



Scientific Committee on Consumer Products

SCCP

THE SCCP'S NOTES OF GUIDANCE  
FOR THE TESTING OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS AND THEIR  
SAFETY EVALUATION

**6<sup>TH</sup> REVISION**

Adopted by the SCCP during the 10<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 19 December 2006

*Nam et ipsa scientia potestas est*  
For knowledge itself is power

Francis Bacon (1561- 1626) Essays

The "Notes of Guidance for Testing of Cosmetic Ingredients and Their Safety Evaluation by the SCCP" is a document compiled by the members of the Scientific Committee on Consumer Products (SCCP, replacing the former SCCNFP and SCC). The document contains relevant information on the different aspects of testing and safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients. It is designed to provide guidance to public authorities and cosmetic industry, in order to improve harmonized compliance with Directive 76/768/EEC<sup>1</sup> and in particular by the Sixth (Dir. 93/35/EEC<sup>2</sup>) and "Seventh" (Dir. 2003/15/EC<sup>3</sup>) Amendments to this Directive.

The "Notes of Guidance" are regularly revised and updated in order to incorporate the progress of scientific knowledge in general, and the experience gained in particular, in the field of testing and safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients.

The last revision took place in 2003 (SCCNFP/0690/03, Final<sup>4</sup>). Since then, several new opinions of importance to the content of this guidance document have been adopted and they form the basis of this new revision.

As was also the case in the previous revision, individual SCC(NF)P opinions are not provided in detail, but are briefly summarized and clearly referred to. They have become too numerous to be given in full in one document.

The "Notes of Guidance" should not be seen as a checklist, but have been compiled to provide assistance in the complex process of the testing and safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients.

Input of scientists from industry and the European Cosmetic Toiletry and Perfumery Association (COLIPA), is gratefully acknowledged.

The Chairperson

---

<sup>1</sup> **Council Directive 76/768/EEC** of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 262, 27/09/1976 p.169.*

<sup>2</sup> **Council Directive 93/35/EEC** of 14 June 1993 amending for the sixth time Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 151, 23/06/1993 p.32.*

<sup>3</sup> **Directive 2003/15/EC** of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 February 2003 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L66, 11/03/2003 p.26.*

<sup>4</sup> **SCCNFP/0690/03, Final** : Notes of Guidance for the testing of cosmetic ingredients and their safety evaluation, 5<sup>th</sup> revision, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 25<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 October 2003.*

## SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PRODUCTS

C. CHAMBERS	(IE)	
G. DEGEN	(DE)	
R. DUBAKIENE	(LT)	
C. GALLI <sup>1</sup>	(IT)	
R. GRIMALT	(ES)	
B. JAZWIEC - KANYION	(PL)	
V. KAPOULAS	(GR)	
J. KRUTMANN	(DE)	
C. LIDÉN	(SE)	
N. LOPRIENO <sup>2</sup>	(IT)	
J.P. MARTY	(FR)	
T. PLATZEK	(DE)	
S.C. RASTOGI	(DK)	
J. REVUZ	(FR)	
V.M. ROGIERS	(BE)	<i>Vice-Chair</i>
T. SANNER	(NO)	<i>Vice-Chair</i>
G. SPEIT	(DE)	
J. VAN ENGELEN	(NL)	
I.R. WHITE	(GB)	<i>Chair</i>

---

<sup>1</sup> Resigned from the Committee in 2006

<sup>2</sup> Resigned from the Committee in 2005

## ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSARY OF TERMS

---

<b>3R</b>	Refinement, Reduction, Replacement
<b>3T3 NRU PT</b>	3T3 Neutral Red Uptake Phototoxicity Test
<b>Acceptability test</b>	A test intended to confirm the fulfilment of the expectations for a cosmetic product in-use [SCCNFP/0068/98]
<b>Alternative methods</b>	All those procedures which can completely replace the need for animal experiments, which can reduce the number of animals required, or which can reduce the amount of pain and stress to which the animal is subjected in order to meet the essential needs of humans and other animals [Rogiers et al. 2000]
<b>Art.</b>	Article
<b>BCOP</b>	Bovine Corneal Opacity and Permeability
<b>BMD</b>	BenchMark Dose
<b>BMDL</b>	BMD Lower limit
<b>BMR</b>	BenchMark Response
<b>BSE</b>	Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
<b>BW</b>	Body Weight
<b>CAS n°</b>	Chemical Abstracts Service registry number
<b>CI</b>	Colour Index
<b>CMR</b>	Carcinogenic, Mutagenic, toxic to Reproduction
<b>Colipa</b>	European Cosmetic Toiletry and Perfumery Association
<b>Compatibility test</b>	A test intended to confirm that there are no harmful effects when applying a cosmetic product for the first time to the human skin or mucous membrane; the test must involve exposure (normal or slightly exaggerated) which closely mimics typical consumer use of the product [based on SCCNFP/0068/98]
<b>Cosmetic ingredient</b>	Any chemical substance or preparation of synthetic or natural origin, used in the formulation of cosmetic products. A cosmetic ingredient may be : 1- a chemically well-defined single substance with a molecular and structural formula, 2- a complex preparation, requiring a clear definition and often corresponding to a mixture of substances of unknown or variable composition and biological nature, 3- a mixture of 1 and 2, used in the formulation of a finished cosmetic product. [based on Art. 5a of 93/35/EEC and SCCNFP/0321/00]
<b>Cosmetic product</b>	Any substance or preparation intended to be placed in contact with the various parts of the human body (epidermis, hair system, nails, lips and external genital organs) or with the teeth and the mucous membranes of the oral cavity with a view exclusively or mainly to cleaning them, perfuming them, changing their appearance and/or correcting body odours and/or protecting them or keeping them in good condition [Art. 1 of 93/35/EEC]

<b>CTFA</b>	Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association
<b>DA<sub>a</sub><sup>1</sup></b>	Dermal Absorption reported as amount/cm <sup>2</sup>
<b>DA<sub>p</sub><sup>1</sup></b>	Dermal Absorption expressed as a percentage
<b>Dermal / percutaneous absorption</b>	<p>The <b>percutaneous/dermal absorption</b> process is a global term which describes the passage of compounds across the skin. This process can be divided into three steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>penetration</b> is the entry of a substance into a particular layer or structure such as the entrance of a compound into the stratum corneum;</li> <li>- <b>permeation</b> is the penetration through one layer into another, which is both functionally and structurally different from the first layer;</li> <li>- <b>resorption</b> is the uptake of a substance into the vascular system (lymph and/or blood vessel), which acts as the central compartment</li> </ul> <p>[WHO 2005]</p>
<b>DG</b>	Directorate-General
<b>DG ENTR</b>	Directorate-General Enterprise
<b>DG ENV</b>	Directorate-General Environment
<b>DG SANCO</b>	Directorate-General Health and Consumer Protection
<b>Dir.</b>	Directive
<b>DNA</b>	DeoxyriboNucleic Acid
<b>Doc.</b>	Document
<b>Dosage</b>	<p>A general term comprising of dose, its frequency and duration</p> <p>[General Introduction: Part B, 96/54/EC]</p>
<b>Dose</b>	<p>The amount of test substance administered. Dose is expressed as weight (grams or milligrams) or as weight of test substance per unit of weight of test animal (e.g. milligrams per kilogram body weight), or per skin surface unit (e.g. milligrams per square centimetre of skin), or as constant dietary concentrations (parts per million or milligrams per kilogram of food)</p> <p>[based on General Introduction: Part B, 96/54/EC]</p>
<b>Dose-descriptor</b>	<p>The calculated amount of a test substance administered daily (e.g. mg/kg body weight/day) that in the case of a non-threshold carcinogen increases the net frequency of tumours at a specific site by a certain percentage (e.g. T<sub>25</sub>)</p> <p>[Dybing et al. 1997]</p>
<b>EC</b>	European Community
<b>ECB</b>	European Chemicals Bureau
<b>ECVAM</b>	European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods
<b>EEC</b>	European Economic Community
<b>EFSA</b>	European Food Safety Authority
<b>EINECS</b>	European INventory of Existing commercial Chemical Substances
<b>ELINCS</b>	European LIst of Notified Chemical Substances
<b>ESAC</b>	ECVAM Scientific Advisory Committee
<b>EST</b>	Embryotoxic Stem cell Test
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>F<sup>1</sup></b>	Frequency of application

<sup>1</sup> used in the calculation of the Systemic Exposure Dosage (see section 3-7.3).

<b>Finished cosmetic product</b>	The cosmetic product in its final formulation, as placed on the market and made available to the final consumer, or its prototype [2003/15/EC]
<b>GCP</b>	Good Clinical Practice
<b>GLP</b>	Good Laboratory Practice
<b>GMP</b>	Good Manufacturing Practice
<b>GPMT</b>	Guinea Pig Maximisation Test
<b>HET-CAM</b>	Hen's Egg Test-Chorio Allantoic Membrane
<b>HPRT</b>	Hypoxanthine-guanine PhosphoRibosyl Transferase
<b>HPV</b>	High Production Volume
<b>HT<sub>25</sub></b>	Human dose-description, derived from T <sub>25</sub> and based on comparative metabolic rates [Sanner et al. 2001]
<b>ICCG</b>	Inter-Committee Coordination Group
<b>IFRA</b>	International Fragrance Research Association
<b><i>In vitro</i> test method</b>	Biological method : using organs, tissue sections and tissue cultures, isolated cells and their cultures, cell lines and subcellular fractions  Non-biological method : such as computer modelling, chemical interaction studies, receptor binding studies, ... [based on Rogiers et al. 2000]
<b><i>In vivo</i> test method</b>	Test method using living (experimental) animals [Rogiers et al. 2000]
<b>INCI</b>	International Nomenclature of Cosmetic Ingredients
<b>INN</b>	International Non-proprietary Name
<b>IPCS</b>	International Programme on Chemical Safety
<b>IUPAC</b>	International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry
<b>JRC</b>	Joint Research Centre
<b>LD<sub>50</sub></b>	Median Lethal Dose 50% : a statistically derived single dose of a substance that can be expected to cause death in 50% of the dosed animals (expressed in mg/kg body weight) [General Introduction: Part B, 96/54/EC]
<b>LLNA</b>	Local Lymph Node Assay
<b>LO(A)EL</b>	Lowest Observed (Adverse) Effect Level : the lowest dose or exposure level within a specific test system, where (adverse) treatment-related findings are observed [ECB 2003]
<b>MLA</b>	Mouse Lymphoma Assay
<b>MM</b>	MicroMass
<b>MN</b>	MicroNucleus
<b>MoE</b>	Margin of Exposure
<b>MoS</b>	Margin of Safety
<b>MR</b>	Mitotic Recombination
<b>MSDS</b>	Material Safety Data Sheet
<b>MTT</b>	3-(4,5)-dimethyl-2-thiazolyl-2,5-dimethyl-2H-tetrazolium bromide
<b>MW</b>	Molecular Weight
<b>NO(A)EL</b>	No Observed (Adverse) Effect Level : the highest dose or exposure level within a specific test system, where no (adverse) treatment-related findings are observed [General Introduction: Part B, 96/54/EC]
<b>NRU</b>	Neutral Red Uptake

<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>Ph. Eur.</b>	European Pharmacopoeia
<b>PIR</b>	Product Information Requirement
<b>P<sub>ow</sub></b>	n-octanol / water partition coefficient
<b>ppm</b>	parts per million (e.g. mg/kg)
<b>Prototype</b>	A first model or design that has not been produced in batches, and from which the finished cosmetic product is copied or finally developed [2003/15/EC]
<b>QSAR</b>	Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationship
<b>RBC</b>	Red Blood Cell
<b>REACH</b>	Registration, Evaluation and Authorization of CHemicals
<b>RIVM</b>	RijksInstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu
<b>S9</b>	Co-factor supplemented post-mitochondrial fraction, prepared from the livers of rodents treated with enzyme-inducing agents [EC B.10]
<b>SC</b>	Stratum Corneum
<b>SCC</b>	Scientific Committee on Cosmetology
<b>SCCNFP</b>	Scientific Committee on Cosmetic products and Non-Food Products intended for consumers
<b>SCCP</b>	Scientific Committee on Consumer Products
<b>SCE</b>	Sister Chromatid Exchange
<b>SCENIHR</b>	Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks
<b>SCHER</b>	Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks
<b>SD</b>	Standard Deviation of the mean
<b>SED</b>	Systemic Exposure Dosage
<b>SHE</b>	Syrian Hamster Embryo
<b>SI</b>	Stimulation Index
<b>SRM</b>	Specified Risk Material
<b>SSA<sup>1</sup></b>	Skin Surface Area
<b>SSC</b>	Scientific Steering Committee
<b>Syndet</b>	Synthetic detergent
<b>T<sub>25</sub></b>	Animal dose-descriptor; chronic dose rate that will give 25% of the animal's tumours at a specific tissue site after correction for spontaneous incidence [Dybing et al. 1997]
<b>TD<sub>50</sub></b>	Is defined as the chronic dose rate (in mg/kg bw per day) which, for a given target site(s), would cause tumours in half of the animals within some standard experimental time – the “standard lifespan” for the species [EFSA 2005]
<b>TER</b>	Transcutaneous Electrical Resistance
<b>TEWL</b>	TransEpidermal Water Loss
<b>TIF</b>	Technical Information File
<b>Toxicodynamics</b>	Cover the process of interaction of chemical substances with target sites and the subsequent reactions leading to adverse effects [ECB 2003]
<b>Toxicokinetics</b>	Describe the time-dependent fate of a substance within the body. They include absorption, distribution, biotransformation and/or excretion [ECB 2003]

<sup>1</sup> used in the calculation of the Systemic Exposure Dosage (see section 3-7.3).

<b>TSE</b>	Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathy
<b>UDS</b>	Unscheduled DNA Synthesis
<b>UV</b>	UltraViolet (wavelengths UV-A : 315-400 nm, UV-B : 280-315 nm, UV-C : 100-280 nm) [2000/33/EC]
<b>Valid method</b>	A technique that has not necessarily gone through the complete validation process, but for which sufficient scientific data exist demonstrating its relevance and reliability. [based on Rogiers 2003]
<b>Validated method</b>	A method for which the relevance and reliability are established for a particular purpose (in most cases according to the criteria established by ECVAM, taking into account that a prediction model needs to be present from the start of the validation procedure). [based on Balls et al. 1997 and Worth et al. 2001] These methods are taken up in Annex V to Directive 67/548/EEC (Dangerous Substances) and/or published as OECD Technical Guidelines*.
<b>VIS</b>	VISible light (wavelength 400-800 nm)
<b>WEC</b>	Whole Embryo Culture
<b>WHO</b>	World Health Organisation

\* available through  
[http://www.oecd.org/document/55/0,2340,en\\_2649\\_34377\\_2349687\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/55/0,2340,en_2649_34377_2349687_1_1_1_1,00.html),  
consulted December 2006.

## REFERENCES

**67/548/EEC** - Council Directive 67/548/EEC of 27 June 1967 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal P 196, 16/08/1967 p.1.*

**93/35/EEC** - Council Directive 93/35/EEC of 14 June 1993 amending for the sixth time Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L 151, 23/06/1993 p.32.*

**96/94/EC** - Commission Directive 96/54/EC of 30 July 1996 adapting to technical progress for the twenty-second time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 248, 30/09/1996 p.1.*

**2000/33/EC** - Commission Directive 2000/33/EC of 25 April 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 27th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.90.*

**2003/15/EC** - Directive 2003/15/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 February 2003 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L66, 11/03/2003 p.26.*



**Balls M.** and Fentem J.H.

Progress toward the validation of alternative tests.  
Alternatives To Laboratory Animals 25, 33-43 (1997).

**Diembeck W.**, Beck H., Benech-Kieffer F., Courtellemont P., Dupuis J., Lovell W., Paye M. Spengler J., Steiling W.

Test Guidelines for *In Vitro* Assessment of Dermal Absorption and Percutaneous Penetration of Cosmetic Ingredients.  
Food and Chemical Toxicology 37, 191-205 (1999).

**Dybing E.**, Sanner T., Roelfzema H., Kroese D. and Tennant R.W.

T25: A simplified carcinogenic potency index: Description of the system and study of correlations between carcinogenic potency and species/site specificity and mutagenicity.  
Pharmacology and Toxicology 80, 272-279 (1997).

**EC B.10** - Mutagenicity - *in vitro* mammalian chromosome aberration test

Commission Directive 2000/32/EC of 19 May 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 26th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.35.*

**ECB** (European Chemicals Bureau)

Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment in support of Commission Directive 93/67/EEC on Risk Assessment for new notified substances, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 on Risk Assessment for existing substances and Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market.

Doc. EUR 20418 EN/1, European Communities (2003).

**EFSA** (European Food Safety Authority)

Opinion of the Scientific Committee on a request from EFSA related to A Harmonised Approach for Risk Assessment of Substances Which are both Genotoxic and Carcinogenic  
The EFSA Journal 282, 1-31 (2005).

**Rogiers V.** and Beken S. (Editors and authors)

Alternative Methods to Animal experiments. Actual status, development and approach in Belgium.

VUBPress, Brussels. ISBN 90-5487-264-0 (2000).

**Rogiers V.**

"Validated" and "valid" alternative methods available today for testing of cosmetic products and their ingredients.

In: Safety Assessment of Cosmetics in the EU. Training Course Vrije Universiteit Brussel, 7-12 April 2003, Part 2, p.1.

**Sanner T.**, Dybing E., Willems MI. and Kroese ED.

A simple method for quantitative risk assessment of non-threshold carcinogens based on the dose descriptor T25.

Pharmacology and Toxicology 88(6), 331-41 (2001).

**SCCNFP/0068/98, Final** : Guidelines on the use of human volunteers in compatibility testing of finished cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 23 June 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0321/00, Final** : Notes of Guidance for Testing of Cosmetic Ingredients for Their Safety Evaluation, 4<sup>th</sup> revision, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary meeting of 24 October 2000.*

**WHO** (World Health Organisation)

Kielhorn J., Melching-Kollmu $\square$  S., Mangelsdorf I.

Dermal Absorption.

WHO / IPCS Environmental Health Criteria, Draft February 2005, accessible through [http://www.who.int/ipcs/methods/dermal\\_absorption/en/](http://www.who.int/ipcs/methods/dermal_absorption/en/) (consulted Dec 2005).

**Worth A.P.** and Balls M.

The importance of the prediction model in the development and validation of alternative tests.  
Alternatives To Laboratory Animals 29, 135-143 (2001).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PRODUCTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2-1 Historical background .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2-2 Mandate .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2-3 Rules of Procedure .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2-4 Outcome of discussions.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2-4.1 The "Notes of Guidance" .....	5
2-4.2 The status of cosmetic ingredients included in Annexes II, III, IV, VI and VII of Dir. 76/768/EEC ....	6
2-4.3 General issues taken up in the "Notes of Guidance" .....	6
<b>2-5 References .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. SAFETY EVALUATION OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3-1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3-2 Safety evaluation procedure of cosmetic ingredients as applied by         the SCCP .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3-3 Chemical and physical specifications of cosmetic ingredients .....</b>	<b>18</b>
3-3.1 Chemical identity.....	18
3-3.2 Physical form .....	19
3-3.3 Molecular weight .....	19
3-3.4 Characterisation and purity of the chemical .....	19
3-3.5 Characterisation of the impurities or accompanying contaminants .....	19
3-3.6 Solubility .....	19
3-3.7 Partition coefficient (Log P <sub>ow</sub> ).....	19
3-3.8 Additional relevant physical and chemical specifications .....	20
<b>3-4 Relevant toxicity studies on cosmetic ingredients.....</b>	<b>20</b>
3-4.1 Acute toxicity .....	22
3-4.2 Irritation and corrosivity .....	22
3-4.3 Skin sensitisation .....	24
3-4.4 Dermal / percutaneous absorption .....	25
3-4.5 Repeated dose toxicity .....	26
3-4.6 Mutagenicity/genotoxicity .....	27
3-4.7 Carcinogenicity.....	29
3-4.8 Reproductive toxicity.....	30
3-4.9 Toxicokinetic studies .....	30
3-4.10 Photo-induced toxicity .....	31
3-4.11 Human data.....	32

<b>3-5</b>	<b>Toxicological requirements for inclusion of a substance in one of the Annexes to Dir. 76/768/EEC (which are evaluated by the SCCP)</b>	<b>33</b>
3-5.1	General toxicological requirements.....	33
3-5.2	Annex II.....	34
3-5.3	Annex III .....	34
3-5.4	Annex IV .....	35
3-5.5	Annex VI .....	35
3-5.6	Annex VII.....	35
3-5.7	Requirements for partial evaluations .....	35
<b>3-6</b>	<b>Basic requirements for cosmetic ingredients (which are evaluated by individual safety assessors)</b>	<b>36</b>
3-6.1	General toxicological requirements.....	36
3-6.2	Identification of mineral, animal, botanical and biotechnological ingredients .....	37
3-6.3	Fragrance materials .....	38
3-6.4	Potential endocrine disruptors .....	39
3-6.5	Animal-derived ingredients, incl. BSE-issues.....	39
3-6.6	CMR-ingredients .....	40
3-6.7	Nanoparticles.....	41
<b>3-7</b>	<b>General principles for the calculation of the Margin of Safety and lifetime cancer risk for a cosmetic ingredient.....</b>	<b>42</b>
3-7.1	Introduction : definitions .....	42
3-7.2	The Margin of Safety .....	42
3-7.3	Dermal absorption issues in the calculation of the SED.....	44
3-7.4	MoS for children .....	45
3-7.5	The Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC) .....	46
3-7.6	Lifetime cancer risk.....	46
<b>3-8</b>	<b>The specific assessment of hair dyes and hair dye components ..</b>	<b>48</b>
3-8.1	Hazard and risk assessment of hair dyes in general .....	48
3-8.2	Step-wise regulation of hair dyes .....	49
3-8.3	Mutagenicity / genotoxicity testing of hair dyes.....	49
<b>3-9</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>LISTS OF INGREDIENTS .....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>4-1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>4-2</b>	<b>Annexes II, III, IV, VI and VII to the Cosmetic Products Directive</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>4-3</b>	<b>The International Nomenclature of Cosmetic Ingredients (INCI)</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>4-4</b>	<b>Annex I to the Dangerous Substances Directive.....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>4-5</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>STANDARD FORMAT OF THE OPINIONS .....</b>	<b>71</b>

<b>6.</b>	<b>SAFETY EVALUATION OF FINISHED COSMETIC PRODUCTS .....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>6-1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>6-2</b>	<b>Categories of cosmetic products and exposure levels in use .....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>6-3</b>	<b>Guidelines for the safety evaluation of finished cosmetic products</b>	<b>84</b>
6-3.1	Introduction.....	84
6-3.2	Toxicological profile of the ingredients .....	84
6-3.3	Stability and physical and chemical characteristics of the finished cosmetic product .....	85
6-3.4	Evaluation of the safety of the finished product.....	85
<b>6-4</b>	<b>Guidelines on microbiological quality of the finished cosmetic   product .....</b>	<b>86</b>
6-4.1	Preamble.....	86
6-4.2	Quantitative and qualitative limits .....	86
6-4.3	Challenge testing.....	87
6-4.4	Good Manufacturing Practice. ....	87
<b>6-5</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>LIST OF OFFICIAL TEXTS OF DIRECTIVE 76/768/EEC   INCLUDING ALL TECHNICAL ADAPTATIONS AND AMENDMENTS .....</b>	<b>89</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

According to Article 1 of Council Directive 76/768/EEC and its amendments, a **cosmetic product** shall mean any substance or preparation intended to be placed in contact with the various parts of the human body (epidermis, hair system, nails, lips and external genital organs) or with the teeth and the mucous membranes of the oral cavity with a view exclusively or mainly to cleaning them, perfuming them, changing their appearance and/or correcting body odours and/or protecting them or keeping them in good condition.

Article 2 of that same Directive specifies that a cosmetic product *must not cause damage to human health when applied under normal or reasonably foreseeable conditions of use*.

Cosmetic products have a history, covering thousands of years, in using a variety of ingredients derived from plants, animals and mineral sources. Modern technology has added an important number of ingredients from synthetic and semi-synthetic origin. Present-day use of cosmetic products has become very extensive and affects most population groups within the European Union, although the degree and nature may vary within the different Member States.

In practice, cosmetic products have rarely been associated with serious health hazards, which, however, does not mean that cosmetics are safe in use *per se*. Particular attention is needed for long-term safety aspects, since cosmetic products may be used extensively over a large part of the human lifespan. Therefore, the safety-in use of cosmetic products has been established in Europe by controlling the ingredients, their chemical structures, toxicity profiles, and exposure patterns [93/35/EEC<sup>1</sup>].

In June 1982 (Report EUR 8794), long before the Sixth Amendment to Dir. 76/768/EEC [93/35/EEC] was implemented, a pioneer document was issued by the former SCC dealing with "Guidelines for the toxicity testing of cosmetic ingredients.". Later, a number of documents followed that took into account both the experience gained by the SCC/SCCNFP in evaluating the toxicological profile of an important number of cosmetic ingredients and the development of the scientific knowledge, in particular in the field of toxicology.

At present, safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients is carried out by the SCCP using data obtained from animal studies (*in vivo*), *in vitro* experiments, QSAR (quantitative structure activity relationship) calculations, clinical studies, epidemiological studies and accidents.

With the implementation of Dir. 2003/15/EC<sup>2</sup>, the need for appropriate *in vitro* tests for the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients and products becomes crucial.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Council Directive 93/35/EEC** of 14 June 1993 amending for the sixth time Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 151, 23/06/1993 p.32.*

<sup>2</sup> **Directive 2003/15/EC** of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 February 2003 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L66, 11/03/2003 p.26.*

The SCCP would like to stress that currently available *in vitro* methods only constitute a fraction of the alternative methodology meant and described by Russell et al [1959<sup>1</sup>], proposing the ultimate alternative methodology, namely replacement of the laboratory animal by non-sentient material (organs, tissue sections, cell cultures, ...). Nevertheless, although replacement remains the ultimate goal, reduction of the number of animals and refinement of the methodology by reducing the pain and distress of the animals, provide realistic and significant improvements of actual testing methods and strategies.

In the present update, the state-of-the-art with respect to the full 3R strategy (refinement, reduction and replacement) of Russell et al [1959], adopted by the European Commission, is incorporated.

In particular, the SCCP has given special attention to those alternative methods that are suitable for the safety testing of cosmetic ingredients. These are taken up in the appropriate chapters.

The revised "Notes of Guidance" are concerned with testing and safety evaluation of the cosmetic ingredients listed in Annexes III, IV, VI, and VII of Dir. 76/768/EEC and those for which safety concerns have been expressed, but are also of interest to all cosmetic ingredients intended to be incorporated in a finished cosmetic product.

Although the "Notes of Guidance" have not been particularly written for the latter purpose, they indeed can be of practical use in making a TIF (Technical Information File) or PIR (Product Information Requirement) for a finished cosmetic product as required by Dir. 93/35/EEC.

These "Notes of Guidance" should not be seen as a checklist. Attempts have been made to incorporate some standardised procedures, exposure patterns, formulation types, etc., but the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients and finished products remains a scientific exercise that can only be performed on a case-by-case basis. When major deviations from standardised protocols / procedures in the safety evaluation process occur, a scientific justification is essential.

As the science of toxicology advances and validated alternative methods become adopted, the "Notes of Guidance" will be revised as scientifically required.

---

<sup>1</sup> Russell B, Russell WMS, Burch RL.  
The principles of Humane Experimental Technique.  
Methuen and Co Ltd, London (reprinted by the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare UFAW, 1992,  
Potters Bar, Herts), UK, 1959.

## 2. THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PRODUCTS

---

### 2-1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Scientific Committee on Cosmetology (**SCC**) was established on 19 December 1977 by Commission Decision 78/45/EEC; the purpose was to assist the European Commission in examining the complex scientific and technical problems surrounding the drawing up and amendment of European Union (EU) rules governing the composition, manufacture, packaging, and labelling of cosmetic products marketed in EU countries. The Committee was to be renewed every three years.

In 1997 a restructured Scientific Committee, named Scientific Committee on Cosmetic products and Non-Food Products intended for consumers (**SCCNFP**), has been established by Commission Decision 97/579/EC. It was composed of independent scientists in the field of medicine, toxicology, pharmacy, dermatology, biology, chemistry, and other disciplines, collectively covering the widest possible range of expertise for this multidisciplinary committee. Between 1997 and 2004, the SCCNFP adopted a series of scientific opinions related to the improvement of the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients.

[[http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/sc/sccp/outcome\\_en.html/](http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/sc/sccp/outcome_en.html/)]

In 2004, the SCCNFP was replaced by the Scientific Committee on Consumer Products (**SCCP**) through Commission Decision 2004/210/EC. This replacement formed part of a larger-scale reorganisation of the EU Scientific Committees in the field of consumer safety, public health and the environment, during which the 8 existing Committees were disbanded and reorganised.

Three scientific committees are established :

- i. Scientific Committee on Consumer Products (SCCP)
- ii. Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks (SCHER)
- iii. Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR)

The coordination between the SCCP, the SCHER and the SCENIHR is done by the Inter-Committee Coordination Group (**ICCG**).

The relevant opinions of the SCCNFP, together with the opinions adopted by the SCCP [[http://europa.eu.int/comm/health/ph\\_risk/committees/04\\_sccp/sccp\\_opinions\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/health/ph_risk/committees/04_sccp/sccp_opinions_en.htm)], are included in this version of the "Notes of Guidance".

## 2-2 MANDATE

In accordance with Commission Decision 2004/210/EC, the SCCP shall provide opinions on questions concerning the safety of consumer products (non-food products intended for the consumer). In particular, it shall address questions in relation to the safety and allergenic properties of cosmetic products and ingredients with respect to their impact on consumer health, toys, textiles, clothing, personal care products, domestic products such as detergents and consumer services such as tattooing.

In addition, the Commission may request advice from the Committee on any other matter in the field of its competence, and moreover, upon its own initiative, the Committee shall draw the Commission's attention to a specific or emerging problem falling within its remit, which is considered to potentially pose an actual or potential risk to consumer safety, public health or the environment.

The work of the SCCP can be divided in two main domains, namely matters related to cosmetic ingredients and products and those related to other non-food consumer products.

Whenever cosmetic ingredients are concerned, the consultation of the SCCP is **compulsory**, whereas it is **not compulsory** in the domain of other non-food products. As it is stated in Art.8.2 of the Cosmetic Products Directive [76/768/EEC], this also applies for the SCCP.

## 2-3 RULES OF PROCEDURE

The Rules of Procedure of the SCCP, SCHER and SCENIHR are laid down in Document SCs/01/04 final (C7(2004)D/370235), adopted on 7 September 2004 by DG SANCO.

## 2-4 OUTCOME OF DISCUSSIONS

The opinions adopted by the Scientific Committee on Cosmetology at the Commission's request were formerly included in EC-Reports (EUR 7297, 8634, 8794, 10305, 11080, 11139, 11303, 14208). Between 1997 and 2004, all SCCNFP opinions have been published on the Internet and can be accessed through [http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/\\_sc/sccp/outcome\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/_sc/sccp/outcome_en.html). They are listed chronologically according to the plenary meetings during which they have been adopted. Therefore an SCCNFP opinion can easily be located on the above-mentioned Website through its adoption date.

