

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910132706203321
Titolo	Chemical alternatives assessments // [edited by R.E. Hester and R.M. Harrison]
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Cambridge, : Royal Society of Chemistry, 2013
ISBN	1-84973-723-1
Edizione	[1st ed.]
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (323 p.)
Collana	ISSN Issues in environmental science and technology, , 1350-7583 ; ; 36
Altri autori (Persone)	HesterR. E (Ronald E.) HarrisonR. M
Disciplina	363.1763
Soggetti	Chemistry, Analytic - Industrial applications Chemicals - Physiological effect - Testing Hazardous substances - Risk assessment Substitute products
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Intro -- Contents -- Editors -- List of Contributors -- Chemicals Alternatives Assessment (CAA): Tools for Selecting Less Hazardous Chemicals -- 1.1 Introduction to Chemicals Alternatives Assessments -- 1.2 Common Traits Among CAA Paradigms -- 1.2.1 Step One: Hazard Assessment Through Literature Search and Data Identification -- 1.2.2 Step Two: Hazard Classification and Benchmarking of Relevant Data -- 1.2.3 Step Three: CAA Report Preparation -- 1.3 Life-cycle Assessment and Chemicals Alternatives Assessment -- 1.4 Chemical Alternatives Assessment Paradigms in Use: a Critical Evaluation -- 1.4.1 US EPA's Design for the Environment (DfE) -- 1.4.2 CPA's GreenScreen™ -- 1.4.3 Cradle to Cradle® (C2C) -- 1.4.4 TURI's Pollution Prevention Options Analysis System (P2OASys) -- 1.4.5 The Chemical Scoring and Ranking Assessment Model (SCRAM) -- 1.4.6 Chemicals Assessment and Ranking System (CARS) -- 1.4.7 SC Johnson &amp; Son's Greenlist™ -- 1.4.8 PRIO -- 1.4.9 The Quick Scan -- 1.4.10 The Column Model and GHS Column Model -- 1.4.11 Evaluation Matrix -- 1.5 Challenges Facing Chemicals Alternatives Assessment Methods -- 1.5.1 Chemicals Alternatives Assessments and Data Gaps

