

1 Introduction to Special Series on Endocrine Disruption: Chemical Testing, Risk Assessment

2 Approaches and Implications; Guest Editor: Katherine Coady

3

4 Endocrine Disruption Chemical Testing; Risk Assessment Approaches and Implications
5 Annegaaike Leopold^{#*} and Katherine Coady[†]

6

7 [#]Wildlife International, EAG Inc [currently Calidris Environment BV, Bergkampweg 1,

8 Warnsveld, 7231CL The Netherlands, telephone: +31653990764; e-mail:

9 annegaaike@gmail.com.] [†] The Dow Chemical Company, 1803 Building, Washington Street,

10 Midland, MI, USA, 48674; Telephone: 989-636-7423; Fax: 989-638-2425; e-mail:

11 kcoady@dow.com.

12

13 *Corresponding Author:

14 Annegaaike Leopold

15 Bergkampweg 1, Warnsveld, 7231 CL The Netherlands

16 Email address: annegaaike@gmail.com.

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 This special series of six papers (this introductory paper and 5 other papers) is about
19 the Focused Topic Meeting on Endocrine Disruption Chemical Testing; Risk Assessment
20 Approaches and Implications (4 – 6 February, 2014, Raleigh, North Carolina). The workshop
21 was composed of five sessions that each dealt with a specific topic. Broadly speaking the
22 following themes were addressed: a) the status of the USEPA Endocrine Disruptor Screening
23 Program, b) how data from how data from both EDSP-directed testing and other sources may
24 be interpreted and applied in regulatory settings and c) approaches for moving beyond
25 estrogen, androgen and thyroid pathways to address current challenges and expanding future
26 approaches to EDC testing. The series of publications summarizes the knowledge presented
27 and discussed at the Focused Topic Meeting and organizes the information by session. Where
28 relevant, the summaries are enhanced beyond the original ideas of the presentations during the
29 meeting. It is the intention of the Steering Committee that these publications will act not only
30 as a record of the proceedings of the meeting, but also as a valuable resource.

31

32 **Key words:** endocrine disruption, risk and hazard assessment, estrogen, androgen, thyroid,

33

34

35

36 **INTRODUCTION**

37
38 Concern both from the public and the scientific community regarding potential
39 endocrine disruption in humans and wildlife due to exposure to exogenous chemicals has led
40 to the implementation of endocrine testing programs for regulatory purposes in certain regions
41 of the world. The most developed approach to screening and testing to date has been
42 implemented by the USEPA in the form of the Endocrine Disruption Screening Program
43 (EDSP). In Europe chemical substances are also starting to be evaluated for potential
44 endocrine activity/disruption. This is leading to a debate about whether or not endocrine
45 disrupting chemicals (EDCs) can be safely assessed by taking the usual approach involving
46 identification of intrinsic hazards, prediction of exposure and consequent calculation of risk or
47 if hazard based assessments are more appropriate for EDCs. Substantial progress is also being
48 made at the crossroads of the academic and regulatory world in developing new and alternate
49 tests looking at a broader range of taxa, including invertebrate ED mechanistic assays (OECD,
50 2014). Many other potential types of vertebrate endocrine disrupting effects (*e.g.*
51 corticosteroid effects) are being investigated for which screening assays still need to be
52 developed and/or validated. Genomics and binding assays are in development, and the
53 sequence of biological events describing how chemical damages in and around cells leads to
54 adverse effects to various tissues, organs and individuals and subsequently populations is
55 being examined in the Adverse Outcome Pathway (AOP) approach (Ankley et al, 2010).
56 Against this background the SETAC North America Focused Topic Meeting (FTM) on
57 Endocrine Disruption: Chemical Testing and Risk Assessment Approaches and Implications
58 was held in Research Triangle Park, NC from 4 -6 February 2014. The meeting, which was
59 co-chaired by Annegaike Leopold (Wildlife International, EAG¹Calidris Environment BV)

¹ Currently at Calidris Environment BV.

