} Before discussing how to apply the precautionary principle to the workplace, we first describe and discuss the recent developments in the European policy on setting standards for carcinogens and substances with reproductive toxicity.

According to the EU directive on carcinogens,¹⁰ companies have to register substances designated by R45 (may cause cancer), as well as some drugs, food additives, and cosmetics. The company's register is open to employers, employees, Occupational Health and Safety services, and governmental control bodies. Moreover, the employer has to assess the extent of risk for his workers. Exposure limits, to be drafted by the EU Council, will be published in an appendix to the directive at a later date. In The Netherlands, the Arboraad, an advisory board for the Dutch Minister of Social Affairs and Employment, proposed to separate the standards for genotoxic carcinogens from current traditional occupational exposure limits (OELs) (in The Netherlands these OELs are called maximum accepted concentrations or MACs), because a mortality risk is accepted when a standard for a genotoxic carcinogenic substance exceeds zero. In principle, this is not the case in standards for non-carcinogenic substances, which claim to

prevent health injury and mortality. For that reason, the Arboraad introduced the term technical limit concentrations (TLC values) for genotoxic carcinogens. Preconditions for using TLCs are (a) the availability of measuring methods and strategies; (b) the principle to keep exposure as low as reasonably achievable; and (c) justification for using a genotoxic agent.¹² In Germany standards have already been set for this category of substances.¹³

Only one EU directive, "pregnant and lactating workers" is available on reproductive policy.¹¹ According to this directive, employers are required to evaluate the risks especially from exposure to specifically listed substances on the safety and health of their workers who fit into these categories.

For genotoxic or carcinogenic substances, setting of standards is still being developed. The European governments still have to decide which type of exposure limits for genotoxic carcinogens should be introduced. Apart from the directives and standards about asbestos, vinyl chloride monomer, and benzene(-derivatives) actual exposure limits have not yet been set in the EU. The proposed strategy for setting standards in The Netherlands, based on a maximum accepted risk, combines the risk acceptance and the risk regulation attitudes. For substances with toxic effects on reproduction the European policy deals with only one aspect of the reproductive toxicity problem: the developmental risks through women to progeny. For the other reproductive risks to men and women no policy has been developed, despite the new "R" sentences on risks. No approach for developing adequate standards for reproductive risks is given.

Methods

Considering the comments on the current standards and the developments in the setting of standards for carcinogens and substances with reproductive toxicity, it seems worthwhile to investigate how to implement the precautionary principle in setting occupational standards. Consequently, we offer a method to develop precautionary OELs, and present examples of them.

The concept of the precautionary principle leaves space for interpretation. Here we elaborate upon it from a realistic perspective of avoidance of risk by concentrating on serious effects and starting with substances with current indications of risk, as presented in policy documents or in peer reviewed literature. We illustrate the applicability of the precautionary principle for two important categories of workplace chemicals that are generally considered to have serious effects: those potentially carcinogenic or genotoxic, and those with potentially toxic effects on reproduction (figure).

CARCINOGENIC OR GENOTOXIC SUBSTANCES

We considered the substances rated as R45 (can cause cancer) and R46 (can cause genetic harm) according to the most recent

Standard setting strategy for occupational exposure standards, based on the precautionary principle. MAC = maximum accepted concentration; RTECS = inhalatory data on reproductive toxicity in the registry of toxic effects of chemical substances; LEL = lowest effect level for reproductive toxicity, as indicated in RTECS; OSF = overall safety factor. *If $LEL/OSF > 0.1 \text{ MAC}$, 0.1 MAC is the proposed precautionary OEL, because of the limitations of the RTECS database.

EU classification of hazardous substances.⁹ Because the Dutch government policy on carcinogenic and genotoxic substances is more comprehensive as it is updated each half year, we have used the Dutch list.¹⁴

We limited ourselves to the separate substances and excluded those that as yet are only suspected as a group. The Dutch order, based on the EU directive, carcinogens, mentions four groups: beryllium compounds, chromium VI compounds, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and aromates of fuels. For substances that belong to these groups the generic strategy proposed here may be followed.

Except for a few substances, in the EU no standards are yet provided for genotoxic or carcinogenic substances, but it is generally accepted that for these substances a "no effect level" (NEL) does not exist. As yet, only Germany has developed a list with TLCs.¹³ The strictest implementation of the precautionary principle in the workplace would mean an exposure limit of zero. In fact, however, we propose that for these substances a precautionary OEL of 0.1 mg/m^3 as a ceiling value should be established as long as other more far reaching measures are not possible and if the use of the substance is justified. Exposure should be kept as low as reasonably achievable below this level. For some specific substances in Europe more far reaching regu-

lations exist—for example, for asbestos and benzene. Sometimes the current OEL is lower than 0.1 mg/m^3 —for example, for vinylchloride monomer. Obviously, in those cases, the more far reaching regulation should be used.

To use a generic ceiling value not primarily based on toxicological motives, stems from the practice used in setting standards for quality of drinking water in The Netherlands. For substances that do not occur naturally in the environment, a value of $0.1 \mu\text{g/l}$ was set.¹⁵ This value was chosen without a basis of toxicological data.

The generic value of 0.1 mg/m^3 was also chosen arbitrarily. If we compare this value with the current Dutch OELs ($n = 642$), we see that 10% of them are equal to or lower than that value. From that perspective 0.1 mg/m^3 is a value at the lower limit. On the other hand, if we compare this value with the current German TLC values established so far for carcinogenic substances ($n = 64$), again much lower values were seen (21 values lower than 0.1 mg/m^3 ; nine values equal to 0.1 mg/m^3 ; 34 values higher than 0.1 mg/m^3). The specific German values, as far as available, may be adopted.

SUBSTANCES WITH TOXIC EFFECTS ON REPRODUCTION

Those substances that do not belong to the category of carcinogenic or genotoxic sub-

stances, but are suspected of causing reproductive risks make up this category. It includes the remaining substances from the EU directive "pregnant and lactating workers". The old category "birth defects" (R47) includes only part of the reproductive risks. Consequently, we searched for supplementary lists.