As from December 2004, the SCCP opinions can be accessed through [http://europa.eu.int/comm/health/ph\\_risk/committees/04\\_sccp/sccp\\_opinions\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/health/ph_risk/committees/04_sccp/sccp_opinions_en.htm), where they are listed chronologically per ingredient category. Therefore an SCCP opinion can easily be located on the above-mentioned Website through the ingredient substance category involved and the adoption date.

It must be emphasized that the SCC(NF)P opinions not only refer to cosmetic ingredients included in Annexes II, III, IV, VI and VII of Council Directive 76/768/EEC, but also to a broad range of diverging scientific issues related to the safety of cosmetic ingredients and finished products.



#### 2-4.1 The "Notes of Guidance"

One of the main responsibilities of the former SCC(NFP) and the present SCCP has been to recommend a set of guidelines to be taken into consideration by the cosmetic and raw material industry in developing adequate studies to be used in the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients. The SCC and its successors SCCNFP and SCCP, have adopted, in this respect, the following opinions :

- (a) Notes of Guidance for the toxicity testing of cosmetic ingredients (28 June 1982; EU Report 8794);
- (b) Notes of Guidance for testing of cosmetic ingredients for their safety evaluation (SPC/803/5/90, First Revision);
- (c) Notes of Guidance for testing of cosmetic ingredients for their safety evaluation (DGXXIV/1878/97, Second Revision);
- (d) Notes of Guidance for testing of cosmetic ingredients for their safety evaluation (SCCNFP/0119/99, Third Revision).
- (e) Notes of Guidance for testing of cosmetic ingredients for their safety evaluation (SCCNFP/0321/00, Fourth Revision).
- (f) Notes of Guidance for the testing of cosmetic ingredients and their safety evaluation (SCCNFP/0690/03, Fifth Revision)

The Notes of Guidance are regularly updated in order to incorporate new knowledge and scientific advances.

As cosmetic ingredients are chemical substances, these guidelines include the toxicological test procedures reported in Annex V to the Dangerous Substances Directive [67/548/EEC] and its adaptations to technical progress. They represent the basic toxicity testing procedures needed to evaluate different toxicological endpoints and are internationally accepted as being the result of long-term scientific agreement. The procedures to be followed for chemical substances include a large number of *in vivo* animal models and a limited number of studies based on *in vitro* models. In addition, when evaluating the information given by industry on cosmetic ingredients meant to be incorporated in one of the Annexes of the Cosmetics Directive, the SCC(NF)P commonly accepted testing procedures in accordance with the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) Guidelines, and well-documented scientifically justified methods based on an *in vitro* model or other 3R procedures.

The early acceptance by the SCCNFP of the *in vitro* study on dermal / percutaneous absorption using human/pig skin is an example of the pro-active work of the Committee. Before an OECD Guideline became available, *in vitro* dermal / percutaneous absorption results were accepted by the SCCNFP on the condition that the methods were scientifically well developed. For this reason, a set of guidelines for dermal absorption studies was established by the SCCNFP [SCCNFP/0167/99]. These have been reviewed in 2003 [SCCNFP/0750/03] and in 2006 [SCCP/0970/06].

Over the years, several alternative methods have been further developed and some have already been taken up in Annex V of Directive 67/548/EEC. The latter not only include reduction and refinement measures in existing *in vivo* studies and the introduction of the Local Lymph Node Assay as an equivalent for the guinea pig Magnusson Kligmann maximisation test, but also 3 *in vitro* models for assessing skin corrosivity and an *in vitro* phototoxicity test [2000/33/EC].

In view of the fact that in the cosmetic field the "Seventh Amendment" [2003/15/EC] imposes deadlines for banning animal testing, not only for finished cosmetic products, but also for their ingredients, much attention is given to the use of alternative methods in the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients and finished products throughout the whole "Notes of Guidance".

## 2-4.2 The status of cosmetic ingredients included in Annexes II, III, IV, VI and VII of Dir. 76/768/EEC

Between its establishment in 1997 and its disbandment in 2004, the SCCNFP provided opinions on more than 400 chemical substances and/or their mixtures and the SCCP has since added more than 50 opinions to that list. The majority of these opinions have been adopted into Cosmetic Legislation, more specifically they have been taken up in the Annexes to Dir. 76/768/EEC (Art. 8.2 and Art. 10 of Dir. 76/768/EEC), and have been used by the risk managers. The actual status of all annexes is shown below :

	STATUS SEPTEMBER 2006
<b>Annex II</b> (forbidden substances)	1228 entries
<b>Annex III, Part 1</b> (restrictions)	94 entries
<b>Annex III, Part 2</b> (restrictions, provisionally allowed)	56 entries
<b>Annex IV, Part 1</b> (list of colouring agents)	154 colourants
<b>Annex IV, Part 2</b> (colouring agents, provisionally allowed)	empty
<b>Annex VI, Part 1</b> (preservatives)	56 preservatives
<b>Annex VI, Part 2</b> (preservatives, provisionally allowed)	empty
<b>Annex VII, Part 1</b> (UV filters)	27 UV filters
<b>Annex VII, Part 2</b> (UV filters, provisionally allowed)	empty

## 2-4.3 General issues taken up in the "Notes of Guidance"

In addition to the revision of the Notes of Guidance and the study of toxicological dossiers of cosmetic ingredients for inclusion in one of the Annexes of Dir. 76/768/EEC, some specific general issues have been addressed by the former SCCNFP and the actual SCCP.

Examples of these include :

### *a. Guidelines for human testing in cosmetic science*

- Guidelines on the use of human volunteers in the testing of potentially cutaneous irritant cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients [SCCNFP/0003/98].
- Guidelines on the use of human volunteers in compatibility testing of finished cosmetic products [SCCNFP/0068/98].
- Opinion concerning the predictive testing of potentially cutaneous sensitising cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients [SCCNFP/0120/99].
- Opinion concerning basic criteria of the protocols for the skin compatibility testing of potentially cutaneous irritant cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients on human volunteers [SCCNFP/0245/99].
- Memorandum on the classification and categorization of skin sensitisers and grading of test reactions [SCCP/0919/05].

*b. The use of alternative methods in the safety assessment of cosmetics*

- Opinion on the use of alternative methods to animal testing in the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients [SCCNFP/0103/99].
- Memorandum concerning the actual status of alternative methods to the use of animals in the safety testing of cosmetic ingredients [SCCNFP/0546/02].
- Opinion concerning "Report for establishing the timetable for phasing out animal testing for the purpose of the cosmetics directive" issued by ECVAM (30/04/2004) [SCCNFP/0834/04].

*c. Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) issues related to cosmetic ingredients*

- Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products [SCCNFP/0451/01].
- Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products [SCCNFP/0521/01].
- Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products [SCCNFP/0552/02].
- Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products [SCCNFP/0612/02].
- Opinion concerning use of specified risk materials in cosmetics : clarification for tallow derivatives [SCCNFP/0724/03].
- Opinion on amino acids obtained by hydrolysis of human hair [SCCP/0894/05].
- Opinion on risk of ingredients deriving from category 1-material and category 2-material as defined in Regulation 1774/2002 in cosmetic products [SCCP/0933/05].

*d. CMR (Carcinogenic/Mutagenic/toxic to Reproduction) substances in cosmetics*

- Opinion concerning chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to the Chemicals Directive 67/548/EEC [SCCNFP/0474/01].
- Opinion concerning chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to the Chemicals Directive 67/548/EEC [SCCNFP/0825/04].
- Opinion concerning request for confirmation of the SCCNFP opinion 0474/01 on chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to Council Directive 67/548/EEC [SCCP/0888/05].
- Opinion concerning request for confirmation of the SCCNFP opinion 0474/01 on chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to Council Directive 67/548/EEC [SCCP/0913/05].

*e. Hair dyes, colourants and their specific safety assessment*

- Opinion concerning foreseeable use of hair dyes [SCCNFP/0059/98].
- Opinion on the use of permanent hair dyes and bladder cancer risk [SCCNFP/0484/01].
- Opinion concerning the safety review of the use of certain azo-dyes in cosmetic products [SCCNFP/0495/01].
- Discussion paper on assessment strategies for hair dyes [SCCNFP/0553/02].
- Proposal for a strategy for testing hair dye cosmetic ingredients for their potential genotoxicity/mutagenicity [SCCNFP/0566/02].
- Opinion concerning request for a re-evaluation of hair dyes listed in Annex III to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products [SCCNFP/0635/03].
- Updated recommended strategy for testing hair dyes for their potential genotoxicity/mutagenicity/carcinogenicity [SCCNFP/0720/03].
- Opinion concerning use of permanent hair dyes and bladder cancer [SCCNFP/0797/04].

- Opinion concerning hair dyes without file submitted [SCCNFP/0807/04].
- Opinion concerning ring study on reaction products from typical combinations of hair colouring ingredients [SCCNFP/0808/04].
- Opinion on personal use of hair dyes and cancer risk [SCCP/0930/05].
- Opinion on exposure to reactants and reaction products of oxidative hair dye formulations [SCCP/0941/05].
- Updated recommended strategy for testing oxidative hair dye substances for their potential mutagenicity/genotoxicity [SCCP/0971/06].

f. UV filters and their possible estrogenic effects

- Opinion on the evaluation of potentially estrogenic effects of UV filters [SCCNFP/0483/01].

g. The inventory of cosmetic ingredients (INCI-list)

- Status report on the inventory of cosmetic ingredients [SCCNFP/0098/99].
- Position paper concerning the present situation of the *Pseudo* INCI names of botanicals [SCCNFP/0099/99].
- Opinion on the 1<sup>st</sup> update of the inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products (Section I) [SCCNFP/0299/00].
- Opinion concerning the 1<sup>st</sup> update of the inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products. Section II : perfume and aromatic raw materials [SCCNFP/0389/00].

h. Safety of infants and children

- Position statement on the calculation of the Margin of Safety of ingredients incorporated in cosmetics which may be applied to the skin of children [SCCNFP/0557/02].
- Opinion on the safety of fluorine compounds in oral hygiene products for children under the age of 6 years [SCCP/0882/05].

i. Fragrance allergy in consumers

- Opinion concerning fragrance allergy in consumers : a review of the problem. Analysis of the need for appropriate consumer information and identification of consumer allergens [SCCNFP/0017/98].
- Opinion concerning an initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of fragrances compounds used in cosmetic products [SCCNFP/0320/00].
- Opinion concerning an initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of cosmetic products except subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down [SCCNFP/0392/00].
- Memorandum on the SCCNFP opinion concerning fragrance allergy in consumers [SCCNFP/0450/01].
- Position statement concerning fragrance chemicals in detergents and other household products [SCCNFP/0588/02].
- Opinion concerning an update of the initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of cosmetic products except subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down [SCCNFP/0770/03].
- Opinion concerning an update of the initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of fragrance compounds used in cosmetic products [SCCNFP/0771/03].
- Opinion on clarifications to SCCNFP/0392/00 "An initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of cosmetic products except subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down" [SCCNFP/1023/06].

j. Hypoallergenic claims on cosmetics

- Opinion concerning hypoallergenic claims on cosmetic products [SCCNFP/XXIV/1895/98].

k. Risk and health effects : miscellaneous

- Consultation concerning risks and health effects from tattoos, body piercing and related practices [SCCNFP/0753/03].
- Opinion on biological effects of ultraviolet radiation relevant to health with particular reference to sunbeds for cosmetic purposes [SCCP/0949/05].

## 2-5 REFERENCES

**67/548/EEC** - Council Directive 67/548/EEC of 27 June 1967 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal P 196, 16/08/1967 p.1.*

**76/768/EEC** - Council Directive 76/768/EEC of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L 262, 27/09/1976 p.169.*

**78/45/EEC** - Commission Decision 78/45/EEC of 19 December 1977 establishing a Scientific Committee on Cosmetology.

*Official journal L 13, 17/01/1978 p.24.*

**97/579/EC** - Commission Decision 97/579/EC of 23 July 1997 setting up Scientific Committees in the field of consumer health and food safety.

*Official Journal L 237, 28/08/1997 p.18.*

**2000/33/EC** - Commission Directive 2000/33/EC of 25 April 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 27th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.90.*

**2003/15/EC** - Directive 2003/15/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 February 2003 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L66, 11/03/2003 p.26.*

**2004/210/EC** - Commission Decision of 3 March 2004 setting up Scientific Committees in the field of consumer safety, public health and the environment

*Official Journal L66, 04/03/2004 p.45.*

**EUR 7297** : Reports of the Scientific Committee on Cosmetology. First series. 1982.

**EUR 8634** : Reports of the Scientific Committee on Cosmetology. Second series. 1983.

**EUR 8794** : Reports of the Scientific Committee on Cosmetology. Third series. 1983.

**EUR 10305** : Reports of the Scientific Committee on Cosmetology. Fourth series. 1986.

**EUR 11080** : Reports of the Scientific Committee on Cosmetology. Fifth series. 1987.

**EUR 11139** : Reports of the Scientific Committee on Cosmetology. Sixth series. 1987.

**EUR 11303** : Reports of the Scientific Committee on Cosmetology. Seventh series. 1988.

**SCCNFP/0003/98, Final** : Guidelines on the use of human volunteers in the testing of potentially cutaneous irritant cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients, *adopted by the plenary session of the SCCNFP of 25 November 1998.*

**SCCNFP/0017/98, Final** : Opinion concerning fragrance allergy in consumers : a review of the problem. Analysis of the need for appropriate consumer information and identification of consumer allergens, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 8 December 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0042/98** : The Scientific Committee Cosmetic and Non-Food Products intended for consumers, Rules of Procedure, *adopted on the 16<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of the SCCNFP of 13 March 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0059/98, Final** : Opinion concerning foreseeable use of hair dyes, *adopted by the plenary session of the SCCNFP of 23 September 1998.*

**SCCNFP/0068/98, Final** : Guidelines on the use of human volunteers in compatibility testing of finished cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 23 June 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0098/99, Final** : Status report on the inventory of cosmetic ingredients, *approved by the plenary session of the SCCNFP on 17 February 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0099/99, Final** : Position paper concerning the present situation of the *Pseudo* INCI names of botanicals, *approved by the plenary session of the SCCNFP on 17 February 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0103/99, Final** : Opinion on the use of alternative methods to animal testing in the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP at the plenary meeting of 20 January 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0119/99** : Notes of Guidance for Testing of Cosmetic Ingredients for their Safety Evaluation. Third Revision. *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary meeting of 23 June 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0120/99, Final** : Opinion concerning the predictive testing of potentially cutaneous sensitising cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 11<sup>th</sup> plenary session of 17 February 2000.*

**SCCNFP/0167/99, Final** : Basic Criteria for the *in vitro* assessment of percutaneous absorption of cosmetic ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 8<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 23 June 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0245/99, Final** : Opinion concerning basic criteria of the protocols for the skin compatibility testing of potentially cutaneous irritant cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients on human volunteers, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 8 December 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0299/00, Final** : Opinion on the 1<sup>st</sup> update of the inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products (Section I), *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 13<sup>th</sup> plenary session of 28 June 2000.*

**SCCNFP/0320/00, Final** : Opinion concerning an initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of fragrances compounds used in cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 12<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 3 May 2000.*

**SCCNFP/0321/00, Final** : Notes of Guidance for Testing of Cosmetic Ingredients for Their Safety Evaluation, 4<sup>th</sup> revision, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary meeting of 24 October 2000.*

**SCCNFP/0389/00, Final** : Opinion concerning the 1<sup>st</sup> update of the inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products. Section II : perfume and aromatic raw materials, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 24 October 2000.*

**SCCNFP/0392/00, Final** : Opinion concerning an Initial List of Perfumery Materials which must not form part of Cosmetic Products except subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 18<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 25 September 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0450/01, Final** : Memorandum on the SCCNFP opinion concerning fragrance allergy in consumers, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 16<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 16 March 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0451/01, Final** : Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 17<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 12 June 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0474/01, Final** : Opinion concerning chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to the Chemicals Directive 67/548/EEC, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 18<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 25 September 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0483/01, Final** : Opinion on the evaluation of potentially estrogenic effects of UV filters, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 17<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 12 June 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0484/01, Final** : Opinion on the use of permanent hair dyes and bladder cancer risk, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 17<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 12 June 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0495/01, Final** : Opinion concerning the safety review of the use of certain azo-dyes in cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 19<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 27 February 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0521/01, Final** : Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 18<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 25 September 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0546/02, Final** : Memorandum concerning the actual status of alternative methods to the use of animals in the safety testing of cosmetic ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 20<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 4 June 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0552/02, Final** : Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 19<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 27 February 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0553/02, Final** : Discussion paper on assessment strategies for hair dyes, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 19<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 27 February 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0557/02, Final** : Position statement on the calculation of the Margin of Safety of ingredients incorporated in cosmetics which may be applied to the skin of children, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 19<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 27 February 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0566/02, Final** : Proposal for a strategy for testing hair dye cosmetic ingredients for their potential genotoxicity/mutagenicity, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 20<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 4 June 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0588/02, Final** : Position statement concerning fragrance chemicals in detergents and other household products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during its 20<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 4 June 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0612/02, Final** : Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 22<sup>nd</sup> plenary meeting of 17 December 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0635/03, Final** : Opinion concerning request for a re-evaluation of hair dyes listed in Annex III to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 23<sup>rd</sup> plenary meeting of 18 March 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0690/03, Final** : Notes of Guidance for the testing of cosmetic ingredients and their safety evaluation, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 25<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 October 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0720/03, Final** : Updated recommended strategy for testing hair dyes for their potential genotoxicity/mutagenicity/carcinogenicity, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 24<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 24-25 June 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0724/03** : Opinion concerning use of specified risk materials in cosmetics : clarification for tallow derivatives, *adopted by the SCCNFP by written procedure on 23 July 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0750/03, Final** : Basic Criteria for the *in vitro* assessment of dermal absorption of cosmetic ingredients - updated November 2003, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 25<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 October 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0753/03, Final** : Consultation concerning risks and health effects from tattoos, body piercing and related practices, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 25<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 October 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0770/03, Final** : Opinion concerning an update of the initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of cosmetic products except subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 26<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 9 December 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0771/03, Final** : Opinion concerning an update of the initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of fragrance compounds used in cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 26<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 9 December 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0797/04, Final** : Opinion concerning use of permanent hair dyes and bladder cancer, *adopted by the SCCNFP on 23 April 2004 by means of the written procedure.*

**SCCNFP/0807/04, Final** : Opinion concerning hair dyes without file submitted, *adopted by the SCCNFP on 23 April 2004 by means of the written procedure.*

**SCCNFP/0808/04, Final** : Opinion concerning ring study on reaction products from typical combinations of hair colouring ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP on 23 April 2004 by means of the written procedure.*

**SCCNFP/0825/04, Final** : Opinion concerning chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to the Chemicals Directive 67/548/EEC, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 28<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 25 May 2004.*

**SCCNFP/0834/04, Final** : Opinion concerning "Report for establishing the timetable for phasing out animal testing for the purpose of the cosmetics directive" issued by ECVAM (30/04/2004), *adopted by the SCCNFP on 1 July 2004 by means of the written procedure.*

**SCCP/0882/05** : Opinion on the safety of fluorine compounds in oral hygiene products for children under the age of 6 years, *adopted by the SCCP during the 5<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 September 2005.*

**SCCP/0888/05** : Opinion concerning request for confirmation of the SCCNFP opinion 0474/01 on chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to Council Directive 67/548/EEC, *adopted by the SCCP during the 3<sup>rd</sup> plenary meeting of 15 March 2005.*

**SCCP/0894/05** : Opinion on amino acids obtained by hydrolysis of human hair, *adopted by the SCCP during the 4<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 21 June 2005.*

**SCCP/0913/05** : Opinion concerning request for confirmation of the SCCNFP opinion 0474/01 on chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to Council Directive 67/548/EEC, *adopted by the SCCP during the 4<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 21 June 2005.*

**SCCP/0919/05** : Memorandum on the classification and categorization of skin sensitizers and grading of test reactions, *adopted by the SCCP during the 5<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 September 2005.*

**SCCP/0930/05** : Opinion on personal use of hair dyes and cancer risk, *adopted by the SCCP during the 5<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 September 2005.*

**SCCP/0933/05** : Opinion on risk of ingredients deriving from category 1-material and category 2-material as defined in Regulation 1774/2002 in cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCP during the 5<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 September 2005.*

**SCCP/0941/05** : Opinion on exposure to reactants and reaction products of oxidative hair dye formulations, *adopted by the SCCP during the 6<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 13 December 2005.*

**SCCP/0949/05** : Opinion on biological effects of ultraviolet radiation relevant to health with particular reference to sunbeds for cosmetic purposes, *adopted by the SCCP during the 8<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 June 2006.*

**SCCP/0971/06** : Updated recommended strategy for testing oxidative hair dye substances for their potential mutagenicity/genotoxicity, *adopted by the SCCP during the 7<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 28 March 2006.*

**SCCP/1023/06** : Opinion on clarifications to SCCNFP/0392/00 "An initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of cosmetic products except subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down", *adopted by the SCCP during the 8<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 June 2006.*

**SCs/01/04 final** (C7(2004)D/370235) : The Scientific Committees on Consumer Products (SCCP), Health and Environmental Risks (SCHER) and Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR) : Rules of Procedure, *adopted by DG SANCO (C7 - Risk Assessment) on 7 September 2004.*

**SPC/803/5/90** : Notes of Guidance for the toxicity testing of cosmetic ingredients. 1<sup>st</sup> revision, 1990.

**XXIV/1878/97** : Notes of Guidance for Testing of Cosmetic Ingredients for their Safety Evaluation. 2<sup>nd</sup> revision, 1997.

**XXIV/1895/98** : Opinion concerning hypoallergenic claims on cosmetic products, *adopted by the plenary session of the SCCNFP of 20 May 1998.*



### 3. SAFETY EVALUATION OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS

---

#### 3-1 INTRODUCTION

The safety of a cosmetic product in the EU is the full responsibility of the manufacturer, the first importer into the EU market or the marketer. **The safety of a cosmetic product is based on the safety of its ingredients**, the latter being evaluated by toxicological testing.

The use of validated alternative methods in toxicological testing of cosmetic ingredients and finished products is compulsory for those tests for which validated alternatives exist. Deadlines for animal testing are laid down in Dir. 2003/15/EC.

The legal basis for the safety evaluation of cosmetic products, as mentioned above, can be found in Articles 2, 4.a.1 and 7a (d) of Directive 76/768/EEC and its Amendments :

**Article 2 :** A cosmetic product put on the market within the Community must not cause damage to human health when applied under normal or reasonably foreseeable conditions of use, taking account, in particular, of the product's presentation, its labelling, any instructions for its use and disposal as well as any other indication or information provided by the manufacturer or his authorized agent or by any other person responsible for placing the product on the Community market.

**Article 4.a.1 :** Without prejudice to the general obligations deriving from Article 2, Member States shall prohibit :

- (a) the marketing of cosmetic products where the final formulation, in order to meet the requirements of this Directive, has been the subject of animal testing using a method other than an alternative method after such alternative method has been validated and adopted at Community level with due regard to the development of validation within the OECD;
- (b) the marketing of cosmetic products containing ingredients or combinations of ingredients which, in order to meet the requirements of this Directive, have been the subject of animal testing using a method other than an alternative method after such alternative method has been validated and adopted at Community level with due regard to the development of validation within the OECD;
- (c) the performance on their territory of animal testing of finished cosmetic products in order to meet the requirements of this Directive;
- (d) the performance on their territory of animal testing of ingredients or combinations of ingredients in order to meet the requirements of this Directive, no later than the date on which such tests are required to be replaced by one or more validated alternative methods listed in Annex V to Council Directive 67/548/EEC ... or in Annex IX to this Directive.

To be kept readily available to the Competent Authorities :

**Article 7a (d) :** Assessment of the safety for human health of the finished product.

To that end the manufacturer shall take into consideration the general toxicological profile of the ingredients, their chemical structure and their level of exposure. ...

The rationale behind Article 7a (d) is that, although there are many thousands of different cosmetic products on the market within the EU, they are all derived from fewer ingredients. Hence toxicity testing has been concentrated on ingredients, and particularly on those that are intended to react with biological matrices and therefore are of most concern for human health. This is also the basis for the lists of authorised ingredients currently covering colouring agents, preservatives and UV filters, more specifically Annexes IV, VI and VII to Dir. 76/768/EEC.

In order to fulfil the main requirements regarding consumer health protection, Article 4 of Dir. 76/768/EEC and its amendments states that :

**Art. 4b :** The use in cosmetic products of substances classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic for reproduction, of category 1, 2 and 3, under Annex I to Directive 67/548/EEC shall be prohibited. ... A substance classified in category 3 may be used in cosmetics if the substance has been evaluated by the SCCP and found acceptable for use in cosmetic products.

**Art. 4(1) :** Without prejudice to their general obligations deriving from Article 2, Member States shall prohibit the marketing of cosmetic products containing :

- a. substances listed in Annex II;
- b. substances listed in the first part of Annex III, beyond the limits and outside the conditions laid down;
- c. colouring agents other than those listed in Annex IV, Part I. with the exception of cosmetic products containing colouring agents intended solely to colour hair;
- d. colouring agents listed in Annex IV, Part 1, used outside the conditions laid down, with the exception of cosmetic products containing colouring agents intended solely to colour hair;
- e. preservatives other than those listed in Annex VI, Part 1;
- f. preservatives listed in Annex VI, Part 1, beyond the limits and outside the conditions laid down, unless other concentrations are used for specific purposes apparent from the presentation of the product;
- g. UV filters other than those listed in Part 1 of Annex VII;
- h. UV filters listed in Part 1 of Annex VII, beyond the limits and outside the conditions laid down therein;

A series of other improvements to safeguard consumer health were introduced with the adoption of the Sixth Amendment [93/35/EEC].

These improvements oblige those responsible for placing a cosmetic product on the Community market to keep the following information readily available for the competent authorities :

- a. The qualitative and quantitative composition of the product; in the case of perfume compositions and perfumes, the name and code number of the composition and the identity of the supplier;
- b. The physical and chemical and microbiological specifications of the raw materials and the finished product and the purity and microbiological control criteria of the cosmetic product;
- c. The method of manufacture complying with the good manufacturing practice laid down by Community law or, failing that, laid down by the law of the Member State concerned; the person responsible for manufacture or first importation into the Community must possess an appropriate level of professional qualification or experience in accordance with the legislation and practice of the Member State which is the place of manufacture or first importation;
- d. Assessment of the safety for human health of the finished product. To that end the manufacturer shall take into consideration the general toxicological profile of the ingredients, their chemical structure and their level of exposure. It shall take particular account of the specific exposure characteristics of the areas on which the product will be applied or of the population for which it is intended. There shall be *inter alia* a specific assessment for cosmetic products intended for use on children under the age of three and for cosmetic products intended exclusively for use in external intimate hygiene.  
Should the same product be manufactured at several places within Community territory, the manufacturer may choose a single place of manufacture where that information will be available. In this connection, and when so requested for monitoring purposes, it shall be obliged to indicate the place so chosen to the monitoring authority or authorities concerned. In this case this information shall be easily accessible;
- e. The name and address of the qualified person or persons responsible for the assessment referred to in (d). That person must hold a diploma as defined in Article 1 of Council Directive 89/48/EEC in the field of pharmacy, toxicology, dermatology, medicine or a similar discipline;
- f. Existing data on undesirable effects on human health resulting from use of the cosmetic product;
- g. Proof of the effect claimed for the cosmetic product, where justified by the nature of the effect or product;
- h. Data on any animal testing performed by the manufacturer, his agent or suppliers, relating to the development or safety evaluation of the product or its ingredients, including any animal testing performed to meet the legislative or regulatory requirements of non-member countries.


In addition, the assessment of the ingredients' toxicity has to be carried out in accordance with the principles of good laboratory practice.

Through the whole Sixth Amendment [93/35/EEC], there was a clear intention to avoid the costly duplication of toxicological studies and more importantly, the unjustifiable use of animals that would result from the routine testing of products. To that end, Article 4 of Dir. 93/35/EEC stated that assessment of the safety of use of the ingredients employed in cosmetics and of the final product, should take into account the requirements of Dir. 86/609/EEC which concerns the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes.

The "Seventh" Amendment [2003/15/EC] provides a rigid time frame regarding the application of non-animal alternative methods instead of animal testing. It imposes a prohibition of *in vivo* studies on cosmetic ingredients from 11 March 2009 on, with the exception of repeated dose toxicity, toxicokinetics and reproduction toxicity tests, which will be prohibited from 11 March 2013.

### 3-2 SAFETY EVALUATION PROCEDURE OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS AS APPLIED BY THE SCCP

In the EU, two channels function with respect to the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients (Fig.1) :



**Fig.1 :** Existing two ways in the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients in the EU.

It is primarily the substances in Annexes II, III, IV, VI and VII that fall under the responsibility of the SCCP. The right part of Fig.1, containing all ingredients of cosmetic products other than those of the Annexes, is the responsibility of the manufacturer through the safety assessor. In general, the **safety evaluation** of cosmetic ingredients by the SCCP is based upon the principles and practice of the risk assessment process [WHO 2001; European Commission 2000] usually applied for ingredients in medicinal products, pesticides, food additives, ...

This risk assessment procedure is subdivided in 4 parts :

- 1) **Hazard identification** : based on the results of *in vivo* tests, *in vitro* tests, clinical studies, accidents, human epidemiological studies and, when available, quantitative structure activity relationship (QSAR) studies. The intrinsic physical, chemical and toxicological properties of the molecule under consideration are studied to identify whether the substance has the potential to damage human health.
- 2) **Dose-response assessment** : in which the relationship between the toxic response and the exposure is studied. In the case of an effect with a threshold, the dosage at which no adverse effects are observed (NOAEL), is determined. If the NOAEL is not available, the lowest dosage at which an adverse effect is observed (LOAEL) is used. In the case of non-threshold carcinogens, a dose-descriptor (e.g. T<sub>25</sub>) is determined [Dybing et al. 1997].
- 3) **Exposure assessment** : in which the amount and the frequency of human exposure to the compound are determined (including potential specific groups at risk, e.g. children, pregnant women, etc.).
- 4) **Risk characterisation** : the probability that the molecule under investigation causes damage to human health and the level of risk, are examined. In the case of a threshold effect, the Margin of Safety (MoS) is calculated according to the formula :

$$\text{MoS} = \frac{\text{NOAEL}}{\text{SED}} \quad \text{where SED represents the Systemic Exposure Dosage.}$$

For non-threshold effects (e.g. non-threshold carcinogenic effect) the lifetime risk usually is determined through the use of a dose-descriptor, defined as the calculated amount of a test substance administered daily (e.g. mg/kg body weight/day) that in the case of a non-threshold carcinogen increases the net frequency of tumours at a specific site by a certain percentage (e.g. T<sub>25</sub>) [Dybing et al. 1997]. The calculation of lifetime cancer risk is described in Section 3-7.6.

Risk characterisation is followed by **risk management** and **risk communication**, which are not the tasks of the SCCP, but of the Commission in the case of the ingredients listed in the different Annexes (see Fig.1) [COM(97) 183].