-- 1.6 Conclusion -- References -- European Initiatives for Selecting Sustainable Flame Retardants -- 2.1 Introduction - What are Flame Retardants? -- 2.1.1 Bromine and Chlorine -- 2.1.3 Nitrogen -- 2.1.4 Mineral Flame Retardants -- 2.1.5 Other Flame Retardants and Synergists: Borates, Zinc Compounds and Expandable Graphite -- 2.2 Environmental and Human Health Concerns About Halogenated Fire Retardants -- 2.3 European Activities Related to Non-halogenated Flame Retardants -- 2.3.1 Formation of the Phosphorus, Inorganic and Nitrogen Flame Retardants Association (pinfa) -- 2.3.2 Technology Drivers: Electronics Groups iNEMI and HDPUG -- 2.3.3 European Legislation: RoHS and REACH. 2.3.4 GreenScreen™ -- 2.3.5 ENFIRO -- 2.3.6 Ecolabels -- 2.4 Conclusion -- References -- MBDC Cradle to Cradle® Product Evaluation and Certification Program -- 3.1 Introduction -- 3.1.1 What is Cradle to Cradle® Design? -- 3.1.2 Long-term Goals - Short-term Actions and Transitions -- 3.1.3 The Cradle to Cradle Principles -- 3.1.4 Complementary Metabolisms -- 3.2 Product Certification Program Overview -- 3.2.1 Certification Levels -- 3.2.2 Program Categories -- 3.2.3 The Cradle to Cradle CertifiedCM Marks -- 3.3 Product Certification Overview -- 3.3.1 Scope -- 3.3.2 Continuous Improvement and Optimization -- 3.3.3 Material Health -- 3.3.4 Material Reutilization -- 3.3.5 Renewable Energy and Carbon Management -- 3.3.6 Water Stewardship -- 3.3.7 Social Fairness -- 3.3.8 Certification Program Summary -- Notes and References -- China's Implementation of Alternatives Assessment in the Building Industry: GIGA -- 4.1 Introduction -- 4.2 China Context -- 4.2.1 Health -- 4.2.2 Barriers to Health -- 4.3 Resurgence of Health -- 4.3.1 Trust as a Catalyst -- 4.3.2 Wealth as a Catalyst -- 4.3.3 Access to Information as a Catalyst -- 4.4 Social Media and the Rebuilding of Trust -- 4.4.1 Perfect Storm of Change -- 4.5 Minimization Versus Regeneration in China -- 4.5.1 Regenerative Chemistry -- 4.6 GIGA (Green Ideas, Green Actions) -- 4.6.1 GIGA: the User's Perspective -- 4.6.2 GIGA: Green Algorithm -- 4.6.3 GIGA: Unpacking Alternatives Assessment -- 4.7 Impact: Process -- 4.8 Alternatives Assessment at Scale -- 4.9 Conclusion -- References -- A Collaborative Industry and University Alternative Assessment of Plasticizers for Wire and Cable -- 5.1 Background -- 5.2 Project Workplan -- 5.3 Selection of a Chemical/Chemical Class of Concern and Application -- 5.4 Pilot Project Team Formation -- 5.5 Screening Against the Red List. 5.6 Using the Quick Chemical Assessment Tool (QCAT) to Screen Chemicals -- 5.7 Applying the GreenScreen™ -- 5.8 Conducting the Chemical Hazard Assessment Portion of the GC3 Project -- 5.8.1 Obtaining Data for GreenScreens™ -- 5.8.2 Reviewing Draft GreenScreens™ -- 5.9 Results -- 5.9.1 Results of the GreenScreen™ Assessments of Alternative Plasticizers -- 5.9.2 Technical and Cost Evaluation of Plasticizers -- 5.9.3 Lessons Learned in the Project -- 5.10 Conclusion -- Acknowledgements -- References -- Chemical Hazard Assessment and the GreenScreen™ for Safer Chemicals -- 6.1 Introduction -- 6.1.1 Origins of the GreenScreen™ for Safer Chemicals -- 6.2 How it Works -- 6.2.1 Assess and Classify Hazards -- 6.2.2 Apply the Benchmarks -- 6.2.3 Make Informed Decisions and Drive Innovation -- 6.3 Continual Improvement -- 6.3.1 Advances to the GreenScreen™ Method -- 6.3.2 Developing Infrastructure for the GreenScreen™ Program -- 6.4 Conclusion -- Acknowledgement -- References -- Hewlett-Packard's Use of the GreenScreen™ for Safer Chemicals -- 7.1 Introduction -- 7.2 Tools and Methods -- 7.2.1 Restricted Substance List (RSL) Screening -- 7.2.2 Risk Phrase or Hazard Statement Screening -- 7.2.3 Multi-criteria Decision Analyses