As a first supplementary list for classification of reproductive effects we took the "review reprotox list" used in an earlier study.¹⁶ A list of substances with potential reproductive toxicity ($n = 145$) was compiled from four reviews of these risks.¹⁷⁻²⁰ The reviews used are only a selection of all those on reproductive toxicity; other, especially more recent, reviews should be screened for supplementary substances. It is expected that in the more recent reviews more data are available on the reproductive risks to or through men. So, our list has a provisional character too; a regular update of the substances on the list and of the toxicological data is needed. As the main goal here is to make obvious how the interpretative space could be used for indications of risks (uncertainties), to give an impression of the consequences, we did not supplement the list with more recent reviews.

We also included the substances mentioned in the German MAK list as potentially fetotoxic (groups A, B, and D).¹³ Group A has a probable risk of fetotoxicity at the current standard; group B cannot be excluded from risk of fetotoxicity at the current standard; group D shows a trend of fetotoxicity, but a more definite categorisation based on current knowledge is not yet possible.

Finally, we included a priority list from the California Department of Health Services of substances that should be evaluated for their potential risk to reproduction or development as perceived by a scientific advisory panel, within the context of Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986.²¹ Substances on this list were first identified from publications by experts or by agencies, and were then categorised for further evaluation.

We limited ourselves here by not proposing a precautionary OEL for specific substances that are not suspected on their own, but are as a group, nor for substances with only an EU connotation of skin absorption. The 11 groups of substances are: anaesthetic gases, camphechlor, cadmium compounds, epoxyresins, fluorhydrocarbons, phthalate esters, methacrylate esters, chlorinated cyclic pesticides, glycidyl ethers, chlorobenzenes, and polychlorinated biphenyls. For substances that belong to these groups one of the strategies described later may be adopted.

It is likely that even when OELs are available, in general they have not been drafted in the light of data on reproductive toxicity. It is reasonable to presume that a toxic effect on reproduction is often one of the critical effects of these substances.^{22, 23} Given that fact it is—at least from the viewpoint of precaution—recommendable to lower current exposure standards. In the preceding article we proposed 0.1 MAC as a precautionary OEL for

these substances, as long as no extended toxicity assessment has been done. The size of that safety factor was mentioned to be somewhat arbitrary. Therefore, here we explain an alternative method to derive a limit—also from the viewpoint of precaution. The approach elaborated here leads directly to a more specific precautionary OEL, based on the registry of toxic effects of chemical substances (RTECS) database of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) in the United States.²⁴ This database comprises data on 79 000 substances, and 16% of them show evidence of reproductive toxicity.²⁵ Only animal data are included.

For substances on the unlimited list one of the next three strategies should be used.

(4) If inhalatory data on reproductive toxicity from the RTECS database is available, a lowest effect level (LEL) can be derived. This value should be converted with a set of safety factors to a precautionary OEL.

The database gives an overview of the available data for each substance; this includes available data on reproductive toxicity. For each study the number of experimental animals, the exposure route and duration, the type of effects, and the LEL are given. From this database we used only inhalatory studies to limit uncertainties in the extrapolation, as human occupational practice mostly involves inhalation as the primary route of entry. If animal inhalation studies of reproductive effects are found for a substance in the RTECS database, then a precautionary OEL can be derived, starting from the LEL with a simple set of three safety factors. Several extrapolations are necessary to assess the risks of reproductive toxicity for men in the workplace. Zielhuis and Van der Kreek proposed an extrapolation method for this purpose.²⁶ They distinguished eight determining factors: (1 and 2) the number of animals and species examined; (3) the size of the animals; (4) the magnitude of the differences between species; (5) the seriousness of the observed health hazards; (6 and 7) the shape of the dose-effect curve, and the number of dose levels; and (8) the availability of human data. Zielhuis and Van der Kreek combined these eight factors into three safety factors; they preferred to offer a range for each safety factor that enables one to make an educated guess in specific cases.²⁶ For the sake of simplicity and practicability, we used one numerical value as the safety factor, which was the average value of all these safety factors (table 1). For each substance the three safety factors relating to

Table 1 Safety factors used (derived from Zielhuis and Van der Kreek²⁶)

Aspects	Safety factor ²⁶	Safety factor used here
Extrapolation from LEL to NEL	2-4	3
Extrapolation from animal to human, combined with daily exposure time:		
6-8 h	3-10	6
24 h	1-3	2
Extrapolation from ST test to LT exposure:		
ST → LT	5-10	7
LT → LT	1	1

LEL = lowest effect level; NEL = no effect level; ST = short term; LT = long term.

Table 2 List of carcinogenic and genotoxic substances (derived from Arbeidsinspectie¹⁴)