It is beyond the scope of the "Notes of Guidance" to discuss the whole process of risk assessment. Review articles and toxicology books exist on this topic [Beck et al. 1994; Dayan 1999; Loprieno 1999; Rogiers 2002a; Masson 1999, Sanner 2001]. The aim is to highlight some key aspects in order to explain why certain data and test results should be provided in the dossiers of the ingredients presented to the SCCP for consideration, e.g. physical and chemical data, results of relevant toxicity studies, etc.

### 3-3 CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL SPECIFICATIONS OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS

Physical and chemical properties of ingredients are considered as crucial information, since they may be able to predict certain toxicological properties. For example, a small molecular weight (MW) hydrophobic compound is more likely to penetrate through the skin than a high MW hydrophilic compound; a highly volatile compound could cause significant inhalation exposure when present in a product applied to the skin. Physical and chemical properties also identify physical hazards of the ingredient (e.g. explosiveness, flammability). In addition, some QSAR programmes and empirical models use physical and chemical property values as inputs [Salminen 2002].

According to the SCCNFP opinion on the basic requirements for toxicological dossiers to be evaluated by the SCCNFP [SCCNFP/0633/02], the basic and minimal specifications for any ingredient to be evaluated by the SCCP should be :

- 1) chemical identity;
- 2) physical form;
- 3) molecular weight;
- 4) characterisation and purity of the chemical;
- 5) characterisation of the impurities or accompanying contaminants;
- 6) solubility;
- 7) partition coefficient (Log  $P_{ow}$ );
- 8) additional relevant physical and chemical specifications.

The information from points 1) to 7) must be included in each toxicological dossier. The appropriate **certificate of analysis** must be present in order to provide full characterisation of the test chemical employed to generate the data of the dossier to be considered by the SCCP [SCCNFP/0633/02].

In the following chapter, the methods are (where relevant) accompanied by their corresponding reference number in Annex V, Part A of Dir. 67/548/EEC [92/69/EEC].

#### 3-3.1 Chemical identity

The precise chemical nature of the ingredient and its structural formula must be identified. The Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) No. of the chemical, the International Nomenclature of Cosmetic Ingredients (INCI) name and the number of the European Inventory of Existing commercial Chemical Substances (EINECS), must be provided. Chemical substances introduced in the EU market after 18 September 1981 do not have an EINECS No., but have to be notified to the competent authority in the Member State in which they are manufactured or into which they are imported [Directive 67/548/EEC as amended for the 7th time by Directive 92/32/EC]. Having received this notification, the competent authority is required to carry out risk assessment of the substance for man and environment in accordance with the principles set out in Commission Directive 93/67/EC. New substances are recorded in the European List of Notified Chemical Substances (ELINCS database) and the ELINCS No. of the new substances must be identified in the dossier to be submitted for safety evaluation.

With regard to ingredients that cannot be identified in terms of their structural formula, sufficient information should be provided on the method of preparation (including all physical, chemical, enzymatic, biotechnological and microbiological steps) and the material used in their preparation to assess the probable structure and activity of the compound.

For the safety evaluation of a natural ingredient (extract), complete information should be provided on the origin of the raw material (e.g. part of plant), extraction method and any additional purification steps used (see also section 3-6.2).

In the case of a preparation used as "raw material", all substances must be given in the qualitative and the quantitative formula. These could be : main components, preservatives, antioxidants, chelators, buffering agents, solvents, other additives and additional external contamination.

When a salt or ester of a substance will be used as cosmetic ingredient, this must be clearly specified in the dossier. The physical and chemical properties of the specific salts/esters must be provided. And the same specific substances must be used in the toxicological studies performed for the safety evaluation. Deviations should be justified.

### **3-3.2 Physical form**

A description of the physical form should be given : powder, paste, gel, liquid, ...

### **3-3.3 Molecular weight**

The MW of each substance should be given in Daltons. In the case of preparations, the MW must be given for each of the constituents.

### **3-3.4 Characterisation and purity of the chemical**

The experimental conditions of the techniques used for the chemical characterisation (UV, IR, NMR, MS, elemental analysis, etc) as well as the resulting spectrum, chromatogram etc. should be provided.

The degree of purity must be clearly defined. The validity of the analytical methodology used, must be shown.

The substance(s) used in physical and chemical tests, toxicity studies, etc., mentioned in the dossier, must be representative of the substances present in commercial products.

### **3-3.5 Characterisation of the impurities or accompanying contaminants**

In addition to the purity of the substance under consideration, an identification of the nature of significant impurities that may be present must be stated, along with their concentrations.

Small changes in the nature of impurities can considerably alter the toxicity of substances. In general, **results of safety studies on a particular substance are only relevant when they refer to that substance used, with its own specific purity and impurity patterns.** The scientific validity of tests performed on batches of the substance with diverging purities is questionable. Therefore, the manufacturer must ensure that neither other impurities nor an increase in the impurities (chemically defined or technically unavoidable, potentially affecting the safety of the finished products) are present in the representative commercial material.

### **3-3.6 Solubility**

The solubility [EC A.6] of the ingredient in water and/or in any other relevant organic solvent should be stated (in g/l at ..°C). Some substances are sparingly soluble or insoluble in aqueous medium.

### **3-3.7 Partition coefficient (Log P<sub>ow</sub>)**

The n-octanol / water partition coefficient [EC A.8] should be given (at ..°C).

In case of a calculated value, the method should be specified.

### 3-3.8 Additional relevant physical and chemical specifications

A typical physical and chemical data set consists of :

- physical state (solid, liquid, gas)
- organoleptic properties (colour, odour, taste if relevant)
- solubility properties [EC A.6] in water and relevant solvents, including receptor fluids (at ..°C)
- partition coefficient [EC A.8] ( $\text{Log } P_{ow}$ , at ..°C), if applicable
- flash point [EC A.9]
- physical properties depending on the physical state :
  - for liquids : boiling point [EC A.2], density [EC A.3] (at ..°C),  $\text{pK}_a$  (at ..°C), viscosity (at ..°C), vapour pressure [EC A.4] (at ..°C), ...
  - for solids : general appearance (crystal form, amorphous, ...), melting point [EC A.1],  $\text{pK}_a$  (..% in ..., at ..°C), ...
  - for gases : density [EC A.3] (at ..°C), ignition point [EC A.15], ...
- in case of a UV light absorbing ingredient, the UV light absorption spectrum of the compound should always be included. It is self-evident that for UV-filters, this spectrum is absolutely indispensable.

### 3-4 RELEVANT TOXICITY STUDIES ON COSMETIC INGREDIENTS

The determination of the toxic potential of a cosmetic ingredient is based on a series of toxicity studies and forms part of the hazard identification. The latter is the first step in its overall safety evaluation.

At present, the majority of these toxicological tests involve the use of animals, as is also the case for other chemical substances. Traditionally, toxicological data relevant for man have been obtained by investigating the toxicological profiles of the substances under consideration on animals, using the same exposure route as in man (topical, oral or inhalation route).

Single dose animal studies, usually carried out with high concentrations of the test compound, allow determination of  $\text{LD}_{50}$ -values, which form the basis for the classification of e.g. dangerous substances [2001/59/EC]. Repeated dose toxicity studies, usually performed with lower concentrations and involving daily administration/exposure for a long period of time (e.g. 28 days/90 days/24 months), allow for the determination of the so-called no-observed adverse effect level (NOAEL), which is used in the calculation of the Margin of Safety (MoS). These studies also give an indication on target organs, mechanisms of action, etc.

Carcinogenicity studies are usually performed with mice and rats for a period of 18 months to 24 months.

One of the scientific objectives of the EU is the development and validation of alternative methods that can provide an equivalent level of information as current animal tests, but which use fewer animals, cause less suffering or avoid the use of animals completely (3R-strategy of refinement, reduction and replacement).

In this respect, some refinement and reduction improvements have been made to existing *in vivo* guidelines and a number of replacement guidelines have been developed. The latter are based on *in vitro* methods, more specifically in the field of skin corrosion, mutagenicity, photomutagenicity, phototoxicity, and dermal absorption. However, due to a variety of reasons, including the complexity of the vertebrate organism, there are presently neither validated *in vitro* alternative methods for the repeated dose animal toxicity studies, nor relevant proposals ready for prevalidation/validation, available [Worth et al. 2002; Rogiers 2002b, Rogiers and Pauwels 2005].



Through the provisions of its 7<sup>th</sup> Amendment [2003/15/EC], the European cosmetic legislation prohibits the marketing of finished products containing an ingredient that has been subject to any animal testing after 2013 in order to meet the requirements of Dir. 76/768/EEC, its amendments and adaptations to technical progress.

As a consequence, with the aim of providing an objective overview of the status of alternative methods/strategies and the prospects for their validation and regulatory acceptance, ECVAM issued the document "Report for establishing the timetable for phasing out animal testing for the purpose of the cosmetics directive", which was later published in ATLA [Eskes and Zuang 2005]. This ECVAM report is a comprehensive and objective overview of the existing *in vivo* and *in vitro* alternatives to animal testing; it includes timetables for the replacement of the majority of animal testing methods.

In July 2004, the SCCNFP adopted an extended opinion [SCCNFP/0834/04] on the content and the conclusions of the ECVAM report. The SCCNFP concluded that, although the 7<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the cosmetic products Directive [2003/15/EC] clearly demands non-animal tests, it should be emphasized that the definition of an alternative method is based on the 3R principle of Russell and Burch [Russell et al. 1959] and not on replacement alone. Total abolishment of animal tests within 10 years was considered not to be feasible from a scientific point of view. Even the alternative strategies discussed in the ECVAM document, which are estimated to take more than 10 years for further development, still include an animal test at one or the other stage. This SCCNFP statement was supported by a previous opinion of the CSTEE<sup>1</sup> ("Opinion on the BUAV-ECEAE<sup>2</sup> report on "The way forward - action to end animal toxicity testing"), adopted in January 2004, in which several aspects of the development of alternative methods were discussed. It was concluded that, in the foreseeable future, the use of live animals in toxicity testing is essential in order to perform reliable risk assessments [CSTEE 2004]. The SCCNFP reviewed the timetable proposed by ECVAM and presented its own more realistic timetable [SCCNFP/0834/04].

For cosmetic ingredients, the SCCP accepts, besides validated alternative methods, also "valid" methods. These have not necessarily gone through the complete validation process, but the Committee considers these methods acceptable when they have a sufficient amount of experimental data proving their relevance and reliability. According to the Sixth Amendment [93/35/EEC] to the Cosmetic Products Directive, the evaluation of the safety for human health also has to be carried out in accordance with the principles of Good Laboratory Practice laid down in Council Directive 87/18/EEC. All possible deviations from this set of rules must be explained and scientifically justified [SCCNFP/0633/02].

The SCCP stresses the fact that it is aware that valuable toxicity data are available for ingredients that have been subject to the chemical substances notification procedure [92/32/EEC].

Although this Directive recognises Art. 7.2<sup>3</sup> of Dir. 86/609/EEC on the protection of laboratory animals, until now the Competent Authorities have not readily accepted alternative test methods that have not been taken up in Annex V, Part B of the Dangerous Substances Directive and its relevant adaptations to technical progress [67/548/EEC, 84/449/EEC, 88/302/EEC, 92/69/EEC, 96/54/EC, 2000/32/EC, 2000/33/EC, 2001/59/EC and 2004/73/EC].

This chapter describes the currently used animal tests and/or their existing alternatives. Every method is referred by its reference number in Annex V, Part B of Dir. 67/548/EEC and by its OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) number.

For every animal study provided, it is essential that the date of the experiment is stated. This date not only may explain certain shortcomings in the introduced studies, but can also be used to follow-up the performance of reduction, refinement and replacement alternative methods once they have been officially accepted.

---

<sup>1</sup> Scientific Committee on Toxicity, Ecotoxicity and the Environment

<sup>2</sup> British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection - European Coalition to End Animal Experiments

<sup>3</sup> **Art. 7.2** : "An experiment shall not be performed if another scientifically satisfactory method of obtaining the result sought, not entailing the use of an animal, is reasonably and practically available."

### 3-4.1 Acute toxicity

The term "acute toxicity" is used to describe the adverse effects on health, which may result from a single exposure to a substance via the oral, dermal or inhalation route [ECB 2003].

The *in vivo* acute oral toxicity test was originally developed to determine the LD<sub>50</sub>-value of the compound under investigation. In the dangerous substances legislation, this LD<sub>50</sub>-value triggers the classification of the compound [2001/59/EC].

The original test method [EC B.1, OECD 401] involving between three and five dosage groups each comprising 5 to 10 animals, has been deleted [2001/59/EC] and replaced by the following alternative methods :

- 1) The **fixed dose method** [EC B.1 bis, OECD 420] abandons lethality as an endpoint and is designed not to cause death, marked pain or distress to the animals and thereby is a useful refinement alternative method to EC B.1 / OECD 401.
- 2) The **acute toxic class method** [EC B.1 tris, OECD 423] does not aim to calculate a precise LD<sub>50</sub>-value, but allows the determination of a range of exposure dosages where lethality is expected. The test follows a complex stepwise dosage scheme and may consequently take longer than the original EC B.1 / OECD 401 and the alternative EC B.1 bis / OECD 420 method. Nevertheless it offers, as a main and important advantage, a significant reduction in the number of animals tested.
- 3) The **up-and-down procedure** [OECD 425] allows an estimation of the LD<sub>50</sub>-value and confidence intervals, and the observation of signs of toxicity. The guideline significantly reduces the number of animals used in comparison to Guideline EC B.1 / OECD 401.

Usually acute toxicity data of cosmetic ingredients are already available as a result of compliance with the provisions of the seventh amendment to Directive 67/548/EEC on the notification, classification and labelling of dangerous substances [92/32/EEC].

### 3-4.2 Irritation and corrosivity

#### 1) *Skin irritation and skin corrosivity*

Skin irritation or dermal irritation is defined as reversible damage of the skin following the application of a test substance for up to 4 hours. The skin irritation test is an *in vivo* test method involving the use of one to three rabbits. Over the years, the test method has been subject to refinement and reduction measures, bringing the number of animals down from maximum six to maximum three, and now involving a number of steps to be taken before the *in vivo* study can even be envisaged.

These steps consist of :

- the evaluation of existing human and animal data
- the analysis of structure activity relationships
- a study of physicochemical properties and chemical reactivity (e.g. substances with a pH ≤ 2.0 or ≥ 11.5 will be considered as corrosive without *in vivo* testing)
- looking at available dermal toxicity data
- taking into account the results from *in vitro* and *ex vivo* tests [EC B.4, OECD 404]

Several *in vitro* skin irritation tests are under validation. It is hoped that an acceptable test will become available soon.

Skin corrosion or dermal corrosion tests assess the potential of a substance to cause irreversible damage to the skin, namely visible necrosis through the epidermis and into the dermis, following the application of a test substance for the duration period of 3 minutes up to 4 hours. Corrosive reactions are typified by ulcers, bleeding, scabs, and, by the end of observation at 14 days, by discolouration due to blanching of the skin, complete areas of alopecia, and scars [EC B.4, OECD 404]. Corrosivity is not a feature one expects to occur with cosmetics, but occasionally could occur after a manufacturing mistake or misuse by the consumer. On the other hand, a cosmetic ingredient that has the intrinsic property to be corrosive, is not necessarily excluded for use in cosmetics. It very much depends on its final concentration in the cosmetic product, the presence of "neutralising" substances, the excipient used, the exposure route, the conditions of use, etc.

For skin corrosion testing, actually 3 validated *in vitro* alternatives are taken up in Annex V to Dir. 67/548/EEC :

- 1) The "*In vitro* Skin Corrosion : Rat Skin Transcutaneous Electrical Resistance test" uses excised rat skin as a test system and its electrical resistance as an endpoint [EC B.40, OECD 430].
- 2) EPISKIN<sup>TM</sup> and 3) EpiDerm<sup>TM</sup> are two commercialised human skin model tests consisting of reconstructed human epidermal equivalent using cell viability (MTT-test) as an endpoint [EC B.40, OECD 431].

The Corrositex<sup>TM</sup> test, which uses penetration of test substances through a hydrogenated collagen matrix (biobarrier) and supporting filter membrane, represents another corrosivity test. It is described in OECD Draft Guideline 435 [OECD 435], which provides a generic description of the components and procedures of an artificial membrane barrier test method for corrosivity assessment. Although the Corrositex<sup>TM</sup> test passed the ECVAM (European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods) Scientific Advisory Committee (ESAC), it has not been taken up in the EU legislation. It was considered to be only useful for acids and bases [ESAC 2000].

## 2) Mucous membrane irritation

Eye irritation tests have been developed to assess the production of changes in the eye following the application of a test substance to the anterior surface of the eye, which are fully reversible within 21 days of application. Eye corrosion is tissue damage in the eye, or serious deterioration of vision, following application of a test substance to the anterior surface of the eye, which is not fully reversible within 21 days of application. There are presently no validated alternative methods replacing the classical Draize *in vivo* eye irritation test, which is an *in vivo* test method now involving the use of one to three rabbits. Over the years, the test method has been subject to refinement and reduction measures, bringing the number of animals down from maximum six to maximum three, and involving a number of steps to be taken before the *in vivo* study can even be envisaged. These steps consist of :

- the evaluation of existing human and animal data
- the analysis of structure activity relationships
- a study of physicochemical properties and chemical reactivity (e.g. substances with a pH  $\leq 2.0$  or  $\geq 11.5$  will be considered as corrosive without *in vivo* testing)
- consideration of other existing information
- taking into account the results from *in vitro* and *ex vivo* tests
- the assessment of *in vivo* dermal irritancy or corrosivity of the substance [EC B.5, OECD 405]

ECVAM is currently involved in the validation of alternative eye irritation methods. It is generally believed that a battery of alternative tests will be required for the assessment of eye irritation since multiple mechanisms of eye irritation exist.

Without being exhaustive, several tests are either under development or validation and some are mentioned here :

- As a "valid" alternative method (not yet formally validated), the BCOP-test (Bovine Cornea Opacity-Permeability test) appears acceptable for neutral organic chemicals [SCCNFP/0546/02]. It provides quantitative data on the opacity and permeability of the cornea of slaughterhouse animals (bovine, chicken, rabbit) after treatment with the compound or product under investigation. It is more sophisticated than the enucleated eye test (bovine eyes) that only provides a subjective score.
- The RBC (Red Blood Cell) and NRU (Neutral Red Uptake) tests are useful for testing of surfactants. For alcohols and esters, no good methodologies are yet available [SCCNFP/0546/02].
- The HET-CAM test (Hen's Egg Test - ChorioAllantoic Membrane) [Gilleron et al. 1996] is a "valid" alternative method often used in screening studies for finished cosmetic products. It has not been formally validated, but is taken up in the legislation of some EU Member States (e.g. France).
- Various culture models for eye and skin cells and reconstructed membranes, are under development.

### 3-4.3 Skin sensitisation

A skin sensitiser is an agent that is able to cause an allergic response in susceptible individuals. The consequence of this is that following subsequent exposure via the skin, the characteristic adverse health effects of allergic contact dermatitis may be provoked [ECB 2003]. As yet, there is not a validated *in vitro* test method accepted for skin sensitisation.

There are three common *in vivo* laboratory animal test methods to evaluate the potential of a substance to cause skin sensitisation :

- 1) The Local Lymph Node Assay (LLNA) [EC B.42, OECD Guideline 429] uses an inbred strain of mice, and is based on the extent of stimulation of proliferation of lymphocytes in regional lymph nodes draining the site of application of the test substance. It is an objective method giving the result as a stimulation index (SI), which is the ratio of stimulation caused by the test substance in animals versus that in vehicle treated control animals. The test substance is applied openly to the dorsum of the ear in a suitable vehicle, and the use of Freund's complete adjuvant as an immune enhancer causing local skin inflammation is avoided. The LLNA is an alternative method on mice that refines the methodology in comparison with the traditional guinea pig-based models as described below.
- 2) The Magnusson Kligman Guinea Pig Maximisation Test (GPMT) [EC B.6, OECD 406] is an adjuvant-type test, which means that the allergic response is potentiated by intradermal injection of the test substance with and without Freund's Complete Adjuvant. The GPMT is considered equal in sensitivity compared to the LLNA. The test result is based on the challenge response to a non-irritant patch test with the test substance. Thus, the test mimics the "real-life" development of allergic contact dermatitis. The method allows repeated challenges, cross reactivity and vehicle effect studies.
- 3) The Buehler test [EC B.6, OECD 406] is a non-adjuvant technique that involves topical application only. The method is less sensitive compared to the GPMT. Scientific justification should be given in case the Buehler test is used.

### 3-4.4 Dermal / percutaneous absorption

Human exposure to cosmetic ingredients occurs mainly via the skin. In order to reach the circulation (blood and lymph vessels) cosmetic ingredients must cross a number of cell layers of the skin, where the rate-determining layer is considered to be the stratum corneum (SC). A number of factors play a key role in this process, including the lipophilicity of the compounds, the thickness and composition of the SC (body site), the duration of exposure, the amount of topically applied product, the concentration of target compounds, occlusion, etc. [for review see Schaefer et al. 1996; ECETOC 1993; Howes et al. 1996].

The dermal / percutaneous absorption has been described by several international bodies [ECETOC 1993, US EPA 1996a, OECD 2004] using a wide variety of terms and it is recognised that confusion is possible. Therefore it seems appropriate to define some important terms in this particular field [SCCP/0970/06].

The **percutaneous/dermal absorption** process is a global term which describes the passage of compounds across the skin. This process can be divided into three steps:

- **penetration** is the entry of a substance into a particular layer or structure such as the entrance of a compound into the stratum corneum;
- **permeation** is the penetration through one layer into another, which is both functionally and structurally different from the first layer;
- **resorption** is the uptake of a substance into the vascular system (lymph and/or blood vessel), which acts as the central compartment.

According to OECD, dermal / percutaneous absorption studies can be performed *in vivo* or *in vitro*.

The *in vivo* dermal / percutaneous absorption method is among others described in OECD Guideline 427 combined with the "Draft Guidance Document for the conduct of skin absorption studies" [OECD 2004]. However, due to the provisions of the 7<sup>th</sup> Amendment to Dir. 76/768/EEC [2003/15/EC], the *in vivo* testing will not be an option for cosmetic ingredients from 11 March 2009 on.

The *in vitro* test has been summarized in OECD Guideline 428 and more detail is given in the above-mentioned OECD Guidance Document, which provides useful additional guidance for both types of studies. In addition, the SCCNFP adopted a set of basic criteria for the *in vitro* assessment of dermal absorption of cosmetic ingredients [SCCNFP/0167/99]. This opinion, published a year before the above-mentioned OECD Guideline 428, focused on the *in vitro* testing of cosmetic ingredients, while OECD 428 addressed percutaneous absorption from a much broader point of view by mentioning *in vivo* methods besides *in vitro* testing and by providing specifications for agricultural products and industrial chemicals besides cosmetics.

Therefore, the SCC(NF)P has always considered **a combination of the OECD Guidelines and the SCC(NF)P "Basic criteria" [SCCNFP/0167/99] and its updates [SCCNFP/0750/03, SCCP/0970/06], as essential** for dermal / percutaneous absorption studies.

The aim of the *in vitro* dermal / percutaneous absorption study is to determine the amount of topically applied substance that may cross the stratum corneum and to enter into deeper skin layers. This amount is subsequently considered as relevant for safety evaluation (calculation of the Margin of Safety), if the application was performed mimicking in-use conditions. The amount is expected to enter the circulatory system unless irreversible binding in the epidermis and/or dermis is demonstrated.

Nevertheless, as explained in the updated "Basic Criteria" [SCCP/0970/06], there are a number of points that require special attention :

- 1) The design of the diffusion cell (technicalities and choice between static and flow through system).
- 2) The choice of the receptor fluid (solubility and stability of chemical in receptor fluid should be demonstrated, no interference with skin/membrane integrity, analytical method, etc.).
- 3) The skin preparations should be chosen and treated with care (human skin from an appropriate site remains the gold standard).
- 4) Skin integrity is of key importance and should be verified.
- 5) Skin temperature has to be ascertained at normal human skin temperature.
- 6) The test substance has to be rigorously characterized and should correspond to the substance that is intended to be used in the finished cosmetic products.
- 7) Dose and vehicle/formulation should be representative for the in-use conditions of the intended cosmetic product.
- 8) Dose, volume and contact time with the skin have to mimic in-use conditions.
- 9) Regular sampling is required over the whole exposure period.
- 10) Appropriate analytical techniques should be used.
- 11) The test compound is to be determined in all relevant compartments :
  - skin surface (product excess),
  - stratum corneum,
  - living epidermis,
  - dermis,
  - receptor fluid.
- 12) Mass balance analysis and recovery data are to be provided.
- 13) Variability / validity / reproducibility of the method should be discussed.
- 14) The amounts measured in the dermis, epidermis (without stratum corneum) and the receptor fluid will be considered as dermally absorbed and taken into account for further calculations. If results are derived from an inadequate *in vitro* study, the default value of 100% absorption could be applied.

In case an insufficient number of skin samples have been tested, the highest absorption value will be taken into account; otherwise the mean value  $\pm$  2 S.D. (standard deviation of the mean) will be used for further calculations.

### 3-4.5 Repeated dose toxicity

Repeated dose toxicity comprises the adverse general (excluding reproductive, genotoxic and carcinogenic effects) toxicological effects occurring as a result of repeated daily dosing with, or exposure to, a substance for a specific part of the expected lifespan of the test species [ECB 2003].

The following *in vivo* repeated dose toxicity tests are available :

- 1) - Repeated dose (28 days) toxicity (oral) [EC B.7, OECD 407]
  - Repeated dose (28 days) toxicity (dermal) [EC B.9, OECD 410]
  - Repeated dose (28 days) toxicity (inhalation) [EC B.8, OECD 412]
- 2) - Sub-chronic oral toxicity test : repeated dose 90-day oral toxicity study in rodents [EC B.26, OECD 408]
  - Sub-chronic oral toxicity test : repeated dose 90-day oral toxicity study in non-rodents [EC B.27, OECD 409]
  - Sub-chronic dermal toxicity study : repeated dose 90-day dermal toxicity study using rodent species [EC B.28, OECD 411]
  - Sub-chronic inhalation toxicity study : repeated dose 90-day inhalation toxicity study using rodent species [EC B.29, OECD 413]
- 3) - Chronic toxicity test [EC B.30, OECD 452]

The 28-day and 90-day oral toxicity tests in rodents are the most commonly used repeated dose toxicity tests and often give a clear indication on target organs and type of systemic toxicity.

The inhalation route is only rarely used in repeated dose toxicity testing due to the complex study design accompanying this kind of toxicity trials, as well as to the lack of relevance of this route of repeated exposure for the majority of cosmetic products.

The objective of chronic toxicity studies is to determine the effects of a test substance in a mammalian species following repeated exposure during a period covering the whole lifespan of the animals. In these tests, effects which require a long latency period or which are cumulative, become manifest.

As already mentioned, for repeated-dose toxicity testing, currently no validated or generally accepted alternative method is available for replacing animal testing. There have been some serious efforts in the domains of e.g. neurotoxicity and nephrotoxicity, but to date, no method or screening battery has been formally (pre-)validated [SCCNFP/0546/02].

In the notification process of dangerous substances, repeated dose toxicity studies are required when the substance under consideration is produced or imported in amounts exceeding 1 tonne/year [92/32/EEC].

In the case of the development of cosmetic ingredients which have specific biological properties and which will come into contact with human skin for a long period of time, the SCCP is convinced that evaluation of the systemic risk is a key element in evaluating the safety of these new ingredients, irrespective of the tonnage-linked and possibly limited requirements imposed by the Dangerous Substances Directive [67/548/EEC].

Therefore the SCCP considers that in certain cases the use of animal long-term experiments to study one or more potential toxic effects remains a scientific necessity. It is self-evident that animal use should be limited to a minimum, but never at the expense of consumer safety. The "7<sup>th</sup> Amendment" [2003/15/EC] to the Cosmetic Directive 76/768/EEC allows up to 11 March 2013 for the development of validated alternative tests for repeated exposure.

### 3-4.6 Mutagenicity/genotoxicity

**Mutagenicity** refers to the induction of permanent transmissible changes in the amount or structure of the genetic material of cells or organisms. These changes may involve a single gene or a gene segment, a block of genes or whole chromosomes. Effects on whole chromosomes may be structural and/or numerical [ECB 2003].

**Genotoxicity** is a broader term and refers to potentially harmful effects on genetic material that are not necessarily associated with mutagenicity. Thus, tests for genotoxicity include those providing an indication of induced damage to DNA (but not direct evidence of mutation) via effects such as unscheduled DNA synthesis (UDS), sister chromatid exchange (SCE), DNA strandbreaks, DNA adduct formation or mitotic recombination (MR), as well as tests for mutagenicity [ECB 2003].

At present, no single validated test method can provide information on all the above mentioned genetic endpoints; their diversity usually precludes the detection of more than one of them in a single system [OECD 2000b, Dearfield et al. 2002].

Several *in vitro* and *in vivo* mutagenicity/genotoxicity tests are available : they have been described in OECD Guidelines [OECD 2000b] as well as in Annex V to Directive 67/548/EEC.

As a general recommendation, the SCCP is of the opinion that the base level of evaluation of the potential for mutagenicity/genotoxicity of a cosmetic ingredient to be included in Annexes III, IV, VI and VII of Council Directive 76/768/EEC should include tests to provide information on the three major genetic endpoints, namely 1) mutagenicity at a gene level, 2) chromosome breakage and/or rearrangements (clastogenicity), and 3) numerical chromosome aberrations (aneugenicity) : these three base levels of information represent the actual consensus of international groups of scientific experts [Muller et al. 2003, Dearfield et al. 2002], and of an expert advisory committee [COM 2000].

Moreover, by considering that the Bacterial Reverse Mutation Test (so-called "Ames test") does not detect all compounds with mutagenic potential [COM 2000; FDA 2000, Dearfield et al. 2002] an additional gene mutation assay in mammalian cells is necessary for the evaluation of those chemicals like the cosmetic ingredients to which a large fraction of the consumers for a great part of their lifetime is exposed.

The need to include two tests for detection of gene mutations is recognized also for the evaluation of food additives [SCF 2001a], of substances to be used in food contact materials [SCF 2001b] and of biocides [98/8/EC].

Clastogens are detected by the chromosome aberration test but also by the induction of micronuclei (MN) or by the induction of "small colony mutants" in the Mouse Lymphoma TK<sup>+/-</sup> Assay (MLA). Aneugens induce MN *in vitro* when tested according to rigorous criteria [Tucker and Preston 1996; OECD 487; Matsushima et al. 1999; Kirsch-Volders et al. 2003; Matsuoka et al. 1992; Honma et al. 1993].

Therefore the SCCP, for the *in vitro* base level testing of cosmetic ingredients indicated above, recommends three assays, represented by the following test systems [SCCNFP/0755/03] :

### **Stage 1 : *In vitro* tests**

1. Tests for gene mutation :
  - i) Bacterial Reverse Mutation Test [EC B.13/14, OECD 471]
  - ii) *In Vitro* Mammalian Cell Gene Mutation Test [EC B.17, OECD 476]
2. Tests for clastogenicity and aneugenicity
  - i) *In Vitro* Micronucleus Test [OECD 487, draft]

There may be instances for which the basic requirement of all three *in vitro* tests seems not necessary or should be modified: in these cases a scientific justification for deviation from the battery of tests, and the decision taken should be given.