60 and Holly Zahner (US Food and Drug Administration; FDA), was co-supported by more than
61 20 sponsors representing the private sector and government. More than 200 participants
62 attended, representing industry, government, and academia from 10 countries which
63 accounted for four of the five SETAC Geographic Units.

64

65 **MEETING OVERVIEW**

66 This meeting was a follow-up to a similar workshop held 24-25 October, 2012 in
67 Brussels. The focus of that meeting was on research and regulatory issues for endocrine-
68 disrupting chemicals (EDCs), with emphasis on the European perspective. The FTM provided
69 an opportunity to explore EDC issues from a North American perspective which differs
70 somewhat from other parts of the world. As such, an important emphasis of the meeting was
71 the status of the USEPA Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP).

72 Session one set the stage of the science and regulations around endocrine disrupting
73 chemicals and identified the challenges that lie ahead. The current debate on whether
74 suspected EDCs should be evaluated using a hazard-based or a risk-based approach was
75 presented. Subsequently an introduction was given to the USEPA EDSP. The legislative
76 mandate, risk-based nature, and multi-stake holder development process of the EDSP was
77 described. The EDSP is applied to a defined universe of chemical substances and focuses on
78 potential perturbations of the hypothalamic pituitary-gonadal and -thyroidal (HPG/T) axes.
79 The debate currently going on in the EU on how to identify EDCs in a regulatory context
80 using technical criteria was highlighted (European Commission, 2014), and the fact that it is a
81 highly political subject in Europe was explained. Finally an EU- industry perspective was
82 given on the repercussions of hazard versus risk-based approaches for EDCs. The regulatory
83 situation in the EU still is evolving and it is not possible to predict exactly how EDC's will

84 ultimately be addressed. It was emphasized that in the absence of a risk-based approach,
85 hazard-based criteria need to be clear, fact based and consistent.²

86 The USEPA's EDSP was discussed in detail in Sessions two and three of the FTM.
87 The EDSP is a two-tiered screening and testing program consisting of Tier 1 to determine
88 potential endocrine activity and Tier 2 to confirm interaction and provide dose/response
89 relationships of endocrine active chemicals via the hypothalamic-pituitary-gonadal axis and
90 the hypothalamus-pituitary-thyroidal axis. Session two of the meeting was entitled: "The
91 Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program: Where have we been: Data interpretation and
92 Lessons learnt from Tier 1". In this session, the background and implementation of Tier 1 of
93 the EDSP was discussed as well as the weight of evidence approach that is used in the
94 evaluation of data. Tier 1 of the EDSP consists of 11 *in vitro* and *in vivo* assays designed to
95 determine the presence of endocrine activity (*i.e.* interactions with the estrogen, androgen,
96 steroidogenesis, and thyroid pathways) in both humans and wildlife. Session three of the
97 Focused Topic Meeting was entitled: "The Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program: Where
98 are we now: Tier 2 testing". In this session, Tier 2 EDSP test designs and interpretations were
99 discussed. Tier 2 is composed of several long-term, and in most cases, multigenerational
100 study designs conducted with both mammalian and environmental species. The Tier 2 studies
101 are designed to involve more intensive testing of potentially active chemicals to determine if
102 activity at Tier 1 translates into adverse effects, and collect data (e.g., dose-response
103 relationships in full life-cycle tests) suitable for conducting formal risk assessments.

104 Session four of the meeting entitled: "Endocrine Disruption: Where are we with
105 hazard and risk assessment?", addressed how data from both EDSP-directed testing and other
106 sources may be interpreted and applied in regulatory settings and various chemical case

² Note from the Guest Editor: In the meantime the European Commission has, on the 15th of June, 2016, published two draft regulations setting out criteria to define endocrine disruption.