Name	CAS number	Name	CAS number
Acrylamide	79-06-1	2-(2-Formylhydrazino)-4-(5-nitro-2-furyl)thiazole	3570-75-0
Acrylonitrile	107-13-1	Furazolidone	67-45-8
Aflatoxins		Fenzapyridine hydrochloride	94-78-0
AFB1	1162-65-8	Hexachlorobenzene	118-74-1
AFB2	7220-81-7	Hexamethylphosphoracid triamide	680-31-9
AFG1	1165-39-5	Hydrazine (+ salts)	302-01-2
AFG2	7241-98-7	Hydrazobenzene	122-66-7
4-Aminobenzene	60-09-3	Hydrazine bis(3-carboxy-4-hydroxy-benzenesulphonate)	—
o-Aminoazobenzotoluene	97-56-3	Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	193-39-5
4-Aminobiphenyl (+ salts)	92-67-1	Lomustine	13010-47-4
o-Anisidine	90-04-0	Melphalan	148-82-3
Arsenic trioxide	1327-53-3	Merphalan	531-76-0
Arsenic acid (+ salts)	7778-39-4	2-Methylaziridine	75-55-8
Arsenic pentoxide	1303-28-2	Methylazoxymethanol	590-96-5
Asbestos	1332-21-4	Methylazoxymethyl acetate	592-62-1
Auramine	492-80-8	5-Methylchrysene	3697-24-3
Azaserine	115-02-6	4,4'-Methylenebis-2-chloroaniline (+ salts)	101-14-4
Azathiopine	446-86-6	4,4'-Methylene bis-(2-methylaniline)	838-88-0
Aziridine	151-56-4	4,4-Methylene dianiline	101-77-9
Benzene	71-43-2	Methylmethane sulphonate	66-27-3
Benzidine (+ salts)	92-87-5	2-Methyl-1-nitroanthraquinone	129-15-7
Benz(a)anthracene	56-55-3	4-(Methylnitrosamino)-1-(3-pyridyl)-1-butanone	64091-91-4
Benz(a)pyrene	50-32-8	1-Methyl-3-nitro-1-nitroso-guanidine	70-25-7
Benz(b)fluoranthene	205-99-2	Methyl thiouracil	56-04-2
Benz(j)fluoranthene	205-82-3	Metronidazol	443-48-1
Benz(k)fluoranthene	207-08-9	Mitomycine C	50-07-7
Benztrichloride	98-07-7	Mustine	51-75-2
Beryllium	7440-41-7	2-Naphthylamine (+ salts)	91-59-8
Bis-(chloro-)methylether	542-88-1	Nickel dioxide	12035-36-8
Bleomycine	11056-06-7	Nickel monoxide	1313-99-1
1,3-Butadiene	106-99-0	Nickel subsulphide	12035-72-2
Bisulfan	55-98-1	Nickel sulphide	16812-54-7
2-(p-Tert-butylphenoxy)-isopropyl-2-chloroethylsulphite	140-57-8	Niridazol	61-57-4
β-Butyrolactone	3068-88-0	5-Nitroacenaphthene	602-87-9
Cadmium chloride	10108-64-2	4-Nitrobiphenyl	92-93-3
Cadmium oxide	1306-19-0	6-Nitrochrysene	7496-02-8
Cadmium sulphate	10124-36-4	Nitrofen	1836-75-5
Calcium chromate	13765-19-0	2-Nitrofluorene	607-57-8
Captafol	2425-06-1	N-(4-(5-nitro-2-furyl)-2-thiazolyl)-acetamide	531-82-8
Carbadox	6804-07-5	2-Nitronaphthalene	581-89-5
Carmustine	145-93-8	2-Nitropropane	79-46-9
Chlorambucil	305-03-3	4-Nitropyrene	57835-92-4
Chlormethine N-oxide	126-85-2	N-4-(methylnitrosamino)-1-(3-pyridyl)-1-butanone	64091-91-4
Chlormethyl methylether	107-30-2	N-nitrosodiethanolamine	1116-54-7
Chlornaphazine	494-03-1	N-nitrosodiethylamine	55-18-5
4-Chlor-o-phenylenediamine	95-83-0	N-nitrosodiisopropylamine	601-77-4
Calcium chromate	13765-19-0	N-nitrosodimethylamine	62-75-9
Chromo III chromate	24613-89-6	N-nitrosodi-n-butylamine	924-16-3
Chromium trioxide	1333-82-0	N-nitrosoethylurea	759-73-9
Strontium chromate	7789-06-2	N-nitrosomethyl ethylamine	10595-95-6
Cisplatin	15663-27-1	N-nitrosomethylurea	684-93-5
Citrus red 2	6358-53-8	N-nitrosomethylurethane	615-53-2
p-Cresidine	120-71-8	N-nitrosomethyl vinylamine	4549-40-0
Cycasine	14901-08-7	N-nitrosomorpholine	59-89-2
Cyclophosphamide	50-18-0	N-nitroso-nor-nicotine	80508-23-2
Dacarbazine	4342-03-4	N-nitrosopiperidine	100-75-4
Daunorubicidine	20830-81-3	N-nitrosopyrrolidine	930-55-2
N,N'-diacetylbenzidine	613-35-4	N-nitrososarcosine	13256-22-9
2,4-Diamino-anisolsulphate	39156-41-7	Panfuran	794-93-4
4,4'-Diaminodiphenylether	101-80-4	Potassium bromate	7758-01-2
2,4-Diaminotoluene	95-80-7	Procarbazine hydrochloride	366-70-1
o-Dianisidine (+ salts)	119-90-4	3-Propanolide	57-57-8
Diazomethane	334-88-3	1,3-Propanesultone	1120-71-4
Dibenz(a,h)acridine	226-36-8	Propylene oxide	75-56-9
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	53-70-3	Ptaquiloside	87625-62-5
Dibenz(a,h)pyrene	189-64-0	Safrol	94-59-7
Dibenz(a,i)pyrene	189-55-9	Semustine	13909-09-6
7H-Dibenz(c,g)carbazole	194-59-2	Silica	148080-60-7
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane	96-12-8	Sterigmatocystin	14464-46-1
1,2-Dibromoethane	106-93-4	Streptozocine	15468-32-3
3,3'-Dichlor-benzidine (+ salts)	91-94-1	Strontium chromate	10048-13-2
3,3'-Dichlor-4,4'-diamino-diphenylether	28434-86-8	Styrene oxide	1883-66-4
1,4-Dichlorbut-2-ene	764-41-0	Sulphallate	7789-06-2
1,2-Dichlorethane	107-06-2	Tetrachloridibenzo-p-dioxin	96-09-3
1,3-Dichlor-2-propanol	96-23-1	Thioacetamide	95-06-9
Diethylsulphate	64-67-5	Thiotepa	1746-01-6
Diglycidyl resorcinolether	101-90-6	o-Tolidine (+ salts)	62-55-5
p-Dimethylaminoazobenzene	60-11-7	o-Toluidine	52-24-4
Dimethylcarbamoylchloride	79-44-7	Treosulfan	119-93-7
1,1-Dimethyl hydrazine	57-14-7	Tris(2,3-dibromopropyl)-phosphate	95-53-3
1,2-Dimethyl hydrazine	540-73-8	Uramustine	299-75-2
Dimethyl sulphate	77-78-1	Urethane	126-72-7
Dimethyl sulphamoylchloride	13360-57-1	Vinyl bromide	66-75-1
Dinickel trioxide	1314-06-3	Vinyl chloride	51-79-6
1,6-Dinitropyrene	42397-64-8		593-60-2
1,8-Dinitropyrene	42397-65-9		75-01-4
Direct black 38	1937-37-7		
Direct blue 6	2602-46-2		
Direct brown 95	16071-86-6		
Disperse blue	2475-45-8		
Doxorubicine	23214-92-8		
Epichlorhydrin	106-89-8		
Enonite	66733-21-9		
Ethylene oxide	75-21-8		
Ethylmethane sulphate	62-50-0		

aspects 1, 2, and 3 have to be multiplied. This leads to an overall safety factor (OSF) of 6, 18, 42, or 126. If the exposure time differs from those times mentioned in table 1, an adapted safety factor can be set.