Certain structurally alerting molecular entities are recognised as being causally related to the carcinogenic and/or mutagenic potential of chemicals. Examples of structural alerts include alkylating electrophilic centers, unstable epoxides, aromatic amines, azostructures, N-nitroso-groups, aromatic nitro-groups.

For some classes of compounds with specific structural alerts, it is established that specific protocol modifications/additional tests are necessary for optimum detection of genotoxicity.

The additional testing needed when the chosen 3-test battery yields negative results for a structurally alerting test compound could consist of such modifications.



### *In Vitro Metabolic Activation*

Cells should be exposed to the test substance both in the presence and absence of an appropriate metabolic activation system. The most commonly used system is a cofactor-supplemented S9 fraction prepared from the livers of rodents (usually rat) treated with enzyme-inducing agents such as Aroclor 1254 or combination of phenobarbital and beta-naphthoflavone. The choice and concentration of a metabolic activation system may depend upon the class of chemical being tested. In some cases it may be appropriate to utilize more than one concentration of S9 mix. For azo dyes and diazo compounds, using a reductive metabolic activation system may be more appropriate [Matsushima 1980; Prival et al. 1984].

### **Stage 2 : *In vivo* studies**

Normally, when concern is raised by positive results from *in vitro* tests, further testing may be justified.

The selection of the *in vivo* assays cannot be defined *a priori* and depends on the positive results observed in the *in vitro* assays.

Nevertheless, before undertaking any *in vivo* testing, a thorough review is needed of the *in vitro* test results of the substance (with its toxicokinetic profile), available information on its chemistry and toxicological profile, as well as data on analogous ingredients. Moreover, it is obvious that a particular *in vivo* test should be conducted only when it can be reasonably expected from all the properties of the test substance and the proposed test protocol that the specific target tissue will be adequately exposed to the test substances and/or its metabolites.

Finally it should be mentioned that for the specific case of hair dyes and hair dye components, a number of separate SCC(NF)P opinions have led to a separate mutagenicity / genotoxicity testing strategy, which is described in detail under 3-8.3.

### **3-4.7 Carcinogenicity**

Substances are defined as carcinogenic if they induce tumours (benign or malignant) or increase their incidence, malignancy or shorten the time of tumour occurrence when they are inhaled, ingested, dermally applied or injected [ECB 2003].

The most commonly performed carcinogenicity tests are :

- 1) Carcinogenicity test [EC B.30, OECD 452]
- 2) Combined chronic toxicity / carcinogenicity test [EC B.33, OECD 453]

Genotoxic carcinogens are chemicals for which the most plausible mode of carcinogenic action includes the consequences of genotoxic effects [ECB 2003]. When there is structural alert for carcinogenicity or positive results in *in vitro* mutagenicity tests, an *In vitro* Syrian Hamster Embryo (SHE) Transformation Test [OECD 1996] may be needed, irrespective of the fact whether it concerns genotoxic or non-genotoxic substances.

As far as genotoxic compounds are concerned, *in vitro* mutagenicity tests are quite well developed. Tests for detecting non-genotoxic carcinogens constitute another issue. Therefore, *in vivo* rodent studies will remain necessary in specific cases.

### 3-4.8 Reproductive toxicity

The term "reproductive toxicity" is used to describe the adverse effects induced (by a substance) on any aspect of mammalian reproduction. It covers all phases of the reproductive cycle, including impairment of male or female reproductive function or capacity and the induction of non-heritable adverse effects in the progeny such as death, growth retardation, structural and functional effects [ECB 2003].

The most commonly performed *in vivo* reproduction toxicity studies are :

- 1) Two-generation reproduction toxicity test [EC B.35, OECD 416]
- 2) Teratogenicity test - rodent and non-rodent [EC B.31, OECD 414]

At the OECD level, there also exists a combined "Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test" [OECD 421], which has to date not been taken up in Annex V to Dir. 67/548/EEC.

Since the field of reproductive toxicity is very complex, it is expected that the various stages cannot be mimicked using one alternative method. Three alternative methods, restricted to the embryotoxicity area, have been developed :

- 1) The Whole Embryo Culture test (WEC)
- 2) The MicroMass test (MM)
- 3) The Embryotoxic Stem cell Test (EST)

The last two tests were considered scientifically valid by ESAC for placing the substance under consideration into one of the 3 following categories : non-embryotoxic, weak/moderate-embryotoxic or strong-embryotoxic. The WEC test is considered scientifically valid only for identifying strong embryotoxic substances [ESAC 2001].

These 3 alternative embryotoxicity tests, which are further refined with ECVAM support, have been discussed within the SCCNFP and are considered to be useful in the CMR strategy for screening out embryotoxic substances. However, more data on positive reacting compounds remain necessary.

### 3-4.9 Toxicokinetic studies

The term "toxicokinetic studies" is used to describe the time-dependent fate of a substance within the body. This includes absorption, distribution, biotransformation and/or excretion. The term "toxicodynamics" means the process of interaction of chemical substances with target sites and the subsequent reactions leading to adverse effects [ECB 2003].

The protocols for toxicokinetics [EC B.36, OECD 417] are designed to elucidate particular aspects of the toxicity of the substance under test. The results may assist in the design of further toxicity studies and their interpretation. Moreover, after dermal absorption of a substance under consideration, its metabolic fate can have an important effect on its toxic potential, its distribution in the body and its excretion. Therefore, in specific cases, *in vivo* or *in vitro* biotransformation studies are required to prove or to exclude certain adverse effects. Several *in vitro* models (e.g. hepatocytes in suspension or culture) are suitable for biotransformation studies, however, none of these models has been validated [Blaauboer et al. 1994, Coecke et al. 1999].

Information on chemical structure (e.g. QSAR) and physical and chemical properties (e.g. logP<sub>ow</sub>) may also provide an indication of the absorption characteristics by the intended route of administration, metabolism and tissue distribution. There may also be information on toxicokinetic parameters from preceding toxicity studies.

Finally, toxicokinetic studies are of importance in extrapolating both *in vitro* and *in vivo* animal data to man.

### 3-4.10 Photo-induced toxicity

#### 1) Phototoxicity (photoirritation) and photosensitisation

The "3T3 Neutral Red Uptake Phototoxicity Test (3T3 NRU PT)" is an *in vitro* method based on a comparison of the cytotoxicity of a chemical when tested in the presence and in the absence of exposure to a non-cytotoxic dose of UV/visible light.

In 1998, the SCCNFP recommended the use of this *in vitro* method for the determination of the phototoxicological/photoirritative profile of all UV light absorbing chemicals and especially for those cosmetic ingredients to be used as UV filters [SCCNFP/0069/98].

In 2000, the 3T3 NRU PT test was formally validated and subsequently taken up in Annex V to Dir. 67/548/EEC [EC B.41, OECD 432], making its use mandatory for testing for phototoxic potential.

The reliability and relevance of the *In vitro* 3T3 NRU Phototoxicity Test was recently evaluated for a number of substances with a chemically different structure [Spielmann et al. 1998], including UV filters used as cosmetic ingredients. The test was shown to be predictive of acute phototoxicity effects in animals and humans *in vivo*. However, it is not designed to predict other adverse effects that may arise from combined actions of a chemical and light, e.g. it does not address photoclastogenicity/ photomutagenicity, photoallergy or photocarcinogenicity.

Presently, no *in vitro* methods for detection of photosensitisation are available. Nevertheless, it is expected that chemicals showing photoallergic properties, are likely to give positive reactions in the 3T3 NRU PT test [2000/33/EC].

#### 2) Photomutagenicity / Photoclastogenicity

In 1990 the SCC adopted guidelines for testing the photomutagenicity / photogenotoxicity of UV radiation absorbing cosmetic ingredients.

The SCCNFP has recommended that the test protocols used by COLIPA (European Cosmetic Toiletry and Perfumery Association) be the subject of a validation study. This recommendation has not yet been taken up because of the difficulty of planning a validation study in the absence of *in vivo* reference data. In the case of photomutagenicity/photogenotoxicity, in view of the established biological mechanisms (alteration of genes, chromosomes, DNA sequences), *in vivo* reference data may not be necessary.

Already in 1999, the OECD was discussing Guidelines for photomutagenicity, but at present no results are available.

The previous version of the Notes of Guidance [SCCNFP/0690/03] already mentioned that for the detection of photochemical clastogenicity/mutagenicity several well-established assays had been adopted to a combined treatment of chemicals with Ultraviolet-Visible (UV-VIS) light including :

- bacterial and yeast mutation assays [Dean et al. 1991; Chetelat et al. 1993a and Averbech et al. 1979];
- tests for detecting clastogenicity [Gocke et al. 1998 and Chetelat et al. 1993b];
- tests for detecting gene mutations in mammalian cells [Pflaum et al. 1998; Chetelat et al. 1996];
- tests for detecting aneugenicity in mammalian cells *in vitro* [Kersten et al. 2002].

Meanwhile, the 2004 state of the art of the existing principles and test methods in the field of photomutagenicity / photogenotoxicity is summarized in a review of Brendler-Schwaab et al., which was the report of the Gesellschaft für Umweltmutationsforschung (GUM) Task Force on photochemical genotoxicity. The methods described include the photo-Ames test, the photo HPRT / photo-mouse lymphoma assay, the photo-micronucleus test, the photo-chromosome aberration test and the photo-Comet assay.

For each method, the results of compounds tested are briefly summarized out of the available literature. One of the authors' conclusions is that, in many cases, the concurrent use of irradiation while performing a classical mutagenicity / genotoxicity study, does not significantly alter the existing OECD protocol without irradiation. Therefore they consider the majority of the described photomutagenicity / photogenotoxicity tests as being valid [Brendler-Schwaab 2004].

Taking the GUM Task Force results into consideration, the SCCP evaluates the individual photomutagenicity/photogenotoxicity tests and their scientific value on a case-by-case basis, keeping in mind the general provisions for the classical mutagenicity/genotoxicity testing battery as mentioned in 3-4.6.

### **3-4.11 Human data**

Cosmetic products are developed to be applied to human skin and external mucosa and to be used by the general public. Occasionally, undesirable side effects, both local and systemic, may occur. Local reactions may be, among others, irritation, allergic contact dermatitis, contact urticaria and sunlight-, especially UV light-, induced reactions. Skin and mucous membrane irritation are the most frequently observed reactions.

Although it is inconceivable that tests in human volunteers would replace animal tests, it is known that tests in animals and alternative methods are of limited predictive value with respect to the human situation. Therefore, a skin compatibility test with human volunteers, confirming that there are no harmful effects when applying a cosmetic product for the first time to human skin or mucous membranes, may be needed scientifically and ethically.

It is self-evident that such a test can only be envisaged provided that the toxicological profiles of the ingredients, based on animal testing and/or the use of alternative methods, are available and no concern is raised. A high degree of safety is to be expected. Finished cosmetic products are usually tested in small populations to confirm their skin and mucous membrane compatibility, as well as their cosmetic acceptability (= fulfilment of in-use expectations).

The general ethical and practical aspects related to human volunteer compatibility studies on finished cosmetic products, are described in SCCNFP/0068/98 and SCCNFP/0245/99.

A separate SCCNFP opinion addresses the conduct of human volunteer testing of potentially cutaneous irritant (mixtures of) cosmetic ingredients [SCCNFP/0003/98]. Ethical and practical considerations are discussed with a specific focus on irritancy.

Finally, an SCCNFP opinion has been issued concerning the predictive testing of potentially cutaneous sensitising cosmetic (mixtures of) ingredients [SCCNFP/0120/99]. These types of tests are much more controversial than the irritancy tests, since predictive human sensitisation tests involve attempts to induce a long lasting or permanent immunologic sensitisation in the individual. Therefore, serious ethical questions arise. In spite of many years of experience with human sensitisation tests, very limited scientific information is available in the literature regarding the consequences involved for the human volunteers who have developed a patch test sensitisation during such a test. Due to the uncertainties mentioned above, it is the opinion of the SCCP that predictive human sensitisation tests should not be carried out without a better understanding of the immunologic background and mechanisms underlying positive reactions in these studies with human beings.

At present, no validated replacement method for predicting skin sensitisation exists. Only a "valid" refinement test, the LLNA, is available.

### 3-5 TOXICOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF A SUBSTANCE IN ONE OF THE ANNEXES TO DIR. 76/768/EEC (WHICH ARE EVALUATED BY THE SCCP)

#### 3-5.1 General toxicological requirements

When a cosmetic ingredient dossier is submitted for evaluation by the SCCP, the manufacturer should provide the Commission with the information set out below :

1. *Acute toxicity (if available);*
2. *Irritation and corrosivity;*
3. *Skin sensitisation;*
4. *Dermal / percutaneous absorption;*
5. *Repeated dose toxicity;*
6. *Mutagenicity / genotoxicity;*
7. *Carcinogenicity;*
8. *Reproductive toxicity;*
9. *Toxicokinetics;*
10. *Photo-induced toxicity;*
11. *Human data.*

In general, points 1. to 6. are considered the minimal base set requirements. However, when considerable oral intake is expected or when the data on dermal / percutaneous absorption indicate a considerable penetration of the ingredients through the skin (taking into account the toxicological profile of the substance and its chemical structure), points 7., 8. and 9. may become necessary, as well as specific additional genotoxicity and/or mutagenicity data. Photo-induced toxicity data (10.) are specifically required when the cosmetic product is expected or intended to be used on sunlight-exposed skin.

Human data (11.) are extremely useful and should be included whenever available. Nevertheless, the use of human volunteers in the confirmatory testing of potentially **cutaneous irritant** cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients is subjected to ethical concerns. The use of human volunteers in the predictive testing of potentially **cutaneous sensitising** cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients, as a contribution to human safety is questionable in comparison with animal testing. Moreover, in these studies a risk for human volunteers cannot be excluded and there is still a lack of information on the severity and frequency of adverse effects [SCCNFP/0633/02].

There may be cases for which it is neither necessary nor technically possible to provide the information mentioned above : in such cases **a scientific justification** must be given.

Safety data can be obtained by means of studies conducted in accordance with guidelines reported in Annex V, Part B of the Dangerous Substances Directive and its relevant adaptations to technical progress, and complying with the principle of Good Laboratory Practice (Directive 87/18/EEC); or by means of adequate and acceptable scientific methods. All possible deviations from this set of rules must be **explained and scientifically justified**.

**When study results are submitted, a declaration should be made that the tests involved were conducted using a substance with a comparable purity/impurity profile and physical and chemical characteristics of that to be included in the finished cosmetic product** [SCCNFP/0633/02].

Stability of the test substance under experimental conditions is of prime importance for the interpretation of test results. The stability of the test material should therefore be reported.

According to Art.7 of Council Directive 86/609/EEC on the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes, an animal study shall not be performed if another scientifically satisfactory method of obtaining the result sought, not entailing the use of an animal, is reasonable and practically available.

Validated *in vitro* methods for the assessment of potentially cutaneous irritants, sensitising cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients are currently not available. However, "valid" methods exist, which are particularly useful for testing of the finished cosmetic product. Animal studies to predict the above said effects are reliable and well documented in the scientific literature.

Finally, the SCCP highlights the important requirement of ensuring that files for evaluation are **complete** when submitted. The applicant must ensure this **by signature**.

Together with the relevant experimental investigations, the following information should also be available :

- any report on epidemiological and/or observational experiences;
- description of all available ecological and environmental effects of the respective substance/compound/preparation;
- all relevant published literature;
- a description of the bibliographical methods used;
- any useful finding to the applicant's best ability;
- any "grey material" available elsewhere.

Subsequently, any new information acquired by industry and/or relevant agencies, should be transmitted to the Commission for review [SCCNFP/0461/01].

### **3-5.2 Annex II**

Annex II to Dir. 76/768/EEC is a list containing substances that must not form part of the composition of cosmetic products.

### **3-5.3 Annex III**

Annex III is defined as a list of substances that are not allowed to be used in cosmetic products, unless subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down.

This Annex contains substances that have been identified as posing a possible risk to human health when used in cosmetic products above the defined maximum authorized concentration in the finished product or where certain applications need to be restricted. The general requirements as defined in 3-5.1 apply for the inclusion of a cosmetic ingredient in this Annex, unless it belongs to the category of hair dyes or hair dye components (see 3-8).

In that respect, Part 1 of Annex III contains a number of oxidative (permanent) hair dye components, such as diaminophenols, hydroquinone, 1-naphthol and resorcinol (ref. n° 10, 14, 16 and 22); while Part 2 provides provisional allowance for 60 colouring agents used as oxidising and/or non-oxidising hair dye components [2002/34/EC, 2005/52/EC]. In March 2003, the SCCNFP issued an opinion on the re-evaluation of 46 of these hair dyes [SCCNFP/0635/03].

### 3-5.4 Annex IV

Annex IV constitutes a list of colouring agents permitted for use in cosmetic products. A number of these colourants have a wide use in food and have been declared as safe for use for many years, while on others clear restrictions have been imposed.

The data requirements for colourants do not differ from those defined in 3-5.1, unless they are being used as hair dyes or hair dye components (see 3-8).

Annex IV contains colourants, a number of which are used as direct hair dyes. Some of these are azo-dyes known to release one or more aromatic amines that have been classified as Carcinogen Category 2 through the Dangerous Substances legislation [1999/43/EC, 97/56/EC, 94/60/EC]. In 2002, the SCCNFP adopted an opinion discussing a large number of these components, concluding that the use of azo-dyes that release one or more carcinogenic aromatic amines, poses a potential risk to the health of the consumer [SCCNFP/0495/01].

### 3-5.5 Annex VI

Annex VI is a list of preservatives, including maximum allowed concentrations in finished products. The requirements for inclusion into this Annex are those as defined in 3-5.1.

### 3-5.6 Annex VII

Annex VII is a list of UV absorbing or UV reflecting substances with their maximum authorised concentrations in cosmetic products.

By their nature, all cosmetic ingredients used as sunscreens or UV absorbers are chemicals that either absorb or reflect UVA- and/or UVB-light. The range of the wavelengths that are absorbed by a given cosmetic ingredient is called its "absorption spectrum".

As a consequence of such light absorption, a chemical may undergo changes in its molecular configuration, or may be transformed into a different chemically reactive molecule. Hence there is a need to investigate specific phototoxic effects, such as photoirritancy, photosensitisation and photomutagenicity by using the methodologies as described in section 3-4.10

It is therefore evident that point 10. (Photo-induced toxicity) of the requirements tabled under 3-5.1 is crucial for the assessment of a possible inclusion of an ingredient in Annex VII.

Finally, it must be emphasized that all the studies relating to the phototoxic potential of an ingredient must be performed by applying the relevant UV light wavelengths derived from the absorption spectrum of the ingredient [SCCNFP/0633/02], and that photostability data under conditions of use should be provided.

### 3-5.7 Requirements for partial evaluations

In some cases, either upon request of the SCCP or on a voluntary basis, industry provides additional data on substances that have been discussed in the past. An evaluation exclusively based on additional reports, together with summaries of earlier submissions may not be adequate to answer the question of the new risk.

As an example the re-evaluation study of Annex VI could be mentioned. This study was triggered by the fact that, besides **the intended use as a preservative**, some of the substances on Annex VI also include the phrase "for other uses" possibly in other (higher) concentrations than used for preservative purposes (these entries are marked by a (+) or a (\*)) [SCCNFP/0125/99].

Therefore, complete dossiers are required when a re-evaluation of only a part of a dossier is necessary [SCCNFP/0125/99].

### **3-6 BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR COSMETIC INGREDIENTS (WHICH ARE EVALUATED BY INDIVIDUAL SAFETY ASSESSORS)**

#### **3-6.1 General toxicological requirements**

Although the majority of the ad hoc opinions of the SCCP is not involved with the safety assessment of ingredients not taken up in the Annexes to Dir. 76/768/EEC, some general considerations are provided in this chapter.

From the EU legislative point of view, many cosmetic ingredients simply have to comply with the requirements of the Dangerous Substances legislation [67/548/EEC and its amendments and adaptations to technical progress]. According to the latter for every newly notified chemical substance the required data package is triggered by the produced / EU imported annual volumes of that compound [92/32/EEC].

The fact that a substance will be used as a cosmetic ingredient, does not trigger any additional toxicological data requirement.

The toxicological requirements for dangerous substances newly produced /EU imported at levels between 100 kg and 1 tonne per year (a category to which several cosmetic ingredients belong), currently consist of :

- Acute toxicity (oral, dermal or inhalation)
- Skin and eye irritation
- Sensitisation
- Mutagenicity data

When higher amounts are produced/EU imported per year, a more extensive list of toxicological requirements is established [92/32/EEC].

A scientifically sound safety evaluation, based on less data than those mentioned above for the 100 kg - 1 tonne/year category, becomes quite impossible. Therefore, suppliers should be encouraged to deliver at least these data to all their customers in the cosmetic industry, in particular since many of these compounds are so-called "actives" and are not necessarily safe at all concentrations.

Moreover, the newly proposed EU regulatory framework for the Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals (REACH) will completely change the setting for existing and new substances in the EU. For one, the above-mentioned toxicological data set will only be mandatory for dangerous substances produced / imported at tonnage levels between 1 and 10 tonnes/year [15921/05].

Therefore, it would be very useful if, in analogy with the ingredients taken up in the Annexes to Dir. 76/768/EEC, new information acquired by the suppliers, industry and/or other agencies, could be communicated to the customers in the cosmetic industry. When more elaborate data packages are available (e.g. high production volume chemicals), a large number of the general requirements described in 3-5.1 should become available.

In addition, the chemical nature of all cosmetic ingredients and their degree of purity, chemical and physical properties (as described in 3-3) should be ascertained. Upon request, the methods for identification and quantitative control should be made available to the relevant competent authorities of the Member States.

In the following paragraphs some general problems, caused by the nature and/or origin of the ingredients under consideration, are discussed.



### 3-6.2 Identification of mineral, animal, botanical and biotechnological ingredients

The nature and preparation of some ingredients may affect the type and amount of data necessary for their identification. The following points indicate the advised requirements for :

#### a) *Complex ingredients of mineral origin*

- starting material
- description of :
  - the preparation process : physical processing, chemical modifications, possible purification,
  - characteristic elements of the composition : characteristic components, toxic components (%).
- physical and chemical specifications
- microbiological quality
- preservatives and/or other additives added.

#### b) *Complex ingredients of animal origin*

- species (bovine, ovine, crustacean, ...)
- organs, tissues, biological liquids (placenta, serum, cartilage,...)
- country of origin
- description of :
  - the preparation process : conditions of extraction (solvent, pH, temperature,...); type of hydrolysis (acidic, enzymatic,...); other chemical modifications; possible purification;
  - commercial form : powder, solution, suspension, freeze-dried,...
  - characteristic elements of the composition : characteristic amino acids, total nitrogen, polysaccharides, molecular mass,...
- physical and chemical specifications
- microbiological quality including relevant viral contamination
- additional external contamination
- preservatives and/or other additives added.

#### c) *Complex ingredients of botanical origin*

- common or usual names of the plant, alga or macroscopic fungus
- name of variety, species, genus, and family
- in case more than one variety of source of a given species is used, each should be specified
- organoleptic, macroscopic and microscopic evaluation
- morphological and anatomical description (including gender, if applicable) and a photograph of the plant or plant part, alga, or macroscopic fungus used
- natural habitat and geographical distribution of the plant, alga, or macroscopic fungus
- current sources of the plant, alga, or macroscopic fungus, including its geographical location and whether it is cultivated or harvested from the wild
- description of :
  - preparation process : collection, washing, drying, extraction, distillation, destructive distillation, possible purification, preservation procedures,...
  - handling, transportation, storage;
  - commercial form : powder, solution, suspension,...
  - characteristic elements of the composition : identification of characteristic components, toxic components (%);
- physical and chemical specifications
- microbiological quality including relevant fungi
- additional external contamination
- preservatives and/or other additives added.

#### *d) Complex ingredients derived from biotechnology*

For special biotechnologically derived ingredients, where a modified micro-organism or a potential toxic substance has not been fully removed, specific data must be available, which can comprise :

- description of organisms involved : donor organisms, recipient organisms, modified micro-organisms
- host pathogenicity
- toxicity, and when possible, identity of metabolites, toxins produced by the organisms
- fate of viable organisms in the environment-survival-potential for transfer of characteristics to e.g. natural bacteria
- physical and chemical specifications
- microbiological quality
- additional external contamination
- preservatives and/or other additives added.

### **3-6.3 Fragrance materials**

Every fragrance compound should be accompanied by an adequate and duly signed certificate of conformity.

Although most fragrance suppliers deliver a standard certificate indicating the safe use of the fragrance compound within a range of concentrations per product type, it is the opinion of the SCCP that such certification should be systematically supplemented by :

- a semi-quantitative concentration of the ingredients in the fragrance compound (i.e., <0.1%; 0.1 to <1%, 1% to <5%, 5% to <10%, 10% to <20%, 20% and more) using the preferred terminology as indicated in Section II of the Inventory of Cosmetic Ingredients and the INCI name if available;
- for natural ingredients, there should be either
  - 1) an analysis of the composition of the batch of the natural ingredient, or
  - 2) an indication of the maximum levels of components which may be present in the natural ingredient, taking into account batch to batch variation;
- an indication of which of the ingredients have an established potential to cause contact sensitisation, phototoxicity, systemic toxicity etc., or are subject to restrictions either by industry guidelines, the Cosmetics Directive or by SCC(NF)P opinions [SCCNFP/0017/98, SCCNFP/0392/00, SCCNFP/0450/01, SCCNFP/0588/02, SCCNFP/0770/03, SCCNFP/0771/03, SCCP/1023/06]; a confirmation that any such restrictions have been conformed to;
- a clear indication of the types of cosmetic products in which the compound may be used and at what maximum concentration.

The above information should be available to the safety assessor of the finished cosmetic product. In the final risk evaluation, reference should be made to the semi-quantitative formulation of the fragrance compound and consideration taken as to the toxic potential of the ingredients considered singularly or in combination and with relevance to the finished cosmetic product considered as a whole.

Specific labelling to reduce the incidence of contact-allergic reactions in fragrance-sensitive consumers has been foreseen by the inclusion of 26 potentially sensitising fragrance ingredients in Annex III to Directive 76/768/EEC. More specifically, the presence of these substances must be indicated in the list of ingredients on the label when their concentrations in the final product exceed 0,001 % in leave-on products or 0,01 % in rinse-off products [2003/15/EC].

### 3-6.4 Potential endocrine disruptors

In recent years, global concerns have been raised over the potential adverse effects that may result from exposure to chemicals that could have the potential to interfere with the endocrine system.

In 2000, DG Env (Directorate-General Environment) issued a document titled "Towards the establishment of a priority list of substances for further evaluation in their role in endocrine disruption" [M0355008/1786Q/10/11/00]. In this study, a working list of 564 substances was drawn up for which information on endocrine disrupting effects has been gathered. The study was carried out in four steps, being (1) a review of existing lists and other sources of information, (2) selection of highly persistent and/or high production volume (HPV) substances, (3) a preliminary evaluation of scientific evidence of endocrine disrupting effects and (4) a preliminary evaluation of exposure to humans and wildlife.

Finally, a number of recommendations were formulated, including the need for standard tests and criteria for identifying endocrine disruption and the need for comparison of the endocrine disrupting effect evaluation with the concentrations at which toxic effects (mortality, reproduction, ...) occur.

Two years later, the IPCS (International Programme on Chemical Safety) published a review on the same issue, taking together all publications, workshop / conference proceedings and expert committee evaluations on endocrine disruptors [Damstra et al. 2002]. This report states that concerns regarding exposure to these endocrine disruptors are primarily due to :

- 1) adverse effects observed in certain wildlife, fish and ecosystems,
- 2) the increased incidence of certain endocrine-related human diseases,
- 3) endocrine disruption resulting from exposure to certain environmental chemicals observed in laboratory experimental animals.

In 2001, cosmetic products were openly mentioned as potential endocrine disruptors. The reason was that in a scientific publication some *in vitro* and *in vivo* estrogenic effects were linked to a number of UV filters actually present in sun products [Schlumpf et al. 2001].

In June 2001, the SCCNFP issued an opinion on the matter and concluded that the study under discussion showed a number of important technical shortcomings.

One of the major points highlighted was that the *in vitro* potency of the UV filters studied, was not only importantly lower (1 million units) than the one observed for the positive control (17 $\beta$ -estradiol), but also very low in comparison with exposure to known "estrogenic" substances in food (flavonoids) and hormonal therapy (birth control pill, morning after pill, post-menopausal therapy).

After a critical analysis of all the available information, the SCCNFP came to the conclusion that, at present, the organic UV filters used in cosmetic sunscreen products allowed on the EU market, showed no estrogenic effects that could potentially affect human health [SCCNFP/0483/01].

### 3-6.5 Animal-derived ingredients, incl. BSE-issues

Commission Directive 97/1/EC, following an opinion issued by the SCC (02/10/1996), was at the origin of entry n° 419 of Annex II, stipulating that "bovine, ovine and caprine tissues and fluids from the encephalon, the spinal cord and the eyes, and ingredients derived therefrom" must not form part of the composition of cosmetic products.

Multiple SCCNFP opinions have been at the origin of several Commission Directives amending entry n°419 in order to align the list of prohibited animal materials to the Commission Decisions regulating the use of material presenting risks as regards transmissible spongiform encephalopathies (TSEs), that update the list of tissues designated as Specified Risk Materials (SRMs) [SCCNFP/0521/01].

The most recent adaptation to entry n° 419 in Annex II of Dir. 76/768/EEC was issued in January 2003 [2003/1/EC] and resulted in :

"**419.** From the date referred to in Article 22(1) of Regulation (EC) n° 999/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L147, 31.5.2001, p.1), the specified risk materials as designated in Annex V to that Regulation and ingredients derived therefrom.

Until that date, the specified risk materials as designated in Annex XI Part A to Regulation (EC) No 999/2001, and ingredients derived therefrom.

However, tallow derivatives may be used provided that the following methods have been used and strictly certified by the producer :

- transesterification or hydrolysis at at least 200°C and at an appropriate corresponding pressure for 20 minutes (glycerol and fatty acids and fatty acid esters)
- saponification with NaOH 12M (glycerol and soap) :
  - batch process : at 95°C for 3 hours
  - or
  - continuous process : at 140°C, 2 bars (2000 hPa) for 8 minutes or equivalent conditions."

As indicated above, tallow derivatives of bovine origin are considered as an exception and are accepted as cosmetic ingredients provided they undergo a number of specific treatments. This exception was questioned by the SCCNFP in 2002 [SCCNFP/0612/02], but has been re-accepted in September 2003 [SCCNFP/0724/03]. At present, there is no evidence that TSE may be transmitted by topical exposure.