-- 7.2.4 Life-cycle Analysis (LCA) -- 7.2.5 Risk Assessment -- 7.2.6 Scoring Schemes, Including the GreenScreen for Safer Chemicals -- 7.3 Integrated Alternatives Assessment Protocol -- 7.3.1 Step 1 - Identify Substances of Concern -- 7.3.2 Step 2 - Characterize Function and End Uses of the Substance -- 7.3.3 Step 3 - Identify Potential Alternatives -- 7.3.4 Step 4 - Assess Chemical Hazards -- 7.3.5 Step 5 - Evaluate Technical and Economic Performance -- 7.3.6 Step 6 - Apply Life-cycle Thinking -- 7.3.7 Step 7 - Approve Alternatives -- 7.4 Opportunities for Improvement -- 7.4.1 Methods -- 7.4.2 Infrastructure. 7.4.3 Criteria for Preferred Material in Ecolabels -- 7.5 Conclusion -- References -- DSM's Sustainability Journey Towards a Proactive Ingredient Policy for Gaining Effectiveness in the Design of Better Products -- 8.1 General Introduction: Sustainability as Business Growth Driver Opportunity and Global Trends -- 8.1.1 Ecological Benefits: Transparent Assessment with Life-cycle Assessment (LCA) -- 8.1.2 Importance of Global Platforms and Partnerships -- 8.1.3 The Challenges Ahead for a Life Sciences and Materials Sciences Company -- 8.2 A Brighter Future with Composites -- 8.2.1 Leading-edge Performance -- 8.2.2 Lower Eco-footprint -- 8.2.3 Elimination of Substances of hazardous concern -- 8.2.4 BluCure™ Cobalt-free Curing Systems -- 8.2.5 Alternatives to Styrene Reactive Diluents -- 8.2.6 Introduction of Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) -- 8.3 Facing the Technical, Performance and Cost Challenges: the Introduction of Halogen-free Flame Retardants -- 8.3.1 Overcoming Technical Challenges -- 8.3.2 Moving Forward -- 8.4 Conclusion -- References -- US Environmental Protection Agency's Design for the Environment (DfE) Alternatives Assessment Program -- 9.1 Introduction -- 9.2 Selecting an Approach for Chemical Substitution -- 9.3 PentaBDE Case Study -- 9.3.1 How DfE Conducted CAA for PentaBDE -- 9.3.2 Limitations of Original Methodology and Criteria -- 9.4 New CAA Methodology and Criteria: Steps to Conducting a CAA -- 9.4.1 Step 1: Determine Feasibility -- 9.4.2 Step 2: Collect Information on Chemical Alternatives -- 9.4.3 Step 3: Convene Stakeholders -- 9.4.4 Step 4: Identify Alternatives -- 9.4.5 Step 5: Conduct the Hazard Assessment -- 9.4.6 Step 6: Apply Economic and Life-cycle Context -- 9.4.7 Step 7: Apply the Results in Decision-making for Safer Chemical Substitutes -- 9.5 Application of New CAA Criteria. 9.5.1 BPA Alternatives in Thermal Paper Partnership -- 9.5.2 Flame Retardant Alternatives to DecaBDE Partnership -- 9.6 Safer Product Labeling Program Case Study -- 9.6.1 Functional Use Concept Advances Greener Chemistry -- 9.6.2 Ingredient-class Criteria Define 'Safer' Chemicals -- 9.6.3 Partnership Process Fosters Teamwork in Safer Formulation -- 9.6.4 Development of Safer Alternatives -- 9.7 What's Next -- 9.7.1 The Community of Practice is Growing -- 9.7.2 Promoting Harmony in CAAs -- References -- NGO Initiatives in the EU - Identifying Substances of Very High Concern (SVHCs) and Driving Safer Chemical Substitutes in Response to REACH -- 10.1 ChemSec Background -- 10.2 Overview of NGO Initiatives - Putting REACH into Practice and Working with Companies -- 10.2.1 The SIN List -- 10.2.2 Substitution Support Portal - SUBSPORT -- 10.2.3 Transparency -- 10.2.4 Business Initiatives -- 10.2.5 NGO-Business Cooperation - Electronics -- 10.2.6 Engaging Financial Investors -- 10.3 The SIN List in Focus -- 10.3.1 REACH and Substances of Very High Concern -- 10.3.2 General Principles Used for the Compilation of the SIN List -- 10.3.3 How the SIN List Has Been Used and Received -- 10.3.4 Detailed Methodology -- 10.3.5 The First Assessment Process (SIN List 1.0) -- 10.3.6 The Second Assessment Process (SIN List 2.0) -- 10.4 Finding Safer Alternatives Through SUBSPORT -- 10.4.1 Background -- 10.4.2

The Web Portal -- 10.4.3 The Substitution Case Story Database -- 10.5  
Conclusion -- References -- Alternatives Assessment in Regulatory  
Policy: History and Future Directions -- 11.1 Introduction -- 11.2  
Rationale for Informed Substitution -- 11.3 Evolution of Alternatives  
Assessment Elements in Government Chemicals Reduction Policies --  
11.3.1 Chemical Restriction and Phase-out Policy Development --  
11.3.2 Alternatives Assessment Policy Development.  
11.3.3 Convergence of Chemical Restriction and Alternatives  
Assessment Policies.

---

Sommario/riassunto

Chemicals are an essential part of everyday life and all too-often taken for granted, yet often portrayed negatively in the media. Concern over the deleterious effects of chemicals to the environment and human health have prompted governments in the developed world to establish screening programmes such as REACH and HPV Challenge to identify chemicals presenting the greatest degree of risk to health and the environment. While such programmes identify chemicals with the greatest risk, there is no ranking system for alternative chemicals, which while being potentially less harmful, still carry

---