(B) If no RTECS inhalatory data are available, 0.1 MAC should be used as a precautionary OEL.

(C) If no MAC is available, 0.1 mg/m³ should be the precautionary OEL. This corresponds to the approach for the category "carcinogenic or genotoxic substances".

Results

CARCINOGENIC OR GENOTOXIC SUBSTANCES

Table 2 summarises the 190 substances that were classified as carcinogenic or genotoxic.¹⁴

SUBSTANCES WITH EFFECTS ON REPRODUCTION

Table 3 shows the 156 substances for which indications of reproductive toxicity were found, and their proposed precautionary OELs. The availability of inhalatory studies indicating reproductive toxicity in the RTECS database (February 1993)²⁴ was checked: for 54 substances inhalatory studies are available (category A); for 59 substances with a MAC, no inhalatory studies are available (category B), and of these, 40 substances had data from other exposure routes; for 43 substances without a MAC, no inhalatory studies were available (category C), and of these, 24 substances had data from other exposure routes.

For the substances belonging to category A, table 3 shows the derivation of a precautionary OEL, starting from the LEL and applying an integrated overall safety factor. If the calculated value was lower than 1/10 of the current MAC, this value was chosen as the precautionary OEL. These values are printed in bold. For comparison of the precautionary OEL, the current MAC values are listed as well. Fourteen of the 54 calculated precautionary OELs exceed 0.1 MAC. In those cases 0.1 MAC is chosen as the precautionary OEL. For lead compounds no exposure is obligatory according to the EU directive "pregnant and lactating women".

Discussion and conclusions

Current attitudes for setting standards combines risk regulation and risk acceptance. In contrast, an approach that judges exposures from the perspective of the precautionary principle fits into the risk avoidance attitude. The strategy for setting standards elaborated here—aimed at preventing serious harm—takes a pragmatic approach: it combines risk avoidance and risk regulation as it starts with substantial indications of threatening harm in policy documents or in peer reviewed literature. It follows that no precautionary OEL is proposed for those substances that are as yet not suspected of causing serious harm and do not have a MAC. A stricter application of pre-

caution would lead to the principle that every exposure to a substance should be zero, unless it is shown that a specified exposure to that substance will not be harmful. Nevertheless, our approach is stricter than the current strategy for setting standards. Also, we provide a more tailor made procedure than the uniform precautionary approach—as described in the preceding article¹—in which for all substances the same safety factor of 10 is used (the “factor 10 method”) as long as no comprehensive assessment has been done in which all studies are critically evaluated according to a set of criteria (the “critical health based recommended OEL method”).²⁷ As 14 of the 54 calculated precautionary OELs exceed 0.1 MAC, it can be questioned whether the generic safety factor, as proposed in the preceding article,¹ is cautious enough for most of the chemical substances, as long as no extensive toxicity assessment has been done. It probably is for those with no indications of reproductive toxicity but not for substances for which indications are evident.

We considered the extent of the EU lists for both categories of substances to be rather limited. For that reason we added other substances from science and policy sources. Although the EU criteria for classification of reproductive substances were broadened recently, until now this has led to only a short list of substances with suspected or proved reproductive toxicity.²⁸ Classification was based on epidemiological and animal studies. Distinction was made between three categories, depending on the strength of evidence of reproductive risks. In the Nordic countries a comparable classification system was developed, but there too it did not lead to a longer list of substances.^{29–30} We therefore combined the EU list with a list based on four critical reviews; the list of suspected fetotoxic agents, derived from the German MAK list; and the Californian list that contained substances with potential toxic effects on reproduction.

For practical reasons, we chose only inhalatory studies. The method would have been improved if the available reproductive studies with exposure routes other than inhalatory had been also taken into account. The same holds for the safety factors used. Although Zielhuis and Van der Kreek offered a range for each safety factor,²⁶ we chose for the sake of simplicity to use the average value. Instead of a range for each factor it would be preferable to enlarge the number of safety factors—for example, by using the eight original elements of the three safety factors mentioned by Zielhuis and Van der Kreek, or by using the eight elements of the safety factor proposed in the “critical health based recommended OEL method”,²⁷ which are somewhat different from those of Zielhuis and Van der Kreek.²⁶

As our method uses the LELs as the reference points without critical evaluation of the study, it could be considered that we evaluated in more detail the quality of the studies that showed LELs much lower—for example, a factor of 100 lower—compared with other LELs. Such an approach may prevent a low

quality study with a very low limit needlessly leading to a very low precautionary OEL.

The method can also be improved by deriving precautionary OELs from data that supplement the RTECS database. The inclusion of human data would contribute substantially to such an improvement. The on line database TOX-ALL may also be of help in this respect.³¹ It is clear that all those improvements in validity take time, and may be impractical, as this method has to be applied by such bodies as occupational health and safety services.

A calculation that only takes into account the LEL for reproductive effects may lead in specific cases to an inadequate generic precautionary OEL. Londo²³ compared 42 substances from the current Dutch MAC list of which LELs for reproductive effects were available in the RTECS database, and at least the LELs for one other organ system; reproductive effect was critical in 27 of those substances, and in seven was one of the critical effects; in eight substances other effects were critical. So to broaden the method to other effects could be considered.