For several years, industry has been pleading in favour of a modification of entry n° 416 in Annex II of Dir. 76/768/EEC, which currently implies a prohibition of all "cells, tissues or products of human origin" in cosmetic products. The modification would imply an exception for amino acids obtained by hydrolysis of human hair, provided that the material has been subject to a hydrolysis with > 20% HCl for at least 6 hours at 100°C. In its opinion of 21 June 2005, the SCCP stated that the resulting risk of the use in cosmetic products for topical application of amino acids obtained from human hair under the prescribed conditions, is negligible [SCCP/0894/05].

Finally, taking into account EC Regulation 1774/02 laying down health rules concerning animal by-products not intended for human consumption, the SCCP is of the opinion that ingredients derived from category 1 (*inter alia* specific risk material) and category 2 (*inter alia* 'fallen stock') material raise concern in terms of biological risk for human health and therefore must not be present in cosmetic products. Since category 3 material is defined as being fit for human consumption, it may also be used as cosmetic ingredient [SCCP/0933/05].

### **3-6.6 CMR-ingredients**

Directive 2001/59/EC describes the criteria for classification of dangerous substances into categories 1, 2 or 3 for carcinogenicity, mutagenicity and reproduction (fertility and development) toxicity. To be classified into category 1 there must be sufficient evidence to establish a causal association between human exposure to a substance and the occurrence of the carcinogenic, mutagenic or reproduction toxic effect. Substances classified into category 2 should be regarded as if they are carcinogenic, mutagenic or reproduction toxic to man, while category 3 substances are defined as causing concern for man, but for which the available information is not adequate for making a satisfactory assessment [2001/59/EC].

As far as chemicals are concerned, Directive 94/60/EC clearly stipulates that substances appearing in Annex I to Council Directive 67/548/EEC and classified as carcinogens category 1 or 2, mutagens category 1 or 2, or toxic for reproduction category 1 or 2, may not be used in substances or preparations placed on the market **for use by the general public** in individual concentrations equal to or more than the concentration specified in Annex I to Directive 67/548/EEC, or the concentration specified in Annex I to Directive 1999/45/EC relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous preparations.

In its opinion of September 2001 [SCCNFP/0474/01], the SCCNFP proposed the prohibition of the intentional use in cosmetic products of substances classified according to Council Directive 67/548/EEC as CMR category 1 or 2 and substances with similar potentials (except substances only carcinogenic by inhalation). Substances classified according to Council Directive 67/548/EEC as CMR category 3 and substances with similar potentials should not intentionally be used in cosmetic products **unless** it can be demonstrated that their levels do not pose a threat to the health of the consumer. If a carcinogen, mutagen, or a substance toxic to reproduction is present in a cosmetic product from its presence in a natural ingredient, as an impurity, or because it is formed during the manufacture, it must be demonstrated that the product does not pose a threat to the health of the consumer.

The SCCNFP opinion on CMR substances was confirmed in 2004 and 2005 [SCCNFP/0825/04, SCCP/0888/05, SCCP/0913/05] and was translated into the cosmetics' legislation through the "7<sup>th</sup> Amendment" [2003/15/EC], Art. 4b and relevant adaptations to technical progress of Annex II to Dir. 76/768/EEC [2004/93/EC, 2005/42/EC, 2005/80/EC].

### **3-6.7 Nanoparticles**

In its plenary meeting of September 2005, the Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR) adopted an opinion on the appropriateness of existing methodologies to assess the potential risks associated with engineered and adventitious products of nanotechnologies [SCENIHR/002/05].

Currently, the specific issue of the safe use of nanoparticles in cosmetic products is under discussion by the SCCP. An opinion will follow.

### 3-7 GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR THE CALCULATION OF THE MARGIN OF SAFETY AND LIFETIME CANCER RISK FOR A COSMETIC INGREDIENT

#### 3-7.1 Introduction : definitions


- Dose :** The amount of test substance administered.  
Dose is expressed as weight (mg or g), as weight of test substance per unit weight of test animal (e.g. mg/kg body weight), as weight per unit of surface (e.g. mg/cm<sup>2</sup> of skin), or as constant dietary concentrations (ppm or mg/kg of food) [based on General Introduction: Part B, 96/54/EC].
- Dosage :** A general term comprising of dose, its frequency and duration. In the calculations of the Margin of Safety, dosage is expressed in mg/kg body weight/day [General Introduction: Part B, 96/54/EC].
- NO(A)EL :** The No Observed (Adverse) Effect Level is the outcome of long-term toxicity studies, such as 28-day, 90-day tests with rats, mice, rabbits or dogs, chronic toxicity tests, carcinogenicity tests, teratogenicity tests, reproduction toxicity tests, ... It is the highest dosage for which no (adverse) effects can be observed [General Introduction: Part B, 96/54/EC].  
In the calculation of the MoS, the lowest obtained NO(A)EL value is used, in order to consider the most sensitive species, as well as the relevant effect occurring at the lowest dosage possible.  
The NO(A)EL should be expressed as mg/kg body weight/day.
- SED :** The Systemic Exposure Dosage of a cosmetic ingredient is the amount expected to enter the blood stream (and therefore be systemically available) per kg body weight and per day. It is expressed in mg/kg body weight/day.  
For this definition a mean human body weight of 60 kg is commonly accepted.  
Since the majority of cosmetic products are applied topically, systemic availability will strongly depend on the dermal absorption of the compound. This can be determined according to the tests described under 3-4.4. Nevertheless, the results of these tests can be interpreted in two different ways (see 3-7.3 : dermal absorption issues).

#### 3-7.2 The Margin of Safety

In risk characterisation, the last phase in the safety evaluation of a cosmetic ingredient, an uncertainty factor applies. For cosmetics, this factor is called the MoS. It is generally accepted that the MoS of a substance can be calculated by dividing its lowest NO(A)EL value by its possible SED.

$$\text{MoS} = \frac{\text{NO(A)EL}}{\text{SED}}$$


This MoS value is used to extrapolate from a group of test animals to an average human being, and subsequently from average humans to sensitive subpopulations (see Fig.2).



**Fig.2 :** Schematic representation of the extrapolation from animal to man [Renwick, 1998].

**It is generally accepted that the MoS should at least be 100 to declare a substance safe for use.**

As shown in Fig.2 this value consists of a factor 10 for the extrapolation from animal to man and another factor 10 taking into account the interindividual variations within the human population. These factors can be further subdivided as indicated in Fig.3 :



**Fig.3 :** Further subdivision of the Margin of Safety, taking into account kinetics and dynamics [based on WHO, 1994].

Generally, the systemic availability of cosmetic ingredients is determined through dermal absorption assays, generating the amount per kg body weight that would daily become available in the human circulatory system. However, in the majority of MoS calculations, this dermal exposure figure is compared to an oral NO(A)EL value, which corresponds to the amount that has been administered orally, though not necessarily to the actual systemic availability of the compound after oral administration. The SCCP acknowledges the fact that in all conventional calculations of the MoS, the oral bioavailability of a substance is assumed to be 100% if oral absorption data are not available. Whenever available, these data should be included in the calculations [e.g. SCCP/0851/04].

A final remark with regard to MoS calculations is whether such calculations are scientifically relevant for cosmetic ingredients which are not used on a daily basis. Comparing a monthly usage level with a NO(A)EL value obtained after daily administration of the substance, is a clear overestimation of the risk. This discussion is not restricted to cosmetic products, but to the risk assessment procedure of all dangerous substances in the EU. Therefore, the SCCP will decide upon the relevance of MoS calculations on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the general toxicological profile of the substance under consideration, its toxicokinetic properties and its intended use.

### 3-7.3 Dermal absorption issues in the calculation of the SED

Calculations of the SED should preferably be based on the absolute amount bioavailable ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ ) after a certain time period, based on the highest anticipated concentration.

Calculations of the SED may also be based on the percentage dermally absorbed. In the latter case the resulting numbers depend on the dose applied on the skin. In this case, the concentrations tested should include the lowest concentration anticipated.

According to OECD Guideline 428 (Skin absorption: *in vitro* method), an application that mimics human exposure, normally 1-5  $\text{mg}/\text{cm}^2$  for a solid and up to 10  $\mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  for liquids, should be used in *in vitro* tests.

Exceptions may exist, e.g. oxidative hair dyes, where 20  $\text{mg}/\text{cm}^2$  usually are applied for 30-45 minutes (depending on the intended use).

Experience has shown that *in vitro* measurements using less than 2  $\text{mg}/\text{cm}^2$  are not technically feasible while the amounts of cosmetic products applied to skin usually do not exceed 1  $\text{mg}/\text{cm}^2$  under in use conditions. Thus the *in vitro* tests are performed with applied amounts exceeding the intended use conditions and if the resulting dermal absorption % of the test dose is used to calculate SED, they may result in an underestimation of systemic exposure.

Hence, when dermal absorption is expressed as a percentage, the absorbed amount resulting from *in vitro* tests has to be expressed as a percentage of the dose applied in real in use conditions, that can be estimated by the ratio of the default amount of formulation applied in real conditions and the respective default value of skin surface area (SSA) per product type, found in tables (see section 6-2).

From the previous, it can be concluded that there are two ways of calculating the SED, depending on the way the dermal absorption of a compound is reported :

#### 1) Dermal absorption of test substance reported in $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ :

For calculating the SED, the skin surface envisaged to be treated with the finished cosmetic product containing the ingredient under study, has to be taken into account, as well as its frequency of application and its retention factor. All other variables should have been taken into consideration in the proper design of the dermal absorption study itself [SCCP/0970/06].

$$\text{SED} = \frac{\text{DA}_a (\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2) \times 10^{-3} \text{mg}/\mu\text{g} \times \text{SSA} (\text{cm}^2) \times \text{F} (\text{day}^{-1}) \times \text{R}}{60 \text{ kg}}$$

With :

SED (mg/kg bw/day) =	Systemic Exposure Dosage
DA <sub>a</sub> ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ ) =	Dermal Absorption reported as amount/ $\text{cm}^2$
SSA ( $\text{cm}^2$ ) =	Skin Surface Area expected to be treated with the finished cosmetic product (see section 6-2 for SSA values per product type)
F ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ ) =	Frequency of application of the finished product
R =	Retention factor (see Table 2 in Section 6-2 for retention factors per product type)
60 kg =	default human body weight



2) *Dermal absorption reported as a percentage of the amount of substance applied :*

It is clear that the percentage of dermal absorption will only be of value when calculated from *in vitro* studies with doses mimicking, but not exceeding the intended use conditions. Higher dose studies may result in an underestimation of the penetration.

The calculation of the SED will be as follows :

$$\text{SED} = \frac{\mathbf{A} \text{ (g/day)} \times 1000\text{mg/g} \times \mathbf{C} \text{ (\%)/100} \times \mathbf{DA_p} \text{ (\%)/100}}{60 \text{ kg}}$$

With : SED (mg/kg bw/day) = Systemic Exposure Dosage  
A (g/day) = Amount of the cosmetic product applied daily : see the daily exposure values for different cosmetic product types (see 6-2)  
C (%) = the Concentration of the ingredient under study in the finished cosmetic product on the application site  
DA<sub>p</sub> (%) = Dermal Absorption expressed as a percentage of the test dose assumed to be applied in real-life conditions  
60 kg = default human body weight

If the application mode is such that the number of applications differs from that mentioned in 6-2 for the intended product type, the SED will have to be adapted accordingly.

Finally, when considering dermal absorption, it is important to know whether the formulation can affect the bioavailability of one of its compounds. There are many penetration enhancers and excipients (such as liposomes) that are specifically added to a cosmetic formulation in order to facilitate dermal absorption of other compounds. It is clear that in such formulations, in the absence of further specific studies, 100% bioavailability of a particular ingredient will have to be assumed. This conservative value may also be used in cases where no or inadequate absorption data are available.

### 3-7.4 MoS for children

In its Plenary Meeting of February 2002, the SCCNFP issued an opinion on the calculation of the MoS for children. The question raised was whether it would be advisable to adjust the threshold factor of 100 for children by multiplying this factor by the difference in Skin Surface Area over Body Weight ratio (SSA/BW) between adults and children [SCCNFP/0557/02].

The difference between the SSA/BW ratio for children from 0 to 10 years is as follows :  
2.3 fold at birth,  
1.8 fold at 6 months,  
1.6 fold at 12 months,  
1.5 fold at 5 years,  
1.3 fold at 10 years [Renwick 1998].

This implies that the mean average discrepancy between the SSA/BW children of 0 to 1 year of age and that of adults is only 1.9, whereas a higher factor of 3.2 is generally foreseen by the WHO for the variability in human kinetics (See 3-7.2).

It can thus be stated that the interindividual variation is already taken into account by the generally accepted threshold value of 100 for intact skin.

Therefore, and further based on the outcome of a symposium on toxicokinetics in children summarised by Renwick [1998], the SCCNFP concluded that, in general, there is no need for an additional uncertainty factor for children when **intact skin** is involved [SCCNFP/0557/02].

### 3-7.5 The Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC)

The TTC is a proposal that is based on the principle of establishing a human exposure threshold value for all chemicals, below which there is a very low probability of an appreciable risk to human health. It was developed in the field of food and food additives in order to limit further toxicological testing for chemicals that are only present at very low levels. The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) accepts a dietary concentration of 1.5 µg/kg/day as sufficiently negligible as to not present a public health concern. This value was mathematically derived from chronic toxicity data for 500 carcinogens tested in 3500 experiments, taking into account a maximum acceptable risk of developing cancer when life span-exposed of 10<sup>-6</sup>.

In recent publications, the proposed TTC values are not solely based upon carcinogenic potential, but also upon metabolism and accumulation, structural alerts, endocrine disrupting properties, together with specific endpoints such as neurotoxicity, teratogenicity, developmental toxicity, allergenicity and immunotoxicity. A complex decision tree is put forward [Kroes et al. 2000, Kroes et al. 2004].

The SCCP is closely following up discussions on the concept of the TTC.

### 3-7.6 Lifetime cancer risk

In the case of non-threshold carcinogens it is assumed that there is no level of exposure that does not pose a small, but finite, probability of inducing cancer. Three methods for quantitative risk characterisation have been used or proposed by regulatory authorities in Europe and USA. The "Linearised Multistage Model" has been extensively used by the US EPA [1986]. The "LED<sub>10</sub> method" has been proposed by the US EPA [1996b] and the "T<sub>25</sub> method" has been used in Europe [Sanner et al., 2001]. The results obtained with these extrapolation methods are in most cases very similar.

Determination of the lifetime cancer risk is carried out in several distinct steps. After determination of an animal dose descriptor from the experimental data, the former is converted to a human dose descriptor. Subsequently, the lifetime cancer risk is determined by linear extrapolation to the actual exposure dose. Finally, a commentary statement is generated stating whether an overall evaluation of all data available indicates that the actual risk may be higher or lower than the calculated risk. The procedure is described in detail by Sanner et al. [2001].

The dose-descriptor T<sub>25</sub> is defined as the chronic dose rate that will give 25% of the animal's tumours at a specific tissue site after correction for spontaneous incidence, within the standard life time of that species. The determination of T<sub>25</sub> is described in details in EC 1999 and Dybing et al. [1997].

The animal dose descriptor (T<sub>25</sub>) is converted to the human dose descriptor (HT<sub>25</sub>) based on comparative metabolic rates, by using the following formula [Sanner et al. 2001] :

$$HT_{25} = \frac{T_{25}}{(\text{body weight}_{\text{human}}/\text{body weight}_{\text{animal}})^{0.25}}$$

Based on the daily lifetime dose, the lifetime cancer risk is calculated by linear extrapolation by use of the following formula:

$$\text{Lifetime cancer risk} = \frac{SED}{HT_{25} / 0.25}$$

SED represents the lifetime daily dose expressed in mg/kg bw/day.

## Elements that affect risk estimates

Elements with a robust basis that can be expressed numerically should be incorporated in the lifetime cancer risks calculated above. Elements that cannot be expressed numerically should form the basis of a commentary statement.

*Epidemiology* : available epidemiological data, not sufficient for quantitative risk characterisation, nevertheless may be used for comparison with the risks derived from animal data.

*Site/species/strain/gender activity* : if the carcinogen is effective in multiple tissue sites and across species and genders, this may indicate that the risk may be higher than based on the calculation for one specific tumour type. If, on the other hand, the carcinogen is only active in a single specific tissue site in a single gender of a single species this may indicate that the risk may be lower than calculated.

*Dose-response relationships* : if the available data for the chosen tumor strongly suggest that linear extrapolation from the dose-descriptor value to some (very) low dose is not accurate and in fact indicate that the calculated risks are clearly under- or overestimating actual risks (i.e. the data indicate a supralinear or sublinear dose-response relationship for this part of the response curve, respectively), some qualitative or quantitative judgment can be made.

*Chemical class* : if the substance under consideration belongs to a chemical group with many carcinogens with  $T_{25}$ s clearly lower or higher than those of the carcinogen in question, and the confidence in the available data is low, the risk for this specific class member may be higher/lower than calculated.

*Toxicokinetics* : data on the relative bioavailability or target-dose of the carcinogen or its active metabolite in humans as compared to that in animals could indicate that the risk may be higher or lower than calculated from the animal data. A similar reasoning can be followed for toxicodynamic differences between humans and animals.

*Additional elements relevant to risk evaluation* : in cases that only one animal data-set is available for determination of the dose-descriptor or only data-sets from one animal species are available, there is greater uncertainty in the results than when data-sets for two species are available. Such cases could indicate that the risk might be higher than calculated from the animal data.

In cases where two or more data-sets are available for determination of the dose-descriptor and the other data-sets give significantly larger values for this parameter, this could indicate that the risk may be lower than calculated from the animal data.

In 2005, the European Food Safety Authority requested its Scientific Committee to issue an opinion on a harmonized approach to for the risk assessment of substances with both genotoxic and carcinogenic properties. In this report, not only the  $T_{25}$  method is described, but also the so-called "TD<sub>50</sub>" and "Benchmark Dose" approaches:

- The TD<sub>50</sub> is defined as the chronic dose rate (in mg/kg bw per day) which, for a given target site(s), would cause tumours in half of the animals within some standard experimental time – the "standard lifespan" for the species. A TD<sub>50</sub> can be calculated either for a particular category of neoplastic lesion (e.g. malignant tumours only, liver tumours only) or for all tumours.
- The Benchmark Dose (BMD) is proposed as an alternative for the classical NOAEL and LOAEL values. The BMD is based on a mathematical model being fitted to the experimental data within the observable range and estimates the dose that causes a low but measurable response (the benchmark response BMR) typically chosen at a 5 or 10% incidence above the control. The BMD lower limit (BMDL) refers to the corresponding lower limits of a one-sided 95% confidence interval on the BMD.

Viewing the fact that the BMD is typically accomplished through dose-response modelling considering all available information on the dose response curve whereas the T<sub>25</sub> calculation is based upon one data point on the dose-response curve, the EFSA Scientific Committee expressed its preference for the BMD approach. However, in case the available data are found to be inadequate for the estimation of a benchmark dose lower confidence limit, it was advised to use the T<sub>25</sub>, representing the (corrected) dose corresponding to a 25% tumour incidence, is advised to being used [EFSA 2005].

Basically, the EFSA approach results into a margin of exposure (MoE), in analogy with the margin of safety (MoS) and is not quantifying human risk.

To date, the SCC(NF)P has mainly used the T<sub>25</sub> approach in order to determine the lifetime cancer risk of cosmetic ingredients.

### **3-8 THE SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT OF HAIR DYES AND HAIR DYE COMPONENTS**

#### **3-8.1 Hazard and risk assessment of hair dyes in general**

With regard to the assessment of hair dyes in general, different approaches are supported for either (i) temporary, (ii) semi-permanent or (iii) permanent hair dyes. It is the opinion of the SCCP that priority should be given to the evaluation and regulation of oxidative (permanent) hair dyes [SCCNFP/0959/05]. Since these hair dyes typically consist of a two component system, intended to result in a chemical reaction, the safety assessment should take into account that the consumer will potentially be exposed to precursor(s), coupler(s), intermediate(s) and end products [SCCNFP/0566/02, SCCNFP/0808/04, SCCP/0941/05, SCCP/1004/06]. Finally, the SCCP experts point out that the aspect of allergenicity of the different compounds has not been addressed yet [SCCP/0941/05, SCCP/1004/06].

The major concern in the safety assessment of hair dye formulations, however, is the putative link between their use and the development of cancer. Several SCC(NF)P opinions have led to the conclusion that the potential risk of developing cancer due to the use of certain hair dyes gives rise to concern [SCCNFP/0484/01, SCCNFP/0797/04, SCCP/0930/05] and that the assessment should focus on leukaemia and bladder cancer, since no evidence was found linking personal use of hair dyes to a cancer risk at other sites [SCCP/0930/05].

It is acknowledged that the calculation of a MoS for hair dyes is scientifically debatable, since the dyes are not intended to be applied on a daily basis. Therefore, the calculation of a daily systemic exposure dosage can be considered as redundant. Nevertheless, in some individual opinions on the safety evaluation of specific hair dyes, the calculations have been performed as if the hair dye (1) would be used on a daily basis and (2) without using a retention factor of 0.1, thus representing an absolute worst case scenario [e.g. SCCNFP/0231/99 and SCCNFP/0232/99]. In case the dermal absorption value was expressed as amount/cm<sup>2</sup>, a default surface of the scalp of 700 cm<sup>2</sup> has been used in order to maintain consistency among the opinions [e.g. SCCNFP/0657/03 and SCCNFP/0669/03]. In dermal absorption studies with hair dye formulations and ingredients, usually an amount of 20 mg/cm<sup>2</sup> is applied for 30-45 minutes (depending on the intended use).

### 3-8.2 Step-wise regulation of hair dyes

In April 2003 the Commission together with the Member States agreed on a step-wise strategy<sup>1</sup> to regulate all hair dyes listed as ingredients in cosmetic products. The main element of the strategy was a tiered, modulating approach, requiring industry to submit by certain deadlines safety dossiers for hair dye components and possible mixtures. This strategy was supported by the SCCNFP through its "Opinion on hair dyes without file submitted", in which the experts clearly expressed the demand for a safety dossier for all hair dyes, irrespective whether they have been taken up in one of the annexes of Dir. 76/768/EEC [SCCNFP/0807/04]. As stated before, however, the SCCP proposes to differentiate between temporary, semi-permanent and permanent hair dyes [SCCP/0959/05].

In a press release of 20 July 2006, the Commission communicates its decision to ban 22 hair dye substances for which industry had not submitted any file at all. The document confirms that the Commission's strategy to ensure the safety of hair dye products foresees to ban all permanent and non-permanent hair dyes for which industry has not submitted any safety files and those for which the SCCP has given a negative opinion [IP/06/1047]. The 22 hair dye substances are taken up in Annex II to Dir. 76/768/EEC [2006/65/EC].

### 3-8.3 Mutagenicity / genotoxicity testing of hair dyes

Viewing the putative link between the use of hair dyes and cancer development, the mutagenic / genotoxic potential of the different hair dye components has received a great deal of attention [SCCNFP/0720/03, SCCNFP/0808/04, SCCP/0941/05].

The testing strategy for testing hair dye cosmetic ingredients for their potential genotoxicity / mutagenicity was firstly issued in 2002 [SCCNFP/0566/02] and has been updated twice [SCCNFP/0720/03, SCCP/0971/06]. SCCP/0971/06 provides a stepwise *in vitro* strategy for hazard identification with regard to the mutagenic / genotoxic potential of hair dyes, so that sufficient *in vitro* data may be obtained.

More specifically, the recommended base set of *in vitro* mutagenicity/genotoxicity assays for oxidative hair dye substances, consists of 3 tests (1 + 2 and 3a or 3b) :

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. a bacterial reverse mutation test :                                 | EC B.13/14, OECD 471 |
| 2. an <i>in vitro</i> mammalian cell gene mutation test <sup>2</sup> : | EC B.17, OECD 476    |
| 3a. an <i>in vitro</i> micronucleus test :                             | OECD 487 (draft)     |
| 3b. an <i>in vitro</i> mammalian chromosome aberration test            | EC B.10, OECD 473    |

The following tests are considered to provide additional useful information / confirmation, but are not considered forming part of the basic requirements :

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| an UDS in mammalian cells <i>in vitro</i> :        | EC B.18, OECD 482 |
| an <i>in vitro</i> SHE cell transformation assay : | OECD 495          |

Should the *in vitro* testing battery show positive results and/or should QSAR results, physicochemical data or any other indication suggest potential mutagenicity or genotoxicity, additional testing may be required.

---

<sup>1</sup> Available through [http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/cosmetics/html/cosm\\_ongoing\\_init.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/cosmetics/html/cosm_ongoing_init.htm).

<sup>2</sup> Preferentially, the mouse lymphoma thymidine kinase assay, because it detects gene mutations and chromosomal effects.

The choice of the additional *in vitro* / *in vivo* tests will be performed on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the following considerations :

- 1) Sound *in vitro* dermal absorption studies generate indispensable data on the potential systemic availability of starting material and reaction products.
- 2) Metabolic activation should be considered in the decision making process.
- 3) Although not considered as first choice, it could be necessary to perform *in vivo* mutagenicity/genotoxicity assays in which the oxidative hair dye mixture is applied on the skin of experimental animals (e.g. nude mice) followed by a micronucleus test and/or a COMET assay on the skin. Further development, standardization and validation of these methods are needed, but their use is encouraged.

Finally, a specific additional requirement for hair dyes recommended to DG Enterprise is the disposition of hair dye reference samples. It was proposed at the 7<sup>th</sup> Plenary Meeting of the SCCNFP of 17 February 1999 that industry should enclose a sample with each new submission to the Committee. Previously, in its meeting of 24 November 1998, the Working Party on Hair Dyes expressed the opinion that collection of samples was needed. Also, it was requested that stability information should be supplied.

### 3-9 REFERENCES

**15921/05** - Presidency Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency and amending Directive 1999/45/EC.  
Doc. 15921/05 COMPET 289 ENV 606 CHIMIE 74 CODEC 1198, available through <http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/chemicals/reach.htm> (consulted April 2006).

**67/548/EEC** - Council Directive 67/548/EEC of 27 June 1967 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.  
*Official Journal* 196, 16/08/1967 p.1.

**76/768/EEC** - Council Directive 76/768/EEC of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal* L 262, 27/09/1976 p.169.

**84/449/EEC** - Commission Directive 84/449/EEC of 25 April 1984 adapting to technical progress for the sixth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.  
*Official Journal* L 251, 19/09/1984 p.1.

**86/609/EEC** - Council Directive 86/609/EEC of 24 November 1986 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States regarding the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes.  
*Official Journal* L 358, 18/12/1986 p.1.

**87/18/EEC** - Council Directive 87/18/EEC of 18 December 1986 on the harmonization of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the application of the principles of good laboratory practice and the verification of their applications for tests on chemical substances.  
*Official Journal* L 15, 17/01/1987 p.29.

**88/302/EEC** - Commission Directive 88/302/EEC of 18 November 1987 adapting to technical progress for the ninth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.  
*Official Journal* L 133, 30/05/1988 p.1.

**89/48/EEC** - Council Directive 89/48/EEC of 21 December 1988 on a general system for the recognition of higher-education diplomas awarded on completion of professional education and training of at least three years' duration.  
*Official Journal* L 19, 24/01/1989 p.16.

**92/32/EEC** - Council Directive 92/32/EEC of 30 April 1992 amending for the seventh time Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.  
*Official Journal L 154, 05/06/1992 p.1.*

**92/69/EEC** - Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.  
*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.113.*

**93/35/EEC** - Council Directive 93/35/EEC of 14 June 1993 amending for the sixth time Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 151, 23/06/1993 p.32.*

**93/67/EEC** - Commission Directive 93/67/EEC of 20 July 1993 laying down the principles for assessment of risks to man and the environment of substances notified in accordance with Council Directive 67/548/EEC.  
*Official Journal L 227, 08/09/1993 p.9.*

**94/60/EC** - European Parliament and Council Directive 94/60/EC of 20 December 1994 amending for the 14<sup>th</sup> time Directive 76/769/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations.  
*Official Journal L 365, 31/12/1994 p.1.*

**96/54/EC** - Commission Directive 96/54/EC of 30 July 1996 adapting to technical progress for the twenty-second time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.  
*Official Journal L 248, 30/09/1996 p.1.*

**97/1/EC** - 20th Commission Directive 97/1/EC of 10 January 1997 adapting to technical progress Annexes II, III, VI and VII of Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 16, 18/01/1997 p.85.*

**97/56/EC** - Directive 97/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 1997 amending for the 16<sup>th</sup> time Directive 76/769/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations.  
*Official Journal L 333, 04/12/1997 p.1.*

**98/8/EC** - Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 1998 concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market.  
*Official Journal L123, 24/04/1998 p.1.*

**1999/43/EC** - Directive 1999/43/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 amending for the 17<sup>th</sup> time Directive 76/769/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations.  
*Official Journal L 166, 01/07/1999 p.87.*

**1999/45/EC** - Directive 1999/45/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 1999 concerning the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous preparations.  
*Official Journal L 200, 30/07/1999 p.1.*

**2000/32/EC** - Commission Directive 2000/32/EC of 19 May 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 26th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.  
*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.1.*

**2000/33/EC** - Commission Directive 2000/33/EC of 25 April 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 27th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.  
*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.90.*

**2001/59/EC** - Commission Directive 2001/59/EC of 6 August 2001 adapting to technical progress for the 28th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 225, 21/08/2001 p.1.*

**2002/34/EC** - Twenty-sixth Commission Directive 2002/34/EC of 15 April 2002 adapting to technical progress Annexes II, III and VII to Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L 102, 18/04/2002 p.19.*

**2003/1/EC** - Commission Directive 2003/1/EC of 6 January 2003 adapting to technical progress Annex II to Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L 5, 10/01/2003 p.14.*

**2003/15/EC** - Directive 2003/15/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 February 2003 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L66, 11/03/2003 p.26.*

**2004/73/EC** - Commission Directive 2004/73/EC of 29 April 2004 adapting to technical progress for the 29th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 152, 30/04/2004 p.1 & Corrigendum : O.J. L 216, 16/06/2004 p.3.*

**2004/93/EC** - Commission Directive 2004/93/EC of 21 September 2004 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC for the purpose of adapting its Annexes II and III to technical progress

*Official Journal L 300, 25/09/2004 p.13.*

**2005/42/EC** - Commission Directive 2005/42/EC of 20 June 2005 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purposes of adapting Annexes II, IV and VI thereto to technical progress

*Official Journal L 158, 21/06/2005 p.17.*

**2005/52/EC** - Commission Directive 2005/52/EC of 9 September 2005 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purposes of adapting Annex III thereto to technical progress

*Official Journal L 234, 10/09/2005 p.9.*

**2005/80/EC** - Commission Directive 2005/80/EC of 21 November 2005 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purposes of adapting Annexes II and III thereto to technical progress

*Official Journal L 303, 22/11/2005 p.32.*

**2006/65/EC** - Commission Directive 2006/65/EC of 19 July 2006 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purpose of adapting Annexes II and III thereto to technical progress

*Official Journal L 198, 20/07/2006 p.11.*

**Averbeck D.**, Moustacchi E.

Genetic effect of 3-Carboxypsoralen angelicin, psoralen and 8-methoxypsoralen plus 365 nm irradiation in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* : induction of reversions, mitotic crossing-over, gene conversions and cytoplasmic "petite" mutations.