107 studies were presented. Processes for regulating EDCs are still under consideration or are still
108 in the early stages of implementation. Various viewpoints exist globally as to whether
109 chemicals with endocrine activity or meeting the definition of an ED should be managed via a
110 hazard or risk-based framework. An outcome of session four was the drafting of a SETAC
111 Outreach Statement that summarizes the overarching themes of a risk vs. hazard approach to
112 regulating EDCs. A further outcome of session 4 was a proposal to organize a SETAC
113 Pellston workshopTM that was to address the scientific questions surrounding the evaluation of
114 chemicals with suspected or known endocrine activity. This would be done through the
115 evaluation of some comprehensive case studies. The intention is for the workshop was to
116 develop a guidance document which can be used by chemical companies and regulators when
117 evaluating chemicals.³

118 In session five, entitled: “Where do we go from here: the future and challenges of
119 EDC testing”, approaches for moving beyond estrogen, androgen and thyroid pathways to
120 address current challenges and expanding future approaches to EDC testing was discussed.
121 This session focused on possibilities for expanding the working universe of endocrine assays
122 in regard to the biological target/endocrine pathway (OECD, 2014) as well as incorporating
123 new technologies and new assessment techniques.

124 Each of the five manuscripts in this special series is aimed at disseminating the
125 knowledge presented and discussed in each of the five sessions of the meeting, and where

³ Note from the Guest Editor: The SETAC Pellston WorkshopTM ‘Environmental Hazard and Risk Assessment Approaches for Endocrine-Active Substances (EHRA)’ was held from 31st January to 5th February 2016 in Pensacola, Florida, USA. The primary aim of the workshop was to provide objective advice, based on current scientific understanding, to regulators and policy makers, whether in industry, government or academia; the aim being to make considered, informed decisions on whether to select an ecotoxicological hazard- or a risk-based approach for regulating a given endocrine-disrupting substance (EDS) under review. The workshop additionally considered recent developments in the identification of EDS. Case studies were undertaken on six endocrine active substances (EAS – not necessarily proven EDS), that are representative of a range of perturbations of endocrine system and considered to be data-rich in relevant information at multiple biological levels of organisation for one or more ecologically-relevant taxa. The workshop was successful in developing consensus. Scientific papers are being prepared for publication.

126 relevant, enhanced beyond the original ideas of the presentations during the meeting. It is the
127 intention of the Steering Committee that these manuscripts will serve not only as a record of
128 the proceedings of the meeting, but also as a valuable resource.

129

130 REFERENCES

131 Ankley GT, Bennett RS, Erickson RJ, Hoff D J, Hornung MW, Johnson RD, Mount DR,
132 Nichols JW, Russon CL, Schmieder PK, Serrano JA, Tietge JE, Villeneuve DL. 2010.
133 Adverse outcome pathways: a conceptual framework to support ecotoxicology
134 research and risk assessment. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 29: 730-741.

135 European Commission. 2014. Defining criteria for identifying Endocrine Disruptors in the
136 context of the implementation of the Plant Protection Product Regulation and Biocidal
137 Products Regulation. [cited July 24, 2015] Available from: [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/planned_ia/docs/2014_env_009_endocrine_disruptors_en.pdf)
138 [regulation/impact/planned_ia/docs/2014_env_009_endocrine_disruptors_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/planned_ia/docs/2014_env_009_endocrine_disruptors_en.pdf)

139 [OECD] Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. 2014. Detailed Review
140 Paper on the State of the Science on Novel In Vitro and In Vivo Screening and Testing
141 Methods and Endpoints for Evaluating Endocrine Disruptors. OECD Series on Testing
142 and Assessment, No. 178, OECD Publishing, Paris. DOI:
143 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264221352-en>.

144 [USEPA] Unites States Environmental Protection Agency. 2015. Unites States Environmental
145 Protection Agency: Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program [cited July 24, 2015]
146 Available from: <http://www.epa.gov/endo/>.

147

148