A major point of contention raised by our approach concerns the extrapolation of safety factors. Internationally, no agreement exists on a safety factor, whether to use a rigid or a more variable one. The World Health Organisation usually takes a rigid safety factor of 100, consisting of a factor of 10 for the differences between species, and another factor of 10 for the differences within species. In The Netherlands, the scientific advisory board has chosen a more variable safety factor,³² based essentially on the study by Zielhuis and Van der Kreek.²⁶ The discussion gained new momentum in the Dutch Expert Group on Occupational Standards, which prepares health based guidelines for workplace exposure standards³³; it seems that in this discussion the principle of variability was still being followed. Safety factors are also a subject of discussion in the European Scientific Expert Group when drafting guidelines for workplace exposure. It seems that this group also prefers variable safety factors.³⁵ In view of the different approaches to the use of safety factors we have chosen to present both the LELs, as indicated in RTECS, and the overall safety factor, as used by us.

In the future, knowledge will increase, presumably leading to lists that are more extended, more limited, but better underpinned. Moreover, our approach elaborated the situation for single substances. Consequently, the groups of substances that were mentioned as suspected of being carcinogenic or having toxic effects on reproduction are not taken into account in this method. One may choose the separate substances belonging to those groups from the three strategies as described here.

Implementation of the proposed precautionary OELs can strongly reduce workplace exposure to substances that may lead to serious or irreversible harm. Because implementation may require major changes in company

Table 3 List and precautionary occupational exposure limits (OELs) of single substances with reproductive toxicity not designated as carcinogenic or genotoxic

Name	CAS number	MAC 1994 (mg/m ³) ³⁵	Studies in* RTECS† (n)	LEL† (mg/m ³)	OSF†	Category‡	Precautionary OEL§ (mg/m ³)
Acetaldehyde ¹³	75-07-0	180	— (+)	—	—	B	18
Actelic ¹⁹	29232-93-7	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
Aldrin ^{19 21}	309-00-2	0.25	—	—	—	B	0.025
Aluminium chloride ¹⁹	7446-70-0	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Aniline ^{13 17 19}	62-53-3	1	— (+)	—	—	B	0.1
Antracol ¹⁹	12071-83-9	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Arsenic, inorganic ²¹	744-03-82	0.05	—	—	—	B	0.005
Atrazine ¹⁹	1912-24-9	5	— (+)	—	—	B	0.5
Binapacryl ⁹	485-31-4	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
Biphenyl ¹³	92-52-4	1	—	—	—	B	0.1
Bisphenol A ¹⁹	80-05-7	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Boric acid ^{19 21}	10043-35-3	—	1	9.6/4h	30	A	0.3
Boron ¹⁷	7440-42-8	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
Bromide ¹⁹	—	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
n-Butanol ¹³	71-36-3	150	2	6000 ppm/7h	126	A	15
Butylacrylate ^{13 19}	141-32-2	55	1	135 ppm/6h	42	A	5.5
Cadmium ²¹	7440-43-9	0.02	— (+)	—	—	B	0.002
Caprolactam ^{18 19}	105-60-2	20	1	125/24h	42	A	2
Captan ¹⁹	133-06-2	5	— (+)	—	—	B	0.5
Carbaryl ¹⁹	63-25-2	5	— (+)	—	—	B	0.5
Carbon dioxide ^{19 21}	124-38-9	9000	6	55 pph/2h	315	A	900
Carbon disulfide ^{9 13 21}	75-15-0	60	8	0.03/8h	126	A	0.0002
Carbon monoxide ^{13 17 19}	630-08-0	29	8	1/24h	42	A	0.02
Carbon tetrachloride ^{13 19 21}	56-23-5	12.6	2	250 ppm/8h	126	A	1.3