*Mutation Research 68, 133-148 (1979).*

**Beck B.D.**, Rudel R. and Calabrese E.J.

The use of toxicology in the regulatory process.

In: Principles and Methods of Toxicology 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition (A.W. Hayes, Ed.) Raven Press Ltd, New York, 19-58 (1994).

**BfR** (Bundesinstitut für Risikobewertung)

Strategies For Genotoxicity Testing Of Substances, November 2002.

**Blauboer B.J.**, Boobis A.R., Castell J.V., Coecke S., Groothuis G.M.M., Guillouzo A., Hall T.J., Hawksworth G.M, Lorenzon G., Miltenburger H.G., Rogiers V., Skett P., Villa P., Wiebel F.J.

The practical Applicability of Hepatocyte Cultures in Routine Testing.

ECVAM Workshop Report n.1. Alternatives To Laboratory Animals 22, 231-241 (1994).



**Brendler-Schwaab S.**, Czich A., Epe B., Gocke E., Kaina B., Müller L., Pollet D., Utesch D.  
Photochemical genotoxicity: principles and test methods - Report of a GUM task force.  
Mutation Research 566(1), 65-91 (2004).

**Chetelat A.**, Albertini S., Dresch I.H., Strobel R., Gocke E.  
Photomutagenesis test development. Part I. 8-Methoxypsoralen, chlorpromazine and sunscreen compounds in bacterial and yeast assays.  
Mutation Research 292, 241-250 (1993a).

**Chetelat A.**, Dresch J.H., Gocke E.  
Photomutagenesis test development. Part II. 8-Methoxypsoralen, chlorpromazine and sunscreen compounds in chromosomal aberration assays using CHO cells.  
Mutation Research 292, 251-258 (1993b).

**Chetelat A.**, Albertini S., Gocke E.  
The Photomutagenicity of fluoroquinolones in tests for gene mutation, chromosomal aberration, gene conversion and DNA breakage (Comet assay).  
Mutagenesis 11(5), 497-504 (1996).

**Coecke S.**, Rogiers V., Bayliss M., Castell J., Doehmer J., Fabre G., Fry J., Kern A., Westmoreland C.  
The Use of Long-term Hepatocyte Cultures for Detecting Induction of Drug Metabolising Enzymes: The Current Status ECVAM Hepatocytes and Metabolically Competent Systems Task Force Report 1.  
Alternatives To Laboratory Animals 27, 579-638 (1999).

**COM** (UK Committee on Mutagenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment)  
Guidance on a strategy for Testing of Chemicals for mutagenicity. December 2000.

**COM(97) 183 Final** – Commission Communication on Consumer health and safety of 30 April 1997, available on the Internet through <http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/sc/comec1en.pdf> [Aug 2003].

**CSTEE** (Scientific Committee on Toxicity, Ecotoxicity and the Environment)  
Opinion of the Scientific Committee on Toxicity, Ecotoxicity and the Environment (CSTEE) on the BUAV-ECEAE report on "The way forward - action to end animal toxicity testing"  
Doc. C7/VR/csteeop/anat/08014 D(04), European Commission (2004).

**Damstra T.**, Barlow S., Bergman A., Kavlock R., Van Der Kraak G.  
Global assessment of the state-of-the-science of endocrine disruptors.  
IPCS (International Programme on Chemical Safety) Publication WHO/PCS/EDC/02.2 (2002).

**Dayan A.D.** Risk assessment and risk communication.  
In: Excipient toxicity and safety (H.L. Weiner and L.A. Kotkoskie, Eds.) Marcel Dekker Inc, New York, Basel, 1999, 305-320.

**Dean S.W.**, Lane M., Dunmore R.H., Ruddock S.P., Martin C.N., Kirkland D.J., Loprieno N.  
Development of assays for the detection of photogenotoxicity of chemicals during exposure to UV light. Part 1. Assay development.  
Mutagenesis 6, 335-341 (1991).

**Dearfield K.L.**, Cimino M.C., McCarroll N.E., Mauer I., Valcovic L.R.  
Genotoxicity risk assessment : a proposed classification strategy.  
Mutation Research 521, 121-135 (2002).

**Dybing E.**, Sanner T., Roelfzema H., Kroese D. and Tennant R.W.  
T25: A simplified carcinogenic potency index: Description of the system and study of correlations between carcinogenic potency and species/site specificity and mutagenicity.  
Pharmacology and Toxicology 80, 272 – 279 (1997).

**EC** - Guidelines for setting specific concentration limits for carcinogens in Annex I of directive 67/548/EEC. Inclusion of potency considerations.  
Commission working group on the classification and labelling of dangerous substances.  
Brussel (1999).  
[Available through <http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/dansub/potency.pdf> (09/2003)]

**EC A.1** - Melting / freezing temperature

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.5*

**EC A.2** - Boiling temperature

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.15*

**EC A.3** - Relative density

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.21*

**EC A.4** - Vapour pressure

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.26*

**EC A.6** - Water solubility

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.54*

**EC A.8** - Partition coefficient

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.63*

**EC A.9** - Flash-point

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.74*

**EC A.15** - Auto-ignition temperature (liquids and gases)

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.98*

**EC B.1** - Acute toxicity (oral)

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.110.*

**EC B.1 bis** - Acute toxicity (oral) - Fixed Dose Method

Commission Directive 2004/73/EC of 29 April 2004 adapting to technical progress for the 29th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 152, 30/04/2004 & Corrigendum : O.J. L 216, 16/06/2004 p.177.*

**EC B.1 tris** - Acute toxicity (oral) - Acute toxic class method

Commission Directive 2004/73/EC of 29 April 2004 adapting to technical progress for the 29th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 152, 30/04/2004 & Corrigendum : O.J. L 216, 16/06/2004 p.190.*

**EC B.4** - Acute toxicity (skin irritation)

Commission Directive 2004/73/EC of 29 April 2004 adapting to technical progress for the 29th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 152, 30/04/2004 & Corrigendum : O.J. L 216, 16/06/2004 p.206.*

**EC B.5** - Acute toxicity (eye irritation)

Commission Directive 2004/73/EC of 29 April 2004 adapting to technical progress for the 29th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 152, 30/04/2004 & Corrigendum : O.J. L 216, 16/06/2004 p.216.*

**EC B.6** - Skin sensitisation

Commission Directive 96/54/EC of 30 July 1996 adapting to technical progress for the twenty-second time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 248, 30/09/1996 p.1, Annex IVC.*

**EC B.7** - Repeated dose (28 days) toxicity (oral)

Commission Directive 96/54/EC of 30 July 1996 adapting to technical progress for the twenty-second time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 248, 30/09/1996 p.1, Annex IVD.*

**EC B.8** - Repeated dose (28 days) toxicity (inhalation)

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.140.*

**EC B.9** - Repeated dose (28 days) toxicity (dermal)

Commission Directive 92/69/EEC of 31 July 1992 adapting to technical progress for the seventeenth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 383A, 29/12/1992 p.144.*

**EC B.10** - Mutagenicity - *in vitro* mammalian chromosome aberration test

Commission Directive 2000/32/EC of 19 May 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 26th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.35.*

**EC B.13/14** - Mutagenicity - reverse mutation test bacteria

Commission Directive 2000/32/EC of 19 May 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 26th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.57.*

**EC B.17** - Mutagenicity - *in vitro* mammalian cell gene mutation test  
Commission Directive 2000/32/EC of 19 May 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 26th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.65.*

**EC B.18** - DNA damage and repair - unscheduled DNA synthesis - mammalian cells *in vitro*  
Commission Directive 88/302/EEC of 18 November 1987 adapting to technical progress for the ninth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 133, 30/05/1988 p.64.*

**EC B.26** - Sub-chronic oral toxicity test: repeated dose 90-day oral toxicity study in rodents  
Commission Directive 2001/59/EC of 6 August 2001 adapting to technical progress for the 28th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 225, 21/08/2001 p.150.*

**EC B.27** - Sub-chronic oral toxicity test: repeated dose 90-day oral toxicity study in non-rodents  
Commission Directive 2001/59/EC of 6 August 2001 adapting to technical progress for the 28th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 225, 21/08/2001 p.157.*

**EC B.28** - Sub-chronic inhalation toxicity study: 90-day repeated dermal dose study using rodent species

Commission Directive 88/302/EEC of 18 November 1987 adapting to technical progress for the ninth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 133, 30/05/1988 p.1.*

**EC B.29** - Sub-chronic inhalation toxicity study: 90-day repeated inhalation dose study using rodent species

Commission Directive 88/302/EEC of 18 November 1987 adapting to technical progress for the ninth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 133, 30/05/1988 p.8.*

**EC B.30** - Chronic toxicity test

Commission Directive 88/302/EEC of 18 November 1987 adapting to technical progress for the ninth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 133, 30/05/1988 p.27.*

**EC B.31** - Teratogenicity study - rodent and non-rodent

Commission Directive 2004/73/EC of 29 April 2004 adapting to technical progress for the 29th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 152, 30/04/2004 & Corrigendum : O.J. L 216, 16/06/2004 p.227.*

**EC B.33** - Combined chronic toxicity/carcinogenicity test

Commission Directive 88/302/EEC of 18 November 1987 adapting to technical progress for the ninth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 133, 30/05/1988 p.37.*

**EC B.35** - Two-generation reproduction toxicity test

Commission Directive 2004/73/EC of 29 April 2004 adapting to technical progress for the 29th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 152, 30/04/2004 & Corrigendum : O.J. L 216, 16/06/2004 p.236.*

**EC B.36** – Toxicokinetics

Commission Directive 88/302/EEC of 18 November 1987 adapting to technical progress for the ninth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 133, 30/05/1988 p.51.*

**EC B.40** - Skin corrosion (rat skin transcutaneous electrical resistance assay and human skin model assay)

Commission Directive 2000/33/EC of 25 April 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 27th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.91.*

**EC B.41** - Phototoxicity - *in vitro* 3T3 NRU phototoxicity test

Commission Directive 2000/33/EC of 25 April 2000 adapting to technical progress for the 27th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 136, 08/06/2000 p.98.*

**EC B.42** - Skin sensitisation : Local Lymph Node Assay

Commission Directive 2004/73/EC of 29 April 2004 adapting to technical progress for the 29th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 152, 30/04/2004 & Corrigendum : O.J. L 216, 16/06/2004 p.247.*

**ECB** (European Chemicals Bureau)

Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment in support of Commission Directive 93/67/EEC on Risk Assessment for new notified substances, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 on Risk Assessment for existing substances and Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market. Doc. EUR 20418 EN/1, European Communities (2003).

**ECETOC**

Percutaneous absorption. European Centre for Ecotoxicology and Toxicology of Chemicals (ECETOC), Monograph No 20, Brussels (1993).

**EFSA** (European Food Safety Authority)

Opinion of the Scientific Committee on a request from EFSA related to A Harmonised Approach for Risk Assessment of Substances Which are both Genotoxic and Carcinogenic  
The EFSA Journal 282, 1-31 (2005).

**Emea** (The European Agency for the Evaluation of Medicinal Products, Evaluation of Medicines for Human Use)

Note for Guidance on Photosafety Testing.  
(ECETOC), Monograph No 20, Brussels (1993).

**ESAC** Statement on the application of the Corrositex™ assay for skin corrosivity testing.

*Adopted by the ECVAM Scientific Advisory Committee (ESAC) at its 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting of 5-6 December 2000 at ECVAM, Ispra, Italy (2000).*

**ESAC** Statement on the scientific validity of the Embryonic Stem Cell Test (EST), the Micromass Test and the Postimplantation Rat Whole-Embryo Culture Assay - *in vitro* tests for embryotoxicity.

*Adopted by the ECVAM Scientific Advisory Committee (ESAC) at its 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting of 16-17 October 2001 at ECVAM, Ispra, Italy (2001).*

**Eskes C.** and Zuang V.

Alternative (Non-Animal) Methods for Cosmetics Testing: Current Status and Future Prospects, A Report Prepared in the Context of the 7th Amendment to the Cosmetics Directive for Establishing the Timetable for Phasing Out Animal Testing.  
ATLA 33, Supplement 1 (2005).

**European Commission**, DG Health and Consumer Protection.

First Report on the Harmonisation of Risk Assessment Procedures, Part 1 . The Report of the Scientific Steering Committee's Working Group on Harmonisation of Risk Assessment Procedures in the Scientific Committees advising the European Commission in the area of human and environmental health (2000), *published on the Internet 20.12.2000*.

**FDA** (Food and Drug Administration)

Toxicological Principles for the Safety of Food Ingredients.  
Red Book 2000, July 7<sup>th</sup> 2000.

**Gago-Dominguez M.**, Castelao J.E., Yuan J.M., Yu M.C., Ross R.K.

Use of permanent hair dyes and bladder-cancer risk.  
International Journal on Cancer 91(4), 575-579 (2001).

**Gilleron L.**, Coecke S., Sysmans E., Hansen E., Van Oproy S., Marzin D., Van Cauteren H and Vanparys P.

Evaluation of a modified HET-CAM assay as a screening test for eye irritancy.  
Toxicology *In Vitro*, 11, 641-644 (1997).

**Gocke E.**, Albertini S., Chetelat A., Kirchner S., Muster W.

The photomutagenicity of fluoroquinolones and other dyes.  
Toxicology Letters 102/103, 375-381 (1998).

**Gocke E.**, Müller L., Guzzie P.J., Brendler-Schwaab S., Bulera S., Chignell C.F., Henderson L.M., Jacobs A., Murli H., Snyder R.D., Tanaka N.

Considerations on photochemical genotoxicity. Report of the IWGTP working group.  
Environmental Molecular Mutagenicity 35, 173-184 (2000).

**Honma M.**, Hayashi M., Shimada H., Tanaka N., Wakuri S., Awogi T., Yamamoto K.I., Kodani N.-U., Nishi Y., Nakadate M., Sofuni T.

Evaluation of the mouse lymphoma tk assay (microwell method) as an alternative to the in vitro chromosomal aberration test.  
Mutagenesis 14, 5-22 (1999).

**Howes D.**, Guy R., Hadgraft J., Heylings J., Hoeck U., Kemper F., Maibach H., Marty J-P., Merk H., Parra J., Rekkas D., Rondelli I., Schaefer H., Täuber U. and Verbiest N.

Methods for assessing percutaneous absorption, ECVAM Workshop Report n. 13.  
Alternatives To Laboratory Animals 24, 81-106 (1996).

**IP/06/1047** : European Commission Press Release

Commission bans 22 hair dye substances to increase consumer safety  
Brussels, 20 July 2006, available through <http://europa.eu/rapid/> (consulted September 2006)

**Kersten B.**, Kasper P., Brendler-Schwaab S.Y., Muller L.

Use of the photo-micronucleus assay in Chinese hamster V79 cells to study photochemical genotoxicity.  
Mutation Research 519, 49-66 (2002).

**Kirsch-Volders M.**, Sofuni T., Aardema M., Albertini S., Eastmond D., Fenech M., Ishidate M. Jr., Kirchner S., Lorge E., Morita T., Norppa H., Surrallés J., Vanhauwaert A., Wakata A.

Report from the in vitro micronucleus assay working group. 3<sup>rd</sup> International Workshop on Genotoxicity Testing (IWGT).  
Mutat Res. 540(2), 153-63 (2003); Erratum in: Mutat Res. 564(1), 97-100 (2004).

**Kroes R.**, Galli C., Munro I., Schilter B., Tran L., Walker R., Wurtzen G.

Threshold of toxicological concern for chemical substances present in the diet: a practical tool for assessing the need for toxicity testing.  
Food Chem. Toxicol. 38(2-3), 255-312 (2000).

**Kroes R.**, Renwick A.G., Cheeseman M., Kleiner J., Mangelsdorf I., Piersma A., Schilter B., Schlatter J., van Schothorst F., Vos J.G., Wurtzen G.

European branch of the International Life Sciences Institute  
Structure-based thresholds of toxicological concern (TTC): guidance for application to substances present at low levels in the diet.  
Food Chem. Toxicol. 42(1), 65-83 (2004).

**Loprieno N.**

Safety assessment of cosmetics and the use of alternatives. A perspective from the SCC.  
In: Alternatives to Animal Testing. Proceedings of an International Scientific Conference organised by The European Cosmetic Industry (SG Lisansky, R Macmillan and J Dupuis, Eds), Colipa, Brussels, Belgium, 1999, 132-147.

**M0355008/1786Q/10/11/00**

European Commission DG ENV - Groshart C.H. and Okkerman P.C. (authors)  
Towards the establishment of a priority list of substances for further evaluation of their role in endocrine disruption – *preparation of a candidate list of substances as a basis for priority setting*. Final Report M0355008/1786Q/10/11/00 (2000).

**Masson P.**

The contribution of the European Cosmetics Directive towards international harmonization : Impact on the evaluation of safety and efficacy.  
In: Cosmetics, controlled efficacy studies and regulation 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition (P. Elsner, H.F. Merck and H.I. Maibach, Eds) Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1999, 20-35.

**Matsuoka A.**, Yamazaki N., Suzuki T., Hayashi M., Sofuni T.

Evaluation of the micronucleus test using a Chinese hamster cell line as an alternative to the conventional *in vitro* chromosomal aberration test.  
Mutat Res. 272(3), 223-36 (1992).

**Matsushima T.**, Sugimura T., Nagao M., Yahagi T., Shirai A., Sawamura M.

Factors modulating mutagenicity microbial tests.  
In : Short-term test systems for detecting carcinogens (Eds. Norpoth K.H. and Garner R.C.) Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 273-285 (1980).

**Matsushima T.**, Hayashi M., Matsuoka A., Ishidate M. Jr., Miura K.F., Shimizu H., Suzuki Y., Morimoto K., Ogura H., Mure K., Koshi K., Sofuni T.  
Validation study of the *in vitro* micronucleus test in a Chinese hamster lung cell line (CHL/IU).  
Mutagenesis 14(6), 569-80 (1999).

**Miller B.**, Potter-Locher F., Seelbach A., Stopper H., Utesch D., Madle S.

Evaluation of the *in vitro* micronucleus test as an alternative to the *in vitro* chromosomal aberration assay: position of the GUM Working Group on the *in vitro* micronucleus test.  
Gesellschaft für Umwelt-Mutations-forschung.  
Mutation Research 10(1):81-116 (1998).

**Muller L.**, Blakey D., Dearfield K.L., Galloway S., Guzzie P., Hayashi M., Kasper P., Kirkland D., MacGregor J.T., Parry J.M., Schechtman L., Smith A., Tanaka N., Tweats D., Yamasaki H.  
Strategy for genotoxicity testing and stratification of genotoxicity test results- report on initial activities of the IWGT Expert Group.  
Mutation Research 540, 177-181 (2003).

**OECD**

OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Draft Guideline : *In vitro* Syrian Hamster Embryo (SHE) Cell Transformation Assay  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, draft approved May 1996.

**OECD**

Draft Guidance Document for the Conduct of Skin Absorption Studies. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Environment Directorate, OECD Environmental Health and Safety Publications, Series on Testing and Assessment No. 28, Paris (2000a).

**OECD**

Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals: Introduction to the OECD Guidelines on Genetic Toxicology Testing and Guidance on the Selection and Application of Assays Vol.2, pp.1-18, Paris (2000b).

**OECD 401** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 401 : Acute Oral Toxicity  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981, deleted 20 December 2002.

**OECD 404** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 404 : Acute Dermal Irritation/Corrosion  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981, last updated 24 April 2002.

**OECD 405** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 405 : Acute Eye Irritation/Corrosion  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981, last updated 24 April 2002.

**OECD 406** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 406 : Skin Sensitisation  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981, last updated 17 July 2002.

**OECD 407** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 407 : Repeated Dose 28-Day Oral Toxicity Study in Rodents  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981, last updated 27 July 1995.

**OECD 408** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 408 : Repeated Dose 90-Day Oral Toxicity Study in Rodents  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981, last updated 21 September 1998.

**OECD 409** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 409 : Repeated Dose 90-Day Oral Toxicity Study in Non-Rodents  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted.

**OECD 410** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 410 : Repeated Dose Dermal Toxicity: 21/28-Day Study  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981.

**OECD 411** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 411 : Subchronic Dermal Toxicity: 90-Day Study  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981.

**OECD 412** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 412 : Repeated Dose Inhalation Toxicity: 28-Day or 14-Day Study  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981.

**OECD 413** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 413 : Subchronic Inhalation Toxicity: 90-Day Study  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981.

**OECD 414** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 414 : Prenatal Developmental Toxicity Study  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981, last updated 22 January 2001.

**OECD 416** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 416 : Two-Generation Reproduction Toxicity Study  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 26 May 1983, last updated 22 January 2001.

**OECD 417** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 417 : Toxicokinetics  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 4 April 1984.

**OECD 420** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 420 : Acute Oral Toxicity - Fixed Dose Method  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 17 July 1992, last updated 17 December 2001.

**OECD 421** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 421 : Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 27 July 1995.

**OECD 423** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 423 : Acute Oral toxicity - Acute Toxic Class Method  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 22 March 1996, last updated 17 December 2001.

**OECD 425** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 425 : Acute Oral Toxicity: Up-and-Down Procedure  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 21 September 1998, last updated 17 December 2001.



- OECD 427** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 427 : Skin absorption: *In vivo* method  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 13 April 2004.
- OECD 428** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 428 : Skin absorption: *In vitro* method  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 13 April 2004.
- OECD 429** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 429 : Skin Sensitisation: Local Lymph Node Assay  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 24 April 2002.
- OECD 430** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 430 : *In vitro* Skin Corrosion: Transcutaneous Electrical Resistance Test (TER)  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 13 April 2004.
- OECD 431** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 431 : *In vitro* Skin Corrosion: Human Skin Model Test  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 13 April 2004.
- OECD 432** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 432: *In vitro* 3T3 NRU phototoxicity test  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 13 April 2004.
- OECD 435** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Draft Guideline 435 : *In vitro* Membrane Barrier Test Method for Skin Corrosion.  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, draft approved 20 May 2004.
- OECD 452** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 452 : Chronic Toxicity Studies  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981.
- OECD 453** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 453 : Combined Chronic Toxicity/Carcinogenicity Studies  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 12 May 1981.
- OECD 471** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 471 : Bacterial Reverse Mutation Test  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 26 May 1983, last updated 21 July 1997.
- OECD 473** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 473 : *In vitro* Mammalian Chromosomal Aberration Test  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 26 May 1983, last updated 21 July 1997.
- OECD 476** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 476 : *In vitro* Mammalian Cell Gene Mutation Test  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 4 April 1984, last updated 21 July 1997.
- OECD 482** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Guideline 482 : Genetic Toxicology: DNA Damage and Repair, Unscheduled DNA Synthesis in Mammalian Cells *in vitro*  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, adopted 23 October 1986.
- OECD 487** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Draft Guideline 487 : *In vitro* Micronucleus Test.  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, draft approved 14 June 2004.
- OECD 495** - OECD Guideline for testing of chemicals - Draft Guideline 495 : *In vitro* Syrian Hamster Embryo (SHE) Cell Transformation Assay.  
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, draft approved.
- Parry J.M.**  
A proposal for a new OECD Guideline for the *in vitro* micronucleus test.  
EEMS Draft (1997).
- Pflaum M.**, Kielbassa C., Garmyn M., Epe B.G.  
Oxidative DNA damage induced by visible light in mammalian cells; extent, inhibition by antioxidants and genotoxic effects.  
Mutation Research 408, 137-144 (1998).

**Prival, M.J.**, Bell S.J., Mitchell V.D., Peiperl M.D., Vaughan V.L.  
Mutagenicity of Benzidine and Benzidine-congener dyes and selected monoazo dyes in a modified Salmonella assay.  
Mutation Research 136, 33-47 (1984).

**Renwick A.G.**

Toxicokinetics in infants and children in relation to the ADI and TDI.  
Food Additives and Contaminants Suppl. 15, 17-35 (1998).

**Rogiers V.**

Notes of Guidance of the SCCNFP in the safety evaluation of cosmetics.  
In: Intensive Course in Dermato-Cosmetic Sciences, Part II, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, 16-20 September 2002, 19-30 (2002a).

**Rogiers V.**

Ecopa : a powerful concept in the way forward for alternative methods.  
Alternatives To Laboratory Animals 30, Supplement 2, 199-202 (2002b).

**Rogiers V.** and Pauwels M.

Good science must be the key factor in the development and use of alternative methods for safety assessment of cosmetics.  
ALTEX 22 (Special Issue), 259 (2005).

**Russell B**, Russell WMS, Burch RL.

The principles of Humane Experimental Technique.  
Methuen and Co Ltd, London (reprinted by the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare UFAW, 1992, Potters Bar, Herts), UK, 1959.

**Salminen W.F. Jr.**

Integrating toxicology into cosmetic ingredient research and development.  
International Journal of Cosmetic Science 24, 217-224 (2002).

**Sanner T.**, Dybing E., Willems M.I. and Kroese E.D.

A simple method for quantitative risk assessment of non-threshold carcinogens based on the dose descriptor T25.  
Pharmacol Toxicol 88: 331-341 (2001).

**SCCNFP/0003/98, Final** : Guidelines on the use of human volunteers in the testing of potentially cutaneous irritant cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients, *adopted by the plenary session of the SCCNFP of 25 November 1998.*

**SCCNFP/0017/98, Final** : Opinion concerning fragrance allergy in consumers : a review of the problem. Analysis of the need for appropriate consumer information and identification of consumer allergens, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 8 December 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0068/98, Final** : Guidelines on the use of human volunteers in compatibility testing of finished cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 23 June 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0069/98, Final** : Opinion on *in vitro* methods to assess phototoxicity in the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 25 November 1998.*

**SCCNFP/0120/99, Final** : Opinion concerning the predictive testing of potentially cutaneous sensitising cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 11<sup>th</sup> plenary session of 17 February 2000.*

**SCCNFP/0125/99, Final** : Restrictions on materials listed in Annex VI of Directive 76/768/EEC on cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 7<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 17 February 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0167/99, Final** : Basic Criteria for the *in vitro* assessment of percutaneous absorption of cosmetic ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 8<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 23 June 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0231/99, Final** : Opinion concerning m-Aminophenol (Colipa n° A15), *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 11<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 17 February 2000.*

**SCCNFP/0232/99, Final** : Opinion concerning 2,7-Naphthalenediol, (Colipa n° A19), *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 11<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 17 February 2000.*

**SCCNFP/0245/99, Final** : Opinion concerning basic criteria of the protocols for the skin compatibility testing of potentially cutaneous irritant cosmetic ingredients or mixtures of ingredients on human volunteers, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 8 December 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0392/00, Final** : Opinion concerning an Initial List of Perfumery Materials which must not form part of Cosmetic Products except subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 18<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 25 September 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0450/01, Final** : Memorandum on the SCCNFP opinion concerning fragrance allergy in consumers, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 16<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 16 March 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0461/01, Final** : Memorandum on Scientific Evaluations and Opinions, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 17<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 12 June 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0474/01, Final** : Opinion concerning chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to the Chemicals Directive 67/548/EEC, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 18<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 25 September 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0483/01, Final** : Opinion on the evaluation of potentially estrogenic effects of UV filters, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 17<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 12 June 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0484/01, Final** : Opinion on the use of permanent hair dyes and bladder cancer risk, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 17<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 12 June 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0495/01, Final** : Opinion concerning the safety review of the use of certain azo-dyes in cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 19<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 27 February 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0521/01, Final** : Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 18<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 25 September 2001.*

**SCCNFP/0546/02, Final** : Memorandum concerning the actual status of alternative methods to the use of animals in the safety testing of cosmetic ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 20<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 4 June 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0557/02, Final** : Position statement on the calculation of the Margin of Safety of ingredients incorporated in cosmetics which may be applied to the skin of children, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 19<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 27 February 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0566/02, Final** : Proposal for a strategy for testing hair dye cosmetic ingredients for their potential genotoxicity/mutagenicity, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 20<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 4 June 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0588/02, Final** : Position statement concerning fragrance chemicals in detergents and other household products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during its 20<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 4 June 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0612/02, Final** : Opinion concerning amendment to entry n° 419 of Annex II to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 22<sup>nd</sup> plenary meeting of 17 December 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0633/02, Final** : Updated Basic Requirements for toxicological dossiers to be evaluated by the SCCNFP, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 22<sup>nd</sup> plenary meeting of 17 December 2002.*

**SCCNFP/0635/03, Final** : Opinion concerning request for a re-evaluation of hair dyes listed in Annex III to Directive 76/768/EEC on Cosmetic Products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 23<sup>rd</sup> plenary meeting of 18 March 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0657/03, Final** : Opinion concerning Dihydroxyindole (Colipa n° A111), *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 23<sup>rd</sup> plenary meeting of 18 March 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0669/03, Final** : Opinion concerning Dihydroxyindoline HBr (Colipa n° A147), *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 23<sup>rd</sup> plenary meeting of 18 March 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0690/03, Final** : Notes of Guidance for the testing of cosmetic ingredients and their safety evaluation, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 25<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 October 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0720/03, Final** : Updated recommended strategy for testing hair dyes for their potential genotoxicity/mutagenicity/carcinogenicity, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 24<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 24-25 June 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0724/03** : Opinion concerning use of specified risk materials in cosmetics : clarification for tallow derivatives, *adopted by the SCCNFP by written procedure on 23 July 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0750/03, Final** : Basic Criteria for the *in vitro* assessment of dermal absorption of cosmetic ingredients - updated November 2003, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 25<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 October 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0755/03, Final** : Recommended Mutagenicity/Genotoxicity tests for the safety testing of cosmetic ingredients to be included in the annexes to Council Directive 76/768/EEC (SCCNFP Notes of Guidance), *adopted by the SCCNFP on 23 April 2004 by means of the written procedure.*

**SCCNFP/0770/03, Final** : Opinion concerning an update of the initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of cosmetic products except subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 26<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 9 December 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0771/03, Final** : Opinion concerning an update of the initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of fragrance compounds used in cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 26<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 9 December 2003.*

**SCCNFP/0797/04, Final** : Opinion concerning use of permanent hair dyes and bladder cancer, *adopted by the SCCNFP on 23 April 2004 by means of the written procedure.*

**SCCNFP/0807/04, Final** : Opinion concerning hair dyes without file submitted, *adopted by the SCCNFP on 23 April 2004 by means of the written procedure.*

**SCCNFP/0808/04, Final** : Opinion concerning ring study on reaction products from typical combinations of hair colouring ingredients, *adopted by the SCCNFP on 23 April 2004 by means of the written procedure.*

**SCCNFP/0825/04, Final** : Opinion concerning chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to the Chemicals Directive 67/548/EEC, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 28<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 25 May 2004.*

**SCCNFP/0834/04, Final** : Opinion concerning "Report for establishing the timetable for phasing out animal testing for the purpose of the cosmetics directive" issued by ECVAM (30/04/2004), *adopted by the SCCNFP on 1 July 2004 by means of the written procedure.*

**SCCP/0894/05** : Opinion on amino acids obtained by hydrolysis of human hair, *adopted by the SCCP during the 4<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 21 June 2005.*

**SCCP/0888/05** : Opinion concerning request for confirmation of the SCCNFP opinion 0474/01 on chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to Council Directive 67/548/EEC, *adopted by the SCCP during the 3<sup>rd</sup> plenary meeting of 15 March 2005.*

**SCCP/0913/05** : Opinion concerning request for confirmation of the SCCNFP opinion 0474/01 on chemical ingredients in cosmetic products classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction according to Council Directive 67/548/EEC, *adopted by the SCCP during the 4<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 21 June 2005.*

**SCCP/0930/05** : Opinion on personal use of hair dyes and cancer risk, *adopted by the SCCP during the 5<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 September 2005.*

**SCCP/0933/05** : Opinion on risk of ingredients deriving from category 1-material and category 2-material as defined in Regulation 1774/2002 in cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCP during the 5<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 September 2005.*

**SCCP/0941/05** : Opinion on exposure to reactants and reaction products of oxidative hair dye formulations, *adopted by the SCCP during the 6<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 13 December 2005.*

**SCCP/0959/05** : Review of the SCCNFP opinion on Hair Dye Strategy in the light of additional information, *adopted by the SCCP during the 8<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 June 2006.*

**SCCP/0970/06** : Opinion on basic criteria for the *in vitro* assessment of dermal absorption of cosmetic ingredients - updated February 2006, *adopted by the SCCP during the 7<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 28 March 2006.*

**SCCP/0971/06** : Updated recommended strategy for testing oxidative hair dye substances for their potential mutagenicity/genotoxicity, *adopted by the SCCP during the 7<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 28 March 2006.*

**SCCP/1004/06** : Skin penetration of oxidative hair dyes formed by the coupling of precursors and couplers under simulated conditions of hair dyeing, Update of the Annex to "Opinion on exposure to reactants and reaction products of oxidative hair dye formulations (SCCP/0941/05)", *adopted by the SCCP during the 8<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 June 2006.*

**SCCP/1023/06** : Opinion on clarifications to SCCNFP/0392/00 "An initial list of perfumery materials which must not form part of cosmetic products except subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down", *adopted by the SCCP during the 8<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 20 June 2006.*

**SCENIHR/002/05** : Modified opinion (after public consultation) on the appropriateness of existing methodologies to assess the potential risks associated with engineered and adventitious products of nanotechnologies, *adopted by the SCENIHR during the 10<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of 10 March 2006.*

**SCF** (Scientific Committee on Food)

Guidance on Submission on Food Additive Evaluations by the Scientific Committee on Food : SCF/CS/ADD/GEN/26/Final, 12<sup>th</sup> July 2001a.