Chlordane ²¹	57-74-9	0.5	— (+)	—	—	B	0.05
Chlordecone ^{17 19}	143-50-0	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Chlormethane ¹³	74-87-3	105	7	500 ppm/6h	126	A	9
5-Chlor-2-methyl-2,3-dihydroisothiazol-3-one ¹³	26172-55-4	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
Chlorodifluoromethane ¹⁷	75-45-6	3600	1	50000 ppm/5h	210	A	360
Chloroform (3,5,6,7) ^{13 17 19 21}	67-66-3	5	6	30 ppm/7h	126	A	0.5
Chloroprene ^{13 17 19 20}	126-99-8	36	6	0.15/24h	6	A	0.025
Copper ¹⁹	7440-50-8	0.2	— (+)	—	—	B	0.02
Copper sulphate ²¹	7758-98-7	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Cyclohexanol ²⁰	108-93-0	1	— (+)	—	—	B	0.1
Cyclohexylamine ¹³	108-91-8	40	— (+)	—	—	B	4
2,4-D ¹⁹	94-75-7	10	— (+)	—	—	B	1
2,4-D Butyl ester ²¹	94-80-4	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
DDT ^{19 21}	50-29-3	1	— (+)	—	—	B	0.1
DDVP ¹⁹	62-73-7	—	1	4/23h	42	A	0.1
Demeton ¹⁹	8065-48-3	0.1	— (+)	—	—	B	0.01
1,2-Diaminoethane ¹³	107-15-3	25	— (+)	—	—	B	2.5
1,1-Dichlorethane ¹³	75-34-3	400	1	6000 ppm/7h	126	A	40
1,1-Dichlorethylene ²¹	75-35-4	—	3	55 ppm/6h	126	A	0.4 ppm
Dichlormethane ^{13 17 19 21}	75-09-2	350	2	1250 ppm/7h	126	A	34
1,2-Dichloropropane ²¹	78-87-5	350	—	—	—	B	35
Dieldrin ²⁰	60-57-1	0.25	— (+)	—	—	B	0.025
Diethylether ¹³	60-29-7	1200	—	—	—	B	120
Diphenylhydrazine ¹⁹	122-66-7	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
Dipholatan ¹⁹	2425-06-1	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
3-(Dimethylamino)-propionitrile ¹⁹	1738-25-6	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
1,4-Hydroxybenzene ¹³	123-31-9	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Dimethyl acetamide ¹⁹	127-19-5	35	4	281 ppm/6h	126	A	3.5
Dimethyl benzantracene ¹⁹	57-97-6	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Dimethyl ether ¹³	115-10-6	1910	—	—	—	B	190
Dimethyl formamide ^{9 13 19 20}	68-12-2	30	2	4/4h	210	A	0.02
Dinitrotoluene ¹⁹	25321-14-6	1.5	— (+)	—	—	B	0.15
Dinoseb ⁹	88-85-7	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Dinoterp ⁹	1420-07-01	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
1,4-Dioxan ¹³	123-91-1	40	— (+)	—	—	B	4
Diquat ¹⁹	2764-72-9	0.5	— (+)	—	—	B	0.05
Endrin ^{19 21}	72-20-8	0.1	— (+)	—	—	B	0.01
Ethanol ¹³	64-17-5	1900	1	20000 ppm/7h	126	A	190
Ethoxyethanol ^{9 13 19}	110-80-5	19	9	10 ppm/6h	126	A	0.3
Ethoxyethyl acetate ^{9 13 19 21}	111-15-9	27	9	50 ppm/6h	126	A	2
Ethyl acrylate ¹³	140-88-5	20	—	—	—	B	2
Ethyl benzene ^{13 19}	100-41-4	215	8	96 ppm/7h	126	A	3
Ethyl formate ¹³	109-94-4	300	—	—	—	B	30
2-Ethylhexyl-3,5-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)-4-hydroxyphenyl methylthioacetate ⁹	80387-97-9	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Ethylene chlorhydrine ¹⁹	107-07-3	3	— (+)	—	—	B	0.3
Ethylene dibromide ²¹	106-93-4	155	9	39 ppm/7h	126	A	2.4
Ethylene glycol ^{19 20}	107-21-1	26	— (+)	—	—	B	2.6
Ethylene thiourea ^{9 19 21}	96-45-7	—	2	27/3h	210	A	0.1
Phenol ^{19 21}	108-95-2	19	— (+)	—	—	B	1.9
Fenthion ¹⁹	55-38-9	0.1	— (+)	—	—	B	0.01
Folpet ^{19 21}	133-07-3	—	1	491/4h	210	A	2
Formaldehyde ^{17 19 21}	50-00-0	1.5	6	0.05/4h	210	A	0.0002
Formamide ^{19 21}	75-12-7	30	— (+)	—	—	B	3
Fundazol ¹⁹	—	—	— (+)	—	—	C	0.1
Gallium ¹⁹	7440-55-3	—	—	—	—	C	0.1
Halothane ^{13 20}	151-67-7	40	12	10 ppm/8h	126	A	0.6
Heptachlor ²¹	76-44-8	0.5	—	—	—	B	0.05
Hexachlorcyclohexane ^{19 20}	58-89-9	0.5	—	—	—	B	0.05
Hexachlorophene ¹⁹	70-30-4	—	1	33.5/24h	42	A	0.8
n-Hexane ²¹	110-54-3	90	3	1000 ppm/6h	126	A	9
Isopropyl alcohol ^{19 13}	67-63-0	980	3	8000/7h	126	A	64