**SCF** (Scientific Committee on Food)

Guidelines of the Scientific Committee on Food for the presentation of an application for safety assessment of a substance to be used in food contact material prior to its authorisation. SCF/CS/PLEN/GEN/100 Final, 19 December 2001b.

**Schaefer H.** and Redelmeier T.E.

Skin Barrier, Principles of Percutaneous Absorption, Karger, Basel (1996).

**Schlumpf M.**, Cotton B., Conscience M., Haller V., Steinmann B. and Lichtensteiger W.

*In vitro* and *in vivo* estrogenicity of UV screens.

Environmental Health Perspectives 109(3), 239-244 (2001).

**Spielmann H.**, Balls M., Dupuis J., Pape W.J.W., De Silva O., Holzhütter H.G., Gerberick F., Liebsch M., Lowell W.W., and Pfannenbecker V.

A Study on UV filter chemicals from Annex VII of the European Union Directive 76/768/EEC in the *in vitro* NRU Phototoxicity test.

Alternatives To Laboratory Animals 26, 679-708 (1998)

**US EPA** (Environmental Protection Agency).

Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment.

Federal Register 51, 33992-34003 (1986).

**US EPA**

Health Effect Test Guidelines. Dermal Penetration. US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Doc. EPA 712-C-96-350, Washington, DC (1996a).

**US EPA** (Environmental Protection Agency).

Proposed guidelines for carcinogen risk assessment.

Fed. Reg. 61, 17960-18011 (1996b).

**WHO (World Health Organization)**

Assessing human health risks of chemicals : derivation of guidance values for health-based exposure limits.

Environmental Health Criteria, 170, WHO, Geneva (1994).

**WHO / UNEP / ILO**

Approaches to Integrated Risk Assessment, Doc. WHO/IPCS/IRA/01/12 of December 2001 (2001).

**Worth A.P.** and Balls M.

Alternative (Non-animal) Methods for Chemicals Testing: Current Status and Future Prospects. A Report prepared by ECVAM and the ECVAM working Group on Chemicals.

Alternatives To Laboratory Animals 30 Supplement 1, 1-125 (2002).

## 4. LISTS OF INGREDIENTS

---

### 4-1 INTRODUCTION

Five lists of cosmetic ingredients can be found as Annexes II, III, IV, VI and VII to Dir. 76/768/EEC. These annexes lay down clear limitations and requirements for the cosmetic ingredients concerned.

Another important list of cosmetic ingredients is the INCI (International Nomenclature Cosmetic Ingredient) inventory [96/335/EC], identifying a large number of substances with their possible function(s) in finished cosmetic products and with reference to their possible restrictions.

Finally, this chapter briefly mentions Annex I to the Dangerous Substances legislation [67/548/EEC], since the "7<sup>th</sup> Amendment" of Dir. 76/768/EEC [2003/15/EC] directly refers to that list when excluding CMR Cat.1 & Cat.2 chemicals from cosmetic use.

It must be emphasized that none of these lists reflects the complete set of ingredients used in cosmetic products.

### 4-2 ANNEXES II, III, IV, VI AND VII TO THE COSMETIC PRODUCTS DIRECTIVE

The Cosmetic Products Directive [76/768/EEC and its adaptations to technical progress] defines the following Annexes :

**Annex II :** a list containing substances that must not form part of the composition of cosmetic products.

**Annex III :** a list of substances that are allowed to be used in cosmetic products, but only subject to the restrictions and conditions laid down.

**Annex IV :** a list of colourants allowed for use in cosmetic products in one of the 4 following fields of application :

- 1) all cosmetic products,
- 2) cosmetic products that are not applied in the vicinity of the eyes,
- 3) cosmetics that have no contact with mucous membranes
- 4) cosmetics that come only briefly in contact with the skin.

**Annex VI :** a list of preservatives that cosmetic products may contain. Preservatives are substances that may be added to cosmetic products for the primary purpose of inhibiting the development of micro-organisms in such products. Some of the preservatives in Annex VI are marked with a "(+)", which means that they may also be added to cosmetics in other concentrations for other scientific purposes apparent from the presentation of the products, e.g. as deodorants in soaps and anti-dandruff agents in shampoos.

**Annex VII :** a list of UV filters that cosmetic products may contain. For the purpose of Dir. 76/768/EEC, UV filters are substances that, contained in cosmetic sunscreen products, are specifically intended to filter certain UV rays in order to protect the skin from certain harmful effects of these rays. Other UV filters, used in cosmetic products solely for the purpose of protecting the product against UV rays, are not included in Annex VII. They have not been submitted to and discussed by the SCC(NF)P.

Annexes III, IV, VI and VII are subdivided in 2 parts, Part 1 being the major list of "definitively" allowed ingredients, while Part 2 is a list of provisionally allowed substances. In time, every substance appearing on Part 2 of an Annex will either be added to Annex II (forbidden substance), taken up in Part 1 of the respective Annex ("definitively" allowed), or simply completely deleted from the Annex.

The applicability of the Annexes for the Member States is given in Articles 4.1 and 5 of Directive 76/768/EEC and its amendments :

	<b>Art. 4.1 :</b> Member States shall <b>prohibit</b> marketing of cosmetics containing :	<b>Art. 5 :</b> Member States shall <b>allow</b> marketing of cosmetics containing :
<b>Annex II</b>	substances listed in Annex II	
<b>Annex III</b>	substances listed in the first part of Annex III, beyond the limits and outside the conditions laid down	the substances listed in Annex III, Part 2, within the limits and under the conditions laid down, up to the dates in column (g) of that Annex
<b>Annex IV</b>	colouring agents : - other than those listed in Annex IV, Part 1 (exception for colouring agents intended solely to colour hair) - listed in Annex IV, Part 1, used outside the conditions laid down (exception for colouring agents intended solely to colour hair)	colouring agents listed in Annex IV, Part 2, within the limits and under the conditions laid down, until the admission dates given in that Annex
<b>Annex VI</b>	preservatives : - other than those listed in Annex VI, Part 1 - listed in Annex VI, Part 1, beyond the limits and outside the conditions laid down, unless other concentrations are used for specific purposes apparent from the presentation of the product	the preservatives listed in Annex VI, Part 2, within the limits and under the conditions laid down, until the dates given in column (f) of that Annex. However, some of these substances may be used in other concentrations for specific purposes apparent from the presentation of the product
<b>Annex VII</b>	UV filters : - other than those listed in Annex VII, Part 1 - listed in Annex VII, Part 1, beyond the limits and outside the conditions laid down therein	the UV filters listed in Annex VII, Part 2, within the limits and under the conditions laid down, until the dates given in column (f) of that Annex

### 4-3 THE INTERNATIONAL NOMENCLATURE OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS (INCI)

Article 5a of Dir. 76/768/EEC states that the Commission shall compile an inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products [93/35/EEC].

On 8 May 1996, the European Commission established an Inventory and a common nomenclature of the ingredients employed in cosmetic products [96/335/EC, part of which amended by 2006/257/EC]. This list was subdivided into 2 sections :

**Section I :** Inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products

**Section II :** Perfume and aromatic raw materials

The Inventory is indicative and does not constitute a list of substances authorized for use in cosmetic products. If an INCI name is available, it is to be used on the packaging and labelling, but the absence of an INCI name on the Inventory does not automatically exclude the use of the ingredient under consideration.

An entry in the Inventory provides identification of that particular ingredient through the following parameters :

- Common name : INCI; but botanicals get their systemic (Linné) Latin names and colours a colour index (CI) number
- Chemical name
- Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number
- Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association (CTFA) name
- European Pharmacopoeia (Ph. Eur.) name
- International Non-proprietary Name (INN) name, recommended by WHO
- International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) name
- European INventory of Existing commercial Chemical Substances (EINECS) number
- European LIst of Notified Chemical Substances (ELINCS) number

In 1998 the European Commission issued a Mandate [DG24/XXIV/1891/98], indicating that the SCCNFP shall act as a resource of scientific expertise to the European Commission, in terms of advising on the :

- medical and professional expectations and requirements of the Inventory,
- scientific accuracy and validity of proposed entries,
- outstanding needs of the existing text / proposed improvements in subsequent updates.

After a collaboration with the JRC (Joint Research Centre) of the Commission, experts from European Industry and Colipa (the European Cosmetic Toiletry and Perfumery Association), the SCCNFP issued a Status Report on the Inventory [SCCNFP/0098/99]. In this report, 6 priorities were identified for a first update of the INCI list :

- 1) To accomplish the principle : each INCI name should refer to only one specific ingredient.
- 2) To correct the INCI names of Ethylhexyl derivatives and to adopt a final decision on Ampho-derivatives.
- 3) To identify botanical entries with greater transparency.
- 4) To solve problems on chemical identification associated to polymers.
- 5) To solve the problem of hair dyes / cosmetic colourants with respect to Colour Index (CI) identification and restrictions.
- 6) To improve the description of the functions of the ingredients.



Having taken into account this list of priorities, the SCCNFP published in June 2000 "The 1<sup>st</sup> Revision and Update of Section I of the Inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetics" [SCCNFP/0299/00]. This update contains many improvements to the original edition of Section I, including 1466 new and 843 modified INCI names, as well as a number of necessary recommendations for future updating of the inventory.

In October 2000, "The 1<sup>st</sup> Update of the Inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products : Section II : Perfume and aromatic raw materials" was issued [SCCNFP/0389/00]. Again, many improvements were introduced (e.g. 650 new entries of botanicals) and recommendations for future updates were added.

The 2006 INCI list can be downloaded through :  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/cosmetics/html/cosm\\_inci\\_index.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/cosmetics/html/cosm_inci_index.htm).

#### **4-4 ANNEX I TO THE DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES DIRECTIVE**

Annex I to Dir. 67/548/EEC gives the list of dangerous substances classified in accordance with the provisions stated in Annex VI to that same Directive laying down the general classification and labelling requirements for dangerous substances and preparations in the EU [2001/59/EC]. Annex I is updated on a regular basis and contains a number of chemicals that can be found in the composition of certain cosmetic products. It has become of particular importance with the introduction of Art. 4b in the "Seventh Amendment" [2003/15/EC] to the Cosmetic Products Directive :

**Art. 4b :** *The use in cosmetic products of substances classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic for reproduction, of category 1, 2 and 3, under Annex I to Directive 67/548/EEC shall be prohibited. ... A substance classified in category 3 may be used in cosmetics if the substance has been evaluated by the SCCNFP and found acceptable for use in cosmetic products.*

## 4-5 REFERENCES

**67/548/EEC** - Council Directive 67/548/EEC of 27 June 1967 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal P 196, 16/08/1967 p.1.*

**76/768/EEC** - Council Directive 76/768/EEC of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L 262, 27/09/1976 p.169.*

**93/35/EEC** - Council Directive 93/35/EEC of 14 June 1993 amending for the sixth time Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L 151, 23/06/1993 p.32.*

**96/335/EC** - Commission Decision of 8 May 1996 establishing an inventory and a common nomenclature of ingredients employed in cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L 132, 01/06/1996 p.1.*

**2001/59/EC** - Commission Directive 2001/59/EC of 6 August 2001 adapting to technical progress for the 28th time Council Directive 67/548/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

*Official Journal L 225, 21/08/2001 p.1.*

**2003/15/EC** - Directive 2003/15/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 February 2003 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

*Official Journal L66, 11/03/2003 p.26.*

**2006/257/EC** - Commission Decision of 9 February 2006 amending Decision 96/335/EC establishing an inventory and a common nomenclature of ingredients employed in cosmetic products

*Official Journal L97, 05/04/2006 p.1.*

**DG24/XXIV/1891/98** : Mandate for the SCCNFP Specific Working Group on Inventory, 2 March 1998

**SCCNFP/0098/99, Final** : Status report on the inventory of cosmetic ingredients, *approved by the plenary session of the SCCNFP on 17 February 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0299/00, Final** : Opinion on the 1<sup>st</sup> update of the inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products (Section I), *adopted by the SCCNFP during the 13<sup>th</sup> plenary session of 28 June 2000.*

**SCCNFP/0389/00, Final** : Opinion concerning the 1<sup>st</sup> update of the inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products. Section II : perfume and aromatic raw materials, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 24 October 2000.*

## 5. STANDARD FORMAT OF THE OPINIONS

---

SCCP/0000/00, date



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
HEALTH & CONSUMER PROTECTION DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate C - Public Health and Risk Assessment  
**C7 - Risk assessment**

**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PRODUCTS**

**SCCP**

**[draft] Opinion on**

Adopted by the SCCP  
[by written procedure on date xxxx]  
during the xx plenary of [date]

---

**1. BACKGROUND**

---

---

**2. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

---

---

**3. OPINION**

---

**3.1 CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL SPECIFICATIONS****3.1.1 Chemical identity**

3.1.1.1 Primary name and/or INCI name

Ref. :

3.1.1.2 Chemical names

Ref. :

3.1.1.3 Trade names and abbreviations

Ref. :

3.1.1.4 CAS / EINECS number

Ref. :

3.1.1.5 Structural formula

Ref. :

3.1.1.6 Empirical formula

Ref. :

**3.1.2 Physical form**

Ref. :

**3.1.3 Molecular weight**

Ref. :

### **3.1.4 Purity, composition and substance codes**

Ref. :

### **3.1.5 Impurities / accompanying contaminants**

Ref. :

### **3.1.6 Solubility**

Ref. :

### **3.1.7 Partition coefficient (Log Pow)**

Ref. :

### **3.1.8 Additional physical and chemical specifications**

Where relevant :

- organoleptic properties (colour, odour, taste if relevant)
- melting point
- boiling point
- flash point
- vapour pressure
- density
- viscosity
- pKa
- refractive index
- UV/visible light absorption spectrum
- ...

Ref. :

### **3.1.9 Stability**

Ref. :

## **3.2 FUNCTION AND USES**

Ref. :

### 3.3 TOXICOLOGICAL EVALUATION

#### 3.3.1 Acute toxicity

3.3.1.1 Acute oral toxicity

Ref. :

3.3.1.2 Acute dermal toxicity

Ref. :

3.3.1.3 Acute inhalation toxicity

Ref. :

#### 3.3.2 Irritation and corrosivity

3.3.2.1 Skin irritation

Ref. :

3.3.2.2 Mucous membrane irritation

Ref. :

#### 3.3.3 Skin sensitisation

Ref. :

#### 3.3.4 Dermal / percutaneous absorption

Ref. :

#### 3.3.5 Repeated dose toxicity

3.3.5.1 Repeated dose (28 days) oral / dermal / inhalation toxicity

Ref. :

3.3.5.2 Sub-chronic (90 days) oral / dermal / inhalation toxicity

Ref. :

3.3.5.3 Chronic (> 12 months) toxicity

Ref. :

**3.3.6 Mutagenicity / genotoxicity**

Ref. :

**3.3.7 Carcinogenicity**

Ref. :

**3.3.8 Reproductive toxicity**

3.3.8.1 2-Generation reproduction toxicity

Ref. :

3.3.8.2 Teratogenicity

Ref. :

**3.3.9 Toxicokinetics**

Ref. :

**3.3.10 Photo-induced toxicity**

3.3.10.1 Phototoxicity/photoirritation and photosensitisation

Ref. :

3.3.10.2 Phototoxicity / photomutagenicity / photoclastogenicity

Ref. :

**3.3.11 Human data**

Ref. :

**3.3.12 Special investigations**

Ref. :

**3.3.13 Safety evaluation (including calculation of the MoS)**

Ref. :

**3.3.14 Discussion**

---

**4. CONCLUSION**

---

---

**5. MINORITY OPINION**

---

---

**6. REFERENCES**

---

---

**7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

---

Members of the working group are acknowledged for their valuable contribution to this opinion.

The members of the working group are :

*Identify chair and rapporteur*



## **6. SAFETY EVALUATION OF FINISHED COSMETIC PRODUCTS**

---

### **6-1 INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the Sixth [93/35/EEC] and "Seventh" [2003/15/EC] Amendment to Council Directive 76/768/EEC, a technical information file (TIF) must be kept available by the manufacturer or importer of each cosmetic product within the EU and made accessible to the competent authorities of the Member States on demand. In particular, the TIF of a given cosmetic product must contain its safety evaluation, made by a safety assessor, with the competence as required in Art 7a(d) and being responsible for it. The safety evaluation of the finished product is based upon the toxicological profile of the ingredients, their chemical structure and their exposure level.

It must be emphasised that it remains the responsibility of the safety assessor to justify whether enough information on the ingredients, the finished product and exposure is available or whether additional data are needed to evaluate the cosmetic product under consideration. However, some practical guidance is provided here. It should not be used as a checklist but rather as an approach to be adapted on a case-by-case basis when evaluating the safety of a finished cosmetic product.

### **6-2 CATEGORIES OF COSMETIC PRODUCTS AND EXPOSURE LEVELS IN USE**

The evaluation of the safety of a cosmetic product is not only based on its intrinsic toxicological properties, but also on how it will be used. Since cosmetic products cover a wide range of product types, many exposure scenarios can be described, e.g. :

- soaps are applied in dilute form and, although the area of application may be extensive, the product is rapidly washed off,
- products used on the lips and mouth will be ingested to some extent,
- cosmetics used around the eyes and genital regions may come into contact with the conjunctiva or mucosa, respectively, potentially resulting in reactions due to the thin epithelial lining of these areas,
- body lotions or body creams may be applied over a large surface of the body and the ingredients, often at appreciable concentrations, may remain in contact with the skin for several hours,
- sunscreens, due to their extensive skin contact, combined with direct exposure to UV radiation for prolonged periods, require a distinct type of safety evaluation (see also section 3-5.7),
- the ingredients of permanent hair dyes undergo oxidative reactions on the hair, precursors(s), coupler(s), intermediate(s) and final products formed come into contact with the skin.

Every specific exposure scenario will be linked to a certain amount of substance that may be ingested or absorbed through the skin or mucous membranes. Translated into a daily amount per kg body weight, it is considered the Systemic Exposure Dosage (SED) of the finished cosmetic product.

It is clear that in use exposure levels can only be obtained on a case-by-case basis for cosmetic products, taking into consideration at least the following factors :

- class of cosmetic product(s) in which the ingredient may be used,
- method of application: rubbed-on, sprayed, applied and washed off, etc.,
- concentration of the ingredient in the finished cosmetic product,
- quantity of product used at each application,
- frequency of application,
- total area of skin contact,
- site of contact (e.g., mucous membrane, sunburnt skin),
- duration of contact (e.g., rinse-off products),
- foreseeable misuse which may increase exposure,
- consumer target group (e.g., children, people with "sensitive skin"),
- quantity likely to enter the body,
- projected number of consumers,
- application on skin areas exposed to sunlight.

Moreover, the relevant exposure depends upon the toxicological effects under consideration. For example, for skin irritation or phototoxicity the exposure per unit area of skin is important, while for systemic toxicity the exposure per unit of body weight is of more significance.

The possibility of secondary exposure by routes other than those resulting from direct application also should be considered (e.g. inhalation of hairsprays, ingestion of lip products, ...).

Finally, the usage of cosmetic products may depend on some factors that will vary over time, such as age group, seasonal variations, local habits, fashion, trends, disposable income, product innovation, etc.

As previously mentioned, exposure assessment will among others result in the determination of the Systemic Exposure Dosage (SED), an important parameter for calculating the Margin of Safety (MoS) of ingredients in a finished cosmetic product [MoS = NO(A)EL / SED].

However, depending on the case whether the dermal absorption is reported in  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$  or as a percentage of the substance applied, different exposure parameters must be known in order to be able to calculate the actual SED :

1) *Dermal absorption of test substance reported in  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$  :*

$$\text{SED} = \frac{\text{DA}_a (\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2) \times 10^{-3} \text{mg}/\mu\text{g} \times \text{SSA} (\text{cm}^2) \times \text{F} (\text{day}^{-1}) \times \text{R}}{60 \text{ kg}}$$

With :	SED (mg/kg bw/day) =	Systemic Exposure Dosage
	DA <sub>a</sub> ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ ) =	Dermal Absorption reported as amount/ $\text{cm}^2$
	SSA ( $\text{cm}^2$ ) =	Skin Surface Area expected to be treated with the finished cosmetic product (see section 6-2 for SSA values per product type)
	F ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ ) =	Frequency of application of the finished product
	R =	Retention factor (see Table 2 in Section 6-2 for retention factors per product type)
	60 kg =	default human body weight

The use of this expression implies that the **skin surface area (SSA)** envisaged to be treated with the finished cosmetic product containing the ingredient under study, has to be known, as well as the **frequency of application (F)** of the finished product.

The first three columns of Table 1 are extracted from a Dutch study on cosmetic exposure assessment performed by the RIVM (RijksInstituut voor Volksgezondheid & Milieu) [Bremmer et al. 2005] and indicate exposed skin surface areas per cosmetic product type. The last column of the same table reflects the equivalent skin surface areas, based on US EPA [US EPA 1997] default values for skin surface areas of relevant parts of the human body. Some of the cells of this last column have been left blank, because:

- detailed parameters for some product types are missing [Bremmer et al. 2005],
- for some of the parameters described in the RIVM study [Bremmer et al. 2005], no equivalent values could be found in the USA EPA [1997] study.

**Table 1 :** Mean exposed skin surface area per product type  
[Bremmer et al. 2005; US EPA 1997]

Product type	Skin surface area involved (RIVM)		EPA equivalent surface area (cm <sup>2</sup> )
	Surface area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	Parameters	
<b>Hair care</b>			
Shampoo	1440	area hands + 1/2 area head	1430
Hair conditioner	1440	area hands + 1/2 area head	1430
Hair spray	565	1/2 area head female	555
Hair styling gel	1010	1/2 area hands + 1/2 area head	1010
Hair styling mousse	1010	1/2 area hands + 1/2 area head	1010
Hair dye spray	580	1/2 area head	590
Oxidation or permanent hair dyes	580	1/2 area head	590
Hair bleach	580	1/2 area head	590
Hair permanent lotion	580	1/2 area head	590
<b>Bathing, showering</b>			
Hand wash soap liquid	860	area hands	840
Hand wash soap solid	860	area hands	840
Showering soap liquid	17500	total body area	19400
Showering soap solid	17500	total body area	19400
Bath foam	16340	area body + area head	
Bath salt	16340	area body + area head	
Bath oil	16340	area body + area head	

Product type	Skin surface area involved (RIVM)		EPA equivalent surface area (cm <sup>2</sup> )
	Surface area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	Parameters	
<b>Skin care</b>			
Face cream	565	1/2 area head female	555
Body lotion	15670	area body + area head female	
Hand cream	860	area hands	840
Peeling / scrubbing gel	565	1/2 area head female	555
Face pack	565	1/2 area head female	555
Body pack	15670	area body + area head female	
Skin whitening cream	565	1/2 area head female	555
<b>Make-up and nail care</b>			
Facial make-up	565	1/2 area head female	555
Facial cleanser	565	1/2 area head female	555
Eye shadow	24		
Mascara	1.6		
Eyeliner	3.2		
Eye make-up remover	50		
Nail polish	4		
Nail polish remover	11		
<b>Deodorant</b>			
Deodorant stick / roller	100		
Deodorant spray <sup>17</sup>	100		
<b>Foot care</b>			
Foot cream antiperspirant	1170	area feet	1120
Foot cream anti-fungal	1170	area feet	1120
<b>Fragrances</b>			
Eau de toilette spray	200		
Perfume spray	100		
<b>Men's cosmetics</b>			
Shaving cream	305	1/4 area head male	325
Aftershave	305	1/4 area head male	325
<b>Sun care cosmetics</b>			
Sunscreen lotion	17500	total body area	19400
Sunscreen cream	17500	total body area	19400

<sup>17</sup> Only dermal exposure is considered here.

Product type	Skin surface area involved (RIVM)		EPA equivalent surface area (cm <sup>2</sup> )
	Surface area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	Parameters	
<b>Baby care</b>			
Baby cream	190		
Baby oil	190		
Baby powder	190		
<b>Miscellaneous</b>			
Depilatory cream	5530	area female legs	5460
Essential oil massage	16340	area body + area head	
Essential oil bath	16340	area body + area head	
Child face paint	475	1/2 area child head (4.5 yrs old)	496
Adult face paint	580	1/2 area head	650

2) *Dermal absorption reported as a percentage of the amount of substance applied :*

The calculation of the SED will be as follows :

$$SED = \frac{A \text{ (g/day)} \times 1000\text{mg/g} \times C \text{ (\%)} / 100 \times DA_p \text{ (\%)} / 100}{60 \text{ kg}}$$

With : SED (mg/kg bw/day) = Systemic Exposure Dosage  
A (g/day) = Amount of the cosmetic product applied daily : see the daily exposure values for different cosmetic product types (see 6-2)  
C (%) = the Concentration of the ingredient under study in the finished cosmetic product on the application site  
DA<sub>p</sub> (%) = Dermal Absorption expressed as a percentage of the test dose assumed to be applied in real-life conditions  
60 kg = default human body weight

In this case the **daily Amount of formulation applied (A)** under intended in use conditions has to be known.

For many years, the Notes of Guidance have displayed the same set of existing Colipa cosmetic exposure data. Upon repeated request of the SCC(NF)P, more recent and robust data were provided in 2005 for 6 product types (body lotion, deodorant, facial moisturizer, shampoo, lipstick and toothpaste) [CREME 2005]. They are summarized in Table 3.

For 19 additional product types, Colipa presented the mean values of exposure data provided by a restricted number of companies, though no individual figures. These have been requested by the SCCP and are still awaited at the moment of this 6<sup>th</sup> revision of the Notes.

**Table 2 :** Calculation of the daily exposure to cosmetics using Colipa data [SCCNFP/0321/02].

<b>Product type</b>	<b>Amount of substance applied</b>	<b>Frequency of application</b>	<b>Retention factor<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>Daily exposure calculated</b>
<b>Hair care</b>				
Shampoo	8.0 g	1 / day	0.01	0.08 g/day
Hair conditioner	14.0 g	0.28 / day	0.01	0.04 g/day
Hair styling products	5.0 g	2 / day	0.1	1.00 g/day
Oxidation or permanent hair dyes	100 ml	1 / month (30 min.)	0.1	Not calculated <sup>19</sup>
Semi-permanent hair dyes (and lotions)	35 ml	1 / week (20 min.)	0.1	Not calculated <sup>2</sup>
<b>Bathing, showering</b>				
Shower gel	5.0 g	2 / day	0.01	0.10 g/day
<b>Skin care</b>				
Face cream	0.8 g	2 / day	1.0	1.6 g/day
General purpose cream	1.2 g	2 / day	1.0	2.4 g/day
Body lotion	8.0 g	1 / day	1.0	8.0 g/day
<b>Make-up and nail care</b>				
Make-up remover	2.5 g	2 / day	0.1	0.5 g/day
Eye make-up	0.01 g	2 / day	1.0	0.02 g/day
Mascara	0.025 g	1 / day	1.0	0.025 g/day
Eyeliners	0.005 g	1 / day	1.0	0.005 g/day
Lipstick, lip salve	0.01 g	4 / day	1.0	0.04 g/day
<b>Deodorant</b>				
Deodorant stick / roller	0.5 g	1.0 / day	1.0	0.50 g/day
<b>Oral hygiene</b>				
Toothpaste (adult)	1.4 g	2.0 / day	0.17	0.48 g/day
Mouthwash	10.0 g	3.0 / day	0.10	3.0 g/day

Finally, for a **sunscreen lotion**, an application of 18.0 g/day is assumed to be a realistic value [SCCNFP/0321/02].

<sup>18</sup> The retention factor was introduced by the SCCNFP to take into account rinsing off and dilution of finished products by application on wet skin or hair (e.g. shower gels, shampoos, ...) [SCCNFP/0321/00]

<sup>19</sup> Daily exposure value not calculated due to the low frequency of exposure

**In the specific case of preservatives**, individual product type exposure values as mentioned in Table 2 might not reflect the overall exposure to these compounds, since there is a clear possibility that a certain preservative will not only be used in the finished cosmetic product under consideration, but also in a number of other cosmetics used by the same consumer. Therefore, the SCCNFP calculated a **global daily exposure value** for all cosmetic products that one person may daily apply on the skin. In a worst-case scenario, considering the consumer would use a set of cosmetic products containing the same preservative, the SCCNFP-value of **17.79 g/day** will have to be used in the calculation of the MoS [SCCNFP/0321/00]. Additional exposure through sunscreen products should also be considered.

**Table 3** : Updated daily consumer exposure values [CREMÉ 2005]

Product type	Amount of substance applied	Retention factor	Daily exposure calculated
Shampoo	10.46 g	0.01	0.11 g/day
Face cream	1.54 g	1.0	1.54 g/day
Body lotion	7.82 g	1.0	7.82 g/day
Deodorant stick	1.51 g	1.0	1.51 g/day
spray	6.54 g	1.0	6.54 g/day
Lipstick, lip salve	0.057 g	1.0	0.057 g/day
Toothpaste (adult)	2.75 g	0.05	(0.138 g/day)

The above table represents the final results of the CREMÉ study, which are intended to replace the corresponding rows in Table 2.