*— (+) Only data with exposure routes other than inhalatory are available in the registry of toxic effects of chemical substances (RTECS) data base; — = no reproductive toxicity data available in RTECS.

†LEL = lowest effect level; OSF = overall safety factor. The LEL and the OSF are only given if RTECS inhalation reproductive toxicity data are available. If the OSF is italicized, an adapted extrapolation factor is used for variable exposure times.

‡A = RTECS inhalatory reproductive toxicity studies available; B = no RTECS inhalatory reproductive toxicity studies available, Dutch MAC (1994)³⁵ available; C = no RTECS inhalatory reproductive toxicity studies available, no Dutch MAC (1994)³⁵ available.

§Calculated precautionary OELs are in bold; 0.1 of the MAC is the proposed precautionary OEL for calculated values >0.1 of the MAC; these values are in italics. CAS = chemical abstract service.

Table 3 continued from page 310

Name	CAS number	MAC 1994 (mg/m ³) ³⁵	Studies in* RTECS† (n)	LEL† (mg/m ³)	OSF†	Category‡	Precautionary OEL§ (mg/m ³)
Kelthane ¹⁹	115-32-2	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Lithium ¹⁹	7439-93-2	—	—			C	0.1
Malathion ^{13 19}	121-75-5	10	— (+)			B	1
Maneb ¹⁹	12427-38-2	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Manganese ^{17 19 21}	7439-96-5	1	—			B	0.1
MCPA ¹⁹	94-74-6	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Metallic lead ^{18 20}	7439-92-1	0.15	2	3/24h	42	A	0.015
Metallic mercury ¹⁸	7439-97-6	0.05	3	0.89 µg/m ³ /24h	42	A	0.2 µg/m ³
Methanol ¹³	67-56-1	260	7	1500 ppm/6h	126	A	15
Methoxychlor ¹³	72-43-5	10	— (+)			B	1
2-Methoxyethanol ^{9 13 18}	109-86-4	16	9	10 ppm/6h	126	A	0.25
2-Methoxyethyl acetate ^{17 19 21}	110-49-6	24	— (+)			B	2.4
2-Methoxyethyl ether ¹⁹	111-96-6	—	1	1100 ppm/6h	126	A	9 ppm
2-Methoxypropanol-1 ^{13 19}	1589-49-7	—	—			C	0.1
2-Methoxypropyl acetate-1 ^{13 19}	70657-70-4	—	5	550 ppm/6h	126	A	4 ppm
Methylazoxy methanol ¹⁹	590-96-5	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Methyl acetate ¹³	79-20-9	610	—			B	61
Methyl butylketone ²¹	591-78-6	2	2	1000 ppm/6h		A	0.2
Methyl formate ¹³	107-31-3	250	—			B	25
Methylethyl ketone ^{17 19}	78-93-3	590	2	1000 ppm/7h	126	A	23
Methyl isocyanate ¹³	624-83-9	0.05	6	1 ppm/6h	126	A	0.005
Methyl mercury ¹⁹	22967-92-6	0.01	— (+)			B	0.001
n-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone ¹³	872-50-4	—	— (+)			C	0.2
Methyl styrene ¹⁹	98-83-9	240	—			B	24
Metiram ¹⁹	9006-42-2	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Mirex ¹⁹	2385-85-5	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Molybdene ¹⁹	7439-98-7	5	— (+)			B	0.5
Monomethyl formamide ^{17 19}	123-39-7	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Naled ¹⁹	300-76-5	—	—			C	0.1
Nickel carbonyl ^{9 21}	13463-39-3	0.35	—			B	0.035
Nitrobenzene ¹³	98-95-3	5	3	1,2/4h	210	A	0.005
Nitrous dioxide ¹⁹	10102-44-0	4	6	0.1/6h	126	A	0.001
Nitrous oxide ^{13 17}	10102-43-9	152	6	1.5/24h	42	A	0.04
Organic tin ¹³	7440-31-5	0.1	—			B	0.01
Oryzalin ¹⁹	19044-88-3	—	—			C	0.1
Ozone ¹⁹	10028-15-6	0.12	2	1 ppm/24h	42	A	0.01
Paraquat ¹⁹	1910-42-5	0.1	— (+)			B	0.01
Paratertiary-butylbenzoic acid ¹⁹	98-73-7	—	2	12.5/6h	126	A	0.1
Parathion ^{13 19}	56-38-2	0.1	— (+)			B	0.01
Pentachlorophenol ^{19 20}	87-86-5	0.06	— (+)			B	0.006
Pentachlorobenzene ¹⁹	608-93-5	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Perchloroethylene ^{13 19}	127-18-4	240	6	300 ppm/7h	126	A	16
p-Phenylenediamine ¹³	106-50-3	—	—			C	0.1
Phthalic acid anhydride ¹³	85-44-9	1	1	1/6h	126	A	0.01
2-propenal ¹³	107-02-8	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Ramrod ¹⁹	1918-16-7	—	—			C	0.1
Selenium ^{17 19}	7782-49-2	0.1	— (+)			B	0.01
Simazine ¹⁹	122-34-9	—	1	17/2h	315	A	0.05
Styrene ^{17 19}	100-42-5	210	6	1.5/24h	42	A	0.04
2,4,5-T ^{19 20}	93-76-5	10	— (+)			B	1
Tellurium ^{17 19}	13494-80-9	0.1	— (+)			B	0.01
Tetrachlorethane ¹⁹	79-34-5	7	—			B	0.7
Tetrachlorophenol ¹⁹	58-90-2	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Tetraphosphor ¹³	7723-14-0	—	—			C	0.1
Thallium ¹⁷	7440-28-0	0.1	—			B	0.01
2-thiourea ⁹	62-56-6	0.5	— (+)			B	0.05
Thiram ^{13 19}	137-26-8	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Titanium ¹⁹	7440-32-6	—	— (+)			C	0.1
Toluene ^{17 19}	108-88-3	375	8	200 ppm/7h	126	A	6
Toluene diisocyanate ^{17 21}	584-84-9	0.04	—			B	0.004
Toxaphene ²¹	8001-35-2	0.5	— (+)			B	0.05
Trichlorobenzene ¹³	120-82-1	40	— (+)			B	4
Trichlorethane ¹⁹	71-55-6	1080	1	2100 ppm/6h	126	A	90
Trichlorethylene ^{17 19 21}	79-01-6	190	6	100 ppm/4h	210	A	3
Trichlorophenol ¹⁹	52-68-6	—	—			C	0.1
Urethane ¹⁹	51-79-6	—	—			C	0.1
Vinyl acetate ¹³	108-05-4	30	— (+)			B	3
Vinylidene chloride ^{17 19}	75-35-4	20	3	55 ppm/24h	126	A	1.7
Warfarin ⁹	81-81-2	0.1	— (+)			B	0.01
Xylene ^{17 19 21}	1330-20-7	435	9	50/6h	126	A	0.4
Zineb ¹⁹	12122-67-7	—	1	20/4h	30	A	0.7

practices it would be best to develop a time frame for the gradual phasing in of precautionary OELs.

The proposed strategy is written from the EU perspective of setting standards and from the EU directives concerning carcinogenic and toxic substances with reproductive toxicity. It is not meant as an alternative to the current EU strategy for setting standards but as a means to adapt and supplement the current, partly very dated, standards easily in a short period of time more towards risk-avoidance, and to supplement the list of standards with substances for which at least indications of carcinogenic or reproductive risks exist. Outside Europe, similar discussions are going on. At the UNCED in Rio de Janeiro in 1992

the precautionary principle was adopted worldwide. With our approach we hope to stimulate international discussion about the way in which this international agreement could be made operational, especially in setting standards for occupational health and safety purposes.

We thank Drs M J Koene from the Dutch Institute for the Working Environment and J P van der Sluys from the Department of Science, Technology, and Society of Utrecht University for their valuable suggestions.

- 1 Stijkel A, van Dijk F. Developments in reproductive risk management. *Occup Environ Med* 1995;52:294-303.
- 2 Douglas M, Wildawsky A. *Risk and culture. An essay on the selection of technical and environmental dangers*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- 3 Sabatier P. Knowledge, policy-oriented learning and policy change. An advocacy framework. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization* 1987;8:649-72.

- 4 Bus J, Posthuma J, Broekhuizen PC van, Stijkel A, Ulenbelt P. *MAC-waarden op de arbeidsplaats (MAC-values at the workplace)*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samson HD Tjeenk Willink, 1992:34-41.
- 5 Landelijk Milieu Overleg (LMO). *Brief aan de Minister van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid betreffende de EG-richtlijn zwangeren in relatie tot milieu en gezondheid (Letter to the Minister of Social Affairs and Employment concerning the EC directive pregnant workers)*. Utrecht: LMO, 1992. (U-LMO-92-107.)
- 6 Landelijk Milieu Overleg (LMO). *Brief aan de Minister van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid betreffende verlaging dioxine norm en ontwerpbesluit zwangere werknemers (Letter to the Minister of Social Affairs and Employment concerning lowering the dioxin norm and the concept Ministerial Order pregnant workers)*. Utrecht: LMO 1993. (U-LMO-93-161.)
- 7 United Nations conference on environment and development (UNCED). *Declaration of Rio*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: UN 1992. (Principle 15.)
- 8 Commission of the European Communities (CEC). *Directive of the Council concerning the classification of hazardous substances*. Brussels: CEC 1967. (67/548/EEC.)
- 9 Commission of the European Communities (CEC). *Directive of the Council concerning the eighteenth amendment to Directive 67/548/EEC*. Brussels: CEC, 1993. (93/21/EEC.)
- 10 Commission of the European Communities (CEC). *Directive of the Council concerning the protection against the risks of exposure to carcinogenic substances at work*. Brussels: CEC, 1990. (90/394/EEC.)
- 11 Commission of the European Communities (CEC). *Directive of the Council concerning the protection at work of pregnant women or women who have recently given birth*. Brussels: CEC, 1992. (92/85/EEC.)
- 12 Arboraad. *Advies inzake grenswaarden voor genotoxisch carcinogene stoffen (Advice concerning standard setting for genotoxic carcinogenic substances)*. Zoetermeer: Arboraad, 1992.
- 13 Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. *MAK- und BAT-werte Liste (MAC- and TRC-value lists)*. Weinheim, 1994. (Mitteilung 30.)
- 14 Arbeidsinspectie. *Werken met kankerverwekkende stoffen en processen (Working with carcinogenic substances and processes)*. The Hague: Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, 1994:187.
- 15 Dijk-Looijaard AM van. *Herziening normen drinkwaterbesluit (Readjustment water supply directive concerning guidelines)*. Nieuwegein: KIWA, 1993. (SWO93.340.)
- 16 Stijkel A. *Een reprotoxinstrument (A reprotox instrument)*. The Hague: Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, Directorate General of Labour, 1992:S138-1.
- 17 Barlow SM, Sullivan FM. *Reproductive hazards of industrial chemicals*. London: Academic Press, 1982.
- 18 Zielhuis RL, Stijkel A, Verberk MM, Poel-Bot M van de. Health risks to female workers in occupational exposure to chemical agents. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 1984;suppl:120.
- 19 Fletcher AC. *Reproductive hazards of work*. Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission, 1985.
- 20 Koeter HBWM, Dreef van der Meulen HC, Stijkel A, Zielhuis RL. *Schadelijke effecten van stoffen op voortplanting en nageslacht anders dan via de inwerking op het erfelijk materiaal, indien deze bekend is. Een literatuurstudie. (Toxic effects of substances on reproduction and progeny. A literature study)*. The Hague: Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, Directorate General of Labour, 1989, (S73).
- 21 Donald JM, Monserrat LE, Hooper K, Book SA, Chernoff GF. Prioritizing candidate reproductive/developmental toxicants for evaluation. *Reprod Toxicol* 1992;6:99-108.
- 22 Koeter HBWM. Relevance of parameters related to fertility and reproduction in toxicity testing. *Am J Ind Med* 1983;4:81-6.
- 23 Londo M. *Implementatie van het voorzorgprincipe in de MAC-waarden: speurtocht naar het kritisch effect (Implementation of the precautionary principle in the MAC-values; search for the critical effect)*. Utrecht: Utrecht University, Department of Science, Technology, and Society, 1994.
- 24 National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. CD-ROM database: registry of toxic effects of chemical substances (RTECS) update. Cincinnati: NIOSH, 1993.
- 25 Paul M, Welch L. Improving education and resources for health care providers. *Environ Health Perspect* 1993; 101(suppl 2):191-7.
- 26 Zielhuis RL, Kreek FW van der. The use of a safety factor in setting health based permissible levels for occupational exposure. I: a proposal; II: comparison of extrapolated and published permissible standards. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 1979;42:203-15.
- 27 Stijkel A, Verberk MM. A proposal for systematically drafting health-based recommended occupational exposure limits (HBR-OEL) illustrated on reproductive toxicity. In: Stijkel A. *On managing reproductive risks of occupational exposure to chemicals*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, Coronal Laboratory, 1995. (Thesis in preparation.)
- 28 Sullivan F. Occupational hazards and reproduction. Third international NIVA course. Lecture: EU criteria. Turkku, 10 November 1994. *J Occup Med* 1995; (in press).
- 29 Taskinen H. Prevention of reproductive health hazards at work. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 1992;18(suppl 2):27-9.
- 30 Taskinen H. Occupational hazards and reproduction. Third international NIVA course. Lecture: Nordic criteria. Turkku, 10 November 1994. *J Occup Med* 1995; (in press).
- 31 Stijkel A. *Vergelijkend warenonderzoek databestanden mbt reprotox (Comparison of databases concerning reproductive risks) internal report*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, Coronal Laboratory, 1991.
- 32 Gezondheidsraad. *Advies inzake uitgangspunten voor normstelling (Advice concerning starting points for standard setting)*. The Hague: Gezondheidsraad, 1985.
- 33 Mik G de. *De advieswaarden: wikkelen en wegen (The guidelines: a weighing process)*. *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Gezondheidszorg* 1993;71:120-1.
- 34 Commission of the European Communities (CEC). *Health and safety, occupational exposure limits, criteria documents. Guidance note on the content and layout*. Brussels: Health and Safety Directorate, 1992.
- 35 Arbeidsinspectie. *De nationale MAC-lijst (The national MAC-list)*. The Hague: Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, Directorate General of Labour, 1994:145.

Correspondence and editorials

Occupational and Environmental Medicine welcomes correspondence relating to any of the material appearing in the journal. Results from preliminary or small scale studies may also be published in the correspondence column if this seems appropriate. Letters should be not more than 500 words in length and contain a minimum of references. Tables and figures should be kept to an absolute

minimum. Letters are accepted on the understanding that they may be subject to editorial revision and shortening.

The journal also publishes editorials which are normally specially commissioned. The Editor welcomes suggestions regarding suitable topics; those wishing to submit an editorial, however, should do so only after discussion with the Editor.