The daily exposure value of 0.138 g/day for a toothpaste is placed between brackets because it is calculated taking into account a retention factor of 0.05 instead of 0.17 as displayed in Table 2. Industry will be requested to clarify this issue.

In addition, the format of Table 3 is different compared to the one that has been used by the SCC(NF)P over the years. The "Frequency of application" column has disappeared and all exposure values are expressed in total amount of grams/day. This format change was introduced by Colipa in response to the CREMÉ finding that for body lotion, face cream, toothpaste and shampoo, there was an inverse correlation between the frequency of application and the amount of substance applied. Therefore a multiplication of the maximum amount applied with the frequency of application per day, would generate a significant overestimation of the exposure [CREMÉ 2005]. Although the latter may be correct, the SCCP would like to emphasize that, since the frequency of application features in the formula for the calculation of the Systemic Exposure Dosage (SED), the proposed change of table format has direct consequences for the calculation of the SED and the Margin of Safety (MoS).

Therefore, the SCCP awaits robust exposure data for the majority of the product types (with the exception of the ones included in the CREMÉ report) before working out any new proposal for the calculation of the SED. Until then, there is no alternative but to use the existing exposure data as displayed in Table 2.

## **6-3 GUIDELINES FOR THE SAFETY EVALUATION OF FINISHED COSMETIC PRODUCTS**

### **6-3.1 Introduction**

Each cosmetic product is considered as an individual combination of cosmetic ingredients. It is generally accepted that the safety evaluation can be done by ascertaining the toxicity of its ingredients [93/35/EEC & 2003/15/EC] on the condition that the information on the most relevant toxicological endpoints of its constituent ingredients is available. In some cases, however, additional information on the finished product is needed in the interest of a better safety assessment. Examples are cosmetics for specific target consumers groups (babies, sensitive skin, etc.), the presence of certain ingredients that increase skin penetration and/or skin irritancy (penetration enhancers, organic solvents, acidic components, etc.), the presence of a chemical reaction between individual ingredients rendering the formation of a new substance of toxicological significance highly probable, the presence of a specific galenic form (liposomes and other vesicular forms, etc.), when the potential toxicity of a particular ingredient is claimed to be decreased, etc.

When, after an in-depth evaluation of the safety of the final product, the safety assessor does not expect it to cause any adverse effect under foreseeable conditions of use, it is recommended to undertake compatibility testing on a number of human volunteers before the product is finally marketed [SCCNFP/0068/98].

### **6-3.2 Toxicological profile of the ingredients**

During the safety evaluation of a finished cosmetic product, the available toxicological data for all ingredients should be taken into consideration by the safety assessor. The data sources used should be clearly indicated and may consist of one or more of the following possibilities :

- *in vivo* tests using experimental animals,
- *in vitro* tests using validated or valid alternative methods,
- human data from clinical observations and compatibility tests in human volunteers,
- data from data banks, published literature, "in house" experience and data obtained from raw data suppliers, including QSAR structural alerts,
- relevant data on analogous compounds,

The general toxicological requirements for cosmetic ingredients have been described in detail in chapter 3 of this document.

For cosmetic products, focus lays in particular on local toxicity evaluation being skin and eye irritation, skin sensitisation, and in the case of UV absorption photo-induced toxicity. In case of significant dermal /percutaneous absorption, systemic effects will also to be examined in detail. When certain test results are not available, a scientific justification should be included.

It is essential to mention here that for each ingredient the toxicological data given should be derived from tests with the same substance as that used in the finished cosmetic product (same degree of purity, same impurity profile, same additives, ...).



### **6-3.3 Stability and physical and chemical characteristics of the finished cosmetic product**

The physical stability of the finished product should be established, ensuring that no changes in physical state of the finished product (e.g. coalescence of emulsions, phase separation, crystallisation or precipitation of ingredients, colour changes, ...) occur during transport, storage or handling of the product. Indeed, exposure to changing temperatures, humidity, UV light, mechanical stress ... could reduce the intended quality of the product and the safety for the consumer.

Relevant stability tests, adapted to the type of cosmetic product and its intended use, should be carried out. To make sure that no stability problems are induced by the type of container and packaging used, physical stability tests are currently carried out with inert containers and those intended to be used on the market.

Relevant physical and chemical parameters should be controlled for each batch of the finished product coming on the market. General parameters could be:

- physical state,
- type of preparation (emulsion o/w or w/o, suspension, lotion, powder, aerosol, ...),
- organoleptic properties (colour, odour, whenever relevant),
- pH (at ..°C) for aqueous preparations,
- viscosity (at ..°C) for liquid forms,
- other according to specific needs.

The criteria and methods used, and the results obtained per batch should be specified.

### **6-3.4 Evaluation of the safety of the finished product**

The scientific reasoning by the safety assessor must be clearly described in the safety evaluation report of the finished product. This means that all toxicological data available on the individual ingredients and the end product (favourable and unfavourable), all chemical and/or biological interactions and human exposure via intended and likely routes must be taken into account. Whenever a NO(A)EL value is available for a specific ingredient, its Margin of Safety (MoS) should be calculated and taken into account.

The conclusions made by the safety assessor must be well-argued and the inclusion in the formulation of particular ingredients of special concern must receive special attention (e.g. perfume, UV filters, hair dyes, etc.). The safety assessor may accept, reject, or accept under specific conditions the formulation under consideration. Recommendations by the safety assessor, which are relevant for the safety-in-use of the product, must be followed up by the responsible manufacturer or EU importer.

The curriculum vitae of the safety assessor must be included in the dossier. The safety assessor may be employed by the manufacturer or may be an external consultant. No connection should exist with production or marketing. The safety assessor must provide evidence of having relevant experience in toxicology, as well as a controlled independence in matters of product related decision.

Finally, the safety of the product should be reviewed on a regular basis. To that end, undesirable effects on human health during in market use of the product should be filed (complaints during normal and improper use, and the follow-up done) and taken into account in the next safety assessment of the product.

As indicated before (see Fig.1 under section 3-2), the safety evaluation of finished cosmetic products is not the responsibility of the SCCP.

## 6-4 GUIDELINES ON MICROBIOLOGICAL QUALITY OF THE FINISHED COSMETIC PRODUCT

### 6-4.1 Preamble

Skin and mucous membranes are protected from microbial attack by a natural mechanical barrier and various defence mechanisms. However, these may be damaged and slight trauma may be caused by the action of some cosmetics that may enhance microbial infection. This may become of particular concern when cosmetics are used around the eyes, on mucous membranes in general, on damaged skin, on children under 3 years, on elderly people and persons showing compromised immune responses. Consequently, two separate categories of cosmetic products are defined in the microbiological quality control limits :

*Category 1* : Products specifically intended for children under 3 years, to be used in the eye area and on mucous membranes.

*Category 2* : Other products.

Microbial contaminants usually come from two different origins : during production and filling, and during the use of the cosmetic by the consumer. From the moment the cosmetic unit is opened until the last use of the product by the consumer(s), a permanent, variable and additive microbial contamination of the cosmetic is introduced, caused by the domestic environment and contact with the skin of the consumer(s) (hands and body).

Reasons for microbial preservation of cosmetics are :

- to ensure the microbial safety of cosmetics for the consumer,
- to maintain the quality and specifications intended of the product,
- to confirm hygienic and high-quality handling.

Although only a small number of cases of microbiological contamination of cosmetics, leading to microbial infections of the consumer, has been reported, microbial contamination of cosmetic products may spoil them or seriously reduce the intended quality.

In order to ensure the quality of the product and the safety for the consumer, it is necessary to carry out routine microbiological analysis of each batch of the finished product coming on the market. The parameters examined, the criteria and methods used, and the results obtained per batch should be specified in properly filed reports and be taken up in the TIF.

### 6-4.2 Quantitative and qualitative limits

[based on Colipa 1997, McEwen et al. 2001, US FDA 2001]

It is generally accepted that for cosmetics classified in *Category 1*, the total viable count for aerobic mesophyllic microorganisms should not exceed  $10^2$  cfu/g or  $10^2$  cfu/ml in 0.5 g or 0.5 ml of the product.

For cosmetics classified in *Category 2*, the total viable count for aerobic mesophyllic microorganisms should not exceed  $10^3$  cfu/g or  $10^3$  cfu/ml in 0.1 g or 0.1 ml of the product.

*Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Candida albicans* are considered the main potential pathogens in cosmetic products. These specific potential pathogens must not be detectable in 0.5 g or ml of a cosmetic product of *Category 1* and in 0.1 g or 0.1 ml of a cosmetic product of *Category 2*.

It is important to note that the microbial limits mentioned above must be obtained after complete processing of 0.5 g (or 0.5 ml) and 0.1 g (or 0.1 ml) in the case of *Category 1* and *Category 2*, respectively. This is done in order to ensure a statistically significant value of the microbial burden of a cosmetic in the case of positive results. However, smaller amounts of product may be processed in the routinely quality control process if negative results are obtained.

### **6.4-3 Challenge testing**

[based on US Pharmacopoeia 2002, European Pharmacopoeia 2001]

The efficacy of the preservation of a cosmetic product under development has to be assessed experimentally in order to ensure microbial stability and preservation during storage and use. This is done by challenge testing. The latter is mandatory for all cosmetic products that, under normal conditions of storage and use, may deteriorate or form a risk to infect the consumer.

A challenge test consists of an artificial contamination of the finished product, followed by a subsequent evaluation of the decrease in contamination to levels ensuring the microbial limits established for Categories 1 and 2. The microorganisms used in the challenge test may be issued from official collection strains from any state in the EU to ensure reproducibility of the test and are : *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Candida albicans*.

Nowadays, it is well known that the consistency of challenge tests relies more on the capability of the used microorganisms to contaminate a specific cosmetic product than on the taxonomic status of the microorganisms, their initial concentrations, or the conditions of incubation and media of recovery used. Microorganisms with the capability to contaminate specific cosmetics are the best candidates for use in a challenge test. Consequently, additional "in-house" bacteria and fungi may be used for additional specific purposes of challenge testing. The microcidal activity of preservatives or any other compound in the finished cosmetic must be ruled out in the challenge test by dilution, filtration, the addition of neutralisers or any other means.

The experimental performance of the microbial controls and the challenge tests must be carried out / supervised and validated by a microbiologist.

As mentioned before, the manufacturer must guarantee the efficacy of the preservation of his products experimentally by challenge testing. However, as no legal nor universal challenge test method is available today, it is up to the manufacturer to decide on the details of the test to be used.

### **6-4.4 Good Manufacturing Practice.**

[based on Van Der Maren 1995, Colipa 1994]

In order to comply with Good Manufacturing Practice and Microbial Quality Management, manufacturers of cosmetics have to define and follow specific cleaning, sanitation and control procedures to keep all apparatus and materials appropriately clean and free of pathologic microorganisms. Procedures also include microbiological control of raw materials, bulk and finished products, packaging material, personnel, equipment and preparation and storage rooms.

Compliance should be checked with the currently available CEN standards (available through <http://www.cenorm.be/cenorm/index.htm>) and/or ISO standards (available through <http://www.iso.org/iso/en/ISOOnline.frontpage>).

## 6-5 REFERENCES

**76/768/EEC** - Council Directive 76/768/EEC of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 262, 27/09/1976 p.169.*

**93/35/EEC** - Council Directive 93/35/EEC of 14 June 1993 amending for the sixth time Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 151, 23/06/1993 p.32.*

**2003/15/EC** - Directive 2003/15/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 February 2003 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L66, 11/03/2003 p.26.*

**Bremmer H.J.**, Prud'Homme de Lodder L.C.H., van Engelen J.G.M.  
Cosmetics Fact Sheet to assess the risks for the consumer, Updated version for ConsExpo4.  
RIVM Report 320104 001/2005 (2005).

**Colipa** (The European Cosmetic Toiletry and Perfumery Association)  
Cosmetic Good Manufacturing Practices, Guidelines for the Manufacturer of Cosmetic Products.  
Brussels, July 1994.

**Colipa** (The European Cosmetic Toiletry and Perfumery Association)  
Scientific Committee on Cosmetology. Notes of guidance for the testing of cosmetic ingredients for their safety evaluation, 47-48, Brussels (1997).

**CREMe** (Central Risk & Exposure Modelling e-solution)  
European Consumer Exposure to Cosmetic Products - Data Analysis  
Final Draft Report, 17<sup>th</sup> September 2005.

**European Pharmacopoeia**  
4th Edition, Supplement 4.2, Council of Europe, Strassbourg (2001).

**McEwen G.N.**, Curry A.S. and Graf J.G. (Editors)  
Technical Guidelines. Microbiological Guidelines.  
CTFA Cosmetic, Toiletries and Fragrance Association, Washington DC, November 2001.

**SCCNFP/0068/98, Final** : Guidelines on the use of human volunteers in compatibility testing of finished cosmetic products, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary session of 23 June 1999.*

**SCCNFP/0321/00, Final** : Notes of Guidance for Testing of Cosmetic Ingredients for Their Safety Evaluation, 4<sup>th</sup> revision, *adopted by the SCCNFP during the plenary meeting of 24 October 2000.*

**US EPA**  
Exposure Factors Handbook  
Doc. EPA/600/P-95/002Fa. Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. (1997).

**US FDA** (Food and Drug Administration)  
Bacteriological Analytical Manual, Chapter 23, August 2001.

**US Pharmacopoeia**  
25th Edition, Monograph 1111 (2002).

**Van Der Maren L.**  
Guidelines for good manufacturing practice of cosmetic products (GMPC).  
Council of Europe, Health protection of the consumer, ISBN : 92-871-2849-9 (1995).

## 7. LIST OF OFFICIAL TEXTS OF DIRECTIVE 76/768/EEC INCLUDING ALL TECHNICAL ADAPTATIONS AND AMENDMENTS

Existing EEC Directive	Reference number	Date of signature	EC Publication O.J.		Content (main items)
			Number	Date	
Basic Council Directive	76/768/EEC	27.07.1976	L 262	27.09.1976	Articles 1 to 15  Ann. I: illustrative list by category of cosmetic products. Ann. II: list of forbidden substances. Ann. III: list of restricted substances. Positive List (PL) for cosmetic colouring agents permitted for all uses. Ann. IV: list of restricted substances provisionally allowed. list of cosmetic colouring agents provisionally allowed. Ann. V: list of substances regulated at national level by EC Member States.
1 <sup>st</sup> amendment Council Directive	79/661/EEC	24.07.1979	L 192	31.07.1979	Ann. IV: provisional authorisations prolonged
1 <sup>st</sup> adapting Commission Directive	82/147/EEC	11.02.1982	L 63	06.03.1982	Ann. II: Ban AETT (362)
2 <sup>nd</sup> amendment Council Directive	82/368/EEC	17.05.1982	L 167	15.06.1982	Articles: - provisional authorizations Ann. IV prolonged - new procedure to adapt Annexes (Art. 8.2) - introduction procedure of Prior National Approval limited to 3 years (Art. 8.a) - unavoidable traces of banned materials permitted (Art. 4.2) Ann. III: new version Part 1 Ann. III + IV: new version of PL for cosmetic colouring agents Ann. VI: introduction of PL for preservatives
2 <sup>nd</sup> adapting Commission Directive	83/191/EEC	30.03.1983	L 109	26.04.1983	Ann. II, III, IV, V: - Ba/Sr/Zr lakes - Al/Zr complexes, silver nitrate
3 <sup>rd</sup> adapting Commission Directive	83/341/EEC	29.06.83	L 188	13.07.1983	Ann. II, III, V: hair dyes - ban OPD + salts; 2,4 DAT + salts; permanent listing PPD + salts
4 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	83/496/EEC	22.09.1983	L 275	08.10.1983	Ann. VI: addition 36, 45
3 <sup>rd</sup> amendment Council directive	83/574/EEC	26.10.1983	L 332	28.11.1983	Articles: new definition of the date of minimum durability, period reduced to 30 months Introduction Ann. VII: PL for UV filters
5 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	84/415/EEC	18.07.1984	L 228	25.08.1984	Ann. II: ban aristolochic acid Ann. III: hydrogen peroxide, hydroquinone, nicomethanol hydrofluoride, silver nitrate
6 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	85/391/EEC	16.07.1985	L 224	22.08.1985	Ann. II: ban specific hydroquinone ethers Ann. III: selenium disulfide; Al/Zr complexes Ann. VI: labelling formaldehyde
7 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	86/179/EEC	28.02.1986	L 138	24.05.1986	Ann. II: ban chloroform, TCDD, dimethoxane, sodium pyrithione Ann. III: DMET, 8-hydroxyquinoline Ann. III + IV: new version of PL for cosmetic colouring agents

Existing EEC Directive	Reference number	Date of signature	EC Publication O.J.		Content (main items)
			Number	Date	
8 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	86/199/EEC	26.03.1986	L 149	03.06.1986	Ann. IV: introduction of other uses 43 Ann. VI: new version of PL for preservatives
9 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	87/137/EEC	02.02.1987	L 56	26.02.1987	Ann. II: ban Captan (370), hexachlorophene (371), Minoxidil (372) Ann. III: Methanol, 77288 - 77289 Ann. VI: permanent: 40, deleted: 9, 12, 13
10 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	88/233/EEC	02.03.1988	L 105	26.04.1988	Ann. II: ban tribromsalan, retinoic acid, phytolacca, 2,4-DAA, 2,5-DAA, 12140, 26105, 42555 Ann. III: Part 1: etidronic acid, phenoxypropanol Ann. III: Part 2: delete 13065, add Acid Red 195 Ann. IV: Part 2: delete 12700, 44025, 73312 Ann. VI: permanent: 41, 42, 43 deleted: 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18, 22, 23, 24
4 <sup>th</sup> amendment Council Directive	88/667/EEC	21.12.1988	L 382	31.12.1988	Articles: - hair dyes excluded from cosmetic colouring agents list - labelling container + packaging - elimination 6 week deadline in Safeguard Clause (Art. 12) Ann. III: becomes only restrictive list Ann. IV: becomes only cosmetic colouring agents PL
11 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	89/174/EEC	21.02.1989	L 64	08.03.1989	Ann. II: ban Padimate A, benzoyl peroxide, 2A-4NP, 2A-5NP Ann. III: Part 2: add 8-OH-quinoline Ann. IV: Part 2: delete 15800, 19120, 20470, 21115, 42170, 45190, 47000, 73905, 75660 Ann. V: delete oestrogens Ann. VI: 39 reduce concentration, add 48 (prov.) Ann. VII: new version Part 2
5 <sup>th</sup> amendment Council Directive	89/679/EEC	21.12.1989	L 398	30.12.1989	Articles: CATP procedure prolonged indefinitely
12 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	90/121/EEC	20.02.1990	L 71	17.03.1990	Ann. II: ban steroid antiandrogens, zirconium compounds, thyrothricine, acetonitrile, tetrahydrozoline, 13065, 42535, 42640, 61554 Ann. III: lead acetate Ann. IV: delete 21110, 42045, 44045, add Solvent Yellow 98 (prov.) Ann. V: transfers to other Annexes
13 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	91/184/EEC	12.03.1991	L 91	12.04.1991	Ann. II: ban 8-OH-quinoline, pyrithione diS, lidocaine, 12075, 45170 Ann. III: add Mg fluoride Ann. IV: 15585 move to Part 2 Ann. V: transfers to other Annexes Ann. VI: add 27 (prov.) Ann. VII: add 7
14 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	92/8/EEC	18.02.1992	L 70	17.03.1992	Prolongation of all provisionally listed substances until 30.06.1992

Existing EEC Directive	Reference number	Date of signature	EC Publication O.J.		Content (main items)
			Number	Date	
15 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	92/86/EEC	21.10.1992	L 325	11.11.1992	Ann. II: ban 15585, Sr lactate, Sr nitrate, Sr polycarboxylate, Pramocaine, 4-ethoxy-MPD, 2,4-Diamino-phenylethanol, catechol, pyrogallol, nitrosamines, secondary dialkanolamines Ann. III: add Sr chloride, Sr acetate, talc, nitrosamines precursors, H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> add oral hygiene Ann. III Part 2 + Ann. IV Part 2: nothing listed anymore Ann. VI: 36 sunscreen use with limit, add 51, 29 (prov.) Ann. VII: delete 1, 4, 16
6 <sup>th</sup> amendment Council Directive	93/35/EEC	14.06.1993	L 151	23.06.1993	Articles: - definition modified, - overall safety clause modified, - ban animal testing foreseen, - inventory cosmetic ingredients, - off-pack labelling in some cases, - labelling of product function, - ingredient labelling, - claims concerning animal testing, - requirements to Poison Centres modified, - Product Information required, - notification manufacturing premises, - all Annexes via CATP procedure, - new Annex VIII
16 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	93/47/EEC	22.06.1993	L 203	13.08.1993	Ann. II: ban 4 A-2NP Ann. III: warning: gloves for hair dyes + H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> add (Part 2) Sr peroxide, phenolphthalein Ann. VII: move 33 to prov.
17 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	94/32/EC	29.06.1994	L 181	15.07.1994	Ann. II: ban 2-Methyl-MPD Ann. III: talc lab. baby prod. modified, add SrO <sub>2</sub> , Sr(OH) <sub>2</sub> , Ann. VI: add formic acid and its sodium salt, 21 reduction conc. + RO only, delete 26, 27, 28 Ann. VII: add 11 (prov.), delete 24
18 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	95/34/EC	10.07.1995	L 167	18.07.1995	Ann. II: ban furocoumarines, ban musk ambrette, ban benzethonium chloride, ban cells, tissues, products of human origin, ban phenolphthalein Ann. VII: Part 1: add octocrylene (10)
19 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	96/41/EC	25.06.1996	L 198	08.08.1996	Ann. II: ban urocanic acid (418) Ann. III: add Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub> and LiOH Ann. VI: Part 1: add 52 Ann. VII: Part 1: add 11
20 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	97/1/EC	10.01.1997	L 16	18.01.1997	Ann. II: ban bovine, ovine and caprine tissues and fluids from encephalon, spinal cord and eyes, and derivatives
Commission Directive postponing the ban on animal testing	97/18/EC	17.04.1997	L 114	01.05.1997	The ban on animal testing of cosmetic ingredients and their combinations is postponed until 30 June 2000
21 <sup>st</sup> adapting Commission Directive	97/45/EC	14.07.1997	L 196	24.07.1997	Ann. II: ban crude and refined coal tars Ann. VI: Part 1: add benzethonium chloride (53) Ann. VII: Part 1: add octyl methoxy-cinnamate (12)

Existing EEC Directive	Reference number	Date of signature	EC Publication O.J.		Content (main items)
			Number	Date	
22 <sup>nd</sup> adapting Commission Directive	98/16/EC	05.03.1998	L 77	14.03.1998	Ann. II: amendment of 419 to derogate tallow derivatives
23 <sup>rd</sup> adapting Commission Directive	98/62/EC	03.09.1998	L 253	15.09.1998	Ann. II: ban of muskene (421) and musk tibetene (422) Ann. VI: Part 1: add benzalkonium chloride (54) Ann. VII: Part 1: add 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
24 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	2000/6/EC	29.02.2000	L 56	01.03.2000	Ann. II: adaptation to entry 419 Ann. III: amendment of 1 and 14, add 65 Ann. VI: Part 1: add 55 and 56, Part 2: delete 21 and 29 Ann. VII: Part 1: add 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25, Part 2: delete 5, 17 and 29
25 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	2000/11/EC	10.03.2000	L 65	14.03.2000	Ann. II: delete 362, 365, 367, 372, 373, 374, 386, 390, 391, 392, 393 and 394, add 362, 365, 367, 372, 373, 374, 385, 386, 390, 391, 393 and 394
26 <sup>th</sup> adapting Commission Directive	2002/34/EC	15.04.2002	L 102	18.04.2002	Ann. II: amendment of 293, add 423 to 451 Ann. III: Part 1: amendment of 8, 15b, 15c and 16 add 66 Ann. III: add 1 to 62 Ann. VII: Part 1: add 26 and 27
adapting Commission Directive	2003/1/EC	06.01.2003	L 5	10.01.2003	Ann. II: amendment of 419
amendment Council Directive	2003/15/EC	27.02.2003	L 66	11.03.2003	Articles: - ban on animal testing with clear deadlines - ban on the use of CMR Cat. 1 and 2 [67/548/EC, Ann.I] ingredients - labelling issues, such as a new requirement for the indication of the date of durability, claims on animal testing, ... - inclusion in the product information of any animal testing performed Ann. III: Part 1: add reference nrs° 67 to 92 (fragrance allergens) Ann. VIIa: symbol representing an open cream jar
adapting Commission Directive	2003/16/EC	19.02.2003	L 46	20.02.2003	Ann. III: Part 2: postponement of the date for 61 and 62
adapting Commission Directive	2003/80/EC	05.09.2003	L 224	06.09.2003	Ann. VIIa: symbol representing an open cream jar
adapting Commission Directive	2003/83/EC	24.09.2003	L 238	25.09.2003	Ann. II: amendment of 178 and 411, delete 382 Ann. III: Part 1: amendment of 14, 60, 61 and 62 add 93,94 and 95 Ann. VI: Part 1: amendment of 36
adapting Commission Directive	2004/88/EC	07.09.2004	L 287	08.09.2004	Ann. III: Part 1: add 96 and 97 Ann. III: Part 2: delete 61 and 62
adapting Commission Directive	2004/94/EC	15.09.2004	L 294	17.09.2004	Insertion of Annex IX (empty)
adapting Commission Directive	2004/93/EC	21.09.2004	L 300	25.09.2004	Ann. II: amendment of 289, add 452 to 1132 Ann. III: Part 1: delete 55



Existing EEC Directive	Reference number	Date of signature	EC Publication O.J.		Content (main items)
			Number	Date	
corrigendum to adapting Commission Directive	2004/93/EC (corrigendum)		L 97	15.04.2005	Ann. II: amendment of 663, 1107, 1127, 1128, 1131 and 1132
adapting Commission Directive	2005/9/EC	28.01.2005	L 27	29.01.2005	Ann. VII: Part 1: add 28
adapting Commission Directive	2005/42/EC	20.06.2005	L 158	21.06.2005	Ann. II: add 1133 to 1136 Ann. IV: Part 1: delete CI 12150, CI 20170 and CI 27290 Ann. VI: Part 1: amendment of 53, add 57
adapting Commission Directive	2005/52/EC	09.09.2005	L 234	10.09.2005	Ann. III: Part 2: adjustment of the dates until which use is allowed
adapting Commission Directive	2005/80/EC	21.11.2005	L 303	22.11.2005	Ann. II: delete 615 and 616 amendment of 687 add 1137 to 1211 Ann. III: Part 1: delete 19, amendment of 1a and 8
Commission Recommendation	2006/406/EC	07.06.2006	L 158	10.06.2006	Establishment of Guidelines on the use of claims referring to the absence of tests on animals pursuant to Dir. 76/768/EEC
adapting Commission Directive	2006/65/EC	19.07.2006	L 198	20.07.2006	Ann. II: add 1212 to 1233 Ann. III: Part 2: - delete 17, 23, 40, 42 - adjustment of the dates until which use is allowed
adapting Commission Directive	2006/78/EC	29.09.2006	L 271	30.09.2006	Ann. II: amendment of 419

## REFERENCES

### The rules governing cosmetic products in the European Union.

2000 Edition by the European Commission, DG Enterprise, Pharmaceuticals and Cosmetics.

**2000/6/EC** - Twenty-fourth Commission Directive 2000/6/EC of 29 February 2000 adapting to technical progress Annexes II, III, VI and VII to Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 56, 01/03/2000 p.42.*

**2000/11/EC** - Twenty-fifth Commission Directive 2000/11/EC of 10 March 2000 adapting to technical progress Annex II to Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 65, 14/03/2000 p.22.*

**2002/34/EC** - Twenty-sixth **Commission Directive 2002/34/EC** of 15 April 2002 adapting to technical progress Annexes II, III and VII to Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 102, 18/04/2002 p.19.*

**2003/1/EC** - Commission Directive 2003/1/EC of 6 January 2003 adapting to technical progress Annex II to Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 5, 10/01/2003 p.14.*

**2003/15/EC** - Directive 2003/15/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 February 2003 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 66, 11/03/2003 p.26.*

**2003/16/EC** - Commission Directive 2003/16/EC of 19 February 2003 adapting to technical progress Annex III to Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 46, 20/02/2003 p.24.*

**2003/80/EC** - Commission Directive 2003/80/EC of 5 September 2003 establishing a symbol indicating the durability of cosmetic products in Annex VIIIa to Council Directive 76/768/EEC.  
*Official Journal L 224, 06/09/2003 p.27.*

**2003/83/EC** - Commission Directive 2003/83/EC of 24 September 2003 adapting to technical progress Annexes II, III and VI to Council Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.  
*Official Journal L 238, 25/09/2003 p.23.*

**2004/88/EC** - Commission Directive 2004/88/EC of 7 September 2004 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC concerning cosmetic products for the purpose of adapting Annex III thereto to technical progress  
*Official Journal L 287, 08/09/2004 p.5.*

**2004/93/EC** - Commission Directive 2004/93/EC of 21 September 2004 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC for the purpose of adapting its Annexes II and III to technical progress  
*Official Journal L 300, 25/09/2004 p.13.*

**2004/94/EC** - Commission Directive 2004/94/EC of 15 September 2004 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC as regards Annex IX  
*Official Journal L 294, 17/09/2004 p.28.*

**2005/9/EC** - Commission Directive 2005/9/EC of 28 January 2005 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purposes of adapting Annex VII thereto to technical progress  
*Official Journal L 27, 29/01/2005 p.46.*

**Corrigendum** to the Commission Directive 2004/94/EC of 21 September 2004 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC for the purpose of adapting its Annexes II and III to technical progress  
*Official Journal L 97, 15/04/2005 p.63.*

**2005/42/EC** - Commission Directive 2005/42/EC of 20 June 2005 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purposes of adapting Annexes II, IV and VI thereto to technical progress  
*Official Journal L 158, 21/06/2005 p.17.*

**2005/52/EC** - Commission Directive 2005/52/EC of 9 September 2005 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purposes of adapting Annex III thereto to technical progress  
*Official Journal L 234, 10/09/2005 p.9.*

**2005/80/EC** - Commission Directive 2005/80/EC of 21 November 2005 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purposes of adapting Annexes II and III thereto to technical progress  
*Official Journal L 303, 22/11/2005 p.32.*

**2006/406/EC** - Commission Recommendation of 7 June 2006 establishing guidelines on the use of claims referring to the absence of tests on animals pursuant to Council Directive 76/768/EEC  
*Official Journal L 158, 10/06/2006 p.18.*

**2006/65/EC** - Commission Directive 2006/65/EC of 19 July 2006 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purpose of adapting Annexes II and III thereto to technical progress  
*Official Journal L 198, 20/07/2006 p.11.*

**2006/78/EC** - Commission Directive 2006/78/EC of 29 September 2006 amending Council Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purpose of adapting Annex II thereto to technical progress  
*Official Journal L 271, 30/09/2006 p.56.*